OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES.

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

SECOND SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

55-56 VICTORIÆ, 1892.

VOL. XXXIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM TH[illegible] TWENTY-FIFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE NINTH DA[illegible] O[illegible] MAY, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1892

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

HON. JOHN JOSEPH CALDWELL ABBOTT, D.C.L., Q.C.

[Created a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George, 24th May, 1892]

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1892

President of the Council (Premier)	Hon. JOHN JOSEPH CALDWELL ABBOTT, D.C.L., Q.C.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL.
Postmaster General	Hon. Sir ADOLPHE P. CARON, K.C.M.G., Q.C.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. JOHN CARLING.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN.
Without Portfolio	Hon. FRANK SMITH.
Minister of Customs	Hon. JOSEPH ADOLPHE CHAPLEAU, LL.D., Q.C.
Minister of Justice	Sir JOHN SPARROW DAVID THOMPSON, K.C.M.G., Q.C
Minister of Finance	Hon. GEORGE EULAS FOSTER.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER, LL.B., Q.C.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. JOHN GRAHAM HAGGART.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. EDGAR DEWDNEY.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUIMET, LL.B., Q.C.
Secretary of State	Hon. JAMES COLEBROOKE PATTERSON.

Clerk of the Privy Council	JOHN JOSEPH McGEE, Esq.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Hon. PETER WHITE	*Speaker.*
JOSEPH G. H. BERGERON, M.P.	*Deputy Speaker.*
JOHN G. BOURINOT, Esq.	Clerk of the House.
FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULEAU, Esq.	Clerk Assistant.
Lieut.-Col. HENRY ROBERT SMITH	Serjeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS:

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

* Died 4th April, 1892.

† Alphonse Desjardins, appointed 22nd April, 1892.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA

1892.

ADDINGTON—George W. W. Dawson.
ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.
ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.
ALGOMA—George Hugh Macdonell.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Hon. Sir John Thompson, K.C.M.G.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, East—Hon. Edgar Dewdney.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.

BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Guillaume Amyot.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—William Le Boutillier Fauvel.
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Eugene A. Dyer.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—James Rowand.

CAPE BRETON—Hector F. McDougall. / David McKeen.
CARDWELL—Robert Smeaton White.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Newton Ramsay Colter.*
CARLETON (O.)—William T. Hodgins.
CARIBOO—Frank S. Barnard.
CHAMBLY—Raymond Préfontaine.
CHAMPLAIN—Onésime Carignan.
CHARLEVOIX—Henry Simard.
CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Pollock Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Paul Vilmond Savard.
COLCHESTER—William A. Patterson.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Darby Bergin.
CUMBERLAND—Arthur R. Dickey.

DIGBY—Edward Charles Bowers.
DORCHESTER—Cyrille Emile Vailliancourt.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Hugo H. Ross.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Thomas Dixon Craig.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Robert Beith.

ELGIN, E. Riding—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—William McGregor.
ESSEX, S. Riding—Henry W. Allan.

FRONTENAC—Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick. † / Hiram A. Calvin.

GASPÉ—Louis Zéphirin Joncas.
GLENGARRY—Roderick R. McLennan.
GLOUCESTER—Kennedy F. Burns.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.

HALDIMAND—Walter Humphries Montague.
HALIFAX—Thomas E. Kenny. / John Fitz-William Stairs.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON—Alexander McKay. / Samuel S. Ryckman.
HANTS—Alfred Putman.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
HOCHELAGA—Alphonse Desjardins.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.

* Unseated; re-elected; took seat 21st April, 1892.
† Appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. Mr. Calvin elected; took seat 15th June, 1892.

HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. RIDING—John McMillan.
HURON, W. Riding—Hon. James Colebrooke Patterson.

IBERVILLE—François Béchard.
INVERNESS—Hugh Cameron.

JACQUES CARTIER—Désiré Girouard.
JOLIETTE—Urbain Lippé.

KAMOURASKA—Henry George Carroll.
KENT (N.B.)—Edward H. Léger.
KENT (O.)—Archibald Campbell.
KING'S (N.B.)—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
KING'S (N.S.)—Frederick W. Borden.
KING'S (P. E. I.)—Augustine Colin Macdonald. / John McLean.
KINGSTON—James Henry Metcalfe.

LAMBTON, E. Riding—George Moncrieff.
Lambton, W. Riding—James Frederick Lister.
LANARK, N. Riding—Bennett Rosamond.
LANARK, S. Riding—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE—Louis Conrad Pelletier.
L'ASSOMPTION—Joseph Gauthier. * / Hormidas Jeannotte.
LAVAL—Hon. Joseph Aldric Ouimet.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Charles Frederick Ferguson.
LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.
LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Pierre Malcolm Guay.
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—William Gibson.
LISGAR—Arthur Wellington Ross.
L'ISLET—Louis George Desjardins.
LONDON—Hon. John Carling.
LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MARQUETTE—Robert Watson.
MASKINONGÉ—Joseph Hormisdas Legris.
MEGANTIC—Louis J. Côté, *alias* Fréchette.
MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—Joseph Henry Marshall.
MIDDLESEX, N. Riding - William H. Hutchins.
MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—James Armstrong.
MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—William Frederick Roome.
MISSISQUOI—George Barnard Baker.
MONCK—Arthur Boyle.
MONTCALM—Louis E. Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Philippe A. Choquette.
MONTMORENCY—Arthur J. Turcotte.
MONTREAL, Centre—John Joseph Curran.
MONTREAL, East—Alphonse Télesphore Lépine.
MONTREAL, West—Sir Donald Smith, K.C.M.G.
MUSKOKA—William Edward O'Brien.

NAPIERVILLE—Dominique Monet.
NEW WESTMINSTER—Gordon E. Corbould.
NICOLET—Joseph Hector Leduc.
NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. Riding—David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—Michael Adams.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—George Guillet.

ONTARIO, N. Riding—Frank Madill.
ONTARIO, S. Riding—William Smith.
ONTARIO, W. Riding—James David Edgar.
OTTAWA, City—Charles Herbert Mackintosh. / Honoré Robillard.
OTTAWA, County—Charles Ramsay Devlin.
OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. Riding—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, K.C.M.G.

PEEL—Joseph Featherston.
PERTH, N. Riding—James Nicol Grieve.
PERTH, S. Riding—William Pridham.
PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Burnham.
PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—James Stevenson.
PICTOU—Hon. Charles Hibbert Tupper. / John McDougald.
PONTIAC—Thomas Murray. † / John Bryson.
PORTNEUF—Arthur Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Isidore Proulx.
PRINCE (P.E.I.)—Stanislaus F. Perry. / John Yeo.
PRINCE EDWARD—Archibald Campbell Miller.
PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.

QUEBEC, Centre—François Langelier.
QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.
QUEBEC, West—John Hearn.
QUEBEC, County—Jules J. T. Frémont.
QUEEN'S (N.B.)—George Frederick Baird.
QUEEN'S (N.S.)—Francis Gordon Forbes.
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)—Louis Henry Davies. / William Welsh.

RENFREW, N. Riding—Hon. Peter White.
RENFREW, S. Riding—John Ferguson.
RESTIGOUCHE—John McAlister.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Joseph A. Gillies.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Clarence C. Cleveland.
RIMOUSKI—Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron, K.C.M.G.
ROUVILLE—Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—William Cameron Edwards.

ST. HYACINTHE—Michel E. Bernier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City—Ezekiel McLeod.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City and Co.—J. Douglas Hazen. / Charles N. Skinner.
ST. JOHN'S (Q.)—François Bourassa.
ST. MAURICE—François Sévère L. Desaulniers.
SASKATCHEWAN—Day Hart Macdowall.
SELKIRK—Thomas Mayne Daly.
SHEFFORD—John Robbins Sanborn.
SHELBURNE—Nathaniel W. White.

* Unseated. Mr. Jeannotte elected; took seat 15th June, 1892.
† Mr. Murray unseated. Mr. Bryson elected; took seat 7th July, 1892.

SHERBROOKE—William Bullock Ives.
SIMCOE, E. Riding—William H. Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. Riding—Dalton McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. Riding—Richard Tyrwhitt.
SOULANGES—James William Bain.
STANSTEAD—Timothy Byron Rider.
SUNBURY—Robert Duncan Wilmot.

TEMISCOUATA—Paul Etienne Grandbois.
TERREBONNE—Hon. Joseph Adolphe Chapleau.
THREE RIVERS—Hon. Sir Hector Langevin, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO, Centre—George Ralph R. Cockburn.
TORONTO, East—Emerson Coatsworth, jun.
TORONTO, West—Frederick Charles Denison, C.M.G.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Girouard.

VANCOUVER ISLAND—David William Gordon.
VAUDREUIL—Hugh McMillan.
VERCHÈRES—Hon. Félix Geoffrion.
VICTORIA (B.C.)—Edward Gawler Prior. Thomas Earle.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—John Archibald McDonald.
VICTORIA, (O.), N. Riding—Samuel Hughes.
VICTORIA (O.), S. Riding—Charles Fairbairn.

WATERLOO, N. Riding—Isaac Erb Bowman.
WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Livingston.
WELLAND—William M. German. * James A. Lowell.
WELLINGTON, C. Riding—Andrew Semple.
WELLINGTON, N. Riding—James McMullen.
WELLINGTON, S. Riding—James Innes.
WENTWORTH, N. Riding—Thomas Bain.
WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Franklin M. Carpenter.
WESTMORELAND—Josiah Wood.
WINNIPEG—Hugh John Macdonald.

YALE—John Andrew Mara.
YAMASKA—Roch Moïse Samuel Mignault.
YARMOUTH—Thomas Barnard Flint.
YORK (N.B.)—Thomas Temple.
YORK (O.) E. Riding—Hon. Alex. Mackenzie. † William Findlay Maclean.
YORK (O.) N. Riding—William Mulock.
YORK (O.) W. Riding—N. Clarke Wallace.

* Unseated. Mr. Lowell elected; took seat 17th May, 1892.
† Died. Mr. Maclean elected; took seat 20th May, 1892.

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

BÉCHARD, Mr. François *(Iberville)*.
BEAUSOLEIL, Mr. Cléophas *(Berthier)*.
CAMERON, Mr. Hugh *(Inverness)*.
CHARLTON, Mr. John *(North Norfolk)*.
DAVIN, Mr. N. F. *(West Assiniboia)*.
DESJARDINS, Mr. Alphonse *(Hochelaga)*.
INNES, Mr. James *(South Wellington)*.
LARIVIÈRE, Mr. Alphonse A. C. *(Provencher)*.
PRIOR, Mr. Edward Gawler *(Victoria, B.C.)*
SCRIVER, Mr. Julius *(Huntingdon)*.
SKINNER, Charles N. *(St. John City and County)*.
SOMERVILLE, Mr. James *(West Bruce)*.
TAYLOR, Mr. George *(South Leeds)*.
WELDON, Mr. R. Chapman *(Albert)*.
WHITE, Mr. Robert Smeaton *(Cardwell)*.

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

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Mr. MILLS's (Bothwell) proposed resolution (Commercial Treaties) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 7th April :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. CORBY.	Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.
Mr. DICKEY.	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).	Mr. FLINT.
Mr. AMYOT.	Mr. FRÉMONT.
Mr. TURCOTTE.	Mr. FAUVEL.

On Mr. LAURIER's proposed resolution (Diplomatic Papers) in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, 28th April :—

Mr. BAKER.	Mr. FREMONT.
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. DYER.	Mr. RIDER.
Mr. FERGUSON.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. HEARN.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. GUAY.

On Mr. EDGAR's proposed resolution (Charges against Sir Adolphe Caron) to refer to Committee on Privileges and Elections, 4th May :—

Mr. TEMPLE.	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).	Mr. WALSH.
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. DELISLE.
Mr. ROSAMOND.	Mr. BOWMAN.

On Mr. LISTER's proposed resolution (Charges against Judge Elliott *re* London Election) to refer Hobbs's and others Petition to a Special Committee, 9th May :—

Mr. POPE.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. McMULLEN.
Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. ARMSTRONG.
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. CARPENTER.	Mr. BAIN.
Mr. NORTHRUP.	Mr. INNES.
Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. BOWMAN.
Mr. HEARN.	Mr. FRÉMONT.

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. LÉPINE.	Mr. DELISLE.
Mr. MACDOWALL.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. ADAMS.	Mr. COLTER.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. PUTNAM.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. GRANDBOIS.	Mr. BOURASSA.

On Mr. McCARTHY's motion for second reading of Bill 27 (N.W.T. Act Amendment) 11th May :—

Mr. SPROULE.	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. POPE.
Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds).	Mr. CLEVELAND.
Mr. WOOD (Brockville).	Mr. GRANDBOIS.
Mr. SUTHERLAND.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. BOYLE.	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. KIRKPATRICK.	Mr. BAKER.

On Mr. LAURIER's amendment (Charges against Sir Adolphe Caron by Mr. Edgar) to refer to Special Committee, to Sir John Thompson's proposed resolution approving appointment of Judges, 27th May :—

Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. ROSS (Lisgar).	Mr. WATSON.
Mr. DUGAS.	Mr. BRUNEAU.
Mr. McKAY.	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. HEARN.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. STAIRS.	Mr. McGREGOR.
Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. GIBSON.
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. GRANDBOIS.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. BERGERON.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. GILLIES.	Mr. MULOCK.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. COATSWORTH.	Mr. ALLAN.

On Mr. LAURIER'S amendment (referring B. to a Conference) to Sir John Thompson's motion for second reading of Bill 76 (Representation in the House of Commons) 2nd June :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. PRIOR.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. FOSTER.	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. BOWELL.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. MONTAGUE.	Mr. MULOCK.
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. McDONALD (Victoria).	Mr. FAUVEL.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. CRAIG.	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. BURNS.	Mr. GIBSON.
Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. LANDERKIN.
Mr. PELLETIER.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. DELISLE.

On Mr. MCCARTHY'S amendment to Sir John Thompson's motion for second reading of Bill 76 (Representation in the House of Commons) 9th June :—

Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. McMILLAN (Vaudreuil).	Mr. BRODEUR.
Mr. GIROUARD (Two Mountains).	Mr. FRÉMONT.
Mr. McDOUGALL(C.B.)	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. COCHRANE.	Mr. BOWMAN.
Mr. GORDON.	Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. CRAIG.	Mr. VAILLANCOURT.
Mr. LÉPINE.	Mr. DELISLE.
Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet).	Mr. MONET.
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. ARMSTRONG.

On Mr. SOMERVILLE'S amendment to Sir John Thompson's motion for second reading of Bill 76 (Representation in the House of Commons) 14th June :—

Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. TYRWHITT.	Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. DEVLIN.
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. McDOUGALL(C.B.)	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. LÉPINE.	Mr. DELISLE.
Mr. BURNHAM.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. WHITE (Shelburne).	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. GIROUARD (Two Mountains).	Mr. FRÉMONT.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. SCRIVER.

On Sir JOHN THOMPSON'S motion (second reading of Bill 76 (Representation in the House of Commons) 14th June :—

Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. TYRWHITT.	Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. DEVLIN.
Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier).	Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. McDOUGALL(C.B.)	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. LÉPINE.	Mr. DELISLE.
Mr. BURNHAM.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. WHITE (Shelburne).	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. GIROUARD (Two Mountains).	Mr. FREMONT.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. SCRIVER.

On Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT'S amendment (Redistribution of Ontario) to Sir John Thompson's motion for third reading of Bill 76 (Representation in the House of Commons) 28th June :—

Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg).	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. DEVLIN.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. HAZEN.	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. McGREGOR.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. BRUNEAU.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. BRODEUR.
Mr. HEARN.	Mr. FRÉMONT.

On Mr. YEO'S amendment (Redistribution of Prince Edward Island) 28th June :—

Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg).	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. DEVLIN.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. HAZEN.	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. McGREGOR.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. BRUNEAU.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. BRODEUR.
Mr. HEARN.	Mr. FRÉMONT.

On Mr. BÉCHARD's amendment (Missisquoi and Iberville Counties) 28th June :—

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg).	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. CLEVELAND.	Mr. CARROLL.
Mr. CAMERON.	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. HAZEN.	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. McGREGOR.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. BRUNEAU.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. BRODEUR.
Mr. HEARN.	Mr. FRÉMONT.

On Mr. LAURIER's amendment (Concurrence in resolution *re* salary of Chief Clerk, Department of Interior) 2nd July :—

Mr. FRÉCHETTE.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Sir J. THOMPSON.	Mr. FORBES.
Mr. CORBOULD.	Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. SUTHERLAND.
Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg).	Mr. CHOQUETTE.

On Mr. ARMSTRONG's amendment (refer back to Committee) to Sir John Thompson's motion for third reading of Bill 67 (Voters' Lists, 1891) 4th July :—

Mr. CORBOULD.	Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)
Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg).	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. FRECHETTE.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. OUIMET.	Mr. RINFRET.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. FLINT.

On Mr. LAURIER's amendment to Mr. Foster's motion for third reading of Bill 99 (St. John Harbour Commission) 6th July :—

Mr. CORBOULD.	Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)
Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg).	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. McDOUGALL(C.B.)	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. PERRY.
Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.)	Mr. YEO.
Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. MULOCK.

On Mr. EDGAR's amendment (postponing concurrence in subsidy to Temiscouata Railway Company) 6th July :—

Mr. CORBOULD.	Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)
Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg).	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. McDOUGALL(C.B.)	Mr. FRASER.
Mr. RYCKMAN.	Mr. PERRY.
Mr. McLEAN (P.E.I.)	Mr. YEO.
Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. MULOCK.

House of Commons Debates.

SECOND SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 25th February, 1892.

THE PARLIAMENT, which had been prorogued from time to time was now commanded to assemble on the 25th day of February, 1892, for the despatch of business.

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

PRAYERS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

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

SOUTH PERTH,	CUMBERLAND,
HALTON,	PEEL,
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA,	WEST HURON,
MONTMORENCY,	EAST SIMCOE,
VICTORIA, N.S.,	MONCK,
KING'S, N.S.,	VAUDREUIL,
EAST BRUCE,	HALIFAX,
QUEEN'S, N.S.,	EAST ELGIN,
NORTH VICTORIA, ONT.,	SOUTH ONTARIO,
DIGBY,	PRINCE EDWARD,
RICHMOND, N.S.,	LENNOX,
BROME,	EAST MIDDLESEX,
GLENGARRY,	LONDON,
SOUTH VICTORIA, ONT.,	MONTCALM.
SOULANGES,	

All of which elections were declared void.

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

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House that he had received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, certified copies of the Judgments of the said Court in the following appeals:—

For the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Northumberland, Ont., and for the Electoral District of Prescott.

He had accordingly issued his warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to made out new Writs of Election for the said Electoral Districts.

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

Muskoka and Parry Sound;
Three Rivers;
Champlain;
Nicolet;
Témiscouata;
Kent, Ont.;
The North Riding of the County of York, Ont.;
The North Riding of the County of Wentworth;
The North Riding of the County of Bruce;
The North Riding of the County of Norfolk;
The South Riding of the County of Norfolk;
L'Islet;
The South Riding of the County of Oxford;
Lévis;
Missisquoi;
Richelieu;
Guysborough;
Quebec Centre;
Napierville;
The East Riding of the County of Peterborough;
Rimouski;
The West Riding of the County of Middlesex;
The North Riding of the County of Middlesex;
Bothwell;
Haldimand;
The North Riding of the County of Wellington;
The Centre Riding of the County of Wellington;
The South Riding of the County of Essex;
Addington;
Algoma;
The North Riding of the County of Waterloo;
Queen's County, P.E.I.;
The East Riding of the County of York, Ont.;
The East Riding of the County of Hastings; and
Prince County, P.E.I.

In all of which the petitions were dismissed or the sitting members declared duly elected.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received notifications of the following vacancies in the representation:—

Of JOSEPH JAMIESON, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Lanark, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit: the office of Junior Judge of the County of Wellington;

Of the Right Hon. Sir JOHN MACDONALD, Member for the Electoral District of Kingston, by decease;

Of the Hon. Sir HECTOR L. LANGEVIN, Member for the Electoral District of Richelieu, by resignation;

Of the Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUIMET, Member for the Electoral District of Laval, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown;

Of JEAN BAPTISTE DAOUST, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Two Mountains, by decease; and

Of SAMUEL BARTON BURDETT, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Hastings, by decease.

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

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of BENNETT ROSAMOND, Esq., for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Lanark;

Of ARTHUR AIMÉ BRUNEAU, Esq., for the Electoral District of Richelieu;

Of RODERICK R. MCLENNAN, Esq., for the Electoral District of Glengarry;

Of the Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUIMET, for the Electoral District of Laval;

Of JOSEPH A. GILLIES, Esq., for the Electoral District of Richmond, N.S.;

Of DAVID HENDERSON, Esq., for the Electoral District of Halton;

Of JOHN ARCHIBALD MCDONALD, Esq., for the Electoral District of Victoria, N.S.;

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

Of WILLIAM GIBSON, Esq., for the Electoral District of Lincoln and Niagara;

Of JAMES HENRY METCALFE, Esq., for the Electoral District of Kingston;

Of JAMES WILLIAM BAIN, Esq., for the Electoral District of Soulanges;

Of URIAH WILSON, Esq., for the Electoral District of Lennox;

Of ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL MILLER, Esq., for the Electoral District of Prince Edward;

Of CHARLES FAIRBAIRN, Esq., for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Victoria, Ont.;

Of HENRY CARGILL, Esq., for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Bruce;

Of JOSEPH FEATHERSTON, Esq., for the Electoral District of Peel;

Of SAMUEL HUGHES, Esq., for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Victoria, Ont.;

Of JOSEPH HENRY MARSHALL, Esq., for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Middlesex;

Of WILLIAM BARTON NORTHRUP, Esq., for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Hastings.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUIMET, Member for the Electoral District of Laval, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Bowell.

CHAS. FAIRBAIRN, Esq., Member for the South Riding of Victoria, Ont., introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Haggart.

DAVID HENDERSON, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Halton, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Bowell.

SAMUEL HUGHES, Esq., Member for the North Riding of Victoria, Ont., introduced by Mr. Haggart and Mr. Wallace.

JAMES HENRY METCALFE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Kingston, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Kirkpatrick.

ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL MILLER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Prince Edward, introduced by Mr. Bowell and Mr. Corby.

JAMES WILLIAM BAIN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Soulanges, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Ouimet.

URIAH WILSON, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Lennox, introduced by Mr. Bowell and Mr. Taylor.

BENNETT ROSAMOND, Esq., Member for the North Riding of Lanark, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Haggart.

WILLIAM GIBSON, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Lincoln and Niagara, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Edgar.

JOSEPH A. GILLIES, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Richmond, N.S., introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Tupper.

Mr. SPEAKER.

JOSEPH FEATHERSTON, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Peel, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Bain (Wentworth).

ARTHUR AIMÉ BRUNEAU, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Richelieu, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Edgar.

WILLIAM BARTON NORTHRUP, Esq., Member for the East Riding of Hastings, introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Corby.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir John Thompson.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER laid on the Table a copy of the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament in the Senate Chamber this day, which is as follows:—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It affords me much gratification to meet you at the commencement of the Parliamentary Session, and to be able to congratulate you upon the general prosperity of the Dominion, and upon the abundant harvest with which Providence has blessed all parts of the country.

The lamented and untimely death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale has aroused a feeling of profound sorrow. The sympathy with Her Majesty and their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, in their bereavement, which has prevailed in the Dominion on this melancholy occasion, has found expression in respectful messages of condolence from my Ministers, from the Provincial Governments, and from many other representative bodies.

The negotiations with respect to seal fishing in Behring Sea have been continued, with a view to the adjustment, by arbitration, of the difficulties which have arisen between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States on that subject. Commissioners have been appointed by both Governments to investigate the circumstances of seal life in Behring Sea; to report thereon; and to suggest the measures, if any, which they may deem necessary for its proper protection and preservation. The Commissioners are proceeding with their deliberations in Washington, and the results will shortly be communicated to Her Majesty's Government. I trust that their investigations, and the determination of the Arbitrators who are to be appointed, may lead to a just and equitable settlement of this long pending difficulty.

The meeting which had been arranged with the United States Government for a day in October last, for an informal discussion on the extension of trade between the two countries, and on other international matters requiring adjustment, was postponed at their request. But, in compliance with a more recent intimation from that Government, three of my Ministers proceeded to Washington, and conferred with representatives of the Administration of the United States on those subjects. An amicable understanding was arrived at respecting the steps to be taken for the establishment of the boundary of Alaska; and for reciprocity of services in cases of wreck and salvage. Arrangements were also reached for the appointment of an International Commission to report on the regulations which may be adopted by the United States and Canada for the prevention of destructive methods of fishing and the pollution of streams, and for establishing uniformity of close seasons, and other

means for the preservation and increase of fish. A valuable and friendly interchange of views respecting other important matters also took place.

In accordance with the promise given at the close of the last Session, a Commission has been issued to investigate the working of the Civil Service Act, and other matters connected with the Civil Service generally. The report of this Commission will be laid before you during the present Session.

The conclusions of the Commission on the manufacture of beet-root sugar will also be laid before you.

It is desirable that the fishery regulations in British Columbia should be examined and revised so as to adapt them better to the requirements of the fisheries in that Province. A Commission has been issued with that object.

An important measure respecting the Criminal Law, which was laid before you last Session, has been revised and improved, as a result of the expression of views elicited by its presentation to Parliament, and will be submitted to you. Your attention will also be directed to measures for the redistribution of seats consequent upon the Census returns; the establishment of the boundaries of the Territories; and the amalgamation of the Departments of Marine and Fisheries. Bills will also be presented to you for the amendment of the Civil Service Act, the Acts relating to real property in the Territories, and of those respecting the fisheries.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the past year will be laid before you, as well as the Estimates for the ensuing year. These Estimates have been prepared with a due regard to economy and the requirements of the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I commend these important subjects, and all matters affecting the public interests which may be brought before you, to your best consideration, and I feel assured that you will address yourselves to them with earnestness and assiduity.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 26th February, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate and report relating to the election for the Electoral District of Charlevoix by which the said petition was dismissed.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of FRANCIS GORDON FORBES, Esq., for the Electoral District of Queen's, N.S.

Of ANDREW B. INGRAM, Esq., for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Elgin.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

ARTHUR DICKEY, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Cumberland; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Tupper.

RODERICK R. MCLENNAN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Glengarry; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Haggart.

JOHN ARCHIBALD MCDONALD, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Victoria, N.S.; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Tupper.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the leader of the Opposition is not able to be in his place this afternoon, and on account of that circumstance I would ask you, Sir, not to proceed with the Orders of the Day. I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 29th February, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of THOMAS E. KENNY, Esq., for the Electoral District of Halifax;

Of JOHN FITZ-WILLIAM STAIRS, Esq., for the Electoral District of Halifax;

Of FREDERICK W. BORDEN, Esq., for the Electoral District of King's, N.S.; and

Of EDWARD CHARLES BOWERS, Esq., for the Electoral District of Digby.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume that it will be in accordance with the wish of the House that the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne should be considered before any other business is taken up. I, therefore, move :

That the introduction of Bills, Questions by Members and Notices of Motion be postponed until after the consideration of the Order of the Day.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the questions to be put to-day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would have no objection to that, but I suppose that at the close of the debate, which is not likely to last long, the questions might be put and answered.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

Motion agreed to.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

EDWARD CHARLES BOWERS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Digby ; introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fraser.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. NORTHRUP. In rising to move that a humble Address be presented to His Excellency, in reply to the Speech delivered from the Throne last Thursday, I confidently trust that the same kind indulgence and generous forbearance by this House which in times past has always been extended to those upon whom has devolved the like duty, will not be withheld from me to-day. Did I consult my own feelings, I would much prefer that upon some abler, more experienced and better qualified member of the House than I to discharge it, had fallen the duty which I now undertake, but, recognizing that the honour which is thus conferred is not upon me, but upon the worthy constituency which I have the honour to represent, knowing that I am expected not to express my own opinion, but to voice the sentiments to which the East Riding of Hastings gave utterance in such thundering tones a week ago last Saturday, I rise with pleasure and with pride, though at the same time with diffidence, to move the adoption of this Address. His Excellency has seen fit at the opening of his Speech to congratulate us upon the general prosperity of the Dominion and upon the abundant harvest with which Providence has blessed all parts of the country, and, inasmuch as in these matters a just comprehension of positive truth can only be attained by a fair comparison between the present and the past, I think it will not be out of place for me to ask members of the House to indulge in a retrospect and to compare the condition of the land and the state of the people, the existing circumstances and the national prospects to-day and 25 years ago. Indeed this is an exceptionally favourable time for us to make that comparison, as we have now completed our first national epoch and are proceeding with the second epoch of our country, and are daily making its history, whether to the shame or the glory of the country time will unerringly tell. Although the first epoch is closed, and the volume of its history is written, it is not a sealed book, but its pages lie open from which all may learn, as so many Canadians have already learned, lessons from which to draw courage, inspiration, and bright hopes—lessons of predictions verified, of promises fulfilled, of obstacles surmounted, of success attained, of prosperity realized. We are now at the beginning of the second epoch of our history. For the first time in the history of our country the present Parliament has assembled without the assistance and encouragement of the counsels and advice of the venerable Nestor who has been called away from us and who has been so happily entitled the Father of Confederation. For twenty-five years the policy of the country has been mainly fashioned and framed and its destiny guided and controlled by the masterly hand of the late lamented Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. Although for twenty-five years his policy has been attacked, his measures criticized, his motives questioned, and his reputation assailed, still, now that the great leader has been carried to his last resting-place, now that the last political battle has been fought, the last shot fired, and the smoke cleared away from the field of action, now that the last blow has been struck, I believe the people of this country, seeing with vision unclouded and eye undimmed, Reformers and Conservatives alike, agree that whatever his reputation, that is, the man as he has been described or supposed or imagined by those about him, his character, the man as he was, not as he was thought, as he was known to his Maker, not as he was judged by his fellows, was pure and unsullied, and that during his whole political life, from the beginning all along the lines down to its brilliant close, he was ever true to those principles which were at once the basis and the apex of his political faith, love for Canada, faith in Canadians, and loyalty to the Crown. But, although we have finished, as I have said, the first epoch of our history, there are lessons to be drawn from it, there are comparisons which it is necessary for us to make at the present time in order to understand the position of this country at this time when it commences its second epoch. Twenty-five years ago, this country consisted of a few scattered provinces, with no community of interest, with very little interprovincial communication or interprovincial trade. Each province regulated its own tariff and was working out its own destiny along its own lines, within its own limits, and regardless of the interests or fortunes of the other provinces. At that time there were many clouds looming up on the political horizon. What is the case at present? We have now a great Dominion stretching from ocean to ocean, reaching from the storm-beaten shores of Labrador to the sunny slopes of the Pacific, and we have all these different territories brought into one and united by a great work, a marvel of engineering skill, the envy of the world and the pride of Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is the result of the policy of this Government. Twenty-five years ago the provinces by the sea had so little interest in the western provinces, and we in them, that, when our friends from the east came to Ontario and Quebec, which were then the western provinces, they were practically unknown to us, while we visiting their provinces were viewed almost as curiosities, but now we are able to agree that at all events we will join with our Reform friends in unrestricted reciprocity in

the men from different parts of the country as well as in the trade which has been developed between the different provinces, and we are proud to meet our friends from the east as we know they are always happy to meet us from the west. The only regret or jealousy we have is that we have not the honour of adding their names to the brilliant roll of those honoured names of whom the great Province of Ontario boasts. If the leader of the Opposition in the late election had visited, as was promised, the east riding of the County of Hastings, although he would have found the overwhelming majority of the people of that riding opposed to his policy and regretting that his great abilities, his persuasive eloquence and his magnetic personality were not employed in the interests of what we consider the true National Policy, still we would have extended to him a greeting worthy of the distinguished leader of a great political party—a welcome fitting to be extended to and received by so illustrious a representative of one great branch of our national tree. Thus we find, that during the past twenty-five years, cloud after cloud has rolled away. But at the beginning of this epoch there was another cloud to which I will refer, and many men believed it was one of the factors that would tend to the dismemberment of this country. Many members of this House will remember the racial and religious cries that were then raised, and we were told by those who should not have spoken thus, that the racial difficulties which existed in this Dominion would prove an insuperable bar to the progress and harmony of the country. Those who thus spoke must have read but little history, or read it to little effect. If they had looked at the history of the mother land, they could have drawn lessons from it which would have been irrefutable answers to the arguments that were advanced. We know that in the mother land there are three countries under one flag and these three, England, Ireland and Scotland, united together, form the great and glorious Empire of Great Britain and Ireland, which all the world knows, all the world honours and all the world fears. Not to occupy the time of this House in recapitulating the history of these various countries, let me take one glance at the history of England. We find there, that causes and circumstances arose somewhat similar to those which existed in Canada ; and we find, that as like causes will, under similar circumstances, produce like results, so the results which followed in the mother land we may fairly expect to follow in Canada. Sir, what is the lesson we can learn in this respect from the history of the mother land? We all know that in England we do not find one aboriginal race, descended from one primitive stock, untainted by intermixture with any other race; but we know that England has been successively overrun by various peoples. We know that when the Romans visited the shores of England nearly two thousand years ago they found two races there, a light-haired light-complexioned people, and a dark-haired and dark-complexioned people. We know that the Roman people settled in the country and mingled their blood with that of the native inhabitants. We know that after the Roman invasion, successive irruptions of Danes, Norwegians, Saxons and Jutes overran the country, each tribe pouring in its own blood and intermingling with the native races. We know, too, that 800 years ago an invasion took place from the north of France under William, whose followers overthrew the Saxon people and mingled their blood with that of the inhabitants of England. Consequently we find that the people of England to-day possess the strength, the force, and the vigour of all these peoples who made these various irruptions into that country, and mingled the best and bravest elements of their characters with the stream of England's blood. We find that as England owes her maritime supremacy to-day to the blood poured into her veins by the old sea vikings centuries ago, so here in Canada like causes will produce like results, and we shall find in our own country that the very factor which it was supposed would make for its dismemberment will be one of the strongest guarantees of her prosperity and progress. We have here in Canada, not one original stock sprung from one race, but we have the refinement, the strength and vigour of the foremost races of the old world. We find in each race there are certain characteristics, certain features, which make it superior to all others in those respects, so that the dispassionate observer, whatever conclusion he may come to as to the comparative excellence of the various races, must admit that in many respects each has some peculiar excellence which the others do not possess. We have the loyal, brave and true Englishman, we have the long-headed, canny and shrewd Scotchman, we have the light-hearted, big-hearted, brave and eloquent Irishman, we have the steady, industrious, learned and law-abiding German, we have the gay, vivacious, religious and chivalrous Frenchman, all pouring their blood in one common stream to fill the veins and throb in the pulse of the people of Canada. So, Sir, we find that the very element which it was predicted would be a factor of dismemberment, and which seemed to many people a portentious cloud looming up on the horizon, which sooner or later would overwhelm this country, has become the strongest guarantee of our progress, permanence and stability. I think we must all agree that the second epoch of our national history begins with a brighter sky and under more favourable auspices than did the first epoch twenty-five years ago. But, Sir, while it is pleasant to dwell on the prosperity of Canada, we are reminded that not only in this country but on the other side of the water, both peoples have received a solemn warning, another melancholy intimation, of the uncertainty of life and the mortality of man. That grim spectre, Death, that summons every man sooner or later, and whose summons, when received, all must obey, that knocks impartially at the castles of the rich and the cottages of the poor, has entered the home of the Royal family of England, the most exalted in the mother land, and has summoned thence the worthy son of an honoured sire, the grandson in the direct line of succession, of our Gracious Sovereign.

"There is a reaper whose name is Death,
And with his sickle keen
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath
And the flowers that grow between."

It is but a short time since the glad news was brought to this country that a marriage was arranged between our future Sovereign and a fair English Princess, and we all remember the pleasure which the news brought to the heart of every British subject. We remember, too, that that

pleasure was heightened by the fact that those political exigencies and state considerations which sometimes compel exalted personages to give their hands without their heart, in this case happily coincided with the love and affections of the two young hearts, and that this was to be a union of both hands and hearts. But the joy we felt in this country was too soon turned to sadness, for the news all too soon was flashed across the water, that the worthy young Prince was stretched on a bed of sickness. We remember, too, how we waited anxiously from day to day for further news, hoping against hope, dreading the possibility of a loss which too soon occurred. In a short time afterwards the news was flashed across the Atlantic that the Duke of Clarence and Avondale was no more. Sir, I am sure that this House, and the people of this country, who mourned with those thus called to mourn, will readily endorse the steps that have been taken to convey to the bereaved relatives the sympathy of this House and of the people of Canada. I am sure, too, there was no heart in Canada, young or old, rich or poor, high or low, that did not send out its sympathy and tender its condolence not only to the bereaved family but to the unfortunate Princess, whose cup of happiness was so suddenly dashed from her lips, and who was so soon precipitated from the heights of bliss to the depths of woe. We are also informed that negotiations have been carried on with respect to the seal fishing in the Behring Sea, and that they are being continued with a view to the adjustment of the various difficulties that have arisen between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States. The difficulties, as this House is aware, continued for several years, and although I believe the members of this House and the people of this country feel, and the people of the Republic south of us feel, that the day has gone by for the two great English-speaking peoples of the world to go so far, and to so forget what is due to themselves and civilization, as to plunge into war, still, from time to time, clouds did appear on the horizon, and it was not at times impossible that the outcome of the difficulties might lead to war. But we are pleased to see that these difficulties are in a fair way of adjustment. Commissioners have been appointed to look into the matter, commissioners not only representing this country and the United States, but France and Norway, I believe, and other countries interested in the matter. I believe this House has confidence that the outcome of these negotiations will be such as to remove for ever any danger of conflict between the two countries. The people of the lower provinces and eastern Canada generally, have but little idea of the value and importance of the seal fisheries to our kinsmen in the west; but, Sir, I find from statistics of the year 1891, that from fifty to sixty vessels were fitted out, carrying on an average from twenty to twenty-five men, and sailed from the ports of British Columbia in order to engage in the seal fisheries. I think it may be proper to refer here to the time when the action taken by the American Government caused a feeling of indignation to run through this country at the idea that our fishermen were being interfered with in what were considered to be the proper exercise of their rights, and then was given an unmistakable proof of the new national feeling which is spreading throughout the length and breadth of the country, for we felt that it was not British Columbia that had been injured, but all the people of Canada, from whatever province they came, or to whatever party they belonged, felt an injury had been done to Canadians. His Excellency has also informed the House respecting a commission of three Ministers who met at Washington to discuss with the authorities of the American Government certain questions in an informal way. On referring to the questions mentioned in the Address we find there are several. The first, I observe, is as to the establishment of the boundaries of Alaska. Probably at the present time it may seem a matter of little importance that the boundaries of Alaska should be ascertained and settled. Such was the idea in regard to the settlement of the boundaries of Maine. Now we know how much more care would be exercised were the question again to arise. I am sure the House would feel that the Government have taken time by the forelock in endeavouring to procure a settlement of the boundaries between Alaska and British Columbia, before international complications of a serious character might arise. There is in British Columbia a country rich in mineral wealth, and every day the question is deferred the greater is the danger; and I am sure the House will rejoice that at last means have been taken between the Government of this country and the Government of the United States amicably to settle this question. Another question that has agitated the minds of the people of the maritime portions of Ontario, as well as the people of other parts of the province, is the question of reciprocity in wrecking and salvage. We all know that the existing state of the law has for years been a burden to the vessel owners and a disgrace to the nineteenth century. It appears almost incredible that a vessel should be wrecked, and although men were prepared and were willing and ready to save the cargo, the property should be allowed to be lost before the very eyes of those people simply on account of the present state of international law, which prevented them interfering, because they did not happen to belong to the right nationality. The question has been referred to a commission and it is expected that a satisfactory arrangement will soon be entered into, the American Government having at last conceded the point contended for by our Government, and at the same time the question of towing and customs should be settled as well. Arrangements, we are informed, have been entered into for the appointment of an international commission to report on various questions as to the fisheries. Questions have arisen between the two countries owing to waters lying between them. For years our close season in Canadian waters has been rigidly observed. The Government has done all in its power to preserve the fish for the fishermen; but to a great extent their efforts have been neutralized by the fact that certain waters and rivers lie partially in the United States and partially in the Dominion, and our regulations have no effect over the American fishermen. So it occurred that while on the one side our fishermen were hampered by these regulations, suitable and proper enough for the preservation of the fish, their effect was absolutely destroyed because the Americans fished almost without restriction. Within certain quarters, for example, on St. John River, there are strict regulations with respect to the pollution of the streams by the saw-mills; but no such regulations prevail on the other side of the line. In regard to the

Lake of the Woods a question has arisen of interest to both countries. About the shores of the lake in both countries there have been a number of Indians living, about one thousand in this country, and three thousand in the United States. Our Government recognized the necessity of supporting and endeavouring to promote the interests of the Indians. But unfortunately the buffalo having disappeared, their means of subsistence has rapidly disappeared and the preservation of the fish is, therefore, an important question in the interests of the Indian population. Now, however, the American Government have agreed with our Government to assist them in regulating the fishing and preserving the fish in the whole lake. No effective measure could be carried out by this Government alone, and this House will rejoice not only that the question of the pollution of the streams, but also this question in regard to the preservation of the fishing in the Lake of the Woods, in which our Indian population are directly interested, have been amicably settled with the Government of the United States, in a manner which will prove in the interest of both parties. No doubt the leader of the Opposition, in referring to this clause with which I have been dealing, will point out that it is quite as remarkable for what it omits as for what it contains. No doubt he will call attention to the fact that it contains no reference to the proceedings in view of freer trade relations with which the visit of the Ministers to Washington has been commonly connected. But, I am sure, the members of the House feel confident that when in due time the Ministers engaged in that duty bring their report before the House, it will be found that the Ministers on going to Washington have carried out faithfully the pledges made to the country, that they have honestly and seriously striven to secure freer trade relations with the United States; and I have no doubt it will be found that in all their negotiations, in all their deliberations, in all overtures made, and in all the discussions and proceedings of the conference, our Ministers have invariably kept a keen eye on the honour of Canada, and I am sure it will be found, and the House will rejoice when such appears, that whatever overtures were made, Her Majesty's Ministers in Canada never forgot that this country is a British colony possessing a loyal people, and that all negotiations must be based on this principle, that we will never discriminate against British goods. In offering these remarks I speak not with the authority of one of Her Majesty's Ministers, but as a humble member of the House and a member of the Conservative party, who has that confidence in the Ministry of the day as to believe that the policy just mentioned will be the policy carried out by them. It would be out of place at the present time, and I have neither time nor inclination, to enter into a discussion of the question of reciprocity or unrestricted reciprocity. I would, however, beg to remind some of our friends in this House, of this fact, apart altogether from the merits of the question, from the consideration whether the Reform or Conservative policy in this matter is right, that there is not only among the people of the country but among members of this House a misunderstanding of the position of the Conservative party with respect to this question. I speak thus because in recent elections I have known hon. members making representations as to the position of the Conservative party which—for I cannot believe that the position was intentionally wrongly stated—indicated that there must be misunderstanding as to our position; and if members, who have listened to all the debates, still fail to grasp the position of the Conservative party on this question it is not remarkable that throughout the length and breadth of the country there are people who fall into the same error. As I have said, without going into the question of the merits one way or the other, I should like to remind our friends of the Opposition that we of the Conservative party are as anxious for reciprocity with the United States as they are, that we have proved again and again our desire to obtain freer trade relations, and we have shown practically time and time again our intention to secure freer trade relations if possible. But I wish also to remind the Opposition of the fact, which they seem to forget, that while the Conservative party are desirous of securing freer trade relations with the United States, we fully and clearly understand the difference between reciprocity and unrestricted reciprocity. I would like to remind them that while they point with pride to the fact that in former days there was a reciprocity treaty and that this country was prosperous under reciprocity, we, the Conservative party, agree that there was a reciprocity treaty and prosperity did reign in that time; but we are not ignorant of this further fact, that there were other causes existing at that time, which do not exist now, which may fully account for the prosperity. For, without professing to enumerate all the causes of difference between that day and this, surely no one can have watched the building of railways and failed to understand the effect on the position of the people of the building of the Grand Trunk Railway, which was commenced at about that time. Reciprocity was secured in 1854, and I can well understand how all the people, Conservatives and Reformers, agreed that reciprocity was necessary, because the United States was the natural market, and in fact apart from the home market was the only market, because there were not then means of communication with the sea-board and between Great Britain and this country to enable our people to send their products to another land even if they had so desired. During that time also other railways were built, the Great Western and the Northern. Again, the Crimean war broke out, during which thousands of men were called to arms by the great nations of the world, and they had to be fed, and inasmuch as the North-West was unopened, and the western States had not sprung into existence, and Egypt and the Argentine republic as grain producers were unknown, we found a steady demand for all we could produce. Thus the Crimean war was a cause which existed then and does not exist now. We know, too, that very shortly after that war terminated the great rebellion in the adjoining republic commenced, a rebellion during which hundreds of thousands of the citizens were taken from their homes, taken from their families, taken from the fields they had been tilling, and had to be supported by their respective Governments. It is true that, while through that civil war the demand for agriculture products increased, the supplies fell off. These were exceptional occurrences which would not arise if we had unrestricted reciprocity to-morrow; but, Sir, it

may not be out of place to remind this House that even during the years of plenty, when we enjoyed not only reciprocal trade but the exceptional advantages to which I have just alluded; even during these years of plenty came the horribly lean year of 1857. There are probably some gentlemen present in this House who will remember the distress which prevailed during that year. I hope I will not be understood as imputing for one moment to the reciprocity treaty of that day the evils and misfortunes of the year 1857. I refer to that sadly memorable year in order to show that a reciprocity treaty is not a sovereign remedy against all the depression which may prevail in the country, and I merely wish to point out even among years of plenty under a reciprocity treaty, we had a year of terrible distress. Now, Sir, without referring longer to this question of unrestricted reciprocity, I pass on and call the attention of the House to the notice taken by His Excellency of the appointment of a commission in order to investigate the working of the Civil Service Act. That is a matter upon which I am sure the members of this House, Opposition as well as Government supporters, will unite in praise of the policy of the Government. It must surely be a matter of congratulation to all the people of this country, apart from their political convictions, that at a time when weaknesses were discovered in the Civil Service the Government saw fit to appoint a commission such as that referred to by His Excellency, composed of able men, to investigate the evils existing in the Civil Service, and to point out a remedy. I am sure that not only in this House, but throughout the length and breadth of this land, when the *personnel* of that commission is known, composed as it is, of men whose names are household words throughout the Dominion, I am sure that the names of the gentlemen composing that commission are at once a guarantee of the sincerity of the Government in appointing the commission, and of the completeness and accuracy of the manner in which the work of that commission will be performed. In due time the report of that commission will, I have no doubt, be laid before the House, and then all the members, Conservatives and Reformers alike, can agree in doing all that the commission proposes, or that their individual experience may suggest, to perfect the working of our Civil Service, in order if possible to avoid any friction or difficulties and any such unpleasantnesses as have occurred in the past. His Excellency also calls to the attention of the House "that the fishery regulations of British Columbia should be examined and revised so as to adapt them better to the requirements of the fisheries of that province," and he points out that a commission has been appointed with that object in view. It may be necessary only to remind the House that the fish in that part of the country are of a different character altogether from those in our eastern waters; and owing to the peculiar habits of the fish in that country it has been found, by experience, that the practical working of these laws which are suitable and proper in the east are unsuitable and unsatisfactory in the Pacific province. The fish of British Columbia are, I believe, not a sporting fish. They are a fish that flock in great numbers up the mouths of the rivers, and they differ in many respects from the fish in the eastern provinces. Therefore, the Government, profiting by the experience of the past, have decided to issue a commission to draw up regulations which will apply as well to the fish of the east as to the fish of the west. No doubt this commission will report during the present Session of Parliament. The attention of the House will also be directed to "measures for the redistribution of seats consequent upon the census returns, the establishment of the boundaries of the territories, and the amalgamation of the departments of Marine and Fisheries." It is necessary under our law that since the census was taken last year, there should be a redistribution of seats. I am sure that the members of this House will uphold the Government in an honest attempt to so carry out the law of this country as to apply the altered conditions which have arisen under the census requirements, to the law of the land, so as to obtain as honest and reasonable a system of representation as can be devised by honest men. The establishment of the boundaries of the territories is a matter, which, like the establishment of the boundary of Alaska, is properly taken up by the Government at the present time. The territories referred to are those beyond the North-West Territories, the boundaries of which latter are already provided for by law. The amalgamation of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is another change which is the result of experience. Formerly the departments were one and the same, but some years ago it was decided, while retaining one Minister in charge of the whole, to appoint two deputy heads. As a matter of practical experience it has been found that the working out of this system of having a double-headed deputy was not satisfactory, and the Government, willing, as they always are, to adapt our laws to the requirements of this country, are ready to profit by experience, and to give to the people of this country the benefit of the special knowledge they obtain. They now come candidly forward and propose to return to the old system, simply because by experience it has been found more satisfactory than the new one. His Excellency also states, "that a Bill will also be presented for the amendment of the Act relating to real property in the territories." The House, no doubt, is aware that in the territories the Torrens system has already been introduced, and however difficult it might be to introduce that system into an old settled country such as the Province of Ontario, I am sure that all will agree that it is desirable that in a new country, everything possible should be done to facilitate an inexpensive and easy transfer of real estate. In our own Province of Ontario, it has been found in the interests of the community, that the transfer of real estate should be as nearly as possible approximated to that of the transfer of personal property, and from year to year laws are framed in that province with a view to obtaining this desirable end. I believe that the members of this House will approve of the action of the Government in taking steps in the early history of these territories to see that the laws regulating real estate are settled on a satisfactory basis. Now, Sir, I am sure that the members of this House, on whichever side they may sit, will agree that there is a variety of topics suggested by the Speech from the Throne, sufficient to occupy this House in legislation during a session of ordinary length. I am sure that the members of this House, and especially those, who, during last summer, sweltered

through the hot months in the committee rooms and in this chamber, will welcome any steps to render as brief as possible the session on which we are now entering. I believe, Sir, that every member of this House has come here actuated by no other view than that of legislating in the interests of Canada, however we may differ politically, and whatever divergence there may be in our views as to the methods of obtaining that great end. I would be sorry to think that there is one member in the House who has come here for any other purpose than to legislate, in order to develop the resources, to promote the industries, and to do everything in his power to further the interests of our beloved country. I believe that the members of this House, actuated by that principle, will also keep in mind the fact that Canada, while blessed in many ways, while one of the fairest of lands, while kind Providence seems to have exhausted her horn of plenty in pouring blessings upon our land, still, I hope, the members will remember that with all these blessings, we have one defect in our country. We simply as Canadians have no historic past, we have no national history to which to point our young men; a history which is necessary for the fostering of that national spirit which is so indispensable for the growth of a young country. Although we have every blessing save this of a national history, yet through our providential connection with the mother land, which can boast of a history, the most glorious amongst the nations of the earth, we become possessed of a historic past. I hope the members of this House, in legislating during the present Session, will remember that we have the great and glorious history of the mother country to look back to, and that every name in the roll of English worthies, whether heroes by land or sea, whether they are names honoured in science or literature or art, are ours as well as our fellow subjects in the mother land; that every mercantile expedition, maritime venture or missionary enterprise in which Great Britain has engaged in, is ours as well as theirs, that by every ray of glory which has glistened in the folds of the Union Jack we are as much entitled to be lighted and warmed as they, and I hope the members of this House, so remembering while sitting here to legislate in the interests of Canada, will so frame their legislation, that all their acts may also be framed with a single eye to the promotion of the interests of Canada along the line, which is at once the surest, most honourable and most permanent, that is, along the line of British connection. I have much pleasure in moving the following resolution:—

That a humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech at the opening of the present Session, and further to assure His Excellency—

1. That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's expression of gratification at meeting us again at the commencement of the Parliamentary Session, and rejoice that His Excellency is able to congratulate us upon the general prosperity of the Dominion, and upon the abundant harvest with which Providence has blessed all parts of the country.

2. That we share the feeling of profound sorrow aroused by the lamented and untimely death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, and are pleased to learn that the sympathy with Her Majesty and Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, in their bereavement, which has prevailed in the Dominion on this melancholy occasion, has found expression in respectful messages of condolence from His Excellency's Ministers, from the Provincial Governments, and from many other representative bodies.

3. That we hear with satisfaction that the negotiations with respect to seal fishing in Behring Sea have been continued, with a view to the adjustment by arbitration, of the difficulties which have arisen between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States on that subject: that Commissioners have been appointed by both Governments, to investigate the circumstances of seal life in Behring Sea, to report thereon, and to suggest the measures, if any, which they may deem necessary for its proper protection and preservation; that the Commissioners are proceeding with their deliberations in Washington, and that the results will shortly be communicated to Her Majesty's Government; and that we trust, with His Excellency, that their investigations, and the determination of the Arbitrators who are to be appointed, may lead to a just and equitable settlement of this long pending difficulty.

4. That we learn with interest that the meeting which had been arranged with the United States Government for a day in October last, for an informal discussion on the extension of trade between the two countries, and on other international matters requiring adjustment, was postponed at their request, but that in compliance with a more recent intimation from that Government, three of His Excellency's Ministers proceeded to Washington, and conferred with representatives of the Administration of the United States on those subjects; and that we are much gratified by the information that an amicable understanding was arrived at respecting the steps to be taken for the establishment of the boundary of Alaska, and for reciprocity of services in cases of wreck and salvage, that arrangements were also reached for the appointment of an International Commission to report on the regulations which may be adopted by the United States and Canada for the prevention of destructive methods of fishing and the pollution of streams, and for establishing uniformity of close seasons, and other means for the preservation and increase of fish, and also that a valuable and friendly interchange of views respecting other important matters took place.

5. That we are well pleased to be informed that, in accordance with the promise given at the close of the last Session, a Commission has been issued to investigate the working of the Civil Service Act, and other matters connected with the Civil Service generally, and that the report of the Commission will be laid before us during the present Session.

6. That we thank His Excellency for informing us that the conclusions of the Commission on the manufacture of beet-root sugar will also be laid before us.

7. That we agree with His Excellency that it is desirable that the fishery regulations in British Columbia should be examined and revised so as to adapt them better to the requirements of the fisheries in that Province, and are glad to know that a Commission has been issued with that object.

8. That we will carefully consider the important measure respecting the Criminal Law, which was laid before us last Session, and which His Excellency is pleased to inform us has been revised and improved, as a result of the expression of views elicited by its presentation to Parliament, and will be submitted to us: that our earnest attention will also be directed to any measures laid before us for the redistribution of seats consequent upon the Census returns, for the establishment of the boundaries of the Territories, and for the amalgamation of the Departments of Marine and Fisheries: and that we will willingly consider any Bills presented to us for the amendment of the Civil Service Act, the Acts relating to real property in the Territories, and those respecting the fisheries.

9. That we thank His Excellency for informing us that the accounts for the past year will be laid before us as well as the Estimates for the ensuing year, and that the said Estimates have been prepared with a due regard to economy and the requirements of the public service.

10. That His Excellency may rest assured that these important subjects, and all matters affecting the public interests which may be brought before us, will receive our best consideration: and that we thank His Excellency for the expression of his confidence that we will address ourselves to them with earnestness and assiduity.

Mr. BAIN (Soulanges.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, unlike my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) who spoke first, and those who occupied my position in former years, I have not, in undertaking the important task which is now mine, of seconding the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, the privilege of asking the indulgence of the hon. members of this House, on account of my youth, or of my

being a stranger to the greater number of them. I fully realize how little equal I am to the task I have had the honour of being intrusted with, and how impossible it is for me to do it justice : but I know that I find myself again in the midst of old friends of both sides of the House, and that they will forgive me if I cannot as I might discharge the task which I thought I should accept in the name of those who have again honoured me with such a flattering token of their confidence, in sending me back to represent them in Parliament. My task is not easy after the brilliant speech which you have just heard from my hon. friend, and if I only took counsel of my own judgment, I would rest satisfied with applauding the fine language and noble sentiments which we have just heard. The first paragraph of the Speech from the Throne congratulates Parliament on the general prosperity of Canada. In order to ascertain how prosperous a country is, it is necessary to refer to this great commercial barometer, its deposit account in the banks, and the amount to the credit of its people in the savings banks. It must not be forgotten that for the four years which immediately preceded last, the crops failed in the greatest part of the country, and that all the industries suffered therefrom. But this did not prevent the commercial bank deposits and the deposits in savings banks to increase yearly. I consider our country as one of the most prosperous in the world. We have not, it is true, such colossal fortunes as are found among our neighbours and elsewhere, but, on the other hand, there is not to be found here such black misery as is met with in those countries. If we compare the great American centres with ours, we see that since the inauguration of the National Policy all the advantages are on our side, and any one who visits our cities or rural districts can convince himself that our people are prosperous and happy. I may be told perhaps that our population has not increased as much as might have been expected. It is true, but it has been the same with our neighbours, and we are not the only ones which were disappointed by the last census. They were as much disappointed as we. The fact is that our showing is better than that of the States of New England, where, instead of increasing, the population has actually decreased. His Excellency continues by congratulating us for the first time for several years, upon the abundant harvest with which every part of the country was blessed by Providence. It is a great gratification for those who are interested in the agriculture, the commerce and the industries of the country ; and if Providence continues for some years to favour us as it has during the last, our industries and our commerce will take a new stride forward, and our prosperity increase as well. We have learned, Mr. Speaker, with a feeling of profound grief, the premature and lamentable death of the one who, in the natural order of things, was one day to reign over the British Empire, and was to be our sovereign. I know that I but echo the sentiments of the hon. gentlemen of this House, and of the French Canadians of the Dominion of Canada, whom no other nationality outdoes in loyalty and attachment to their sovereign and the British Crown, when I repeat that which has been so well said by my hon. friend, the mover of the Address. Our most sincere sympathy with Her Majesty and their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, in their grief upon this lamentable occasion, have found expression in all parts of the Dominion. Another passage in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, refers to the difficulties which for a number of years have existed in regard to the Behring Sea. We learn with much satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, that the question for some time under discussion between the Government of Her Majesty and that of the United States, concerning the fur seal fisheries, is on the point of an amicable settlement by arbitration. This will be of great importance as it will remove a source of contention between the two nations. It is highly necessary that this settlement should take place, because we have the greatest interests at stake, not only through British Columbia, but also owing to the fact that every year a large number of vessels from the eastern provinces go and fish for seal in Behring Sea, which they reach by way of Cape Horn, and that a certain number of these vessels have been seized and confiscated with their contents by the American revenue cutters. It is a well-known fact that the United States were the first to resent and protest against the pretensions of the Russians, who before 1825 claimed the exclusive right of fishing in the Behring Sea within a hundred miles of the shore. As the shores on both side belonged to Russia, it meant the exclusion of all the other nations from that part of the Pacific Ocean. However, by a treaty made with the United States in 1825, and another with the British Government in the same year, she waived her rights. And why were these treaties made ? Because Russia understood that its contentions were untenable. However, after having bought from Russia Alaska and the neighburing islands, including the Pribyloff group, composed of the islands of St. George and St. Paul, which are the most frequented by the fur seal, the Americans forbade the entrance of Behring Sea, although that sea is six or seven hundred miles wide. Let me tell you, by the way, that in making this purchase for $7,200,000, they made as good a bargain as we did when we bought the territories of the North-West, since the right of fishing for the fur seal on the Pribyloff Islands gives them more than sufficient to pay the interest on the purchase money, while there are, on the other hand, gold mines in Alaska, one of which yields more than $1,000,000 per annum. Forgive me the digression. I was saying that the United States, after having bought this territory, had set up the same pretensions which Russia had, by claiming in virtue of the purchase treaty with Russia, the exclusive right of fishing in the Behring Sea. This is why I am happy to see that this source of dissension is soon to be removed. And I hope that the investigations to be made and the judgment to be rendered by the arbitrators will bring about a just and equitable settlement of this long-pending difficulty. I see with pleasure that upon the invitation of the Government at Washington, our Ministers went to confer with the representatives of that Government, and have reached an amicable arrangement of several questions of the highest importance to the country. The first to be mentioned is the determining of the boundary of Alaska. A few years ago there was an impression that this part of our territories was of no value, and was, in fact, but a country of ice and snow-clad mountains. But the surveys made in that part of our territory estab-

lish that these mountains contain gold and other precious metals, and that the rivers carry gold deposits, and are replete with fish, such as salmon, trout, &c. A population of miners and fishermen has found its way to that region to work out its riches, and already a number of canning establishments are to be found there. In 1885, Mr. Bayard, the Secretary of State for the United States, in a despatch on this question to the American Minister in London, Mr. Phelps, said :

"Rude and inaccessible as is the 'sea of mountains' of south-eastern Alaska and forbidding as it may appear for ordinary purposes of inland settlement, it should be remembered that it is a mineral-bearing region, the geological continuation of the gold and silver belt of California and Nevada, and may at any time spring into an importance not now calculable. It is of evident advantage to both countries to agree upon some boundary line capable of survey at a reasonable cost, yet so precisely and practically described, that in case of need any given point thereon may be readily determined in advance of a general survey, and to do this while the whole question of local values is in abeyance."

Therefore, it is very important for the two countries that this question be settled without further delay, in order that we may not have to deal with difficulties that may later arise, and in order to avoid conflicts of individual interests, or conflicts of jurisdiction which may result in retarding or embarrassing the locating of the line. President Grant, in his message to Congress on the 2nd of December, 1872, said :

"Experience of the difficulties attending the determination of our admitted line of boundary, after the occupation of our territory and its settlement by those owing allegiance to the respective Governments, points to the importance of establishing, by natural objects or other monuments, the actual line between the territory acquired by purchase from Russia, and adjoining possessions of Her Britannic Majesty. The region is now so sparsely occupied that no conflicting interests of individuals or jurisdiction are likely to interfere to the delay or embarrassment of the actual location of the line. If deferred until population shall enter and occupy the territory some trivial contest of neighbours may again array the two Governments in antagonism. I therefore recommend the appointment of a commission to act jointly with one that may be appointed on the part of Great Britain to determine the line between our territory of Alaska and the coterminous possessions of Great Britain."

There is no difficulty as to the line which follows the one hundred and forty-first degree of longitude from the glacial sea, down to Mount St. Elias ; but there the difficulty begins, to continue as far as Portland canal according to the American claim, which would give them the Prince of Wales, Pierce and other islands, or as far as the Straits of Clarence, according to our claim, which would give us those islands. Difficulty is also met in regard to the width of the strip of land extending along the coast, and bounded by the crest of the mountains the nearest from the coast when not at more than ten marine leagues therefrom, a limitation which we claim to be independent of the indentations of the coast, while the Americans claim it to be otherwise. Serious studies of the question have been made by Dr. Dawson on our behalf, and Mr. Dall on behalf of the United States. Let us now examine the question of shipwreck and salvage. According to the present law and customs regulations, as there are more shipwrecks on the northern shores of the lakes and rivers which divide us from our neighbours, than on the south shores, I believe that we have the best of it. However, as it is our wish to live in harmony with them, I am happy to see that amicable arrangements have been made for the settlement of this question. We also learn with pleasure that they have agreed to appoint an international commission to report on the regulations to be adopted by the United States and Canada, to prevent the use of destructive methods of fishing, the pollution of our rivers, the uniform closing of fishing seasons, and on other means for the preservation and increase of fish. It is an acknowledged fact that notwithstanding all that we may do everywhere in the Dominion wherever our lakes and rivers form the boundary line between the two countries, if our friends of the other side of the line do not take the same measures that we do for the preservation and the propagation of fish, our efforts and our expenditure in that direction will be useless. I might instance the shores of the American Atlantic where the absence of regulations has allowed the destruction of fisheries formerly of great value. The Speech from the Throne tells us of the appointment of a commission to investigate the working of the Civil Service Act. I am sure that the report which will be made by the distinguished men who compose this commission, will be of great advantage in reforming the abuses which may exist. I must at the same time congratulate the Government upon the prompt action they have taken in expelling from the service all those found guilty of irregularities. And I am certain that they will continue this policy until no dishonest employés remain ; because it is of the highest importance for the good administration of the country, that the employés of the Civil Service, more than any other class of society, be above suspicion, and they should be thoroughly convinced that no irregularity will be forgiven them. But it is a consoling fact that out of so large a number of employés, so few dishonest ones should be found to have failed in their duty. We see every day in the best of our financial institutions, and in spite of the strictest control, employés becoming defaulters. It is not surprising, therefore, that occasionally some be found in the Civil Service, and from what I know of the service, and the acquaintance I have with a number of employés, I must say that as a body the Civil Service is as honourable and honest as any other class of society. The next paragraph informs us that the report of the commission of enquiry into the question of beet-root sugar will be submitted to us. It is a question which certainly deserves all the attention of this House and of the country. I hope that we will continue to protect an industry which should be a source of great riches to the provinces the soil and climate of which are adapted to the growing of this plant, and which should be of as great a benefit to us as it has been to France, Germany and the other European countries where it has become one of the main industries. It is said that whoever can cause two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before is a benefactor of his country, and I consider that Napoleon the First has done more for France, in causing the French to produce their own sugar than in winning all the battles which made of him the greatest man of Europe. We also see with pleasure that a measure codifying our criminal law is to be submitted to Parliament, but as the Bill was already put before the House last year, and as almost every member is acquainted with it, there is no necessity for further remarks. We also see that measures

will be brought before the House for the redistribution of seats consequent upon the census returns; for the establishment of the boundaries of the Territories; and the amalgamation of the Departments of Marine and Fisheries as a step towards economy and better administration. A Bill concerning real property in the Territories in accordance with the Torrens system, and Bills concerning the fisheries will also be submitted to us. With this programme from the Government, and the public and private Bills that will be presented, we shall have plenty with which to occupy our time during the session. In concluding my remarks, I must beg the pardon of my hon. colleagues for having gone into more details than I had intended at first, and thank them for their attention.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr Speaker, I very heartily tender my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address for the manner in which they have performed the tasks which they have assumed. It gives me pleasure to say to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), that the speech which he has delivered to the House this afternoon is, in my humble opinion, one of the most quiet in tone and rich in matter which it has been my pleasure to listen to in many years. He has uttered sentiments which we would all be glad to hear more frequently uttered on the floor of this House—not because we believe they are not generally felt, but because the more often such sentiments are repeated the greater effect they have in moulding our future destiny. At the same time, it shall not surprise the hon. gentleman, I am sure, if I tell him that much as I find to admire in his speech, I cannot agree in everything he has said; but the exceptions which I have to take to his remarks are very few, because in the main I am disposed to agree with what he has said. I was surprised, I must say, to hear him speak as he did of the prosperity of this country. I was not at all unprepared to see the statement in the Speech of His Excellency, we are accustomed to that; but, Sir, is it possible that a young Canadian could entertain the opinion which the hon. gentleman has just expressed, that he finds the state of the country one to be congratulated upon? Is it possible that the advisers of His Excellency, in putting the statement in his mouth that the country was prosperous, were really serious and sincere? May we not rather suppose that they were playing a game of bluff, imagining that they were bound to persist in that assertion? Is it possible that they can hold such an opinion in the face of the census returns? Why, Sir, the census has been a revelation in this House:—not a revelation, I should say, but a confirmation of the truths which have been uttered again and again on this side of the House, but which have been as often denied by the other side—dismissed with lofty contempt as the pessimistic utterances of mere fault-finders. After all, though it is not a matter of satisfaction to us, still it is a duty to re-assert that all the statements made on this side of the House have been verified, and more than verified, by the revelations of the census, in regard to the state of the country. In the last decade our population has grown just one bare half-million. We had expected that it would reach five millions or more, but it was found to be under five millions. We have not maintained the natural increase of our population, nor have we kept the immigration which was brought into the country at great cost; and yet we are told, forsooth, that the country is prosperous. I want to know the evidences of prosperity. A happy, teeming population would be the best possible evidence of the prosperity of the country; but what is the use of talking of prosperity when one million of Canadians have deserted our shores to settle in another country which is not more favoured by nature than our own. If we had kept this million of Canadians, if we had kept the immigrants whom we have brought here, then there would have been some reason to talk of prosperity. Prosperity there may be; I would not doubt that there is prosperity for some privileged classes; but prosperity for the toiling masses—Sir, it is a mockery to speak of it in the face of such a state of things. Why, Sir, our population has increased at the rate of only 11 per cent. A young country like Canada, which is able to afford food, clothing and homes to at least one hundred millions of people, has not kept even the five millions which we had anticipated. If Canada were an old land, on the continent of Europe, then I could understand hon. gentlemen opposite claiming that it was prosperous so long as the people were not starving. But Canada is in America; Canada has the greatest possible future before it; Canada is bound to have some day or other, when it is properly governed and administered, a population of one hundred millions. At the present time we should at least have six or seven millions; but we have not five; and yet, forsooth, hon. gentlemen opposite talk of prosperity. Our neighbours to the south during the last decade have increased 25 per cent. They have kept not only their own population, but the population which has come to them from abroad. We have been told again and again, and I think the hon. member for East Hastings repeated the statement, that there has been a displacement of population in the United States. So there has been; but though there has been a displacement of population in that country, people moving from one state to another, the nation as a nation has suffered no loss whatever. Under such circumstances it seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite, in purposely closing their eyes to the real state of the country, are not discharging the duty which the country has a right to expect from them. The true patriot does not, like the ostrich, bury his head in the sand and ignore the facts, but he looks the real situation of the country in the face. Anyone who does that must see that the present state of the country is not satisfactory, and that there must be reform. I claim, Sir, that on this occasion, as on other occasions, the only patriots are found on this side of the House. I say it with all candour, that if hon. gentlemen opposite were at all awake to the duty of the hour, they would not assert that the country is prosperous; but they would frankly admit that for a young country which is bound to have a great future, it is in a lamentable condition when it cannot retain its own population, and that it becomes the duty of all patriots to seek for some kind of reform. What is that reform to be? That is the question; and much as we differ on one side of the House or on the other, I am sure that we all agree in this, that the reform which Canada requires at this moment is a more extended market for its products. Canada is in the position to-day of

a young giant shackled and manacled, not free in his movement, and the only thing he wants is to be set free from his shackles and to have the opportunity of extending his energies abroad. This is the policy we have been pursuing for years, and, although the policy has not been accepted on the other side of the House I am aware that many other hon. gentlemen on the other side have in their hearts been compelled to admit that the policy that must be adopted is to find markets for our products somewhere. On the other hand, there are many of our colleagues on the other side who, not many days or weeks or months ago, indulged in the hope that Great Britain would alter its policy in regard to trade and that we would find a larger market than we possess, that Great Britain would depart from the principle of freedom of trade and would discriminate in favour of colonial products, while the colonies would discriminate in favour of British products. That question has been settled on the floor of the British Parliament the other day, when the answer was given that no such hopes could be indulged in, that Britain would depart from her policy of freedom of trade, so that all the hopes which have been indulged in by some of our colleagues on the other side of the House have passed away and can no longer be entertained. It, therefore, becomes the duty of these men who believe in their hearts that the situation could be amended in that respect, to turn over a new leaf in the book and seek for markets somewhere else. It is manifest, after what was said the other day on the floor of the Imperial Parliament, that Britain will not depart from her policy of freedom of trade. I am bound to say, however, that there is grandeur in the policy, in the economic policy of Britain which is greater than that of any other country. She opens her doors to the whole universe, not minding whether the rest of the universe opens its doors to her or not. But it is manifest at the same time that the dream which was entertained fifty years ago by John Bright and Cobden as to freedom of trade has not been realized. It was expected in those days that nation after nation would follow the lead of Britain and adopt freedom of trade. Those hopes have not been verified. England is the only nation that has adopted freedom of trade, but, although the dream has not been realized to the fullest extent, still it is manifest that the idea of freedom of trade is gaining ground. It is coming in a different manner, it is coming by means of commercial treaties. Nations which are protectionists to-day, not because of any love of protection but simply because they fear that if they adopted freedom of trade they would give an advantage to their neighbours, are passing legislation which gives freedom of trade to the neighbouring countries in exchange for the freedom of trade offered by them. For example, we find this in Germany. The German Zollverein is one of the most protective societies to be found on the face of the earth, but we find that within the last twelve months the German Zollverein has been offering reciprocity of trade to Switzerland, Belgium and Italy, and, I believe, also to Austria and Spain. Then we have the example of the policy of our neighbours to the south of us, who have extended freedom of trade to all the nations of Southern America, and also to the West Indies. This is also the policy of the Liberal party of Canada. I admit that it is not possible for us to obtain or accept freedom of trade as we would desire to have it or as it exists in England, but the policy we have in view is to extend freedom of trade by means of commercial treaties with other nations. This is the policy which I believe commends itself at the present time not only to this party but to the most civilized nations of the earth. It is true that on this question we have not been met with any favourable action on the other side of the House. They are Conservative, and therefore slow to adopt new ideas, but there must be something sound in the policy which we have propounded, seeing that about ten days or two weeks ago they paid a visit to Washington. I do not propose to-day to discuss the question of unrestricted reciprocity which does not come within the four corners of the Speech from the Throne, and which we will have occasion to discuss again and again during the session; but the hon. gentleman stated that we on this side of the House did not understand what was the position of the Conservative party in regard to reciprocity. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite do not understand what unrestricted reciprocity is. At all events they profess not to understand it, or they certainly grossly misrepresent it. The hon. gentleman, who, I am sure, is a good Conservative, has told us that his party was anxious to obtain reciprocity in natural products. If he had been in this House last session, or for some time before, he would have known that this may have been the policy of his party in antiquated days, but that it was their policy no longer. Did we not hear, two or three years ago, a Minister of the Crown state on the floor of Parliament that reciprocity in natural products would be the bane of Canadian farmers? That is not an isolated statement, but the statement has been repeated on the floor of this House time and again by the rank and file of that party. Only last session we heard again and again the statement that reciprocity in natural products would be the bane of the farmers. Therefore, I ask myself, what is the reason why the Canadian Ministers went to Washington some little time ago? Perhaps, in their hearts, after all, they do not adopt the policy of their old colleagues or of some one of their followers, but in their heart of hearts they may believe, as must appear to every reasonable man, that reciprocity in natural products would be beneficial to the Canadian farmers. We are in favour of unrestricted reciprocity on this side of the House; but if we cannot have unrestricted reciprocity we are quite willing to accept reciprocity in natural products, as we are desirous of securing to the fullest possible extent the advantages of trade between the two countries. But if the Government and their supporters will not grant this country reciprocity on the old lines, if they will to-day, or to-morrow, or at any time, obtain reciprocity even in ever so few articles, they will have the support of the Liberal party on this side of the House. Sir, we have been told again and again that unrestricted reciprocity was not possible, that the Americans would not grant it. I would like to quote on this subject from a speech delivered in New York a few days ago by the Hon. Mr. Foster, who holds, as I understand, a high position in the State Department at Washington. After speaking of the tendency and the policy of

the American Government to establish wide commercial treaties with the different nations, he goes on to say :

"But, it may be asked, if this be true, why not extend it to our Canadian neighbours on the north? The first answer is that with our tropical neighbours, whose products are so dissimilar to ours, reciprocity is a simple matter, but when we come to deal with a country having thousands of miles of conterminous territory and with like products and industries, the question becomes more complex. But this is not the insuperable difficulty. The fact that Canada does not possess the right of negotiating her own treaties, but must have them negotiated for her by a distant power which is controlled by economic principles entirely different from those of both the United States and Canada, constitutes the chief barrier to any arrangement."

Sir, though I would not subscribe altogether to everything that is said here, I see, however, no insuperable difficulty, judging from the language of the American authorities, to securing complete reciprocity between Canada and the United States. The difficulty at this moment is that we have not the power to negotiate our own commercial treaties. The power to negotiate our own commercial treaties is one which has been long claimed by this House. As far back as 1882 Mr. Blake introduced a resolution in favour of asking the mother country to grant us that power. That motion was voted down. Some years afterwards my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright), in 1888, if I remember aright, or in 1889, introduced a similar motion, which was also voted down. But in view of the events that have taken place, in view of the fact that we are progressing as a nation, in view of the fact that it is becoming recognized on both sides of the House that the trade of Canada must be extended somehow, and that this country will no longer consent to be shut up within its own boundaries, it is more than ever opportune to debate and to discuss this question once more, and this question, I may say at once, must be debated at no distant day during the present session. A few days ago three Canadian Ministers paid a visit to Washington. This time their visit lasted longer than did their visit of last April. Their present visit, we are told in the speech, was the result of an intimation from the American Government. I was not prepared for that statement, but I accept it with a great deal of pleasure indeed. I am glad to hear from the advisers of His Excellency, that the visit which they paid to Washington was made upon an invitation from Washington. This, Sir, is of good omen, it shows friendship on the part of the United States; and for my part I deplore the fact that between Canada and the United States, between two countries of the same blood, of the same language, in a large measure, and of similar institutions, there should be any feeling other than one of the closest friendship. Patriotism does not mean hostility to any country; patriotism ought to be founded, not upon hostility to any country, but upon the broadest and most generous instincts of human nature. While we ought to profess ourselves friends to the Americans, on our side, I am sure, we do not wish to do so with any loss of dignity. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that he was sure the Canadian Ministers at Washington had not done, and would not do, anything detrimental to the dignity of Canada. Sir, I have no doubt of it, but I can tell him that there is no party in the House who would negotiate a treaty with the States, if such a treaty were to imply any derogation to the dignity of Canada. We do not admit on our side of the House the view which is often stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity would imply derogation to the dignity of Canada. Nothing of the kind. For my part, I am glad that the Canadian Ministers went to Washington some time ago. They did not, and could not, succeed, because the basis upon which they wanted to negotiate could not be accepted by the American Government. Some time or other, sooner or later, and sooner rather than later, if another Government were to send a deputation to Washington charged with negotiating the fullest treaty that it is possible to obtain from the American Government, I may tell hon. gentlemen opposite at once, that if on such an occasion the American authorities were disposed to be arrogant or unfriendly, or were disposed to make us pay any price at the expense of our dignity for the privileges we desired, we would say: We want none of it. We would say: We will remain as we are, and for my part I would turn about face immediately. But, Sir, it was not possible for the hon. gentlemen to succeed, and why? The hon. gentlemen did not want to succeed on the basis of unrestricted reciprocity: they wanted to negotiate only on the basis of restricted trade; and as mentioned in the letter of Mr. Blaine to Congressman Baker, which it is useless to cite again to the House, the American Government has intimated again and again that they would not negotiate on any other basis than that of unrestricted reciprocity. So their mission was bound to fail from the very outset. Yet I am glad they went, not because I expected they could accomplish anything in the way of securing reciprocal trade, but simply because I desire to see them open friendly relations with our neighbours. In that respect I am glad to see that their mission has not been without some effect. As a result of that mission we are to have, as I understand, an arrangement concluded for settling the boundary between Canada and Alaska. This is an important measure from every standpoint. It is not likely that that part of the country will ever be thickly settled, if settled at all; but, at all events, it is open to trade, and it is far preferable that the boundaries between the two nations should be settled now than at a later date after there may possibly have been a collision between traders, with all the consequences of such a collision. So far the visit of the Ministers to Washington has not been without fruit, and so far it is of some importance. Then, as another result of the mission of the Ministers to Washington, we are to have, at last, legislation for reciprocity of services in cases of wrecking and salvage. Well, this is certainly an important result of the mission to Washington. There has been, as I understand, a statutory offer of reciprocity on our part, standing for years; I do not know whether it still exists; if it has been repealed it has been done within a year or two. But it existed during many years, and was never accepted. Hitherto they have not exerted themselves in having such legislation passed. Once or twice, certainly once, the Bill was introduced, if I remember rightly, by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirpatrick) to establish such a reciprocity on our side of the line, which could be met at any time by legislation on the other side of the line. The Bill did not become law, it was killed by the Ministers;

it may not have been killed openly, but, I am sure that the Ministers never lifted a finger in its behalf. I am sure also, knowing the great influence which they wield upon the representation in this House, that if they only lifted their little finger in favour of the Bill it would have been passed. For some reason or other a Bill similar was killed in a subsequent session. Now, while they were in Washington, the matter was discussed with the American Government, and as a result we are to have this humane legislation, because, it must be admitted to be a crying shame to these two civilized nations that such a law has not sooner been passed. Then, we are to have a commission to devise regulations for the preservation of fish, and to prevent the pollution of the seas. This is a technical subject which I do not profess to be competent to deal with, but I am sure that it is a subject of great importance, and one which must be productive of a great deal of good, that is, we can have international regulations which will apply both to the United States and to Canada to prevent the pollution of the waters, and to prevent the use of those means of catching fish which are so destructive. So far the visits of the Ministers have been productive of good. We are to have an international commission, and we are to receive a report of a commission of our own--the commission on the Civil Service. I will refrain from making reference to that subject until we have the report of the commission itself. This is a subject somewhat dangerous to touch on unless we possess full information, and I deem it more prudent at this time to say nothing about it, awaiting the result of the commission's report. But I am surprised that I am unable to find within the corners of the speech any mention whatever of another commission, which had been promised with great flourish of trumpets, and which was to investigate the working of prohibition legislation in foreign countries. I have not heard a word of it, I believe, since July last. I thought, and everybody expected, there would be some mention of this commission in the speech; because, if we remember rightly, this commission had been appointed to investigate and correct an error which had been committed by the Minister of Finance in a moment of weakness, and in a moment of courage he thought it better not to persist in his error, but to inform himself on a matter as to which he had pronounced without having sufficient information. But I am not to judge from what I fail to see before me, I believe the hon. gentleman has had another moment of weakness in this matter. As to the legislation which is promised, it is of a mild character, and, as was anticipated and suggested by the member from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), it is conducive to a brief session. At least there is not much in it which should lead to protracted debate in this House, except one measure,—the measure with respect to the distribution of seats. This is, of all measures proposed, the most important that Parliament has to deal with, because it is the very basis of the system of government under which we live. The proper representation of the people, the fair and adequate representation of the people, the fair and adequate representation of everyone, is the very basis of responsible government. The hon. gentleman hoped a moment ago that this basis would be founded on the principle of fairness. Sir, I am glad to hail this announcement, because it will be the first time such a measure was ever based upon such principles. There never yet was a measure of this kind that was based on the principle of fairness, and we shall see whether on the present occasion the Government will act up to the expectation of their follower, whether in the forthcoming measure they will or not follow the old method of hiving the Grits so as to give a chance to the Tories elsewhere, or whether they will distribute the Grits and Tories alike so as to give a chance for the opinions of the country to be fairly expressed in every section and every division. I am not sure, however, that the hon. gentleman has not expected too much. I will not say he is misled, I will not venture any prediction, but I am glad to hail the information that he, at all events, expects fairness to be displayed, and I hope the same spirit will pervade every member forming the majority on the other side of the House. There is but one more remark I desire to offer, and it is one of sadness. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has referred in fitting terms, in most fitting terms, indeed, to the sad event which lately shocked all British subjects the world over, and not only British subjects but all civilized nations. There is, after all, a universal brotherhood in the whole human family. It is our misfortune that sympathy is elicited more by the sadness than by the joys of life. Nothing, indeed, can be sadder than the death on the threshold of manhood of one born to so great dignity, so full of hope, and surrounded by such love and affection. Certainly it is one of the most painful tragedies of this age, this death of one born to so great a dignity as I have said, of one on the step of the bridal altar. To those to whom he was so close it is impossible to offer any consolation, because this is one of the griefs which cannot be consoled on earth; but it is a melancholy pleasure for us to offer our sympathy, and to say to those who bear his loss to-day, that we, the loyal subjects of Her Majesty, and the future subjects of His Majesty, if he had lived, share to the fullest extent the loss they have sustained.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, if we on this side of the House cannot fully concur in all the remarks which the hon. gentleman has made, I am sure we can very heartily and sincerely concur with him in the congratulations he has extended to the mover and seconder of the Address. Those hon. gentlemen, I agree with him, have discharged the duty which devolved upon them with rare ability and good taste, and we cordially congratulate these two gentlemen or their first appearance this session in the House, the mover of the Address representing the young members, and the seconder representing gentlemen who have served with us before and are coming back with a warm welcome from their friends and coadjutors. I would have liked very much to have gone further and included in my expressions of concurrence and congratulation the leader of the Opposition himself, for, if we except three or four expressions which he used and which I am sure on a little reflection he would be disposed to revise, as, for example, the assertion that the patriots all sat on his side of the House, and, for example, the denial of the prosperity of this country, and the assertion that hon. gentlemen on this side were sitting with eyes perversely closed to the true

condition of the country, we might fairly congratulate the hon. gentleman and allow his speech to go with nothing except an expression of concurrence. But we are unable to do so for the reason I have just mentioned. Whether perversely or otherwise he insists on stating as His Excellency mentions in his speech, and as we have stated on many occasions, that the condition of the country to-day is a matter for which Canadians ought to be proud and grateful. Whether we consider the economic condition of our people, their industrial progress, or whether we consider the matters which the hon. gentleman in a moment of forgetfulness five minutes afterwards referred to in his speech as the progress of this country towards nationality, we have every reason to feel proud of the position this country occupies, and if the hon. gentleman insists, as he and his party have frequently done, on inscribing on their banner "war, pestilence and famine," the hon. gentleman will find the standard is not one that will rally the youth, the hope and pride of Canada under it. The hon. gentleman compared Canada to a young giant struggling with all his energy, but manacled by shackles. In stating the policy of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the hon. gentleman singularly misapprehended us, because we conceive that the policy which he has urged on the House to-day, which he and his followers have urged on the country, is not one that will free the energies of the young giant, but will compel him to take on new shackles and limit the field of his exertions. In the same breath my hon. friend referred to the members of this House who had, and perhaps still have, high hopes that a favourable arrangement may be carried out by Great Britain, whereby a preferential market will be afforded to the colonies of the Empire, and he invited those gentlemen, in view of the proceedings which have taken place in the Imperial Parliament, to turn over a new leaf and seek for markets elsewhere. Sir, we believe that whether with or without a preferential market the markets of Great Britain are the greatest markets for the products of this country; and the gentlemen upon this side of the House who either expect or do not expect that preference will be given to the products of the colonies in the British market, are at any rate not willing to submit to a policy by which our people shall jeopardize that market and which shall exclude the products of that country from ours. The hon. the leader of the Opposition in this connection read an extract from a speech by General Foster in the United States, in which he referred to the position of this country as regards the power to negotiate her own treaties. The hon. gentleman has studied that speech in vain, if he has not found that General Foster's impression of the situation amounts to this: that the difficulty in obtaining a treaty with Canada such as the people of the United States most desire, is not merely the technical difficulty of the right to negotiate our own treaties, which can be, and has been time and again, conceded by the mother country; but the peculiar position which Canada occupies in negotiating her treaties as part of the British Empire to which she owes duties, to which she owes allegiance, and to which she is attached by ties of interest as well. It does not become me in speaking on an Address in answer to the speech from the Throne, to go into a minute discussion of that question; but General Foster may, or may not, have correctly stated the difficulties which stand in the way. He may or may not have magnified them; but the difficulty which he pointed to, is one which stares hon. gentlemen opposite in the face, even if their resolution with regard to the right to negotiate our own treaties should be carried to-morrow and acquiesced in by the Government of the mother country. I am glad to know, Sir, that the hon. gentleman appreciates the results likely to flow from the mission of Ministers to Washington. I am glad to know that he regards the fact that an intimation came from the United States indicating that such a visit would be acceptable to the Administration of that country, as an intimation of friendliness on the part of that country. I am the more glad to know this, because last session while we were accused of the most dire unfriendliness to our neighbours to the south, we were at the same time taunted and gibed for having sought an interview, and having opened negotiations with the Government of that country. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the expression of any intimation from that Government favouring an interview in which the relations of the two countries whether as regards trade, the boundaries of our countries, the joint fisheries of our countries, or any other question, can be discussed frankly and fully and a complete understanding arrived at as to the sentiments and interests of each country, is an advantageous one, and is likely to lead to increased friendliness, a friendliness which no gentleman on this side appreciates less than the leader of the Opposition, who has spoken so highly of its desirability. Now, Sir, with regard to the question which the hon. gentleman touched upon particularly as one of the results of our mission, namely, the question of wrecking and salvage, the hon. gentleman has made allusion to our policy in the past. He has indicated that in spite of the measure introduced by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and in spite of the support which that measure received from a large body of the members of this House, including nearly the entire Opposition, the Bill as then introduced was opposed by the Government, or, at any rate, had not received the cordial aid or co-operation of the Government. That is true, Sir. The question upon which the friends and the opponents of that Bill divided was this: Whether at the first suggestion on the part of the United States, and without guarantees of the sufficiency of the details of the measure, we should accept that proposal and agree to free reciprocity; or, whether it was not desirable that the progress of the measure should be delayed until there were inserted the additional safeguards which the Minister of Customs explained to the House as being necessary, and which we will discuss by-and-bye, but, which I venture to say in advance, have been secured by the negotiations which the acting Minister of Customs personally conducted. The difference between our policy and theirs is that they propose to give away everything at the first glance and to take the risk of its being satisfactory, while the position of the Government was that the matter ought to be the subject of further negotiation, with a view to secure necessary safeguards in the interest of the industry affected. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has called attention, naturally enough, to the fact that while several royal commissions are mentioned

in the speech, as having been appointed by His Excellency during the recess, no mention is made of the commission with regard to prohibition. If His Excellency had mentioned everything in his speech the hon. the leader of the Opposition would have had nothing to say to-day, and we should not have had the charm of listening to him as we have done for the last half hour. It was not entirely for that reason that the omission was made, as the hon. gentleman may well understand. It is not the custom of His Excellency in addressing Parliament from the Throne to announce executive measures which are in course of completion but which have not yet been entirely completed. I think that before the hon. gentleman's criticisms have reached print in all probability that commission will have been appointed and will be prepared to enter on its duties. It would have been more satisfactory if we had been able to announce the appointment of that commission in the speech I admit, but the acquiescence of certain persons whose services it is desirable to obtain in connection with that commission, made it necessary that for a few days the announcement of the commission should be delayed. Considering as I have said, that the criticisms which the hon. gentleman applied to the Address were limited, were courteous, and were such as we could concur in, with the exceptions of the few instances I have mentioned, I will not attempt to detain the House longer with a reply. I cannot close without expressing in the fullest sense on the part of the members on this side of the House, concurrence in the views which he expressed concerning the calamity which has befallen the Sovereign of this country. Every person who has a spark of patriotism or humanity in his bosom must agree with those views. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has expressed our feeling in such elegant and eloquent terms, for we on this side of the House can heartily join him. I think it will be the duty of the House at an early stage of the session to manifest on its own behalf some expression of the profound sorrow and sympathy which is felt throughout this country, at the death of the Duke of Clarence, and which I am sure is deeply felt by members on both sides of the House, with our Sovereign Lady the Queen and their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales on the occasion of this bereavement,—a bereavement which is not theirs alone, but which is the bereavement of the entire Empire.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That the said resolution be referred to a special committee composed of Sir Adolphe Caron, Mr. Northrup, Mr. Bain (Soulanges), and the mover, to prepare and report the draft of an Address in answer to the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON, from the committee, reported the draft of an Address, which was read the first and second times, and ordered to be engrossed, and to be presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are of the Honourable the Privy Council.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FOSTER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That a Special Committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, Lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday last, the 25th instant, to be composed of Sir John Thompson, Sir Adolphe Caron, Sir Richard Cartwright, and Messrs. Costigan, Bowell, Laurier and Mills (Bothwell).

Motion agreed to.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL. It is usual at the earliest period of the session to appoint a committee to supervise the Debates of the House, and, with the consent of the House, and waiving the usual notice, I beg leave to move :

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time; to be composed of Messrs. Beausoleil, Béchard, Cameron, Charlton, Davin, Desjardins (Hochelaga), Innes, LaRivière, Prior, Scriver, Skinner, Somerville, Taylor, Weldon, and White (Cardwell).

I may mention that this is the same committee as that appointed last year.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg, in accordance with the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, to lay on the Table of the House, statements of the Governor General's Warrants issued since the closing of the last session of Parliament, and of the expenditures made thereon. I hope my hon. friend opposite will not be too severe in his criticism of the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest, as a matter of convenience, and I give notice to the hon. gentleman, that I think I shall move, and, I presume, he will have no objection, that the items referred to in these Governor General's Warrants be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts, along with the ordinary items. They are a class of items which ought, I think, to go to that committee.

THE FAVOURED NATIONS' CLAUSE.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1. Whether Her Majesty's Government in London have denounced or terminated certain provisions of the treaties between Great Britain on the one part, and Belgium and the German Zollverein of the other parts, as requested in the Address to Her Majesty, passed last Session by the Canadian Parliament? 2. Whether Her Majesty's Government in London have assented to the proposition contained in such Address, that "the continuation of the restrictions imposed upon Canada and other portions of the Empire by the so-called 'favoured nations' clause' creates an unnecessary and unjustifiable obstruction"?

Mr. FOSTER. This Government has received no official reply from Her Majesty's Government in regard to either of these questions.

FISHING RIGHTS ON THE RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. LAURIER (for Mr. BRODEUR) asked, Whether the Government have granted to any person the exclusive right of fishing the Richelieu River between Chambly and St. Johns? If so, to whom was the said privilege granted, for what price? Has there been any legal question raised as to the right of the Government to grant such fishing leases, and what has been the result of such litigation, if any?

Mr. TUPPER. Leases have been granted by the Government for the right of fishing for eels in the public waters of the Richelieu River, between Chambly and St. Johns, to the following parties: Arthur H. N. Bruce, for the privilege of fishing between the towns of St. Johns and Iberville, during the period of five years, at $400 per annum: Napoléon Masse, for the privilege of fishing near Ste. Thérèse Island, during the period of one year, at $75 per annum. Legal questions have been raised as to the right of the Government to grant such leases, but there has as yet been no decision on the question.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the litigation pending?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

I.C.R.—TRAFFIC AT MULGRAVE STATION.

Mr. FRASER moved for:

A detailed statement showing: (1) Traffic at Mulgrave Station for the six months ending 31st December, A.D. 1890 and 1891; also for the months of January, 1891 and 1892. The return to include sale of tickets, freight received and freight sent. (2). The number of staff employed during the said months, salaries paid and amount paid for extra labour, with the names of staff and extra labour employed. (3). Return of work done by shunting engine during said periods, and the number of men employed in shunting and the cost. (4). If there is a yardmaster at said station, when he was appointed, whether he has an assistant, and, if so, when such assistant was appointed and what pay each receives. (5). The number of men employed in the scow at the said station, their names and whether they are paid by the hour or by the day and at what rate?

He said: In asking for this return, I trust the Minister of Railways will be able to bring it down as quickly as possible. I think it would only take a couple of hours to make it out.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—ASH WEDNESDAY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That when the House adjourns to-morrow (Tuesday), it do stand adjourned until Thursday next at 3 o'clock, p. m.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister of Finance bring down the ordinary statement of the ten days revenue to the 1st March without a motion being made?

Mr. FOSTER. I will bring it down.

Mr. EDGAR.

BEHRING SEA SEAL FISHERIES.

Mr. LAURIER. I call attention to the following press despatch which has been received and which has just been placed in my hands:—

"WASHINGTON, 29th February, 1892.—The negotiations between United States and Great Britain looking to the submission to arbitration of the long-pending controversy between the two countries in regard to the Behring Sea Seal Fisheries reached a favourable condition to-day. Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Minister, met Secretary Blaine by appointment to-day and signed the treaty of arbitration on behalf of Great Britain. The treaty is still subject, however, to the action of the British Parliament and the United States Senate."

I suppose that this treaty will also be submitted to the Canadian Parliament.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not in a position to make any formal announcement on the subject, but I suppose the press announcement as to the treaty having been signed is very probably correct. I am not in a position to say that it has to be agreed to by this Parliament. The hon. gentleman will see that, while this affects very seriously certain inhabitants of this country, it does not affect any of the waters which are really within our jurisdiction. At a later period of the session we will be able to give definite information on this point, and I am sure that any representation made by this Government will receive every attention at the hands of the Imperial Government.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the Minister lay on the Table the documents in reference to the *Sayward* case? I do not see why they should not be published in this country as well as in the United States.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The case is not concluded, but the documents now in our possession will be submitted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to know when the report of the Auditor-General will be laid on the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. I sympathise with my hon. friend in his anxiety to have that report, but I fear that it is not quite complete yet.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 5:35 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

F. W. BORDEN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of King's, N. S.: introduced by the Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fraser.

HENRY CARGILL, Esq., Member for the East Riding of Bruce; introduced by the Hon. Mr. Costigan and Mr. Sproule.

JOS. H. MARSHALL, Esq., Member for the East Riding of Middlesex: introduced by the Hon. Mr. Bowell and the Hon. Mr. Haggart.

A. B. INGRAM, Esq., Member for the East Riding of Elgin; introduced by Sir John Thompson and the Hon. Mr. Foster.

REPORTS.

Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended the 30th June, 1891.—(Mr. Bowell.)

The Public Accounts of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1891.—(Mr. Foster.)

JUDGES ACTING ON COMMISSIONS.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (for Mr. DELISLE) asked, Have the Government been informed that in the Province of Quebec, Judges Baby, Davidson, Jetté, Mathieu and Pagnuelo have set aside their judicial duties in order to undertake political inquiries? If so, what course do the Government intend to take in the matter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government are aware that the judges named in the question asked by the hon. member were appointed to be members of a Royal Commission for making inquiries into matters of great public importance. Two of them being judges of the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Quebec were replaced for a short time by assistant judges. I understand that all of them were available for duty in case of necessity during the performance of these duties. The Government do not consider that it is necessary for them to take any action in the matter.

POST OFFICE AT ST. RAYMOND.

Mr. VAILLANCOURT (for Mr. DELISLE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to build a post office in the parish of St. Raymond, in the County of Portneuf?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a question that can hardly be answered until the Estimates are brought down, inasmuch as no appropriation at present exists for that service.

PRIVILEGE—THE LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to put a motion to the House of which I have not given notice, because, although it may not be a matter of urgency, I think that it is a matter of privilege. I beg to move:

That an Order of the House be issued, directing the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to lay on the Table of the House the original list of voters received from the revising officer of the City of London, also the list as printed and upon which the recent election in that city was held.

I make this motion because I understand that a large number of the names on the list that was sent in by the revising officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, were struck off, and that the list as printed and forwarded by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, shows that a large number of names were struck off, but that it has been printed with those names on. If that be so—and I am informed by a gentleman who has personally inspected the list that it is so—I think it is a matter requiring the serious consideration of the House. Therefore, with the consent of the House, and without further notice, because it is a matter affecting the constitution of the House itself, I beg to make the motion that I have just read.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman has not only failed to show it to be a case of privilege, but he has not shown that there is any urgency in the matter. If that could be shown I do not think that any one would be disposed to stand upon a mere question of whether it was a matter of privilege or not. Under the circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman had better put a notice of motion on the Orders of the Day. I may say this is the first I have heard of what the hon. gentleman has stated.

Mr. LAURIER. I take it that this is a matter of privilege, this is a matter which directly affects the mode in which members of this House are elected. If that be so, Mr. Speaker, the motion of my hon. friend requires no notice. Of course, if the hon. gentleman takes this ground I take issue with him. But if he thinks that, as a matter of courtesy, notice should be given before he is prepared to give an answer, I would suggest to my hon. friend to let his motion stand till the day after to-morrow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must adhere to that ground. In any case, I think it would be better that we should have an opportunity of enquiring into the facts stated for the first time this afternoon. The hon. gentleman might renew his motion on Thursday without prejudice to our right to object to it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say, in reply to the Minister of Justice, that I think this is a matter seriously affecting the constitution of Parliament. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is an officer of Parliament, and he has certain duties to discharge. If the facts are as I have stated, and I have no doubt that my information is strictly accurate, they are of great importance. I am informed that the list of voters as forwarded for the City of London, will show a large number of voters struck off which were included upon the list as printed, and so I ask that the original list may be laid upon the Table of the House, and that the printed list upon which the election was held may also be laid on the Table of the House. This will facilitate business, because I purpose to invite the consideration of the House to further matters connected with this election, which are of a very serious character and which, it seems to me, affect the liberties of the people. It would facilitate the business of the House very greatly if this motion were granted, and this list was laid upon the Table at the earliest possible date. The Minister of Justice is opposed to that, he does not deny that it is a matter of privilege, he simply denies that it is a question of urgency. Surely it is a matter of some urgency, at all events, if an irregularity has occurred. If the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has not properly discharged his duty, if he has sent a list to the printers in one form while it was received by him in another, I think the sooner the House takes cognizance of that fact, the better. It seems to me that a matter of that sort is always, not only a matter of privilege, but also in some degree a matter of urgency.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Although it may seem a small matter and one of form only, I think the motion should read that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who is an officer of the House, should attend at the Table and bring with him these lists. These papers are supposed to be now in the custody of an officer of the House; and I think the motion should read that this officer should be ordered to

attend the next sitting of the House, and bring with him these lists.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The case which the hon. gentleman makes for urgency is precisely one that any member of the House might make for any other matter. I simply requested him to let the matter stand over until the next sitting of the House, for the reason, as I stated, that the matter had not been mentioned at all. It would be inconvenient for the transaction of public business, whenever a member receives information affecting even a matter of privilege, if he were to rise and found a motion upon it, without giving notice to the House, and without any declaration on his own part that it involved greater urgency than any other business which this House can be called upon to transact. I think it would be unwise to establish a precedent of that kind; and, under all the circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman has not stated any reason why he is likely to be prejudiced by the delay.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood from the hon. gentleman when he spoke first that he objected to the motion because no urgency had been shown. But the moment he puts it on the ground that he has not had sufficient notice, then there is no objection to letting the matter stand until Thursday.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am still of that opinion.

Motion withdrawn.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing the number of Royal Commissions that have been issued in each and every year since Confederation, to whom issued, together with the subjects enquired into, giving the cost of each and the total of all.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 3rd March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate relating to the Electoral District of Carleton, N.B., by which the said election was declared void; and he had accordingly issued his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new Writ of election for the said Electoral District.

He also informed the House that he had received from two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate relating to the Electoral District of Gloucester, by which the sitting member was declared duly elected.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of William Smith, Esq., for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Ontario.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

WILLIAM SMITH, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Ontario; introduced by Mr. Foster and Mr. Taylor.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 4) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. Taylor.)

THE INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to amend the Insurance Act.

Mr. LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The object of the Bill is to abolish the practice of granting rebates of premiums upon first insurance, and also to compel insurance agents to take out licenses.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the first time.

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the Department of Public Works has let the contract for new works at Miminegash Breakwater, Prince Edward Island? If so, to whom is the contract let and for what amount? If not let, why not?

Mr. OUIMET. The contract for an extension to the South Pier at Miminegash, and two dams built of brush and stone was awarded to Alexander McDonald, the amount of his tender being $2,000. Alexander McDonald refused to sign his contract, and nothing has been done yet towards re-letting the work. Plans and specifications are being revised, and new tenders will be called for in a short time.

RAILWAY FROM SUMMERSIDE TO RICHMOND BAY.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Department of Railways and Canals to commence building a branch railway from Summerside to Richmond Bay, Prince Edward Island, in accordance with a vote of the House of Commons passed for that purpose during the session of 1890?

Mr. HAGGART. A subsidy was granted by 53 Vic., chap. 2, for a railway from Summerside to Richmond Bay, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, three miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $9,600. Up to this time no company has applied to enter into a contract for the construction and operation of this road under the Act. The Government have

not undertaken to build the road, but have granted aid towards its construction of the amount I have named, $3,200 per mile.

I. C. R.—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What were the receipts and expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway from the 1st July, 1891, to the 1st February, 1892, and from the 1st July, 1890, to the 1st February, 1891?

Mr. HAGGART. From 1st July, 1891, to 1st February, 1892, earnings, $1,758,790.68; working expenses, $2,404,633.70; loss, $645,843.02. From 1st July, 1890, to 1st February, 1891, earnings, $1,811,009.28; working expenses, $2,182,151.95; loss, $371,142.67.

BOUNTIES ON BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. EDGAR) asked, Whether any sums have been paid under the Act of last session by way of bounty to the producers of beet-root sugar in Canada? If so, when, to whom, and to what amount?

Mr. BOWELL. Sums of money have been paid under the Act of last session by way of bounty to the producers of beet-root sugar in Canada. These sums were paid at different dates between 15th October, 1891, and 23rd January, 1892, to Mr. Alfred Musy, of Farnham, in the Province of Quebec. The total amount paid is $21,939.85. The following is a detailed statement of bounty on beet-root sugar paid to Alfred Musy, of Farnham, Que., showing dates of payments and the several amounts paid:—

Date of payment.	Amount paid.	Date of payment.	Amount paid.
	$ cts.		$ cts.
Oct. 15, 1891	335 66	Nov. 9, 1891	1,458 12
" 19, 1891	638 70	" 13, 1891	1,714 47
" 20, 1891	863 88	" 14, 1891	1,679 35
" 24, 1891	852 92	" 17, 1891	1,752 43
" 28, 1891	1,232 71	Dec. 8, 1891	3,149 26
Nov. 2, 1891	1,528 01	" 16, 1891	100 00
" 3, 1891	1,585 14	" 29, 1891	1,397 30
" 6, 1891	1,660 88	Jan. 23, 1892	2,000 00
Total amount paid			$21,939 85

The latter sum of $2,000 is larger than the others, owing to some little dispute that we had with the manufacturers as to the exact amount that should be paid, or what they call the second and third products.

EMPLOYÉS ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. MCMULLEN) moved for:

Return giving the names and addresses of all parties employed by the Government, on or in connection with Government railways in the Dominion, stating the nature of the work engaged in, the salary paid per month or year, and the gross amount paid each employé during the year ending the 31st December, A.D. 1891.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg to remind the hon. gentleman that this will be a very, very costly return to prepare.

Mr. LAURIER. It is worth the money.

Mr. HAGGART. It will take some time to get ready. There are 4,473 regular employés upon the Government railways, and probably from 600 to 700 temporary men employed for short periods on maintenance during the summer season, and at snow shovelling, &c., during snow storms in the winter. To get this return up it will be necessary to go through all the pay-rolls in order to arrive at the amount each man is paid during the year.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman in whose name this motion stands, is to-day absent from the House, and after the statement made by the Minister of Railways, I would ask that the debate be adjourned until the hon. gentleman is present. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. COCKBURN moved:

That a select committee be appointed to take evidence under oath, and report upon any claims remaining still unpaid of the workmen, labourers of the workmen, and of those who supplied board to the workmen and labourers; of the furnishers of building material and other privileged parties, in connection with the building of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, in the Province of Quebec.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I am about to make are not conceived in a spirit of political hostility, nor are they made with a desire of securing any party advantage. Luckily, the party to which I have the honour to belong is so deeply enthroned in the hearts and affections, and, I may add, the intelligence of the people, that that party needs no such adventitious aid.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am glad my hon. friends so fully appreciate the results of the late elections, and I have no doubt they will be still more confirmed in their opinion when the returns from the few elections yet to take place are brought before this House. But, Sir, the remarks which I have to make are made in justice to the Ontario Bank, whose action in dealing with the labourers and workmen employed on the Baie des Chaleurs Railway has been grossly misrepresented; they are made in the interest of the Dominion Government itself, which passed over to the Ontario Bank the subsidy of $54,000 to which I shall afterwards allude; they are made in justice to the poor labourers and workmen employed on this railroad; they are made, I may say, in justice to myself, who gave the promise to the late Premier that the Ontario Bank would see such claims paid; and, I may add finally, they are made in what I conceive to be the interest of public morality itself. The Ontario Bank, of which I have the honour to be a director—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKBURN. Hon. gentlemen again manifest the same spirit. I say I am proud to be a director of that institution. I know of no institution that carries a prouder or more honourable name, and there are no gentlemen perhaps who would more willingly enter that institution than hon. gentlemen opposite. The Ontario Bank had, in the ordinary course of its business, agreed to make certain advances of a monetary character to Mr. Henry Macfarlane, a contractor, to enable him to complete the fifth and sixth sections of ten miles each of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway; and in

return for this engagement to advance money on the part of the bank, on 14th June, 1888, the railway company assigned as collateral security to the manager of the Ontario Bank at Montreal the sum of $70,000, payable by the Government of Quebec on the completion of those two sections, extending from mile 40 to mile 60; all of which, I may say, is fully detailed in the report of the Senate last year on the enquiry regarding the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. As soon as this engagement was completed, the Ontario Bank was careful to give due notice of it to the Government at Quebec; and, accordingly, Mr. Alexandre Gauvreau, notary public, was instructed to notify the Government of the contract entered into, and he did so notify them. Accordingly, there was paid to the manager of the Ontario Bank on account of this subsidy, and in virtue of this transfer, the sum of $41,454, leaving of the $70,000 that had been assigned to the bank, a balance of $28,546 in the hands of the Quebec Government. The Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company enjoyed the subsidies not only from the Local Government at Quebec, but also in the ordinary way from the Dominion Government, a subsidy, I think, of $3,200 a mile. Accordingly, on the 12th of October, 1889, $54,000 of such subsidies were due to the contractor; and as these subsidies had been made over to the Ontario Bank for advances to enable the contractor to build the road, the bank was informed by the Department of Railways and Canals that, inasmuch as certain wages amounting to some $13,000 had not been paid to the labourers and workmen on that road, they thought it their duty to withhold the payment until such times as they had the assurance that these wages were paid. Well, Sir, I myself interviewed the Minister of Railways and Canals at that time, the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, on the subject, and I suggested to him that the Ontario Bank would be willing to give a guarantee that they would see that the $13,000 of arrears of wages were paid to the workmen, provided he would allow the $54,000 of subsidies to be handed over to the bank as representing the contractor. The following is a copy of the letter, which is found at page 138 of the report of the Senate :—

"OTTAWA, 12th October, 1889.

"To the Hon. Minister of Railways and Canals,

"SIR,—The Ontario Bank understand that there are wages due to Macfarlane's men, for work done for the first 60-mile section of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, amounting to $13,000. There is payable to the railway company $54,000, part of the Dominion subsidy. The Ontario Bank is entitled to receive this $54,000 per Mr. Noel, manager of the Quebec Bank, Ottawa, who is attorney for the railway company, to receive this subsidy for the Ontario Bank. If the Government pay over this $54,000 forthwith to Mr. Noel to be paid to the Ontario Bank, the bank undertakes to see the above wages to the men paid.

"A. SIMPSON,
"*Manager*."

Meanwhile I have already stated that there remained in the hands of the Quebec Government the balance of $28,546, the balance of the subsidy belonging to the Ontario Bank, which again and again insisted upon its being paid over to them. However, remonstrances were in vain, for the large hearts of Mr. Mercier and his coadjutors were being moved by feelings of the deepest compassion for the unfortunate workmen and labourers whom he graphically depicted as men who were in the agonies of famine and without the means of subsistence for themselves or their families, and he says:

"I will not yield to the temptation of saying what I think of those who received the money of the province and of the Dominion for the purpose of building this road, and who failed to do so."

I think, perhaps, the House may, later on, yield to the temptation of telling him and some others of the manner in which they regard their spending the money of the province and of the Dominion. Then, later on, in the exuberance of his grief, he says:

"I wish everyone of the members had time to read the sad tale which is about to be laid before the House. The relation of the saddest things is to be found therein. Poor labourers with nothing but their work to depend upon, had not, in the month of March last, received their wages for the ten months previous, and these wages the only thing they had to live upon and feed their families. This money, which had been furnished by the province on condition that it would be used to pay these legitimate and privileged debts, had found its way in the pockets of speculators."

And he might have added: Into the pockets of adventurers. Moreover, Mr. Chrysostôme Langelier, Deputy Provincial Registrar, in his sworn evidence, tells us that the Quebec Government, in their zeal to protect these men, acted as follows:—

"The Government said: Instead of paying that $28,545 for the company, we will keep it and pay the workmen ourselves direct so that we may be sure that they are paid."

I believe that the zeal which was manifested here by the Government of Quebec in keeping this money in order to pay every dollar to the labourers and workmen employed is worthy of all commendation. When asked:

"Q. Do you know what induced the Local Government to pay the workmen out of the local subsidy the first time?"

He answers:

"It was because the Government thought, if they paid the money to the company or the contractor, the money might have been misapplied from its proper purpose, as it was before."

No people were better qualified to judge of such dangers of misapplication of money as the gentlemen who recorded these sentiments. They had great experience in that department of politics, and they have had more since. Let us now see how this truly paternal provision was carried out by the Quebec Government. On 3rd October, 1889, Mr. Charles Langelier, member of this rifle brigade, was appointed commissioner to enquire into the claims of the labourers, workmen, furnishers of materials and board, and others privileged; and, after spending six weeks among these poor people, and dealing with their case, in heart-broken accents he reported on the 19th November that the amount required to meet such claims "in full"—I want to call the attention of the House to the words "in full"—would be nearly $29,000. He then modestly suggested that the amount of $28,546 which remained in the hands of the Government and which belonged to the Ontario Bank, might be safely appropriated to that purpose. Nay, more—he found the destitution amongst these poor people was so great that he made an interim report and urged upon his colleagues the advisability of appointing Mr. J. C. Langelier, civil service employé (and he might have added, his own brother) as a special commissioner to go down to the spot and pay these poor men, and on page 330 of the blue-book, we find that the commissioner recommends:

"That the sum of $28,546 be paid to Mr. J. C. Langelier, civil service employé, to be by him applied to the payment, in discharge of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway

Company or of its representatives—deduction first made of the expenses of the said enquiry, the allowance to the commissioner, his travelling expenses, and all other legitimate expenses connected therewith—of the amount due to the labourers, to the workmen, to those who supplied board to the workmen and labourers, to the furnishers of building material and to other privileged parties, in full, conformably to the list annexed to Mr. Langelier's preliminary report; and that the balance which shall remain after settlement of the claims above enumerated be distributed between the sub-contractors and other unprivileged claims *pro rata* to their respective claims.

(Signed) "GUSTAVE GRENIER,
"*Clerk of the Executive Council.*"

Now, when the manager of the Ontario Bank became aware of the manner in which the funds of the bank were being treated, he wrote to the Treasurer of Quebec protesting against the balance of the subsidies being applied by the Government to payment for material, as the amount had been assigned to the bank and on that assignment the bank had advanced the money in good faith. On the 13th December (page 321 of the blue-book) the Treasurer wrote in reply setting forth the facts and stating that:

"On the 25th November, 1889, after receipt of a report by the said commissioner, who had examined and verified by the evidence of the sub-contractor the equity of the claims, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council ordered the balance of the subsidy, granted by the Legislature on the said twenty (20) miles of railway, to be placed in the hands of a civil service officer, in order that he might proceed to the spot and use such balance in the discharge of such claims. I am instructed by the Prime Minister and Acting-Treasurer to say that in the disastrous state of affairs that had occurred on the railway there was no other course open to the Government than that pursued, and in so doing he cannot admit, in view of the above record of the facts connected with the subsidy and its transfer, that the Government has acted either with hardship or injustice.

"At the same time the Government recognizes the injustice done to the bank by the railway company or its contractors, and it desires, if there is any way in which it can be accomplished, to protect the bank against the loss of moneys advanced in good faith.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"H. V. MACHIN,

"*Assistant Treasurer, Province of Quebec.*"

Then, on the 27th June, the following letter was received by the General Manager of the Ontario Bank:

"QUEBEC, 27th June, 1890.

"C. HOLLAND, Esq.,
"Manager of the Ontario Bank,
"Toronto, Ont.

"SIR,—Agreeable to your request, I beg to give the following information:

"1. By an Order in Council of the 25th of November last, I was appointed special officer to pay, in discharge of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company or its representatives, the privileged claims against the 60 miles of that road covered by the sub-contract of Henry Macfarlane, out of the $28,546 of subsidy remaining due by the Government of Quebec for that part of the railway.

"2. That balance of subsidy was by the Government placed to my credit, and out of that sum I have paid all the privileged claims, sworn to before the commissioner and acknowledged by H. Macfarlane or the other sub-contractors, which were presented to me for payment, comprising all proved and admitted claims for wages.

"3. All proved claims for wages have been paid, except for the amount of $2,150.07, which amount will be paid as soon as all the necessary formalities are fulfilled.

"Yours very humbly,

"J. C. LANGELIER."

Then we find in the evidence of the same gentleman, on 29th August, 1891, at page 346 of Exhibit 66:

Statements of Disbursements, i.e., balance of Quebec Subsidy applicable to miles 40 to 60 of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, from Nov. 28, 1890, to Oct. 31, 1891.

SUBSIDY		$28,545 00
Paid Macfarlane's workmen and other bills in connection with contract	$25,379 90	
Paid Armstrong's workmen and other debts	689 50	
Expenses of the investigation and payment in connection with same	2,475 60	
		$28,545 00

And at the same time on page 122 of the evidence, he assures us that he had not a single *sou* left, that it had all been paid to the workmen and to certain boarding-house people, and to certain people who had furnished supplies on the road. Such, Sir, is the statement given to us by the Quebec Government of the manner in which they dealt with this subsidy. In their eagerness, they kept their hands upon it; they sent two officers down to examine into the matter, and they appointed one of them a special commissioner to go and pay those claims. He told you last session that he had paid every claim, that he had not a *sou* left; so that I think, as far as the bank is concerned, that it must be said that the bank, in accordance with its contract with Sir John A. Macdonald, saw all those men paid. But, Sir, while this is the story given to the public when I was in Quebec last year, other facts were divulged to me which have since become a matter of public notoriety, but which were then divulged to me on the express condition that I should make no use of any of the information I had received, unless it bore directly on the $280,000 subsidy, the history of which I was then investigating. But now that I am relieved from any pledge of secrecy, through revelations of the last few days, I think it but due to all parties, and to the interests of morality, that I should show what really has been done with this money. It appears from the evidence taken before the royal commission at Quebec on the 23rd of February, just a week ago, that on the 25th of November, 1889, a warrant was issued by the assistant-treasurer in favour of John Chrysostôme Langelier, and a cheque was drawn then for $28,546 of the bank's money. The Hon. Honoré Mercier kept his eyes steadily on this warrant. He took the warrant from the treasurer as soon as issued, and, as it was a warrant in favour of Chrysostôme Langelier, he gave his receipt for it. He then took Chrysostôme Langelier a cheque on the Bank of Montreal and got him to endorse it: then he took this cheque to his own bank, the Banque du Peuple, endorsed that cheque, and deposited the money to his own private account in that bank. Well, Sir, it was with some difficulty that these facts were elicited the other day, inasmuch as the manager of the Bank of Quebec, Mr. Dumoulin, was naturally very averse to revealing matters bearing on the private interests of his clients. However, we were able to find that this money was taken by Mr. Mercier and put to his own private account. Mr. Dumoulin gives us his sworn evidence that out of this money the Hon. Honoré Mercier proceeded to pay his own private bills. I am divulging no secret when I say that at that time Mr. Mercier was what we would technically call very "hard up," since the whole amount that he had to his credit in the bank was $8.28.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is that the exact amount?

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes, and that is more than some people have. However, that was all there was at that time. Well, he then decided to be very liberal with this money that had come as a windfall into his possession, and he drew out a cheque for $39.90 in payment of early vegetables and choice fruits which had been sent to him by Mr. Roumilhac, green grocer in Quebec. This was the next day after he had deposited the cheque, and the very same day the inevitable Ernest Pacaud appeared on the scene and claimed $100. He left rejoicing with the $100 in his pocket, all of it paid, in a manner, by those poor men down by the sea. Then, like an honest man, Mr. Mercier proceeded to do what a good many people are not ready to do, that is, to pay his rent, which was overdue, and he gave his cheque for $75 for one month's rent. However, Mr. Mercier seems to have been a man who needed a little *délassement*: he had been brooding for a long time over the troubles and hard fate of these men, and probably with tears in his eyes he told his friends how careful he had been not to let the bank handle the money, or the company to handle the money, in case anything should be improperly spent. He was worn out by his emotions, and he felt the necessity of taking a little trip to New York. So he paid Mr. R. M. Stocking, out of this money, $73.40 for a first-class passage to New York, as became the Premier of the Province of Quebec. It must be said for him, however, that he was not a man who was going to forget entirely his sad friends down by the sad sea waves; so he handed Chrysostôme Langelier a cheque for $17,500 out of the $28,500. They probably thought they might manage to pay debts amounting to $28,500 out of $17,500. These men had an astounding belief in their financial power, because we know that Premier Mercier, with a moderate income managed to live like a prince, and there was no reason why Pacaud might not be able by some wonderful stroke of financiering to pay debts even greater than $28,564 with $17,500. At all events, that was all Mr. Mercier gave him. He has no sooner handed his cheque and told that gentleman to go down and relieve the sufferings of the heart-broken people than Mr. Pacaud again came in and claimed his little share, and he received $250. So much for the 26th and 27th day of the month. Now we come to the 28th. I find the account of Jean Barbeau, who had been doing some little repairs to some of the palaces belonging to Mr. Mercier. He was awarded $170 as part payment of his account; while Mr. Chas. Langelier, who had so skilfully suggested the little arrangement of having a commissioner in the shape of his brother to pay these accounts, received $500. The 29th day of the month is a little dark, inasmuch as the cheques are carefully made payable to bearer; one is given for $1,000, another for $50, another for $26, and then, as Mr. Mercier was probably in New York, he found it necessary to have a little more money, and so he drew a couple of thousand for himself. As there is nothing mean about him, he handed to his brother on 5th December a cheque for $600 out of this money, and then he generously pays an account that has been deferred for some little time of $736. He meets an obligation in the bank of $1,000; then he gives to Mr. Perry for furniture $22, and there is a bill for the Garrison Club of Quebec of $269.25. How much of that sum was spent in champagne of the finest brand and in cigars of the best quality to sustain the feelings of his friends, is not for me to say--I was not there; but I am not surprised that it required an expenditure of $269.25 to solace Mr. Mercier and his friends in their afflicted condition. We know that sometimes, even among the best of men, a little drop of "cratur" or a glass of sparkling champagne has a peculiarly exhilarating effect and makes one forget in the meantime the troubles surrounding them. The day afterwards Mr. Mercier paid a bill to Mr. Pacaud--Mr. Mercier had got ahead of him at this time-- but Mr. Pacaud got $500 out of him that day, and on the same day E. Morency & Frères, picture frame makers, were paid $15.50 for framing a print of perhaps pretty little Mrs. So-and-so--we will not give the name --but at all events that sum was paid for the picture frame. The Merchants Bank received $190.40, and Mr. Mercier sent to New York a draft for $500 to cover up his little expenses, in addition to $2,000 drawn previously. Then comes a sum of money, $1,200, for payment of a pair of horses, perhaps, of which I will not speak just now. Mr. J. C. Langelier, the commissioner, received a paltry $200; but he was a great financier, and it is for us to determine what little percentage he might have made on the $17,500, when gratitude urged these poor starving men to accept partial payment in full discharge of all their claims. It must be said for Mr. Mercier that there are some good points about him, for I find he gave his wife at one time $125. Mr. Pacaud again comes up next day and claims $500 more. Then another one of the family or perhaps the same member of the illustrious rifle brigade received $818, the whole account being wound up with the payment of $774.70, and $1,000, leaving Mr. Mercier with a balance still somewhat in excess of the $8.28 with which he started when he first seized money belonging to the Ontario Bank and concluded to devote it to these personal purposes. I think, in view of these circumstances, in view of what I have stated, in view of the fact that this House is intimately connected with this railway, that it released moneys on the understanding that these people were to be paid out of them, that Mr. Langelier gave the Bank of Ontario receipts and assurances that all these claims had been paid, that $54,000 was paid to the Ontario Bank by the Dominion Government, it is our duty to enquire and ascertain if in very truth these workmen have received the wages which they are said to have received. I can only conclude by saying that a more miserable series of petty larcenies, a more wretched prostitution of office, a more disgraceful betrayal of a sacred trust, a more infamous robbery perpetrated under the guise of heartfelt sympathy for the poor and oppressed ones, has never yet been recorded in the annals of any civilized country, and it becomes hon. members of this House to see that signal punishment is meted out to those who have brought such foul disgrace upon our beloved country, and that these poor labourers and poor workmen who have been so infamously defrauded of their hard-earned wages should not be left to the tender mercies of hypocritical political adventurers.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand from the explanation which the hon. gentleman has given in support of this motion, that the question, as he brings it before the House, has two aspects. One is in relation to the Ontario Bank; and the

hon. gentleman has explained to the House that it is partly in vindication of the position and reputation of his bank that he desires this motion to carry. I think, so far as that is concerned, the facts he has stated to the House, and which I understand appear on the public records, are sufficient for his purpose, and that it will be preferable to wait until the action of the bank with respect to its guarantee to the Government is in some way impugned before the motion should be pressed on that ground. But it has a second aspect, upon which the hon. gentleman addressed the House with great earnestness and fervour, that with respect to the claims of the workmen themselves, who, I understand from his remarks, as well as from the little I know of the case otherwise, had some right under the terms of the contract with this Government to claim the protection of the Government in respect to their wages and supplies. Perhaps it is stating the case somewhat too strongly to say that they had a right to claim the protection of the Government, but, at any rate, the Government in such contracts reserves to itself the right, at any time, to step in and make payments to the unpaid employés with a view to prevent disturbances on the work. Possibly, in consequence of some view of that kind, it was that the late First Minister made an arrangement with the Ontario Bank by which a portion of the subsidy which had been earned by the company was withheld until the guarantee of the Ontario Bank was given that the wages would be paid in due course. But, with regard to that aspect of the case, whether we consider the position of the unpaid employés—if there are any still—or whether we regard the alleged misapplication of the fund, I have to remind the House that the whole matter is practically *sub judice* now in the Province of Quebec. The Provincial Government, as every member of the House is fully aware, has appointed two royal commissions, and I understand that this subject forms a matter of enquiry for both of them. At any rate, it forms a matter of enquiry by one of these royal commissions, and I believe that the other has taken some evidence on the subject, and that really it is from the proceedings of that second commission that the facts have transpired which the hon. gentleman referred to this afternoon. It would, therefore, serve no practical purpose whatever for the House to enter on this enquiry by a committee now. We may fairly assume that the authorities which have been constituted by the Province of Quebec will make a full and searching enquiry into such features of the case as appear to call for it, and that in due course of time that matter will be properly dealt with. After it has transpired what the result of the commission has been, and how this whole subject has been dealt with, would certainly be a more suitable time, if the House thinks it desirable at all, to appoint a committee to make enquiry into the subject. I think for both reasons: because of the complaint which the hon. gentleman makes with regard to the statements made against the bank, and on the ground that the rights of the persons who are alleged to have been unpaid are being enquired into and being dealt with now by the Provincial authority—I think it would be inexpedient for the House to yield to the motion and to appoint a committee at the present time. At a future time there may possibly be a case for it.

Mr. COCKBURN. I beg to withdraw the motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not at all surprised at the announcement just made by the hon. gentleman for Toronto Centre (Mr. Cockburn). I thought from the first that this motion was simply intended to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to make the stump speech which he has just delivered; but perhaps it would have been more in accordance with the effect he wanted to produce, if he had gone to Quebec where there is an election just now pending and delivered that address. The hon. gentleman is a good French scholar, I know, and whether in French or English he could have explained to the electors what he has just stated; but there is nothing new in his remarks, for all these facts have been long before the public.

Motion withdrawn.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved:

That all payments made since the last session under the sanction of the Governor General's Warrants be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before placing the motion in your hands I would just say that I am glad to find that the admonitions from this side of the House as to the abuse of Governor General's Warrants have apparently borne some fruit, and that the warrants brought down are much fewer in number and much smaller in amount than has been the case hitherto. I congratulate the Minister of Finance on the improvement in that respect. As to the desirability of referring these warrants to the Public Accounts Committee, I should think that probably the Minister of Finance himself and the Government will see no objection. These are extraordinary payments made in extraordinary circumstances defined in the Act, and having been actually made and the money gone out of the public treasury it is obviously desirable and convenient that they should be examined into, if necessary, before the Committee on Public Accounts. Frequently when discussions have arisen about them in Supply we have been told that it is no use discussing them because the money has actually gone, or that in any case it is not convenient, as it might lead to prolonged and unnecessary discussions on the floor, of a character which I think would be much better conducted in the Public Accounts Committee. I, therefore, make this motion, and I trust there will be no objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, this motion, although a little unusual, may, I think, be very well permitted to pass. I, at least, have no objection to make to it. This is an appropriation of some kind, part of which has been expended, and in that way, it is before the House, having been brought down and laid on the Table. I am sorry, however, that my hon. friend has shown his accustomed lack of generosity towards us, and has not allowed for any good intentions on our part.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am praising you for what you have done.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has attributed all to the valuable advice that he gave us from that side of the House last year, but I must remind my hon. friend, that the interim between the sessions has been a very short one, and that possibly had it been longer and the exigencies of the public service greater, the Governor-General's Warrants might have been larger in amount.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be instructive if we also referred to the same committee, copies of the reports on which these warrants were issued. I am not able at the present moment to criticise these expenditures, but I would call the attention of the House to the fact that the first item for an amount of $24,000 appearing in this account as having been expended, was a warrant said to have been issued on the 15th day of October, which was just about two weeks after Parliament rose, and it was in respect of expenditure that was, I presume, well known to the Government when Parliament was in session. It is entitled "C.P.R., Capital, Expenses Special Arbitrators between Government and C.P.R., respecting work in British Columbia." Now, it would be well for the Government to understand the true spirit of the Act. I cannot see that such an item as this can be regarded unless special circumstances may disclose it as an unforeseen expenditure, and it is the duty of the Government, if I may use a not very elegant expression, to clean up all such accounts with the permission of Parliament, and not to wait until Parliament adjourns and then issue a Governor-General's Warrant. That appears to have been what occurred in this case. The Government well knew that these expenses were pending and had to be met, and, therefore, the House ought to have been asked to have voted upon that item when in session. It is perhaps possible that the report made by the Ministers to the Governor in Council may fairly explain the cause. The Minister of Finance will remember that last session he promised to be a very much better Minister in future, and that in the reports that were presented to the Governor-General asking him to assume the exercise of this prerogative, he would take care to see that the reasons which moved any Minister of the Crown for this special exercise of authority would appear on the face of the report presented to His Excellency. It may be that these reports do contain all the material which would have authorized His Excellency to have issued these warrants, and, therefore, I abstain from criticising them adversely or speaking of them favourably, until the reasons for this expenditure are given. I was not aware of this notice being on the Paper, and I was engaged in drafting an Address to the House for the production of the reports and Orders in Council on which these were issued. But perhaps the hon. mover of the motion, with the consent of the House, would allow an amendment as follows: to insert in the motion after the word "warrants" the following words: "together with copies of all reports and Orders in Council."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are not on the Table yet.

Mr. MULOCK. No, they are not on the Table, and if the point is raised I shall have to make a substantive motion to meet the case.

Mr. FOSTER. Better get the papers first.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I will not make the motion, but I think the reports ought to cover the undertaking of the Minister last year, or it will be necessary to amend the Audit Act in this respect.

Motion agreed to.

THE LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved:

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery do attend this House with the original list of voters received from the revising officer of the City of London, also with list as printed and upon which the recent election for that city was held.

He said: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that when I brought this motion to the attention of the House two or three days ago, I did so as a matter of privilege, and it seemed to me to be a matter of importance. There was some doubt expressed as to whether it really was a matter of privilege or not. With a view of deciding that question, although it is not of practical importance at this moment, I would call the attention of the House to the discussion that took place on the 20th of March, 1875, with reference to an election for the County of Victoria in the Province of Ontario. At that time the law provided that certain officers should be returning officers, and it was not until those parties refused to serve or were otherwise preoccupied so that it was impossible they could serve as returning officers, that the Government had power to go outside of those officials and appoint others. On that occasion the Government did appoint another party, and the question as to why they made such an appointment instead of taking one of the officials designated in the statute, was made a matter of privilege and brought before the House for discussion; and it was held that the House, in regard to the election of its members, had not, by the reference of the trial of controverted elections to the judges, in any way impaired its original authority to exercise supervision over the proceedings of the various officials who were called upon to act in an election. That was affirmed on both sides of the House by the leader of the Government, by the gentleman who made the motion, and by Sir John Macdonald who at that time led the Opposition. Now, it is of the highest importance, if the House of Commons is to retain its position as a representative body, that it should be fairly constituted, and that those who are returned here should represent the electors—should represent those whom the law has entrusted or intends to entrust with the exercise of the elective franchise. I mentioned the matter to the House as it was stated to me by a gentleman who had inspected the original list of voters and also the list as printed. I stated that the list as it came from the revising officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery contained a number of names which were struck off, through which a pen had been drawn. In the list as it was printed and used in the election, these names were included among the list of voters; and I thought it was important that the House, in the discharge of its duties, and in the exercise of that watchfulness and care which it is necessary it should always manifest for the preservation of the rights of the people and the purity of the House of Commons, should order the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to come here and lay on the Table of the House the original list as

it was received by him from the revising officer, and also the list as it was printed. Difficulties have arisen to which I shall to-morrow ask the attention of the House, with the consent of the House and the leader of the Government. All I propose to do to-day is to call the attention of the House to the manner in which, I think, the list ought to be made up, as provided by the Electoral Franchise Act. The clauses of that Act which specially refer to the question of the preparation of the lists, and to the use which may be made of them when an election is being held before all the appeals are finally disposed of, will be found in sections 21, 22, 26, 30, 33 and 35 of the Act; and I will read those provisions to which I wish to direct the attention of the House, so that the House may see how far, if at all, they have been departed from in the preparation of the list, and in the list as printed. By section 21 it is provided:

"After the lists for the several polling districts in an electoral district have been so finally revised, they shall be certified in the form E in the schedule to this Act by the revising officer, and they shall be kept by him for the purposes of this Act, and a duplicate of each such list, certified as aforesaid, shall be transmitted forthwith by him to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa, who, on receipt of all the said lists for any electoral district, shall, in the then next issue of the *Canada Gazette*, insert a notice in the form F in the schedule of this Act, on and after the publication of which notice the persons whose names are entered on the said lists as voters shall, subject to any correction or amendment made by any judgment on appeal, as hereinafter provided for, be held to be duly registered voters in and for such electoral district: Provided, however, that in the event of any such appeal, such lists, after the publication of the last mentioned notice in the *Canada Gazette*, shall apply to every election for such electoral district or portion of any electoral district, taking place before such appeal has been disposed of and the result thereof communicated to the revising officer, subject to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act with respect to the counting of the ballot of any voter whose right to have his name registered as a voter upon any such list and to vote, or the exclusion of whose name from any such list as a voter is the subject of an undecided appeal."

By section 22 it is provided:

"After the lists of voters have been so finally revised, or amended, and corrected on appeal, if any such appeal takes place, and after they have been certified and brought in to force as hereinbefore prescribed and until other lists are, in a future year, as herein provided, revised, amended and corrected on appeal, if any such appeal takes place, and are certified and brought into force in their stead, those persons only whose names are entered upon such lists as so revised, amended and corrected on appeal as aforesaid, if any, shall be entitled to vote."

Then by section 26 it is provided that:

"The revising officer shall have power at any court or sitting held under this Act by him, to amend or give leave to amend, when he sees fit, any proceedings taken in reference to any list of voters."

The law proceeds on the assumption that it is of consequence in order to preserve the rights of electors to give full latitude for the removal of names that should not be on the list, and to secure on the list the names of persons who have the necessary qualication and are entitled to be there. It is assumed that the persons who are so entitled will not in every case be learned in the law, and that the strict proceedings of law and evidence shall not be enforced against them, and, if any blunder takes place, it is clear from this section that the revising officer shall have power to adjourn his court, to make the necessary amendment, or to give leave to make the necessary change or alteration in order to bring the party within the provision of the law if he is entitled so to be brought. Then section 30 of the Act provides as to the lists certified while an appeal is pending, and it is just at this point, as it seems to me, that these lists do not conform exactly to the law. There are various classes of persons in regard to whom appeals may be pending, who may be differently circumstanced, and I think it is from the provisions of this section perfectly clear that these different classes of persons are to be kept distinct. It is also, with regard to this section, evident that some of its provisions are obscure, and it is only by looking back to the Acts which were in force before the consolidation took place that we can see with clearness precisely what is meant by some of the phrases employed in this section. It is said here:

"If, at any time when the revising officer is required to furnish or certify any list of voters to any officer or person, there is, with respect to such list, any appeal pending and undecided, or, if there is any appeal with respect to such list in which the decison, if given, has not been notified to the revising officer, the revising officer shall furnish such list as then last revised, corrected and certified by him, noting thereon the names of all persons who have been retained on the list of voters."

I wish to say here, before reading further, that it will be seen from the provisions of this section, that the lists as they are sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery are not supposed to contain the names of any parties about whom any dispute has arisen, or about whom any appeal is pending, because the provision of this section is that, in case an election is about to be held on this list, before these questions are disposed of, then the revising officer shall append these names, shall note them on the list, a statement which makes it perfectly clear to my mind, that prior to this return, except as to the first class, these names are not there, and that the list sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery contains the names of none of the others, of those persons whose claims are in appeal, but only the names of those about whose right to vote there is no dispute at all. The provision goes on to say:

"Noting thereon the names of all persons who have been retained on the list of voters, notwithstanding objection."

There is the first class, the names of all those who have been retained notwithstanding the proposition to strike them off--

"The names of all persons who have been struck off the list of voters."

That is the second class—

"And the names of all persons who have applied to be placed on the list of voters, and whose applications have been refused."

That is the third class. Now, as the next paragraph of this section reads, one would suppose that it constituted a fourth class:

"And noting also thereon the names of all persons who have appealed from his decision."

That is obscure as it stands, but, when we look at the 47th section of the Act, which has been embraced in this consolidated Act, the words are perfectly clear. They are these:

"And whose applications have been refused, and who have respectively appealed from his decisions."

That is, he does not note the name of every person who has been struck off, or of every person who has applied to go on and whom he has refused to put on, but so many of those as are appealed are noted--not all, but those who have appealed to the county judge, from the decision of the revising barrister, are noted. This is made clear by the 47th section applying to the preceding classes and

not referring to a distinct class. In fact, to attempt to give any other interpretation to the statute would be to make it nonsense, and the 8th section of the Act, which brings this Act into operation, provides that:

"The said revised statutes shall not be held to operate as new laws but shall be construed and have effect as a consolidation, and as declaratory of the law as contained in the said Acts and parts of Acts so repealed."

And so on. Showing that it was not the intention of Parliament, at all events, to make the law different from what it was before, but simply to consolidate all the various provisions of the law as it stood at that time: and so, when we look at the 47th section, we see precisely what the meaning of those words is. Where the list has been corrected by the decision of the revising officer, he must notify the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who corrects the lists accordingly. I do not propose at this moment to enter into a discussion of what has been done under this provision of the law; I do not propose to say how far the variation of the list as presented deviates from the form in which the statute intended it should be, or how far that has affected the proceedings in the election which has taken place. All I wish to do on this motion is to call the attention of the House to the fact that the lists have, in my judgment, not been printed in the way that the law requires, and it is most desirable that in matters of this sort there should be uniformity of procedure, that the lists as they are prepared in one constituency should be so prepared in every other constituency, that the law as it is construed and applied to the case of the voters' list in one constituency should be so construed and so applied to the lists in every other constituency of the Dominion. It is, I think, of the first consequence, because, if a departure from the clear intention of this statute is permitted, and if what has been done by the revising officer, or by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, as the case may be, has given to the electors a list in a different form from that in which the statute intended, it may have seriously affected the future proceedings that have taken place or which may hereafter take place upon that list. I wish to bring under the attention of the House specially at this moment, the fact that it was not the intention of Parliament, as I understand the provisions of this law, to put upon the voters' lists the name of any party that the revising officer has decided to strike off, except as noted for the purpose of the election until it was placed there by the decision of the county judge. If there is to be an election before that decision takes place, then it must be noted there by the revising officer with special reference to that election; it must clearly appear that it is the name of a party whose right to go upon the list is yet undecided. It seems to me, and upon that matter I shall ask the attention of the House to-morrow, that these parties whose right to go upon the list is still pending, are parties who are not to be counted in a general summation until the question of their right is finally disposed of by the officer who has power to deal with the subject. However, as I say, I shall not discuss that matter to-day, but I give notice that I shall do so to-morrow upon a motion asserting the authority of the House to exercise its undoubted right, and to discharge its undoubted duty, by exercising supervision in this matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman refers to the discussion which took place the other day on the question of privilege, and has not quite accurately stated, I think, the ground which I took. The hon. gentleman says that my argument was that this was not a matter of privilege, and therefore could not be dealt with at that time; and he cited authorities to show that in 1875 some motion of the kind was considered a matter of privilege. As I understand our rule and practice, a question of privilege may arise with regard to any part of the business of the House, or to any part of the proceedings connected with the election of a member to the House. What I did urge was that the hon. gentleman had not shown it to be a case of privilege. It does not follow because the question relates to the way a revising officer or a returning officer has discharged his functions, that therefore it is a matter of privilege; nor, on the other hand, does it follow that because it is quite remote from any business of that kind, it is not a matter of privilege. But my argument was that the hon. gentleman was bound to state something to the House to show that it was a matter of privilege, and, above all, that before we should discuss the question without any notice he was bound to state to the House why it was urgent; because, as I understand it, not all matters of privilege are to be taken up without any notice whatever. I think, therefore, we will agree upon that point, and the hon. gentleman having courteously given me what I thought I was entitled to, as a matter of right, that is, the postponement of the motion until to-day, I think it is only right that I should state to the House fully what information I have on the subject, more especially as the hon. gentleman wishes to make it a subject of future discussion, and also, because some of the facts which I will state to the House will not appear from the documents which he requires the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to lay upon the Table. In the first place, I understood the hon. gentleman, when he raised this discussion the other day, to refer not at all to the appealed votes, about which so much has been said in the press and about which we have got information within the last few days that very few of us had before, and which certainly I had not, as to the political complexion and the position in other respects of these appealed votes. I supposed the hon. gentleman to refer to votes struck off in the ordinary way, and by some malpractice or error, printed upon the list which was finally used for the purposes of polling. Now, under the circumstances, I felt a good deal surprised at the statement he made. I was confident it was inaccurate, and I said it was the first time I heard that assertion made. I judge, however, from the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) this afternoon, that he had reference principally to those appealed votes, and therefore the statement that I will make will put the House in full possession of what was done with regard to that matter. I may say that the hon. gentleman and his friends, when they come to see the documents which will be placed upon the Table in accordance with his motion, and the other documents bearing upon it, will have every reason to admit that

whatever was done, whether by mistake or otherwise, was done with perfect good faith and with a desire simply to carry out the law. Now, the facts are these: That when the revising officer sent his lists to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery those lists contained a number of names which the revising officer had adjudicated upon, which he had decided should be struck off the list, and in relation to which there was no appeal. These were all erased in black ink; and no comment whatever was made. The votes about which there was an appeal and in relation to which the appeal was pending and undetermined, he drew a line through with red ink, and marked opposite the name "appeal pending," or something of that kind. Now, what follows with regard to the printing of the lists is this: The Clerk of the Crown sends the list to the Queen's Printer to be printed in the public printing establishment. When the lists are so printed from the original lists which he sends in, the proof sheets are sent to the revising officer for correction, and coming back corrected by him, the lists are finally struck off according to any corrections he may have made upon the proofs. The reprints are then sent to him, copies are given to the Clerk of the Crown, and to anybody else who requires them, and these lists, as so finally completed and printed, are furnished by the revising officer to the returning officer when the election comes on. Now, as I said when I diverted to state what the practice was as regards the printing of the lists, the revising officer sent the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the lists with the names upon which he had adjudicated finally, struck off in black ink, the others which were the subject of an appeal, he drew a pen through with red ink, and marked them "subject to a pending appeal," or something to that effect. The Clerk of the Crown received those lists in that way and sent them to the Printing Bureau for printing; but the printers omitted every name, whether erased in black ink or marked through with red ink, as being subject to appeal, and the proof was sent to the revising officer with all these names omitted. The revising officer wrote to the Queen's Printer, calling attention to the fact that the omission of the names subject to pending appeal was not in accordance with the Franchise Act. His view of section 30 was that these votes, subject to pending appeal, should appear on these lists, for the reason, in his judgment, and certainly in mine, that they were entitled to appear on the election lists until the appeal had come on and a decision given by the county judge disallowing the right of the parties to vote. Under these circumstances, he considered that the list was not correctly printed, and he desired that the Queen's Printer should obtain an opinion from my department upon the question whether the lists had been properly printed or not. He called attention to section 30 of the Franchise Act, and said:

"If these cases of undecided appeals should not appear in some way on the face of the list of voters, the only way the returning officer could have knowledge of them would be by certifying in each polling division a list of the undecided appeals for that division. Do the Franchise and the Election Acts endorse these modes of procedure? I call your attention to these matters so that no responsibility may rest with me in case of a mistake. As there are 220 names appealed, it would be a very serious matter if any mistake should arise, and I would like very much if it were submitted to the Minister of Justice before you proceed to the printing of the lists."

Mr. MULOCK. What is the date of the letter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 1st February is the date on which he returned the proof.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that the date of the letter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the date of the letter from the revising officer to the Queen's Printer. The Queen's Printer wrote a letter to the Premier, enclosing that of the revising officer, and requesting the opinion of the First Minister, who was then Acting Secretary of State. The Premier transferred the communication to my department; and my deputy gave the Queen's Printer an opinion, that, inasmuch as the Franchise Act and the Election Act entitled these parties to vote, they should appear upon the list until a decision of the county judge as to their right to vote was rendered, but they should be marked and designated in some way to indicate that they are not ordinary voters but simply persons who remain on the list, subject to an undecided appeal as to their right to vote. Under these circumstances, and without any supervision on the part of my department or any other, these names, which had been marked by the revising officer as subject to pending appeals, were inserted in the electoral list marked "A," and a foot note gave the explanation that all voters so marked "A" were subject to pending appeal. That list so printed was sent to the revising officer, who of course had to decide whether it was in accordance with what he deemed to be a correctly printed list. The revising officer certified that to be a correct list, and handed it to the returning officer when the polling came on. I regret that when the hon. member (Mr. Mills) raised the question the other day, I had no idea he sought to raise a discussion on these appealed votes. I said the hon. gentleman's remarks took me by surprise, and I had never heard of the matter before. I would, however, have probably made the same statement even if I had known what he referred to, because I did not remember, if indeed I was ever aware of the fact, that an opinion had been asked from my department, I do not disown my responsibility for it—but this circumstance explains what I stated the other day in respect to having been taken by surprise. I should like to call the attention of the House for a moment to the sections of the Act bearing on the question, because my opinion is quite at variance with the hon. gentleman's view of the requirements of the law on that subject. The first section of the Act bearing on it is No. 21. It provides that in the event of any appeal—that is, an appeal as to the right to vote—

"Such list, after the publication of the last mentioned notice in the *Canada Gazette*, shall apply to every election, for such electoral district or portion of electoral district, taking place before such appeal has been disposed of and, the result thereof communicated to the revising officer, subject to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act with respect to the counting of the ballot of any voter whose right to have his name registered as a voter upon any such list and to vote, or the exclusion of whose name from any such list as a voter is the subject of an undecided appeal."

I take it that this provision merely contemplates that when there is an appeal pending as to one's right to vote, he has the right, until that appeal is determined, to have his name appear on the list, because both this Act and the Elections Act clearly establish that he has the right to vote while the appeal is pending.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How can the hon. Minister reconcile that argument with the first part of section 30?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will go through the various sections. Section 30, irrespective of comparison with this section, clearly requires the same thing. Hon. gentlemen will observe with respect to what I have said as to this section that it is to be subject to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act as to the counting of the ballots, and it provides that the exclusion of any voter's name on such list shall be subject to appeal. Section 30 seems to me, and I say it with all respect to the argument which the hon. gentleman has presented to the contrary, to make it clear that the name must appear on the list until the appeal be decided. This section, as well as the provision of the Dominion Elections Act, places it beyond dispute that if a certain individual has the right to vote, his vote must be counted, subject, of course, to final determination by the constituted authority as to the name being properly on the list. Section 30 provides that lists are to be certified while an appeal is pending—

"If at any time when the revising officer is required to furnish or certify any list of voters to any officer or person, there is, with respect to such list, any appeal pending and undecided, or if there is any appeal with respect to such list in which the decision is given, has not been notified to the revising officer, the revising officer shall furnish such list as when last revised, corrected and certified by him, noting thereon the names of all persons who have been retained on the list of voters, notwithstanding objections, the names of all persons who have been struck off the list of voters, and the names of all persons who have applied to be placed on the list of voters and whose applications have been refused, and noting thereon the names of all persons who have appealed from his decision."

I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the interpretation of these words: "all persons who have appealed from his decision:" but it is clear that the list which is furnished the revising officer must, in order to comply with section 30, as the revising officer himself called to our attention, contain these names, because the Act says he shall note thereon the names of all persons who have appealed from his decision; and such list, with the persons' names who have appealed from his decision appearing thereon shall serve and avail according to the provision of the Act, for the election with reference to which it is furnished: but whenever any appeal is decided, so as to require the correction of the list, and the formal order or judgment has been served upon him, he shall forthwith correct the list accordingly. If the hon. gentleman's argument is that those names should not appear on the list, this language of the Act would be absurd, because when the judgment shall be given, as if Judge Elliot, the County Court judge, declare that these persons have a right to appear on the list, there would not be any correction of the list, because the names would not be there. The Act says:

"And shall forthwith notify the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of such formal order or judgment, that he may correct the duplicate list in his hands accordingly."

I repeat he would have no ground of correcting it at all, if the names did not appear there.—

"And the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall forthwith correct the same accordingly."

Then, if the hon. gentleman is right in his arguments that these 220 names ought never to have appeared on the list, and Judge Elliott had decided otherwise, how is this list ever to be corrected, so as to be effectual for the purposes of the election?

"Provided, that if the decision in appeal, requiring the correction of any list of voters, is notified to the revising officer by service of the formal order or judgment, or otherwise before the day of polling, a duly certified copy of the corrected list of voters, together with a copy of the formal order or judgment on appeals as received by him duly certified by such revising officer, shall be furnished before the said day by the revising officer to the returning officer for the polling district, the list of voters for which has been corrected upon the said appeal, which copy shall contain the correction in question, certified as hereinbefore provided, in which case the election shall take place upon such corrected list if received in time by such deputy returning officer."

Now the hon. gentleman's view is that, under that, the course of procedure where the revising officer thinks that names ought to be struck off, is to leave them off, but that if the parties have appealed, their names shall in some way appear on some supplementary list which the revising officer shall furnish to the returning officer or deputy returning officer. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that there is no power or provision for making any supplementary list. He must give the list that he has prepared of the voters, and that is subject to correction if the authority in appeal should decide that the names ought to be removed from the list. Let me call the attention of the House to what I think is conclusive upon the point in the provisions of the Election Act with regard to such appeal votes. Section 50 says:

"In the event of any person desiring to vote at any election whose name is registered on the list of voters for any polling district in the electoral district for which such election takes place and whose right to have his name registered on such list as a voter and to vote, appears by the list of voters to be the subject of an undecided appeal under the provisions of 'The Electoral Franchise Act,' or of the Act passed in the session held in the forty-eighth and forty-ninth years of Her Majesty's reign, and intituled: 'An act respecting the Electoral Franchise,' the deputy returning officer shall number the ballot of such a person, and shall place opposite to his name in the poll book, a number corresponding to the number so placed upon such ballot paper."

Now, what was eventually done, was to make it appear in these lists that these voters whose names are on the list, were all subject to an undecided appeal. The hon. gentleman's view, which I dissent from, is that these names ought not to appear there at all. How, then, are we to understand the provisions of the Electoral Act, which says:

"Whose right to have his name registered * * * appears by the list of voters to be the subject of an undecided appeal."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then there is no name to be struck off by the revising officer?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; all those which are not the subject of an undecided appeal. If the appeal is taken these names are to appear there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are seven days allowed for an appeal; what is the position of the name during these seven days?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. During the seven days the revising officer does not certify the lists to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, not until he knows whether an appeal is taken from his decision.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see under section 35 where all the names to be struck off are to be restored.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Subsection 2 of the same section says:

"In the event of any person desiring to vote at any election whose name has been excluded from the list of voters for any district in the electoral district for which such election takes place, and the exclusion of whose name from such list, appears by the list of voters to be the subject of an undecided appeal under the provisions of 'The Electoral Franchise Act' or the Act passed in the session held in the 48th and 48th years of Her Majesty's reign and intituled: 'An Act respecting the Electoral Franchise,' he shall be entitled to receive a ballot paper and to vote."

He would be entitled to receive a ballot paper, but how can he receive a ballot paper if he does not appear on the list at all?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He does appear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He does not appear unless he appears in the way I have mentioned as having been followed in this case, because there could be no suplementary list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think he does appear under section 30, because—

"If at any time when the revising officer is required to furnish or certify any list of voters to any officer or person, there is, with respect to such list, any appeal pending or undecided, or if there is any appeal with respect to such list in which the decision, if given, has not been notified to the revising officer, the revising officer shall furnish such list as then last revised, corrected and certified by him, noting thereon the names of all persons who have been retained on the list of voters, notwithstanding objection, the names of all persons who have been struck off the list of voters, and the names of all persons who have applied to be placed on the list of voters and whose applications have been refused."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is precisely what he did and what I understand the hon. gentleman objected to, because on the list which he handed to the returning officer as the list upon which the balloting should take place, all these names appear as being the subjects of an undecided appeal, although, according to his argument, they ought to have been struck off the list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would the hon. gentleman excuse me for interrupting by asking him this question: There is a third class of parties whom he has refused to put on. Now, these are on the voters' list as they were voted upon. How do they get there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He must put them on if they are the subjects of an undecided appeal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And the others are exactly in the same position.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He must undoubtedly put them on and keep them on, and mark on the list that they are subject to an undecided appeal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister will see that these sections of the Election Act which he has quoted apply to that class as well as to the other two.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To all. They appear on the list as subjects of an undecided appeal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They appear on that list only and not on the list as printed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that he is bound to put them on the list because the law says that if his decision shall be overruled he has to correct the list.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is the list that is voted upon.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That list which is voted upon must be the same as the list which he sent in. He is bound to leave them all on because he is bound to make the correction if the county court judge decides against him. The hon. gentleman will see that we can discuss this case, from the position of there having been no election held in London at all. Suppose there had been no election held in London let us test the correctness of the revising officer's views, that these names are to appear on the lists sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. What would be the effect if Judge Elliott decided that 200 of these names ought not to be put off? According to the hon. gentleman's views they would be then added. If the judge decided that the revising officer was right in striking them all off there would be no correction to be made, and in the meantime the election having come on, the provisions of the Election Act that every such individual has the right to receive a ballot paper and to vote, would be defeated and nugatory. The Act says:

"And the deputy returning officer shall receive his ballot paper and shall number the same and place opposite to the name of such person in the poll book a number corresponding to the number so placed upon such ballot paper. Every such person if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates, or one of their agents, or by any elector present, shall, before receiving his ballot paper take the oath of qualification in the form X in the first schedule to this Act."

Then section 56, subsection 3 of the Act, says:

"The deputy returning officer shall also in counting the ballots place in two separate envelopes or parcels the two classes of ballot papers, of persons whose right to have their names registered upon the list of voters and to vote at such election, and of persons the exclusion of whose names from the said list as voters are respectively the subjects of undecided appeals under 'The Electoral Franchise Act.'"

Although it has no direct connection with the subject of our argument, I daresay the members of the House have this question occurring to them: What remedy is there if these persons who are the subjects of undecided appeals eventually have no right to vote?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will consent we will discuss that on my motion to-morrow.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I merely refer to it as a matter of explanation. The Act makes clear provision for that to be dealt with; a provision giving means for a delay until there shall be a recount, and for delaying the recount until the appeals are decided.

Mr. LAURIER. That has been refused.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not so understand it, but I will not discuss that to-day; I merely mentioned the point for the purpose of showing that these provisions seem to quite coincide with the view I have taken: that these names ought to have appeared on both lists—the list as sent to the revising officer, and the list furnished by him to the returning officer. I beg to say that while I have no recollection whatever of the circumstances ever having come to my knowledge, personally, at the time the opinion was given—they may have done so—but I certainly at that time had not the slightest knowledge of the position of these appeal votes, as to which side politically they were on, or whether any political controversy could possibly arise about it. My deputy prepared the opinion from his view, and it is my view of what the Election and Franchise Acts require as to the way of dealing with these names. The revising officer held the same view in writing this letter of the 1st February, in which he

called attention to the fact that we had not treated his list as he evidently intended it to be treated, and as he thought the Franchise Act requires, and his opinion was further shown when he certified the list as printed in accordance with his remonstrance, and sent it to the returning officer and the deputy returning officers for the polling.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before you put the motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word or two in reference to the argument of the hon. Minister of Justice that these names would not be on the list at all as required by the election law unless they were on the list as printed for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I think when he admits that the one class at all events would not be there, the class whom the revising officer refused to put there, he gives up all the force of that argument. So that the question simply comes to this, in what way are these names to be put on the list, and at what time? Now, as I understand the provision of section 30, it it pretty clear that they are to be put on at the time when the election is being held:

"If, at any time, when the revising officer is required to furnish or certify any list of voters to any officer or person, there is, with respect to such list, any appeal pending and undecided."

It is only at that time that he is required to furnish the list, and it is at that time that he is to note on that list the latter two of the three classes of persons here spoken of. One class he has refused to strike off; they are there and designated. There are two classes not there. By section 35 it is provided that the county judge is to put on those names which he thinks should be put on, of the classes struck off—not that he is to strike off some names which have already been struck off. If they are not struck off the list, how can they be put on? I do not think it is a matter of vital consequence, if the class is designated to which they belong; but it is of vital consequence that they shall subsequently be recognized as a class, and that the officer shall conform to the provisions of the law applicable to these particular parties. The hon. Minister of Justice has admitted there is no fourth class. His observations apply to three classes, and so far there is no dispute. But it does seem to me that when the revising officer has decided that certain parties are not qualified, and when the law provides that those who are not qualified shall be struck off the list, they ought not to be found on the list supplied to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, if the law is complied with. They are off the list, and remain off until they are put on by the superior authority of the county court judge; then, the list is to be corrected accordingly. As to the third class, they are off, and yet they are entitled to vote; they do not stand in a different position from the other two classes, and they cannot get on the list except by their names being noted according to the provisions of section 30. The noting of the names of those persons whom the revising officer has refused to put on the list is not a different noting from that of the names he has decided to strike off. Those whom he has refused to put upon the list are equally entitled to vote with those he has struck off. If that be so, then the hon. Minister cannot argue that they must be on the list as printed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, when he admits that so far as one class is concerned they are not there at all until they are put on by the revising officer for the purpose of the election.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I say that they must be there if they are subjects of an undecided appeal. If I may be indulged for one moment, I should like to make clear the point on which we differ. I understand the hon. gentleman to agree that those names ought to appear on the list as handed to the returning officer.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say that section 30 provides that they should be there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman does not dispute the right of the persons so appearing on the lists to vote, I understand?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No. I admit their right to vote in conformity with the law, their ballots being marked as the law provides.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My object in asking this question was to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is practically no difference between us as to the result arrived at. In the list handed to the returning officer as the list for the polls, all these names appeared as the subjects of an undecided appeal—not in the same way as ordinary voters, but marked in the way I described to the House. The hon. gentleman admits that those very names ought to have appeared on that list in that way, and he admits the right of those persons to have their votes polled. As I understand, their votes were polled, many of them, so that as regards the result arrived at they are in exactly the same position as they would have been if the course proposed by the hon. gentleman had been pursued.

Mr. LAURIER. The difference between the hon. Minister of Justice and my hon. friend is not very great. It is simply as to how the list is to be printed—whether it is to be printed with the appealed names or not. If there is to be an election, the list must be furnished to the returning officer with the appealed names. The difference is not very great, but it is important to lay down at once what is the true law in this matter. There is no doubt that these appealed names had a right to vote: that is not disputed; but at the same time there is no doubt, in my construction of the law, that the count ought not to take place until the appeal is decided. I understand that the returning officer acted differently, and counted those votes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was no result of the printing of the list.

Mr. LAURIER. I know that the difference between the hon. Minister of Justice and my hon. friend is not very great; but it amounts to this: whether these appealed votes ought to have been counted, and in my humble opinion the view taken by my hon. friend is the correct one.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I am very glad to find, from the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that no charge of improper conduct is made in regard to the return of this list. I thought the other day, when the matter was mentioned, that there might be such a charge; but to-day that seems to be entirely withdrawn, and the question is simply how the appealed votes should appear on the voters' list. That is certainly very satisfactory; and the last remark made by the leader of the Opposition would seem to give us to understand that this is a matter of very little moment.

Mr. LAURIER. No, no.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I understand that both sides agree that those people whose votes were the subject of appeal were entitled to vote at the election, and the leader of the Opposition says there is not any great difference, the only question being how the appealed names should appear on the voters' list. Now, by section 30, these names must be noted upon the list. There is no direction given as to the manner in which they are to be noted. Can it be possible to have a plainer way in which to note them than that which was adopted? The name is placed on the list without any number, and a large capital "A" is placed opposite it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about the names the revising officer refuses to put on?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I will answer that presently. The revising officer notes that these votes which had the letter "A" are subject to appeal. Perhaps this is the first instance where votes have been kept hanging up, so to speak, during an election.

Mr. MULOCK. Under the Franchise Act.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked me what about names that were never upon the list. In answer to that I refer him to the Election Act, section 50, sub-sections 1 and 2. The first sub-section refers to the class of votes where an appeal is taken against the votes being allowed. Sub-section 2 applies to appeals against the exclusion of votes. That is the kind of cases which you refer to. A man wants to be put on the list and is excluded. He was never on the list. Sub-section 2 reads:

"In the event of any person desiring to vote at any election whose name has been excluded from the list of voters for any polling district in the electoral district for which such election takes place, and the exclusion of whose name from such list appears by the list of voters to be the subject of an undecided appeal."

Now, I will ask you a question in return for the one you asked me. You asked me: What becomes of the voter's name who was never on the list? I ask you: How could the objection to his name appear, if his name was not on the list? The man's name must be on the list or the reason for his exclusion could not be given. The leader of the Opposition takes a different view of this. I do not know whether he and the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) agree, but the leader of the Opposition said that he had no objection to the votes, that these men were entitled to vote, but that they could not be counted until after the appeal upon them had been decided. I will answer him by referring to section 56 of the Act. Before doing so, I may say that I need not take up any time in endeavouring to express my views as to whether or not these men are entitled to vote, because it seems to be conceded on both sides that, in some way or other, they ought to appear on the list and that they were entitled to vote at that election, because, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has shown, a man in such a position is entitled to be put upon the voters' list, but has to be noted, and all those who are on the list are entitled to vote. Now, as to the duties of the officers at the close of the poll, by section 56, sub-section 3, we find that—

"The deputy returning officer shall also, in counting the ballots, place in two separate envelopes or parcels the two classes of ballot papers."

There is no place in this Act which says that appealed votes are to be excluded when the votes are counted up. If you refer also to sub-section 1 of section 56 you will find it stated that—

"Immediately after the close of the poll, the deputy returning officer shall open the ballot box and proceed to count the number of votes given for each candidate."

There is no distinction whatever to be made in counting these votes. The duty of the deputy returning officer is to count the number of votes given for each candidate. And what is he to reject? Here is the test:

"1. He shall reject all ballot papers which have not been supplied by the deputy returning officer; 2. All those by which votes have been given for more candidates than are to be elected; and, 3. All those upon which there is any writing or mark by which the voter could be identified, other than the numbering by the deputy returning officer in the cases hereinbefore provided for."

My hon. friends well know that the numbering by the deputy returning officer is only done in the class of cases correctly mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and that, when a ballot is subject to appeal, the deputy returning officer may put any number upon it that he chooses —999 if he pleases—and such number is placed on the ballot paper for the purpose of identification.

Mr. MULOCK. Read section 58.

Mr. LAURIER. Read section 64.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I will read section 58, which says:

"The deputy returning officer shall make out a statement of the accepted ballot papers, of the number of votes given to each candidate, of the ballot papers counted which were deposited by persons whose right to be registered on the list of voters and to vote, and by persons the exclusion of whose names from the list of voters appeared by the said list to be the subjects of undecided appeals, as aforesaid."

You will not find any place in the Act where the deputy returning officer is to throw out all the votes which are the subject of an undecided appeal. Then, the further duty of the returning officer, after having counted every vote, with the exception of the three classes that I have named, is to add together the number of votes given for each candidate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is discussing a subject which is not before us now—that is the counting of the ballots and the proceedings at an election.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I have taken the liberty to do this because after, as I understand, mature deliberation, the leader of the Opposition laid it down that these votes were not to be counted at all when the returning officer was adding up the votes.

Mr. LAURIER. Nothing of the kind. I said it was important to settle the difference between the Minister of Justice and my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as to these votes which are the subject of appeal being counted until the appeal was decided.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Am I mistaken now in saying that you took the position that those votes which were, as we might say, hung up in appeal, should not be added by the deputy returning officers until such time as the appeal be decided?

Mr. LAURIER. Nothing of the kind. What I said was the count which took place yesterday

should not have taken place until this appeal had been decided. That is the point at issue.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The appealed votes have not been decided yet.

Mr. LAURIER. Exactly. Do you pretend they should be counted?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Of course I do. I understand your position exactly. You say they should not have been counted, and I am taking the ground that they should have been counted. If you will refer to a section further on you will find provision made for the case of an election taking place when there are pending appeals. That is your case. The law says, then, that the time for having a recount shall be extended until some six days after the final decision is given.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you think the returning officer should?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I was merely following out the line of argument I was pursuing when I was reminded that I was varying from the question that was at issue between the two sides of the House. Referring, then, to section 60, it says:

"It shall be the duty of the returning officer to add ogether the number of votes given to each candidate, rom the statements contained in the several ballot boxes returned by the deputy returning officers of the ballot papers counted by them; and the candidate who, on the summing up of the votes, is found to have the majority of votes, shall then be declared elected."

Now, I am not going into the question of who is elected in this case; I am merely referring to that section to show conclusively that it would be the duty of the deputy returning officers not to exclude, in their calculation of the votes given, any votes that are subject to appeal. As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that he will bring the subject before the House again to-morrow, I shall be pleased then to consider what he has to say. In the meantime, I think, the position he has taken in reference to those names which are upon the voters' lists and marked subject to appeal, is a construction of the statute that I, at any rate in my humble judgment, cannot agree to.

Mr. MULOCK. As this question is to come up to-morrow I shall follow the example of my hon. friend who has just spoken, and not go very fully into it. The revising officer declared that, in his judgment, 229 names, which were subsequently put upon the list, were not the names of *bonâ fide* voters. He made his return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. He did more than the Minister of Justice says he did: he not only gave the names of the qualified voters, but he appended at the foot of that list a certificate enumerating the number in each polling sub-division, and his judgment of the qualified voters on that enumeration entirely excluded the 229 names that are now the subject of appeal. As has been stated, he also added a foot note to each list wherein he stated that certain names which he had struck out, namely, the 229 which he had disallowed, were, in his judgment, not valid, but he stated that they were the subject of an appeal. That list he forwarded to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, under the Franchise Act. When he did that is duties as revising officer were, in my judgment, entirely completed. His power was spent, he had adjudicated, and he had exhausted his powers. Judgment had been rendered by him, and that judgment became of record when it was gazetted by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in pursuance of his duties, gazetted that return, publishing in the *Gazette* the notice required by section 21 and sub-section 4 of the Franchise Act, which says:

"The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on receipt of the said lists for any electoral districts, shall, in the next issue of the Canada *Gazette*, insert a notice in the Form 'F' in the schedule to this Act,—on and after the publication of which notice the persons whose names are entered on the said list as voters shall, subject to any correction or amendment, made by any judgment on appeal, as hereinafter provided for, be held to be duly registered voters in and for such electoral district."

Schedule "B," referred to in the Act, sets forth a form of the return by the revising officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and this form contains no provision whatever for the revising officer setting forth the names that are the subject of appeal, or setting forth any information except such as indicates who are the voters. Schedule "B" sets forth, in the first column, the names in full of the electors. Then, opposite their name there is a number, and the total number shows the total number of electors, according to his finding. The return has to be in that form, and I submit that whatever the revising officer placed in that form other than what the law requires, is simply a nullity. Now, Mr. Speaker, what has followed? Admitting that the advice and opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice is correct, the Minister of Justice himself has scarcely taken the responsibility of endorsing it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What I said was that I did not wish to be supposed as disclaiming responsibility.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, that has taken place. The revising officer, in the first place, pronounced against these names. An election has been held. A portion of these 229 names against whom there has been an adverse decision, have succeeded in getting their votes into the ballot box —or their ballots rather, for we cannot call them votes yet. Now, it is contended that these votes, which have up to this moment been declared bad, against which there is an adverse judgment, must, nevertheless, be counted, and the result of which we all know, and it means the seating of a candidate who, but for these votes, would not be seated.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I may say, nevertheless, that of the excluded votes, the votes which are the subject of an undecided appeal, 128 were cast for Mr. Carling, and three were cast in favour of Mr. Hyman. That leaves a majority of 125 of these votes in favour of Mr. Carling. Now, his majority, as found by giving him credit for these 125 votes, which have been decided not to be votes by the revising barrister, is only 109. If the 125 votes, which the revising barrister has said were bad votes, were ignored, Mr. Hyman would have a majority of 16 votes. That is the state of the facts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They will be ignored so soon as the appellate authority decides that they shall be ignored.

Mr. MULOCK. The point is whether we are going to aid in any way in the seating of a candidate who has not received a majority of votes. Are we

now going to endeavour to construe the Act against right and justice, and give encouragement to those who are seeking to do so? We know what has happened before, and I cannot forget what revising officers have done, and what has happened in this House. I cannot suppose we are going to encourage the making of a return by a returning officer before the county court judge has dealt with the case. We know what happened in Bothwell. In that case the returning officer ignored the county court judge and returned a candidate who had been defeated, but who, nevertheless, succeeded in holding his seat for a session or more, and was only at last ejected from his position by a decision of the Supreme Court. The county court judge may take this question into his deliberation on a recount. But we were told before the returning officer made his return he was going to do this. It was stated in the *Free Press* of London that the returning officer intended to count Mr. Carling in, and now it is in the air that the county court judge intends to count him in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Order! The time has come when we must take care of our rights in this House and the country. I am perfectly in order. I say again, it is generally rumoured that the county court judge has manifested a bias in this case, and that is a bias which may be made available to enable the ends of justice to be defeated, and a return to be made here that has no merit in it. Suppose an appeal is taken, and the county court judge delivers his judgment, he may, perhaps, reverse the whole decision of the revising barrister, and in the whole 125 votes he will find, I am told he is going to find, enough good votes to seat Mr. Carling.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON The hon. gentleman will not say that on mere rumour.

Mr. MULOCK. I say it from my position here as a member of the House. I fully recognize the responsibility of saying it, and I repeat it. The time has arrived when we must look after our liberties here.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should withdraw that remark, unless he is prepared to present a motion for impeachment.

Mr. MULOCK. No matter. I will not pursue it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you rule, Mr. Speaker, that it is not competent for us, if there is ground for supposing there has been maladministration of justice, to call the attention of the House to it, unless we are prepared to move a motion for impeachment? If so, I should like your ruling taken down, for I cannot concur in it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not so understand the statement of the hon. gentleman. What I understood was that he made a statement that he believed Judge Elliott would improperly allow those names to be put on the voters' list.

Mr. MULOCK. I say it is currently rumoured that the judge in this case will find in favour of Mr. Carling; that he will find good votes enough, if it is necessary to do so, to seat him. However, in deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will not press that observation further; but I was about to ask the Minister of Justice whether he would deem it right——

Mr. SPEAKER. It is laid down that—

"The rules of the two Houses are only intended to protect their own members, and consequently any reflections on the conduct of persons outside cannot strictly be considered breaches of order. But the Speakers of the English Commons now always interfere to prevent as far as they can all personal attacks on the judges or courts of justice. They have always felt compelled to say that 'such expressions should be withdrawn,' and that 'when it is proposed to call in question the conduct of a judge, the member desiring to do so should pursue the constitutional course of moving an address to the Crown.'"

Mr. MULOCK. I will make no further observations as regards the action of the judge, and what is further I will withdraw anything I have said. But I wish to put this question to the Minister of Justice, if he will permit me: Does he think it will be becoming and right that the returning officer shall make his return to this House before the county court judge—suppose there is a recount—has given his judgment?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a subject on which I would prefer to give no opinion. I have always declined to give any advice or opinion to returning officers. I would expect a returning officer, if he had any doubt as to his duty under the law, to take advice, and proceed under it, but I certainly would not advise him.

Mr. MULOCK. Of course, the returning officer has his own responsibility. He ought to walk according to the law; but if he exceeds the law and returns a defeated candidate as member to this House he can only be ejected from his seat after long and expensive litigation at the hands of the candidate who was the choice of the people. In view of what has been done in the past by returning officers on some occasions, while I commend the Minister of Justice for his caution, yet I think he owes something to Parliament and the people, and when there is such a case as the present in point he will be doing a public service by seeing that no violation of the law is committed. The hon. gentleman must remember how the returning officer in the Bothwell case ignored the decision of the judge. In this case I do not know what the decision of the judge may be, but surely until that decision is rendered, there should be no return to this House, supposing there is a recount. The spirit of the law, and I suppose the letter of the law as well, provides that the returning officer should make no return until the judge had decided in regard to these votes on a recount. Does not the Minister of Justice think it to be his duty to control the conduct of any officer of this House? I must confess I will be disappointed if the hon. gentleman will not take steps to prevent any wrong being committed; and if there is any return made by the returning officer, either before he should in law do so, or if he should ignore the decision of the county court judge, the responsibility for the act will certainly rest to a considerable extent upon the Administration, if they neglect to take steps to prevent it. I think the Minister of Justice has an opportunity here of preventing an injury being done, and from all that has taken place there appears to be a well-founded and widespread opinion that whatever the result of the election, the man whom we think has been defeated by the people is to be returned to the House. If that should take place and if the Government should refuse to raise their hand to prevent it, they cannot

after that he relieved of the responsibility for whatever does take place.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing the date of the Speaker's Warrant, the date of the writ, and the date of the appointment of a returning officer, in the case of election of members to the House of Commons, since the close of last session: also a statement of the causes of delay in reference to any of these matters where delays have taken place.—Mr. Mills (Bothwell).

THE LATE DUKE OF CLARENCE.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a Message from the Senate stating that they had passed an Address to Her Majesty the Queen expressing regret and sympathy at the untimely death of the late Duke of Clarence and Avondale and to which was desired the concurrence of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the subject be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 4th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

JOHN FITZ-WILLIAM STAIRS, Member for the Electoral District of Halifax; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Tupper.

REPORT.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to lay on the Table the report of Prof. Saunders on the production and manufacture of beet-root sugar. This was the report which was promised last year when we were discussing the subject. Prof. Saunders has performed his duty. I took the liberty of having the report printed, and it has already been distributed to members of the House.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, an approved Minute of Council, appointing the Honourable Mackenzie Bowell, Minister of Militia and Defence, the Honourable John Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue, the Honourable George Eulas Foster, Minister of Finance, and the Honourable Joseph Aldric Ouimet, Minister of Public Works, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 3rd March, 1892.

LONDON ELECTION VOTERS' LIST.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is in attendance at the Table with the original list of voters received from the revising officer of the city of London, also with lists as printed, and on which the recent election for that city was held.

Mr. MILLS moved:

That the said voters' list do lie on the Table of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be extended until Friday, 18th instant, and for presenting private Bills until Thursday, 24th instant.

Motion agreed to.

THE LATE DUKE OF CLARENCE AND AVONDALE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In accordance with the resolution which the House carried yesterday on the subject of the Address proposed by the Senate to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Laurier, that:

The said Address of the Senate to Her Most Gracious Majesty, be concurred in by the House, and the blank therein filled up with the words "House of Commons."

I have only to say, in making this motion of concurrence, that this Address states, what is undoubtedly the fact, that the people of Canada have learned with universal and deep sorrow of the affliction which has befallen Her Gracious Majesty by the bereavement referred to in the Address. There is expressed in the Address the sentiment that our people, represented by this House, pray that Divine Providence may aid and console Her Majesty in this great affliction, and the sentiment, likewise, that the universal sympathy which has been felt throughout the Empire with Her Majesty and with the Prince and Princess of Wales may, to some extent, aid in affording them that consolation which is so deeply needed on an occasion of this kind. Under these circumstances and in view of the expressions of sympathy already made by this House, it is only necessary for me to make these few observations in asking the House to concur in this Address.

Mr. LAURIER. It was my privilege some days ago to express the feeling which we on this side of the House entertain in reference to the subject contained in this Address. At the present time I can only say that I fully concur in and endorse all the sentiments so well and gracefully expressed by the Minister of Justice, and I heartily second the motion.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House has passed the accompanying Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to transfer the Joint Address of both Houses to Her Most Gracious Majesty, of condolence at the untimely death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That this House do send a message of condolence to Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales:

To express the profound and universal sorrow of the people of Canada on the occasion of the untimely death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale,

And respectfully to convey their sincere and deep sympathy to Their Royal Highnesses in the sad affliction which has fallen upon them in the loss of a young Prince, the Heir of their illustrious House, at the commencement of a career which appeared to be fraught with the most brilliant prospects of happiness and distinction.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in the following words:—

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Sir Frederick Arthur Stanley, Baron Stanley of Preston, in the County of Lancaster, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom; Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Governor General of Canada.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, have resolved to send a message of condolence to Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales:

To express the profound and universal sorrow of the people of Canada on the occasion of the untimely death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale,

And respectfully to convey their sincere and deep sympathy to Their Royal Highnesses in the sad affliction which has fallen upon them in the loss of a young Prince, the Heir of their illustrious House, at the commencement of a career which appeared to be fraught with the most brilliant prospects of happiness and distinction.

We beg leave to approach Your Excellency with our respectful request that you will be pleased to transmit the said message to Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales in such a way as Your Excellency may see fit.

Motion agreed to.

The said Address was ordered to be engrossed, and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such Members of this House as are Members of the Privy Council.

DUTIES OF ELECTION OFFICIALS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved:

That it is the undoubted right and duty of the House of Commons to see that the returning officers and other officials who have duties imposed upon them in the election of members to this House, act with perfect fairness towards the various candidates, and to hold such returning officers and other officials to the strict discharge of their duties; and this House further affirms that the trial of election petitions by the courts does not lessen the authority of the House over such officials, nor take away the necessity for its supervision.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I gave notice yesterday, with the assent of the leader of the House, that I would to-day make a motion in reference to the duties of this House in relation to the elections which may be from time to time held. The motion which I now propose affirms that it is the undoubted right of the House of Commons to see that the returning officers and other officials who have duties imposed upon them in the election of members to the House, should act with perfect fairness to the various candidates, and to hold such returning officers and other officials to the strict discharge of their duties. The motion also says: "This House further affirms that the trial of election petitions by the courts does not lessen the authority of the House over such officials, nor take away the necessity for its supervision." I think, Sir, that the doctrine laid down in this motion is too clear to admit of controversy. The House is the judge of its own rights and privileges, and it is also its duty, as the representative body of the nation, to see that those who become members of the House, do so in accordance with the provisions of the law of the land. I do not say, Sir, that it is always necessary that this supervision should express itself actively; it is sufficient that it potentially exists, called into activity only when there is some abuse, some disregard of duty, some misconduct or malfeasance in office on the part of officials who are required to discharge duties in the way prescribed by the law of the land. The subject is an important one, because every departure from perfect fairness in the discharge of duties by an official may affect the results which ought to be accomplished by the exercise of the elective franchise. The effect of such unfairness may alter the representation in Parliament; and in so far as it accomplishes this end, the influence and respect which this House should command in the country will be seriously weakened. It must not be forgotten that under our system of parliamentary government the administration is always an interested party. But there is one marked difference between our system and that which exists in England, that here the Ministry as an interested party have it within their power to exercise an amount of influence, and to exercise that influence in an undue way, which is not open to an Administration in the United Kingdom. I say, Sir, that this power in reference to elections, which is possessed by the Ministers here in a larger degree than it is possessed by Ministers in the United Kingdom, requires on the part of this House even a more active vigilance than is called for by the duties that devolve upon the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, when he receives the warrant of the Speaker, is required to issue the writ to an officer appointed by the law, a permanent official of the House, for the purpose of having an election in a particular district. It is not open to the Administration to interfere. The power of Ministers over the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, their power to interfere with him in the discharge of his duties, so far as the law is concerned, is there no greater than the power of other members of the House of Commons. But, Sir, that is not the case here. A few years ago, an Act was passed in this House repealing the law which named certain officials as permanent officers of the House for the purpose of holding elections. So long as that law continued on the Statute-book, it was open to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in Canada to discharge the duty in precisely the same way that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the United Kingdom discharges his duty. But, Sir, by the repeal of that law, the relation between the Administration and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was very seriously interfered with. The Administration was given a control over that officer in the discharge

of his official duties which is altogether unknown to the law in the United Kingdom. The result of this is that one of the parties interested in every contest that takes place possesses an undue influence in that contest. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery cannot issue the writ, he cannot conform to the warrant issued by the Speaker, until the Administration make known to him whom they have appointed as returning officer for the purpose of holding the election; and so, however desirous he may be to discharge his duty, in conformity with the spirit and intention of the Act, his good intentions in that respect are frustrated; his ability to conform to the requirements of the law are rendered nugatory, so long as the Administration choose to refrain from appointing an officer to hold the election. That being the case, it is of the first consequence that Parliament should watch carefully every step taken in every election which is being held in any portion of this Dominion. We sometimes hear it said here that parties are disposed to live and to die British subjects. I am not going to discuss the question of dying, because I suppose most hon. gentlemen like to stay where they are acquainted; and so, I suppose, they have no particular anxiety to end their days in any hurried manner. But, Sir, I may say that those who are anxious to live as British subjects in Canada ought to be anxious to maintain the spirit and principles of British institutions; and it is not maintaining the spirit and principles of British parliamentary government to put it in the power of an Administration to exercise an undue influence through the instrumentalities which are employed in holding a parliamentary election. The Government, I say, are always a party to every election contest that takes place; and in the election contest to which I am about to refer, the one which has recently taken place in London, a Minister of the Crown was one of the candidates. That Minister of the Crown was also a party to advising His Excellency who the returning officer and the various deputy returning officers, within the constituency, should be. Hon. gentlemen will see, then, that the relation between one candidate and all the officials employed holding the election is quite different from the relation between the other candidate and those officials. So, where these large powers are given to an Administration, it is of all the more consequence to see that the parties who are appointed for the purpose of holding an election strictly conform to the law. I say, Sir, that Parliament always has the power to protect itself; and the appointment of an election court, for the purpose of trying controverted elections, does not at all derogate from the power that is inherent in the House of Commons. So far as a particular class of matters are concerned, it may be important that the House should abstain from taking any action where the courts are called upon actively to interfere and to adjudicate in reference to litigated matters. That the original authority and right of Parliament is not derogated from by the substitution of a court of justice for a committee of the House in the trial of controverted elections, was admitted in a discussion that took place in this House some years ago. In that discussion, Mr. Blake said:

"He would be very sorry to believe that the House had been deprived, by the position of the Controverted Elections Act, of its power over returning officers and deputy returning officers—of its power to investigate complaints made against them, and to punish them for improper conduct."

And Sir John Macdonald, in speaking in the same debate, said:

"He was glad the hon. member did not propose to ask the House to consider the points raised in the petition when the election case was before another tribunal; at the same time it was not to be supposed that the House had abandoned its right to control, censure and if need be, punish, returning and deputy returning officers."

So that, so far as the power of Parliament is concerned, there can be no question that the power does exist, that this House has inherently in itself the power to supervise the officials it employs to hold elections in any constituencies; and while in some cases it may not be necessary to intervene, it is always proper to observe, so that, when there is a serious abuse of authority, when there is an abuse of office, this House may use the power with which it is vested in the public interest for the purpose of protecting the rights of parties which are affected when the power can be more conveniently exercised by this House than by any other tribunal or party. This is obvious for this reason. Let me suppose, for instance, that the returning officer should return to this House a party who had received a minority of votes, a party who is an alien, a party who is a felon, and no objection had been filed in the case, no action had been taken in the case—clearly the House is not in such a helpless position that it could not purify itself and protect the rights of the electors of the country against any intrusion or abuse of that kind. The returning officer may commit a fraud upon the House, he may return a candidate having a minority of votes, and surely it is open to this House to call on the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery—and it has been done again and again—to produce the return made and to insist upon an amendment of the return in accordance with the facts. If there be any question of law, if there be any question of litigation between the parties, if no reference is made to the courts for adjudication, it is open to this House to protect itself against abuse and against any person who has no right to sit here now, just as much as it was in the former history of Parliament. As a rule the courts have to consider questions of law and fact, and the conclusions of the law from the facts so stated and proved, but, where the question is merely one of arithmetic and nothing more, I think it is clear that the observations made by Lord Esher in an important case—the Bangor case which was tried three or four years ago—are strictly applicable, and it would be a neglect of duty for the House to refuse to do justice in the matter and to compel the parties to have recourse to expensive legislation. I do not mean, by the resolution I have proposed, that this House shall exercise a meddlesome oversight, that it shall use the power with which it is vested, where the employment of such power is unnecessary, but I say that, whenever it becomes clear that a wrong is about to be done, that authority is about to be abused, that the parties who are entrusted with the discharge of important duties are failing in their duty, the fact that this House is not indifferent to what is being done, that it is exercising a supervision over its officers, is calculated to have a very important and salutary effect, and when that supervision is exercised with fairness and moderation, I am certain that such abuses as existed in the Province of New Bruns-

wick a few years ago, in the case of an election to this House, are not likely to be very frequent, and this House will be saved trouble, and the public will be saved scandal, if this House holds its officers to a strict responsibility. I am asserting no more than this, that it is the duty of the officers of the House to obey the law. It is obvious that no department of Government could be satisfactorily administered if every difference between a superior officer and an inferior officer had to be litigated upon and decided by a judicial tribunal rather than by a decision of the superior officer, and therefore I say that, where it is obvious to the common sense and to the sense of fairness of every member of this House that a wrong is being done, the House would be derelict in its duty to the country if it failed to exercise the power with which it is vested and to insist upon right being done. Yesterday the House considered another branch of this subject, but to-day I will again refer briefly to the question as to who are the electors, who are the parties who are found upon the voters' list or who should be on that list when the election was held, the voters' list as put in the hands of the deputy returning officers, and how votes should be taken, how the enumeration should take place, and how, in any matter of controversy in regard to the enumeration, it is to be disposed of. These are the questions which I propose to ask the House to-day to consider and discuss. By section 30 of the Electoral Franchise Act, it will be seen that there were two classes of persons entitled to vote at elections, those persons about whose right to go on the list there was no controversy, and those persons about whom there were appeals pending. Of this second class, there are three special classes first, those retained on the list notwithstanding an application to have them struck off; then those who are said to be struck off by the revising officer against whose decision an appeal is had to the county judge; and the third class is those who have applied to be put on the list and whom the revising officer has refused to put on the list. As I understood the Minister of Justice yesterday, we agreed that the first class should be on the list, that is, the revising officer having refused to strike them off, they should remain there. We also agreed that the third class, those the revising officer refused to put on, could not be on the list; but we differed as to the second class, those the revising officer had struck off the list but in regard to whom an appeal is made. I understand the Minister of Justice to maintain that those voters, notwithstanding the fact that they are struck off, are still on the list. I dissent from that opinion. I think there are two of three sub-classes off the list, and that they are noted when the list is required for the purpose of election. But if the law was in other respects complied with, there would be no practical mischief, perhaps, arising from the adoption of one or the other of these contentions. I am informed that in some instances, in the city of London, in the recent election, certain parties whose names were on the list and who were the subjects of appeal, instead of taking the oath X that they are required to take under the statute, took the ordinary oath of electors who are not the subjects of appeal, and it was contended that because their names were so printed upon the list, they had a right to vote upon the ordinary oath being administered. I mention this as one of the mistakes that arose, and that is likely to arise where there is no proper distinction made between names that are on the list as of right, and those that are on that list as a matter of controversy. The 32nd section of this Act with reference to voters' lists, shows how the Act is to be understood and interpreted. It can never be accurately or properly interpreted by looking at each individual section and undertaking to construe that according to the strict grammatical import of the words. In both Chapter 5 and Chapter 8 of these Consolidated Statutes, we must look at the whole Act, consider every provision of each of these Acts, and so construe them that they may all stand together, and best carry out the intention of Parliament. Section 33 shows that the class that is struck off the voters' lists under section 30, have seven days within which to appeal from the decision of the revising officer to the county judge, and the reason of such a time being given for that appeal is to allow them being restored to the list. Until that restoration takes place it seems to me that they do not stand upon the list. Then, if we look at section 56 of Chapter 8, we find the same limitation on the proceedings before the deputy returning officers in making the count of the votes that have been polled. The first part of that section provides:

"Immediately after the close of the poll, the deputy returning officer shall, in the presence of the poll clerk and the candidates, or their agents—and if the candidates and their agents or any of them are absent, then in the presence of such, if any, of them as are present, and of at least three electors,—open the ballot box and proceed to count the number of votes given for each candidate; and in so doing he shall reject all ballot papers which have not been supplied by the deputy returning officers, all those by which votes have been given for more candidates than are to be elected, and all those upon which there is any writing or mark by which the voter can be identified, other then the numbering by the deputy returning officer in the cases hereinbefore provided for."

Then the second section provides:

"The other ballot papers being counted, and a list kept of the number of votes given to each candidate, and of the number of rejected ballot papers, all the ballot papers indicating the votes given for each candidate respectively, except as in this section is hereinafter provided, shall be put into separate envelopes."

Now, the exception from that "as hereinafter provided" refers to the particular class of votes that are in appeal. The third sub-section reads as follows:—

"The deputy returning officer shall also, in counting the ballots, place in two separate envelopes or parcels, the two classes of ballot papers of persons whose right to have their names registered upon the list of voters and to vote at such elections, and of persons the exclusion of whose names from the said list as voters, are respectively the subjects of undecided appeal."

And it further provides:

"He shall keep a list of each of the said classes of ballots."

What is the meaning of "keeping a list of each class?" Why, Sir, as we see before the use of these words, that he shall enumerate each class, not that he shall confuse them indiscriminately by enumerating them together, but that he shall enumerate each class of ballots, those about which there is a controversy or dispute as to the rights of the parties to vote, and those about whose right to vote there is no dispute. Now, when we look at the 58th section we find this enumeration of the two classes of voters separately and distinctly, still further emphasized. Section 58 says:

"The deputy returning officer shall make out a statement of the accepted ballot papers, of the number of votes given to each candidate, of the ballot papers counted, which were deposited by persons whose right to be registered on the list of voters and to vote."——

That is one class

—"and by persons the exclusion of whose names from the list of voters appeared by the said list to be the subjects of undecided appeal as aforesaid."

Here the enumerations of these two classes of voters are still to be kept distinct by the deputy returning officer. If we read this section with the words that are intended to be supplied, which is the subject of the first predicate, and which also is the implied subject of the second predicate, it would read as follows :

"The deputy returning officer shall make out a statement of the accepted ballot papers, of the number of votes given to each candidate, of the ballot papers counted which were deposited by persons whose right to be registered on the list of voters and to vote, and of the number of votes given to each candidate by persons the exclusion of whose names from the list of voters appeared, &c."

So that there are two distinct enumerations, the enumeration of those whose right to vote is undisputed, and another enumeration of those whose right to vote is a matter of appeal ; and these papers are to be kept separately, are to be sealed up in separate packages, the contents of these packages are to be carefully noted upon the back of the envelopes, and they are to be placed in the ballot boxes, and the ballot boxes are to be returned with them to the returning officer. Now, I ask this question at this point, for the purpose of further showing what construction must be put upon those provisions of the law which relate to the discharge of duties by the returning officer himself. If the returning officer was to count those ballots indiscriminately, if he was to confuse the ballots of these two classes, which the deputy returning officer is required to keep separate, and which he is instructed in the clearest possible manner to keep separate, for what purpose would separation be made ? If the returning officer was not called upon to keep them separate and to make separate additions of those two different classes of voters, those about whose votes there is no dispute, and those that are the subject of contention, why should the deputy returning officer be required to keep them separate ? If they were to be added together, then those provisions pointing out with such minuteness and detail the duties of the deputy returning officer would be altogether without meaning, they would be nugatory, they would have no force, they would be perfectly aimless, accomplishing nothing, simply provisions altogether without object. I do not so understand the statute. I think they are to be kept separate for a specific purpose. They are to be kept separate because there are to be separate additions made by the returning officer as well as by the deputy returning officer. The next provision of the Act to which I wish to call the attention of the House is section 50. This section provides that the returning officer at the close of the polls, after having received all the ballot boxes, shall proceed to open them in the presence of the election clerk, the candidates, or their representatives, if present, or of at least three electors, and so on ; and that the candidate who has on counting up the votes a majority of the votes, shall be then declared elected. If you were to read that section by itself you would say that the returning officer must add up those votes and must declare the candidate having a majority elected, without reference to the distinction that has been made before. But if you read all the provisions of the Act relating to the duties of the returning officer, it becomes perfectly obvious that the distinction made is intended to be kept strictly in view. Immediately after, in section 62 —and I shall endeavour to make this matter clear - you will see that if the ballot box is lost, if any of the ballot boxes are not returned at the appointed time, he may postpone action and wait until a subsequent day. And so in section 63 provision is made for the loss of ballot boxes. But it is important to read in connection with this the provision of the law of last year. It amends section 62, and it provides as follows as regards the returning officer :

"In case any deputy returning officer has not duly enclosed in the ballot box the said statement of the ballot papers counted by him as required by this Act, or if for any other cause the said returning officer cannot at the day and hour appointed by him for that purpose ascertain the exact number of votes given for each candidate, the returning officer may thereupon adjourn to a future day and hour the said summing up the number of votes given for each candidate, and so from time to time, such adjournment or adjournments not in the aggregate to exceed two weeks."

There the duty of the returning officer in regard to counting the votes is set out ; and I claim that looking at what the law intends with respect to these votes that are to be subject to appeal, that right to remain on the list must be decided before a proper return can be made ; and it is perfectly clear from that provision that the returning officer is not in a position to sum up the votes as required by the law, as amended last session, until the question as to the right of those parties whose votes are in appeal is decided. Let us further look at the provisions of the Act on this subject. By section 35 of the Electoral Franchise Act, it is provided that the judge shall, upon receiving the said notice of appeal, and copy of the decision appealed from, appoint a convenient time and place for the hearing of the appeal. What is meant by his appointing a convenient time and place ? Does it mean an indefinite time, a time that you cannot at the moment the appointment takes place ascertain ? I do not think so. I hold that it is clear from the provisions of this statute that this cannot be the case. The judge considered these matters in November last. Certain cases were taken before him on appeal. He dealt with those cases. He decided that he would not hear any evidence anew, that he would not make any investigation for himself, that he would take the evidence as it had been taken by the revising officer and the report of that officer, and then decide as to the rights of the parties to go on the list and remain there. That was the course he pursued in dealing with, I think, thirty cases. With respect to those parties who had been put upon the list at the preliminary revision or at a preliminary stage of the proceedings, and about whom notice has been given that those names should be struck out on the ground that the parties were not qualified, the revising officer was inclined to hold, in fact he did hold, that the words "not qualified" were not a sufficient designation of the objection to the names of those parties going on the list. In the meantime an appeal was had to the County Court judge from that decision, and the judge expressed himself as follows :—

"I think the notice was invalid under the Act. I do not enter into an academic discussion as to whether it was null and void. I think all that I am required to do is to determine whether it was a valid or invalid notice, and I say it was invalid, and my reason for thus deciding is that no grounds are stated by them why the man's name should be removed, and thus it is invalid under the Act. So far as the rest of the appeal is presented for my consideration, I am of opinion that under the 33rd section my power is confined to the action of the revising officer with the list; that is to say, as to the proper admission of names or exclusion of them, being as to something which is or should be in the list or which ought not to be in it. It is not said that there is an appeal to the county judge as to the proceedings of the revising officer which would be a comprehensive term such as is used in section 26. I consider that I have no authority to interfere with the action of the revising officer in amending or adjourning the court to a future time. Whatever may be the importance of my ruling as to the question whether the notice in question is insufficient or invalid and null and void, as I am pressed to decide, I do so, and rule as I have said, that it is invalid under the Act, and so far the appeal is sustained, but in respect to my authority to interfere with the revising officer's power to order amendment or to adjourn the court I do not entertain the appeal."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the revising officer, upon that ruling of the county judge, refused to proceed. He had adjourned his court to a future day and he had given the parties leave to amend their notice, but after this decision he refused to proceed. The County Court judge himself admits that he had not the power to deal with this question of procedure, that he had no authority under the Act to express an opinion on the subject or to adjudicate on it, and the subject was taken before the Court of Queen's Bench. An application was there made for a writ of mandamus to compel the revising officer to proceed and to discharge his duty, which writ was granted. The decision of the whole court was this: that the notice was sufficient: they dissented from the view taken by the county judge: they held "not qualified" was a sufficient notice. Every one of these persons were on the voters' lists for some qualification or other, and certainly "not qualified" meant not qualified in the character in which they were entered on the list. The Court of Queen's Bench therefore held in the first place that the notice was sufficient, and in the second place that no appeal is given by the Act to the county judge from the revising officer's decision. Therefore, that the proceedings before the County Court judge were *coram non judice*, and so these proceedings being nugatory were set aside. The revising officer acting upon the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench, proceeded to adjudicate upon these names, and 228 of them, all the names that are in controversy, were struck off the voters' lists. That was the decision, although they are subsequently printed on the list. There can be no dispute whatever that the decision was that they should be struck off. Now, there was an appeal from that decision of the Court of Queen's Bench to the Court of Appeals, and the Court of Appeals held that as the revising officer had acted upon the writ and obeyed the command of the court, that there was nothing before the court to decide, and that they were not called upon to say whether the Court of Queen's Bench had the power to order the revising officer to proceed or not. He had acted; he could not recall what he had done, he could not undo what he had done, and the validity of his act would not at all be affected by the question whether the Court of Queen's Bench possessed this power, or whether it did not. But the Court of Appeals held the notice was sufficient. And so the matter stood. Now, Sir, in the first place, when the application was made to the Court of Queen's Bench and the revising officer proceeded with the work of revising the list, an appeal was had; an application was made in the meantime to the county judge to consider by way of appeal the decision of the revising officer in reference to these names. The county judge said: I will not adjudicate upon the matter at present, I will postpone the consideration of the subject until there is a decision by the Court of Appeals. There was a decision by the Court of Appeals, and then an appeal was had from the decision of the Court of Appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada, and when the second application was made the County Court said: I will not adjudicate until there is a decision by the Supreme Court, and so there has been no time and no place fixed to this day for the consideration of these appeals. I wish to call the attention of the House, in the first place, to this matter. It seems to me, from looking at the provisions of the Act, that it is only when a question of merit is involved, a question of the right of the party as a voter to be on the voters' lists, that there is an appeal from the decision of the revising officer to the County Court judge. On a mere matter of procedure—since the revising officer is not bound to conform to the ordinary rules of a court of justice, but is given a greater latitude to enable him to make his proceedings effective, in view of the absence of knowledge of the law by the voters—that in that matter he is acting in accordance with his discretion, and a matter of discretion cannot be a matter of appeal. It is not pretended—or at all events it has not been pretended—that these persons had any right to be on the list, or that they were in any sense qualified by law to vote. That was not the contention; the contention was that the notice to strike off had not been sufficiently definite, and that contention the Court of Appeals and the Court of Queen's Bench both held was an erroneous view. The revising officer proceeded: he heard the evidence so far as there was evidence to submit, and the names of these persons were struck off the roll. Now, if we look at section 64 which provides for a recount under certain circumstances, among other things which are provided for is this:

"That any person voting at such election, whose name was included on any list of voters used at such election, or whose name was excluded from any such list, and whose right to have his name so included on the said list, or the exclusion of whose name from such list, as the case may be, appeared by such list to be the subject of an appeal pending and undecided under the provisions of the Electoral Franchise Act, and that judgment has been rendered on such appeal deciding that such person was not entitled to have his name so registered upon said list, or that the name of such person was properly excluded therefrom, as the case may be."

Now, that is one class of persons, that is one ground upon which a recount by the County Court judge may be sought, but I ask the attention of the House to subsection 2 of this section, which reads as follows:—

"If any such appeal in respect of any person whose name is entered on the poll book as having voted at such election is not decided before the expiration of the said four days allowed for the making of an application for a recount, the time for the making of such application for a recount on the ground of the result of the decision of any such appeal shall be extended for and until the expiration of six days after the decision of any such appeal."

It is not stated that the recount shall be postponed;

but the statement is that the time for making such application for a recount—application to whom? why, to the judge—shall be postponed until the expiration of six days after the decision of the appeal. I would like to know how it is possible for the returning officer to make a return during that period of time, while the question of appeal is undecided. It is perfectly clear that the party has six days after the appeals are decided to make this application. Now, it it were possible for the returning officer to make his return before that period of time, then it is perfectly obvious that he has not the six days to make the application,—that he would not have any time, on this ground, to make the application. He cannot make the application after the return is made: and it is clear as noonday, that under these provisions, the returning officer is estopped from making a return until these appeals are decided. I call your attention further, Sir, to the fact that the two classes of voters under section 68 are to be kept distinct. The returning officer is to enumerate under one class those who are entitled to vote, to whom no exception is taken, and he must make a separate list for those whose cases are in appeal. Now, these two classes cannot be fused together in one enumeration, until this question of appeal is decided: and that appeal is not to be exercised in such a way as to take from the party aggrieved his right to make the application. He is not forced to make his application at once. It is not an application which after it is made is to be postponed. It is this fact which is kept clearly in view by this sub-section, that until six days elapse after these appeals are disposed of, the returning officer cannot make a return. And why should he? What right has he to do so? Suppose 400 or 500 names were improperly put on the list, and were made a subject of appeal just on the eve of an election, is it possible that it could be seriously argued that this House has discharged its duty in so incompetent a way, that it has so far failed to make provision for the proper expression of public opinion, that these votes could be counted before it should be finally determined whether the names ought to be on the voters' list or not? It is clearly the intention of the law that section 60 shall not be read by itself. It must be read in connection with what follows. It is not that sole section which decides what are the duties of the returning officer. His duties are limited and explained further by section 61; they are also limited by section 62, where, if a ballot box is missing, an adjournment is provided for, notwithstanding the clear and positive declarations of section 60; they are further limited by section 63; and they are limited by the amendment of last year, which shows that the votes cannot be counted until it is known whether those persons are really entitled to be so counted or not. In conformity with this construction of the law, you have this provision of section 64:

"If any such appeal in respect of any person whose name is entered on the poll book as having voted at such election is not decided before the expiration of the said four days allowed for the making of an application for a recount, the time for the making of such application for a recount on the ground of the result of the decision of any appeal shall be extended for and until the expiration of six days after the decision of any such appeal."

Why, Sir, if you were to put any other construction on the Act, you would leave a party in an important case without a remedy, except by the active interference of this House to protect itself against a gross wrong. I do not think we are called upon to put such a narrow construction on the Act. We must read all parts of the Act together; we must look at its spirit and at the intention of Parliament as disclosed in the Act: and it is clear, in view of these provisions for a recount, that the returning officer cannot make a return until it is decided whether those parties who have voted, and whose names are in appeal, were or were not entitled under the law to have the elective franchise. Now, Sir, let me read some circumstances connected with the declaration. Mr. Pritchard is the returning officer in the city of London. Mr. Pritchard, when asked to delay making his declaration in accordance with the amendment of the law of last year, said:

"I have no hesitation or doubt in the matter. The question of the undecided appeals is in the hands of the Court of Appeal, and I have nothing to do with it."

Why, Sir, he had everything to do with it. Then Mr. Magee, the counsel for Mr. Hyman, said:

"I would call your attention to the words of sub-section 2 of section 62, and if for any other cause, the said returning officer cannot at the day and hour appointed by him for that purpose ascertain the exact number of votes, &c., he may thereupon adjourn to a future day."

Now, the number of votes was not ascertainable, because those parties' right to vote was a subject still pending. The returning officer opened ballot box number one and declared 73 votes polled for Mr. Carling and 90 for Mr. Hyman. Then Mr. Magee said:

"I call your attention to the fact that there are six of these ballots cast for the Hon. Mr. Carling which were deposited by persons whose right to be registered is disputed."

It seems that instead of the different classes of ballots being kept separate as provided for by section 58, they were mingled together. Mr. Pritchard, the returning officer, said:

"I may as well state here that I have nothing to do with the question of the undecided appeals. I shall simply take the votes that are recorded for Mr. Carling and for Mr. Hyman."

Now, Sir, that is the question of first importance that this House is called upon to consider: Had he nothing to do with it? Had he a right to proceed to sum up the good and the questioned votes together? I think it is clear from the provisions of the Act, that he had not to do it, that he had no power or right to make a return until that question was decided. If he made a return, it is quite clear that it could only be a special return—a return stating that there were so many votes polled for Mr. Carling and so many for Mr. Hyman about which there was no question, and that there were so many for Mr. Carling and so many for Mr. Hyman which were under appeal. But I think, looking at the provisions of the Act of last year, that it is quite clear that no return of any sort ought to be made; no return such as the law contemplates can be made until it is decided whether these votes are to be struck off the list of those entitled to vote, or whether they are to remain. Until that takes place it is not possible to say with absolute certainty who has the majority of legal votes cast at an election. I am not going to discuss this subject further. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House, and have called its attention to the important question of the necessity of insisting that all

officers shall conform to the law and discharge their duties in a fair and impartial manner. I am informed by telegram that the county judge has to-day the question of the undecided appeals before him, and, although in the latter part of November or the early part of December he ruled that he would not take any evidence when appeals were made by the Reform Committee, but would simply decide the question on the evidence as reported by the revising officer, nevertheless to-day a different rule is to be adopted in regard to the other side. I hope that may prove to be an unfounded statement, or, if it is true, that His Honour may reconsider his determination and may act upon the same rule throughout. I think that the importance of the question justifies my bringing it before the House, and I think, also, that the House ought to accept the proposition laid down, that it ought to accept this declaration of its rights and duties, because in my opinion the adoption of such a resolution would have a wholesome effect upon the officers of the House in the discharge of the very important duties which have been assigned to them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With the exception of one or two expressions in the resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Mills), I think it simply embodies a principle which is familiar to this House and about which, I suppose, there can be very little dispute. The exceptions to which I refer I will call the attention of the House to in a few moments, but, laying them aside for the present and considering the hon. gentleman's resolution as affirming an elementary rule as to the authority of this House over officers appointed to discharge duties in connection with the election of its members, I have still to observe that the affirmation of an undoubted principle may be untimely, and may serve a most improper purpose. It may be that a resolution affirming that Mr. Pritchard is the returning officer for the city of London, that Mr. Pritchard has certain duties to perform there, and that, if he does not discharge his duties properly, he may be brought to the bar of the House and punished, though it is what no one will deny, may be an interference with an officer who is discharging duties of the highest importance, not only to this House but to the constituency in which the election has taken place, and in that sense it is most untimely and is a proposition which this House should be asked to resist. The hon. gentleman has not attempted in any way to disguise the purpose of this resolution, nor has he claimed that the right of the House to supervise an election needs affirmation otherwise than as he thinks it necessary to invoke the authority of the House in order to interfere in a question which is now pending in regard to the election in the city of London. The hon. gentleman has avowed that he has moved this resolution, not because the principle is in doubt, because he says in the first part of his resolution that the right is undoubted, but it is because the matters which are in question in the London case may give rise to some question in the course of next week. Let me mention now the expressions in the resolution to which a few moments ago I said some exception might be taken, notwithstanding that it is the affirmation of a general principle about which there can be little doubt. These expressions refer to the circumstances which have arisen in this particular case, and the remarks of the hon. gentleman justify the criticism and the objection that the resolution does not merely affirm "that it is the undoubted right and duty of the House of Commons to see that the returning officers act with perfect fairness towards the various candidates," but that it proceeds to declare in the most open manner that it is the duty, and right of the House to exercise supervision from time to time over the manner in which those officers discharge their duties. Let me call the attention of the House to the extent to which that principle would carry us. It is admitted that it is the duty and right of the House to see that its officers act with perfect fairness, but is it necessary, as this resolution affirms, that this House shall supervise the conduct of the officer in every circumstance that may arise, that the House shall step in and declare by its authority that, for example, when the returning officer posts his notices, he shall post them in special places and at special times, that, in appointing deputy returning officers, he shall appoint those nominated by this House or by some other person outside of this House, or, the election having taken place, that we are to supervise the proceedings and to see whether Mr. Hyman or Mr. Carling is—returned or not to be returned some day next week? If that is necessary, as affirmed in this resolution, it may be claimed to be necessary for this House to step in and see that the ballots are properly counted and to see that the candidate this House desires to seat should be returned by the returning officer. Why, Mr. Speaker, I need not call the attention of the House, I suppose, at any great length to the dangerous, to say nothing of the inconvenient, consequences that would ensue if we were to place the discharge of the duties of these officers at the command of the majority of this House. Let us suppose the position to be reversed, let us suppose that the appealed votes in the city of London had been those of voters a majority of whom had voted for Mr. Hyman, and that it was proposed on this side of the House, to declare by the authority of this House that if the returning officer dared to return Mr. Hyman to this House, he would be liable to the authority of the House, all of which is vaguely shadowed—not vaguely shadowed but plainly shadowed and outlined in the phrases of this resolution. I conceive, Sir, that hon. gentlemen opposite would declare that it was such an attempt to coerce one of our officers by the weight of the majority of this House that it would almost justify a revolution. Let me call the attention of the House to another phase of the question. The House has with great deliberation and following high authority, passed an Act to transfer jurisdiction in election cases to the courts of this country. The hon. gentleman states in his resolution, and he has declared in his speech, that there are occasions in which this House ought, notwithstanding that, to exercise the jurisdiction which is still kept in reserve on the part of this House. He has made that argument to us more than once. Nobody disputes that the power still remains in this House to deal by a political committee with the rights of the various candidates who contest an election, as was the case in days of old, but nobody of common sense will dispute that the measure transferring that jurisdiction to the courts voluntarily on the part of Parliament, after

almost centuries of resistance of the claim of the courts to that jurisdiction as a matter of right, was an enlightened proceeding, one that tends to conserve the liberty of the subject, one that secures proper representation in the country, and that a reversion to the old method of trying those questions by a political committee would not only degrade Parliament but would rob the constituencies of their principal protection. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman desires us to affirm, and his argument made this afternoon expresses a strong opinion, that we should assert continuously the right of this House to deal with such cases. He stated that that right is not in dispute. There are many rights in connection with the constitution which are not in dispute. There is the right of the Sovereign to perform acts of executive administration without the advice of the Minister, the power of the Sovereign to refuse assent to a statute which has received the assent of both Houses of Parliament, but in relation to which, if that right were exercised, it would be an outrage on constitutional practice as understood by the country. Sir, I say in relation to the powers of this House to deal with election proceedings, which powers are kept in reserve, especially with regard to the affirmation of those powers in times when there are questions in controversy before any of the officers who are named in the resolution, that it is exceedingly unwise, against every principle of fairness, that the House should interfere by the covert threat which is contained in a resolution of this kind. There is another ground upon which the same view can be sustained, and that is the utter absence of accurate information, and of competency, to decide finally on the part of this House itself. Here are, in relation to what the hon. gentleman has put before us, at least half a dozen statements, which are mixtures of law and of fact; and in some of these the basis is denied, while others are made avowedly upon mere rumour and without any kind of proof. The hon. gentleman has quoted, for example, a telegram stating that something is to be done by the returning officer next week before the County Court judge; but before six o'clock he may find that that telegram was entirely unfounded. For my part I decline to believe that the county judge, or the returning officer, or anybody else in connection with that election, will do other than his strict duty according to law; I should be very much surprised if they returned Mr. Carling or Mr. Hyman otherwise than with the view to their strict accountability for the discharge of the important duties which devolve upon them in this crisis. For my part, upon the question which the hon. gentleman has raised as to the right of the returning officer to make a return this week, as to the right of the county judge to take evidence, or to refuse to take evidence, upon the appealed votes, I decline to-day to express any opinion whatever, for the simple reason that if I were to do so I would not only be prejudging the case which may come before us next week, but I should be relieving these officers, which I have no idea of doing, of their responsibilities to this House and to the country in the ordinary course of law; I should be expressing an opinion, and aiding the hon. gentleman in putting before the returning officer an argument in favour of his adopting a certain course next week, when it may be that he will stand at a future day at the bar to receive the judgment of the House for doing wrong; I should be attempting to guide the returning officer in a matter, in relation to which he has discharged duties at every step for the violation of which he is liable by statute to very heavy penalties; and I have no idea of putting that returning officer or that judge in the position of saying that the authority of this House, or the authority even of myself, small as that authority may be, stands between him and the responsibility under which he ought to discharge his duties. How are we to decide the question which the hon. gentleman mentions, when he says he is informed that some person took oath "X" contrary to law? If it is necessary for the House to exercise its supervision over the way in which he performed his duties, how are we to find out whether the persons took oath "X," who ought not to have taken oath "X"——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Practically that, because, although the resolution says nothing about oath "X," that is part of the argument by which the hon. gentleman sustains his resolution, it is partly in that view that the hon. gentleman comes here and asks the House to affirm a principle which he says is undoubted, and yet in respect of which as an urgent matter, the House should express an opinion this afternoon. But the hon. gentleman is not in a position to tell us that anybody took oath "X" who ought not to take that oath.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say that the oath "X" is the oath which is required to be taken by parties in appeal. I simply mention the fact that in consequence of the names being upon the list, it was contended, and the deputy returning officers admitted, that they were entitled to take the regular oath instead of the special oath which is prescribed by the statute.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And the hon. gentleman is not able to tell us that they did not take oath "X."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, I am.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, is so informed; but surely there is nothing in the information which has been conveyed to him, or that he has intimated to the House, to induce the House to pronounce judgment with regard to what has been done with appealed votes, and with regard to the manner in which they have been left upon the list. The hon. gentleman has made an argument to the House as to there being no reason why these votes should be kept separate. With regard to all these matters, if it is true that we are to exercise our authority whenever an officer has done wrong, it is most important that until he has done wrong we should express no opinion, and no judgment, about the case; because he would then be in a position not only of saying: You have completely relieved me of my responsibility under the law; but he will be in a position to tell us that we have prejudged his case before we have heard it. Now, the hon. gentleman has gone into other phases of the London case. He has referred to the telegram about what the judge is going to do; he has made an argument upon the Act of last session; he has considered all the phases of this question, not only as they have occurred, but as they may possibly come up in the near future. Now, I do not propose to the House

this afternoon, that we should either affirm the principle which the hon. gentleman asks us to affirm, or that we should refuse to affirm it. But I do think the House, while treating as beyond question the principle contained in the hon. gentleman's resolution, in so far as it is clear and undisputed, should at the same time decline to express an opinion which will either commit the House to a future judgment in this case, or relieve any person of his responsibility with respect to it. The hon. gentleman referred us to a case which occurred in 1875, in which Mr. Blake and the late Sir John Macdonald both agreed that the power of the House remained intact, notwithstanding the legislation which gave jurisdiction to the courts; but I think the hon. gentleman forgot the lesson which that debate conveyed, and it was this: that the leaders of both sides of the House consented, notwithstanding that the power remained in the House, that the House ought to absolutely refuse to interfere with respect to particular cases or persons while they were still in controversy. The position of this case is further illustrated by cases that a number of us have here. I will not refer to any positive attempt, because I presume at the outset that one must acquit any hon. member of this House of making any attempt in this resolution, or in this debate, to influence the judgment of any judicial officer in this country; but if it be proper for us, in advance of any decision, to take up details of the London case, which is partly, we are told, before the returning officer and partly before the county judge, how is it that last session we did not take up in detail the case of every member who had an election petition against him, and discuss its merits, and say, we yesterday received a telegram of certain corrupt practices committed in that gentleman's county, and affirm by resolution that we had full authority in these cases, notwithstanding the statute giving jurisdiction to the judges, and stating that we proposed to exercise it whenever necessary? And how is it we did not discuss the principles of law which arose on those petitions, and express an opinion by resolution of the House, or, at all events in debate by the speeches of members of high standing in their profession, or high authorities on constitutional questions, for the purpose of guiding the decisions of judges who were to try them? Perhaps, the hon. gentleman, in view of the fact that some of us are still in the position of having our cases before the courts, has still in view an idea of invoking the authority of this House to discuss, if not to decide, the election cases which are still pending. We might just as well do so, we might do so with just as much propriety, and with as much fairness, and with as much prospect of receiving the respect of the country, as to discuss the London election case. What I propose to the House is the following amendment:—

That all the words after "That" be struck out of the motion and that the following be substituted therefor:—While it is the right and duty of this House to enquire into and punish any unfairness or misconduct on the part of any officer who has duties imposed on him in the election of a member of the House, and while the powers given to the courts for the trial of election petitions does not lessen the authority of the House over any such officer, the House will, at all times refrain from expressing any opinion or taking any action which would involve or imply an interference in any unfinished proceeding of any such officer or which might lessen the responsibility of any such officer or his obligation to proceed with his various duties according to the best judgment in which he is able to form in regard thereto.

One purpose which may be served by the amendment is an expression of the principle to which the hon. gentleman referred. The resolution referred especially to returning officers. In so far as it may be proper to affirm a general principle, I propose to affirm this principle as applicable to all officers who have duties in connection with the elections. The hon. gentleman mentioned returning officers and all other officials simply because he proposed to base his argument and his attack on what one returning officer had done, or to direct what that returning officer should do hereafter, although I admit he added the words "other officials" as well. The expression, in so far as it is proper to make it, that the duties of all officers connected with the elections must be discharged with perfect fairness to the candidates, is one that should apply to every officer charged with duties of that kind, and I have no objection to affirming that general principle; but it will be proper for the House, in view of the special circumstances under which this resolution has been brought to its notice, to decline to express the view that the House ought to interfere with respect to any proceeding which is yet unfinished on the part of any such officer. I have thought that the more necessary because, as I have already mentioned, the hon. gentleman's resolution declares, or intimates at all events, the necessity of supervising the discharge of the duties of those officers, and the expression "supervise" conveys something more than mere review and something more than mere power of punishment if any wrong should be done intentionally.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think there is much more fault to be found with the amendement than there was fault to be found with the motion itself. The hon. Minister stated at the opening of his remarks that on general principles he did not very materially dissent from the motion submitted by my hon. friend. I take the same view with regard to the amendment, and I do not dissent very much from the position therein laid down. I quite agree that it would not be proper for the House to interfere with any officer of the House in the proper discharge of his duty. The motion of my hon. friend did not propose to do so. It only covered the general principles, which, as he stated, it is well to recall and re-affirm, for although they are well known, there may be occasions when it is desirable to bring them to the attention of all officers of the House. The answer of the Minister of Justice was that if an officer improperly discharged his duties he was always liable to be brought to the bar of the House, and there receive adequate punishment. But the hon. gentleman will agree with me that when the law is ambiguous, and when an officer has a duty to discharge in regard to which he may be uncertain as to what course to follow, it would be better to give him advice than afterwards to bring him to the bar of the House for punishment. I agree with him that it would be improper for the House under any circumstances, to dictate to the officers what they should do, and how they should discharge their duties, reserving to the House, of course, the power—not reserving it, because it exists as a matter of course—to review the action of the officer. But, Sir, there is an immense difference, I conceive,

between the House interfering with the proper discharge of a duty by an officer, and the other proposition which is this: That when the law is ambiguous and the officer is called upon to discharge certain duties of a dubious character, then if the Minister of Justice gives advice with the consent and with the knowledge of the House, it seems to me that all the ends of justice would be properly met. Let us take the present case. At a certain stage when the lists were being printed the revising officer, whether he sought advice or not, received the advice of the Department of Justice as to the manner in which he should discharge his duty, and he discharged his duty accordingly, not in the light of his own judgment as I conceive, but in the light of the advice that was given him by the Minister of Justice. He had sent the list to be printed in a certain manner, omitting from that list the names which were subject to appeal; but upon the advice which was then tendered him by the Minister of Justice he reversed his action and then he ordered the list to be printed, not as he had directed it should be printed, but with the addition of the names which were subject to appeal. Well, we have proceeded to another step in this matter. We have reached this stage, that the vote has been taken, that the names which have been objected to have cast their votes and properly cast their votes; I find no fault with that. Whether it was done one way or the other the elements of justice require that these voters should be allowed the privilege of recording their opinion as long as their right to do so was pending before a court of justice. We come to this stage: whether or not these votes are to be counted in the result. The proposition which was laid down by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and the proposition upon which the House would have been gratified to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice, was this: that these votes, though they are recorded, though it can be ascertained for whom they have voted, if they have a right to vote, though their votes can weigh the balance in the scale, still it would be against all justice that a return should be made in that matter until and only after such time as the courts have decided whether or not they are qualified to vote. This was the proposition laid down by my hon. friend, and this was the proposition which he intends to have recorded, and upon which he wanted to test the opinion of the House, and especially of the Minister of Justice. I am sorry, for my part, that the Minister of Justice did not choose to express an opinion upon, or did not even choose to announce anything more than his opinion. It would not be fair, it would not be right, it would not be law either, that any returns should be made until and only after such time as the courts of justice which are now in possession of the question have decided and determined whether or not these votes upon which the election must finally depend, should be counted or not counted. The Minister of Justice, instead of giving an opinion on this point—which is to me a point of so elementary justice that it is not possible to have two opinions on it—remains absolutely silent, and he says: No; we shall not interfere with the discharge of his duty by the officer, but if he fails he shall be brought to the bar of the House and made to answer for his delinquency. Would it not be infinitely more proper that instead of reserving to ourselves the right to punish that delinquent officer

—delinquent perhaps only in judgment, and not in intention—would it not be better to say at once what is, in the opinion of the House, the law on the subject and to have this opinion of the House as a guide for him to act upon? The question is: Shall we or shall we not have a return in this matter, before the point has been decided by the courts whether or not these voters which are now in appeal have the right to vote? That is the only proposition after all to be debated here now. The hon. gentleman says that we have to determine it next week. It is true we may have to determine it next week, when possibly gross injustice is done to the one or to the other candidate. There would be no pretension on this side of the House—even if the majority of these votes had been recorded in favour of Mr. Hyman instead of having been recorded in favour of Mr. Carling, as it is said they have been recorded—there would be no pretension on this side of the House, if the majority of the votes were recorded in favour of Mr. Hyman, to have Mr. Hyman's return postponed until the right of these voters who have passed their votes had been determined. So long as the matter is pending it seems to me that there can be no injustice and no interference with the proper jurisdiction of the officer, to affirm solemnly on the floor of this House—if not by resolution, at least by the exchange of opinions, which often takes place—that no return should be made until the right of these voters shall have been determined. Sir, this is the only proposition which is made. My hon. friend, in the drafting of his resolution carefully abstained—I will not say minutely—to go into the particulars of any case, and as I understood my hon. friend, the object which he had in view was not only to affirm a solemn principle, as to which there can be no possible discussion; but rather to have at this moment a discussion upon the law as it stands to-day with a view, I do not disguise it, of serving as a guide to the returning officer as to how he should act in this matter. I am sorry to say that the resolution has not been met in the spirit in which it was offered. I am sorry to say that the Minister of Justice, instead of receiving it in this way, has chosen to reserve the powers of the law to threaten the returning officer with condign punishment if he does not act as he should act. The trouble is that the question arises, how should he act? It seems to me his duty is clear, but there are different opinions upon it. As to the amendment proposed by the Minister of Justice, as I said a moment ago, it seems to me to be perfectly unobjectionable in substance. I am sorry to say, however, that it is an evasion of the principle which was proposed to the House, and which it was certainly suitable that the House should accept at the present time.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Yesterday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I detained the House for a short time, in discussing the questions which had been raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which were in the first place: Who are the proper persons to be counted as voters according to the Franchise Act; and secondly, the question whether voters who had been entered upon the list as appeal voters, should be counted or not, when the deputy returning officer is adding up the votes in the ballot boxes. I think, Mr. Speaker, that upon that question perhaps enough

was said yesterday. I can assure this House, at any rate, that whatever was said upon the question only refers to matters that had taken place and had passed, and that I did not anticipate, nor would I for one moment anticipate, what might be the action of any officer of this House in the future. Now, Sir, can any hon. gentleman who has heard the remarks of the two speakers on the Opposition side of this House come to any other conclusion but that this motion has direct reference to the election of Mr. Carling in the city of London? Can any person come to any other conclusion than that it is a motion calling for an expression of opinion by this House as to how the officers in London should perform their duties? It is either that, or else it is introduced for the purpose of intimidating those officers in the discharge of their duties. In either case I deprecate the resolution from the first word of it to the last. We are asked by it to assert the rights of this House. Who is tampering with the rights of this House, I should like to know? We are asked to indicate to all our officers throughout the country that we are going to exercise our powers over them. This resolution is particularly pointed at the returning officer, the revising barrister and the county judge of the County of Middlesex. As such it is a most improper resolution. The first step the hon. member for Bothwell takes is to call for the voters' list; and he follows that up with this particular resolution which applies to no person in the Dominion of Canada other than the three officers in the city of London. I think it would have been much more proper if the hon. gentleman had moved a resolution to the effect, that this House should act fairly towards all its revising officers and all other officers under its control. That would have been more in accordance with the way in which this House has always acted in regard to its officers. The hon. member for Bothwell, in the early part of his remarks, said that he found "that authority was about to be abused." What does that mean? He referred to the election in the city of London, and to the conduct of the officers there. He said that he found this resolution to be necessary, and that this House ought to assert its dignity and its powers. Now, I feel that there is no fear whatever that authority is going to be abused in the city of London. The officers there are men of the highest integrity, not only the judge, but the revising barrister and the gentleman who acted as returning officer: I have every confidence that those gentlemen will discharge their duties faithfully and properly, and I deprecate any intimation being made in this House by any gentleman on one side or the other, which would indicate to them in the slightest way what this House or any individual member of it thought their duty to be. The hon. member for Bothwell deliberately took the bull by the horns and told this House that it was impossible for the returning officer in the city of London to declare Mr. Carling elected until six days after the county judge had given his decision on the appealed votes. I am not discussing now whether he is right or wrong. I do not propose to discuss that, because that would be an indication that I thought the hon. member was right or wrong. The hon. gentleman asked an expression of opinion from the hon. Minister of Justice on this point, and the hon. leader of the Opposition remarked that he thought it would be better that the hon. Minister of Justice should suggest a course by which the returning officer would know that he, the Minister of Justice, thought that he ought not to return Mr. Carling in the meantime. Why, Mr. Speaker, I never heard of such a thing before. I think, I may venture to say, that if you were to search through *Hansard* for the last twenty years, you would not find such a proposition ever made on the floor of this House during that time. Now, I do not for one moment think that the hon. leader of the Opposition could have considered carefully the remarks he made, because he introduced his speech by stating that he agreed in every way with the amending resolution of the hon. the Minister of Justice; but what did he drift into before he got through? Why, Sir, he drifted into the very same argument as the hon. member for Bothwell, contending, that no return should be made by the returning officer of London until six days had expired after the time the county judge had decided on the appealed votes. There we find both of them hand-in-glove together, determined if possible, by hook or by crook, to squeeze some expression of opinion or direction from the hon. the Minister of Justice as to what the returning officer in the city of London should do. I am perfectly sure that if the parties in this House changed places to-morrow, and if the hon. leader of the Opposition were on this side as Minister of Justice, he would deprecate, in far stronger language than I have done, any attempt to squeeze from him a direction to any returning officer or county judge in this Dominion. Now, Sir, I intend not to say any thing in reference to the votes in the city of London, but simply to meet in a couple of words the contention of the hon. member for Bothwell as to who should have voted at that election and who should be counted. I would like to call his attention to a misconception or misreading of section 56 which he has adopted. That section provides that at the close of the poll the returning officer is to count the number of votes given for each candidate in the ballot boxes, and that in doing so he shall reject three classes of papers, and he is to reject no more. He is to reject those ballots which have not been supplied by the deputy returning officer: secondly, all those by which votes are given for more candidates than are to be elected; and thirdly, all those on which there is any writing or mark by which the voter can be identified. You will not find in this section or in any other any provision that he is to reject any others, except, as the hon. member for Bothwell contends, are inferentially to be excluded in the next sub-section. But I believe that he himself will concede that I am correct in stating that the section which I have just mentioned, refers to counting the votes, whereas the next sub-section, as the marginal note indicates, refers only to what is to be done with the ballots after the votes are counted—

"The other ballot papers being counted,"——

That is, every other ballot paper with the exception of the three classes I have named——

"The other ballot papers being counted, and a list kept of the number of votes given to each candidate and of the number of rejected ballot papers, all the ballot papers—"

That is, after this count has been had——

—"all the ballot papers indicating the votes given for each candidate respectively, except as in this section is

hereinafter provided, shall be put into separate envelopes or parcels."

Are they to be put up into separate envelopes before being counted? By no means. Every vote in the ballot box is to be counted before the separation takes place, and this sub-section only directs the deputy returning officer what to do with them after having been counted. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked what was the object of separating the ballot papers, and inferentially from what he said it might be understood that he thought they should not be counted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say that.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I said inferentially.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I spoke of section 58 and pointed out that they were to be enumerated separately.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. You asked what was the purpose of separating those ballots from the others. I will tell you the purpose. Every one is the subject of appeal, and those votes must go before the judge and have to be decided upon by the judge of the County Court as to whether the persons who cast them are properly on the list or not. It has to be ascertained what proportion of those were cast for Mr. Hyman and what proportion for Mr. Carling. If they were not numbered and put in separate envelopes, there would be no way of indentifying the voter, or telling what proportion of them was cast for the one or the other. You referred to section 58, which says:

"The deputy returning officer shall make out a statement of the accepted ballot papers, of the number of votes given to each candidate, of the ballot papers counted which were deposited by persons whose right to be registered on the list of voters and to vote, and by persons the exclusion of whose names from the list of voters appeared by the said list to be the subject of undecided appeals."

This speaks of the two classes of ballot papers, but you will not find any place, though the separation is made for convenience, where it is directed that these votes shall not be counted. On the other hand, it is stated that the votes in every ballot box are to be counted except in the three classes I have referred to. Section 60 directs the returning officer to add together the number of votes given for each candidate according to the statements contained in the several ballot boxes made by the deputy returning officers from the ballot papers counted by them. The deputy returning officers are directed to count the votes, and the returning officer is told to add them together. I should not have alluded to this point had it not been already discussed. These votes have been added up by the returning officer in the city of London. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) gave a resume of the law as to voters' lists, to show how it was amended, the different courts the lists were in, and the expressions of the different judges that had been given in regard to them. In the main, I think he was probably correct. In some matters, I think he has probably been misinformed, but I do not think it necessary to take up the time of the House in going over them. I think the position of the matter at the present time is this, that there are a number of appeals as to voters whose names were on the voters' list, and who formed the class of voters that were marked "A" on the list we have had laid on the Table, and that the right of their voting is at present a subject of appeal before the county judge of the County of Middlesex. What the proportion of those voters who voted for the different candidates is, I do not know, except by hearsay, and I do not particularly care, but it must be remembered that the intention of the hon. gentlemen opposite is to throw some reflection upon the officers in London, and perhaps upon those voters. I am not aware that these votes have been decided. I understand they are under appeal, and the judge has a right to deal with them according to the statute. I am not aware that at this moment the appeal is before the judge. I have not received any telegram telling me what the judge is about to do as the hon. member for Bothwell claims to have, and if I had received one I do not think I would make the mistake of stating on the floor of this House what course I had heard that the judge of the County of Middlesex intended to take. I do not intend to detain the House further. The terms of the amendment of the Minister of Justice are entirely in accordance with my views, as I think that all officers, including those of the city of London, understand that this House expects that every officer will do his duty faithfully and conscientiously, and will make proper returns to this House.

Amendment (Sir John Thompson) agreed to, on a division.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE LATE DUKE OF CLARENCE AND AVONDALE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a Message from the Senate acquainting this House that the Senate have agreed to their Address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to transmit the Joint Address of both Houses to Her Gracious Majesty the Queen, of condolence on the untimely death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale, in such a manner as His Excellency may see fit, in order that the same may be laid at the foot of the Throne, by filling up the blank with the words "The Senate and House of Commons."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 7th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Palmer and the Hon. Mr. King, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate relating to the Electoral District of Queen's, N.B., by which certificate George Frederick Baird, Esq., is

declared to be the duly elected member to represent the said electoral district. In conformity with Chapter 9, Section 46, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, directing him to amend the return to the writ of the last election for the said electoral district, by expunging therefrom the name of George Gerald King, Esq., and substituting in lieu thereof the name of George Frederick Baird, Esq., as the duly elected member to represent the said electoral district in the House of Commons.

He also informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate to the effect that the writ had been duly amended.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of JOHN HEARN, Esq., for the Electoral District of Quebec West; and

Of JOSEPH GIROUARD, Esq., for the Electoral District of Two Mountains.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

FRANCIS G. FORBES, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Queen's, N.S.; introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Flint.

FISHING BOUNTY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) to amend Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels." He said: The House may have observed that I laid on the Table the other day a return in compliance with section 4 of the Act relating to the distribution of the bounty. That paper contained the Orders in Council and the regulations under which the bounty for the last fiscal year was distributed. But section 3, which I propose to ask the House to repeal, has been practically a dead letter ever since it was on the Statute-book. That section enacts that in addition to the return which I brought down, there shall be laid on the Table of the House a statement of the mode in which it is proposed to distribute the bounty in the ensuing year. It has been found in practice impossible, or most inconvenient, to do that, so much so that the House has never required it, nor has its attention been called to the fact that the return has never been made. This can only be ascertained at the end of the distribution, because the amount payable to each man either lessens or increases according to the experience of the department of the number of claims which were found entitled to the bounty during the preceding year. If such a statement were laid before the House, the hands of the department would be so tied that a distribution made on that basis in the following season would probably more than swallow up the amount of the appropriation. As the attempt was made last year to keep strictly within the amount appropriated by Parliament for this object, I propose now to ask the House to strike out section 3.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the first time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. FLINT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1888. He said: This is substantially a repetition of the Bill introduced by me last session, which passed its second reading, but did not reach its third reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

P. E. I.—SUBMARINE TUNNEL.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government during the present session to cause further surveys and bearings to be made across the Straits of Northumberland from Prince Edward Island to the mainland, with the view of obtaining further information, with that already obtained, to enable the Government to ask for tenders to build a tunnel across said Straits with as little delay as possible?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government at present has this matter under consideration.

TIGNISH WHARFINGER FEES.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has taken any action to recover from Benjamin Gaudet, late wharfinger at Tignish Breakwater, Prince Edward Island, moneys or fees collected by him during the years 1890 and 1891 and not accounted for to the department?

Mr. TUPPER. Action has been taken. A demand has been made upon the late wharfinger for the amount due, which is about $15.

THE NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT.

Mr. KAULBACH asked, When will copies of all correspondence relative to the Newfoundland Bait Act be laid on the Table of the House? What position has the Government of Canada taken to induce the Government of Newfoundland to suspend the operation of said Act against Canada, and Canadian fishermen? Also, what action has the Imperial Government taken through their Colonial Secretary, as respects Newfoundland's discrimination in said Bait Act against Canada, after having had the assurance from the Newfoundland Government that said Act should not operate adversely against British or Canadian fishermen?

Mr. TUPPER. The correspondence referred to will be brought down as soon as an answer can be obtained from Her Majesty's Government as to whether a certain portion of it shall be included in the return or not. The return is all ready, with that exception. As to the second branch of the question, all possible representations have been made on this subject both to the Government of Newfoundland and to Her Majesty's Government, and a full explanation on that point, as well as the answer to the other branch of the question, will be laid on the Table at an early date.

Mr. LAURIER. What does the hon. gentleman mean by an early date? Has he to wait for an answer from Her Majesty's Government?

Mr. TUPPER. The delay is simply caused because we have to obtain the consent of Her Majesty's Government to the submission of a certain portion of the documents. We do not anticipate

any difficulty as to that, but we have not yet the permission which we expect to receive at an early date.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS SINCE CONFEDERATION.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) moved for :

Statement of all Government contracts let by tender from 1st July, 1867, to 1st July, 1891, to contain the following information : 1st. Names and residences of parties tendering for each work ; 2nd. The amount of each tender in each case ; 3rd. The names of parties in all cases obtaining the contract ; 4th. In cases where the lowest tenders were not accepted, the reasons for non-acceptance ; 5th. Where deposits were required to accompany each tender, the percentage of amount of tender required. If not, the cases in which it was not refunded, demanded or not received ; 6th. Whether deposits were returned to any tenderer who refused to accept the contract when called on to comply with the specifications upon which his tender was based, the names of the parties, and the reasons for returning deposits.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I must ask the hon. member for Huron to reconsider the motion, which is a very extensive one, and to reflect as to whether the object he wishes to accomplish could not be obtained by some less expensive mode. This return would require the examination, classification and copying of some 300,000 or 400,000 contracts. There are about 70,000 or 80,000 in the Post Office Department alone, and it would require the employment of a large staff for some years to complete this return. I have no doubt there is some information which the hon. gentleman desires which we could get at more easily and cheaply than the whole of this which he asks by his motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I would be willing to confine the motion to Public Works and Railways. I think there is a return bringing that down to 1878, but I have been unable to find it. If the Minister will consent, I will confine this to those departments.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the motion will have to be amended in that way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would make some limitation in regard to this. Some of these contracts are very trivial, only for a few dollars, but I presume he refers to the more important contracts. The return to which he refers, which was brought down to 1878, might be continued to the present time, though it would take a long time to do that, especially during the session. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will take a little time to consider whether he could not make some limit in the extent of the return he desires.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

BOUNDARIES OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would have desired to proceed with my motion in reference to the north-western, northern and eastern boundaries of the Province of Quebec to-day ; but, for some reason, no doubt a very good one, the members for the Province of Quebec are for the most part away. Therefore, I would ask that it should remain on the Order paper.

Motion postponed.

Mr. TUPPER.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) moved for :

Return, in the form used in the statements usually published in the *Gazette*, of the Exports and Imports from the 1st day of July, 1891, to the 1st day of March, 1892, distinguishing the products of Canada from those of other countries ; and comparative statements from the 1st day of July, 1890, to the 1st day of March, 1891.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to the return, in fact it is a periodical one. I have to repeat what I have said on a number of occasions in the past, that it is impossible to bring down the returns for some little time. As the House will readily understand, in order to make it complete we must have the reports from the different ports, and until they are received, the return cannot be completed or made out. But the return will be laid before the House as soon as the information is received at the department.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all petitions, correspondence, vouchers, depositions, inspectors' reports and documents whatsoever, respecting the dismissal of B. Loiselle, Esq., postmaster of the Parish of Ste. Angèle, County of Rouville.—(Mr. Sutherland for Mr. Brodeur.)

That the Clerk do lay on the Table a statement of the number of petitions for Prohibition presented to the House of Commons during the session of 1891. (1.) Total number of petition spresented. (2.) Total number of signatures to these petitions. (3.) Number of (1) petitions ; (2) signatures ; (*a*) Presbyterian Church ; (*b*) Methodist Church ; (*c*) Baptist Church (separate figures for Free Baptists) ; (*d*) Episcopal Church of England ; (*e*) Salvation Army. (4.) Number of (1) petitions ; (2) signatures from each Province and each Territory ; name and figures for each Province and each Territory separately. (5.) Number of separate petitions from Church, Courts and Temperance Societies, or any other bodies signed by officials, giving name of Church, Court, Temperance Societies, &c., sending such petitions, with number of signatures.—(Mr. Fraser.)

RETURNS—ENQUIRIES.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to remind the Government that about the middle of last session an Order of the House was passed asking for a return of the expenditure in the different electoral districts under three heads, viz. : Public buildings, harbours and rivers, and railways. I would like to know when it will be brought down?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will ascertain tomorrow and inform the hon. gentleman how it stands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to call the attention of the House and the Government to the fact that the return I asked for in reference to Speaker's Warrants, writs of election, and the Order in Council appointing the returning officer, is not complete. There are no causes assigned. I take, for instance, the election in Quebec West. The date of the Speaker's Warrant is the 29th December, the date of the Order in Council appointing the returning officer is the 9th February following, and the issue of the writ is on the same date. I notice that the issue of the writ is, in nearly every instance, the date of the appointment of the returning officer, and a very wide period of time has elapsed between the date of the Speaker's Warrant and the Order in Council appointing the returning officer. Now, I supposed when I moved my motion, that where there was any reason for this delay, it would be assigned.

It may be that in some instances the voters' list was in preparation and was not ready, but the date of the receipt of the voters' list and the date of the printing, it seems to me, ought to be given where those are the justification, and if they are not the justification relied upon, any other reason for this long lapse of time between the issue of the warrant and the appointment of the returning officer, should be stated.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON I understand the return called for the reasons of the delay, and if so, the return laid upon the Table can, of course, only be considered as a partial return. It has not been before the Government or any member of it, and the reasons for the delay require to be assigned by the department. Therefore as soon as we have had an opportunity of examining this return, we will supply the data.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. BOWELL presented the report of the special committee appointed to report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House, as follows:—

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Baker,
Beausoleil,
Bruneau,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Choquette,
Coatsworth,
Costigan,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Desaulniers,
Dickey,
Edgar,
Flint,
Fraser,
Girouard (JacquesCartier),
Ives,
Kirkpatrick,
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McLeod,
Masson,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monerieff,
Mulock,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Préfontaine,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tupper,
Weldon, and
Wood (Brockville).—41.

ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),
Cameron,
Cargill,
Carroll,
Corbould,
Hutchins,
Legris,
McDonald (Victoria),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Pope,
Reid,
Robillard,
Ryckman,
Savard,
Simard,
Somerville,
Temple, and
Tyrwhitt.—27.

Dawson,
Delisle,
Dugas,
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Flint,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grieve,
Henderson,

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

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Adams,
Allan,
Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Barnard,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corbould,
Corby,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Davin,
Davis,
Delisle,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Devlin,
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dupont,
Edgar,
Fairbairn,
Fauvel,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Fraser,
Fréchette,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Girouard (Jacques Cartier),
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Langelier,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
La Rivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Léger,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackenzie,
Mackintosh,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDougald (Picton),
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McKeen,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan (Huron),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McMullen,
Madill,
Mara,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Mignault,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Montague,
Mulock,
Murray,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pope,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Putnam,
Reid,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Robillard,
Roome,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Savard,
Scriver,
Simard,
Smith (Ontario),
Smith (Sir Donald),
Sproule,

Godbout,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guay,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Hearn,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Ingram,
Innes,
Ives,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Landerkin,
Stairs,
Stevenson,
Sutherland,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tyrwhitt,
Vaillancourt,
Wallace,
Watson,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brockville,
Wood (Westmoreland), and
Yeo.—159.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Allan,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Barnard,
Beith,
Borden,
Bourassa,
Brodeur,
Campbell,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Casey,
Choquette,
Cleveland,
Cochrane,
Corbould,
Corby,
Craig,
Davies,
Delisle,
Denison,
Dickey,
Dupont,
Edwards,
Fairbairn,
Featherston,
Frémont,
Geoffrion,
Gillmor,
Girouard (Jacques Cartier),
Hazen,
Hodgins,
Ives,
Joncas,
Kenny,
LaRivière,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Léger,
Legris,
Lépine,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonell (Algoma),
McAlister,
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McKeen,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Madill,
Marshall,
Mignault,
Miller,
Moncrieff,
Monet,
Northrup,
Ouimet,
Pelletier,
Prior,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Skinner,
Smith (Ontario),
Stairs,
Vaillancourt,
Watson,
Weldon,
White (Shelburne), and
Yeo.—71.

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

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Bergeron,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Burnham,
Cargill,
Desaulniers,
Earle,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Ferguson (Renfrew),
Gillmor,
Macdowall,
McKeen,
McNeill,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Monet,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Rinfret,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Grieve,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Landerkin,
Lavergne,
Léger,
Rosamond,
Rowand,
Scriver,
Semple,
Stevenson,
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Wood (Brockville).—45.

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

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Amyot,
Bergin,
Bourassa,
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Davin,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Grandbois,
Innes,
Kaulbach,
Landkerkin,
Mackintosh,
McLean,
McMullen,
Patterson (Huron),
Putnam,
Rider,
Somerville,
Stevenson,
Taylor, and
Tisdale.—21.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Adams,
Baker,
Béchard,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Bowell,
Cameron,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Chapleau,
Charlton,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Corby,
Costigan,
Daly,
Davies,
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Devlin,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Forbes,
Foster,
Fraser,
Gordon,
Haggart,
Hearn,
Hughes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Lister,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackenzie,
McDougald (Pictou),
McMullen,
Madill,
Mills (Annapolis),
Mills (Bothwell),
Moncrieff,
Montague,
Mulock,
Murray,
Paterson (Brant),
Rinfret,
Scriver,
Skinner,
Somerville,
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmoreland).—55.

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

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Allan,
Amyot,
Barnard,
Beausoleil,
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Borden,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Bruneau,
Burnham,
Burns,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Laurier,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdowall,
Mackenzie,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),

Cargill,
Carignan,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Charlton,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Cockburn,
Corby,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Davies,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Devlin,
Dickey,
Dugas,
Earle,
Edgar,
Edwards,
Featherston,
Flint,
Forbes,
Foster,
Fraser,
Frechette,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Girouard (Jacques Cartier),
Guay,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Hearn,
Henderson,
Ives,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langelier,
McDougall (Cape Breton),
McKay,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McNeill,
Mara,
Masson,
Metcalfe,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monerieff,
Mulock,
Murray,
Northrup,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Prefontaine,
Prior,
Putnam,
Rider,
Rowand,
Ryckman,
Sanborn,
Scriver,
Semple,
Skinner,
Smith (Sir Donald),
Stairs,
Sutherland,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Wallace,
Watson,
Welsh,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilson,
Wood (Westmoreland), and
Yeo.—112.

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

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Bain (Soulanges),
Bain (Wentworth),
Beith,
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Burnham,
Burns,
Cameron,
Carignan,
Carpenter,
Casey,
Choquette,
Christie,
Cleveland,
Cochrane,
Corbould,
Daly,
Davin,
Davis,
Dawson,
Desaulniers,
Dewdney,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Hodgins,
Hutchins,
Ingram,
Innes,
Joncas,
LaRivière,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lépine,
Lippé,
Livingston,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdowall,
Mackintosh,
McLean,
McLennan,
McMillan (Huron),
McNeill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Metcalfe,
Mignault,
Miller,
Montague,
O'Brien,
Paterson (Brant),
Patterson (Colchester),
Perry,
Pope,
Putnam,
Reid,
Robillard,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Tyrwhitt,
Watson,
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Wood (Westmoreland).—96.

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

Mr. BOWELL moved:

That the report of the special committee appointed to report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

JOSEPH GIROUARD, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Two Mountains; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Ouimet.

THE CRIMINAL LAW.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law. He said: This Bill is substantially the same as that introduced last session, but it contains some improvements which have been suggested in consequence of the circulation of the Bill, and which I will explain to the House more fully on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) relating to salvage and wrecking. He said: This Bill is somewhat similar in character to that which was introduced a couple of sessions ago by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), with the additions for which those who opposed it at the time contended. It gives to American wreckers and salvage companies the right of wrecking and salvage in Canadian waters, together with all other privileges which are necessary in order to make that right of any use. I might also add that the American Government, or those who represent that Government, have consented to extend the provisions of their Bill in the line of this measure, which will give the Canadian wreckers the same privileges in American waters that we are giving to American wreckers in Canadian waters.

Mr. LAURIER. I apprehend that this Bill is one of the results of the visit lately paid to Washington by some of the Canadian Ministers. I take this occasion to ask the Government if they have, or if they propose to lay on the Table, any correspondence that preceded or any papers relating to what took place in connection with that visit, or if they are purely informal and not to be presented to the House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is some correspondence which can be laid on the Table of the House, and I am able to say that nothing which transpired is precluded from being mentioned in the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Is there any writing to that effect, or is it purely verbal?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, writing.

Mr. LAURIER. I presume we shall have it at an early day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE LOBSTER FISHERIES.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to further amend the Fisheries Act, Chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes. He said: There are several clauses of minor importance in this Bill. Its main object is to provide for placing the lobster fisheries of Canada under license. Into that subject, which is a very important one and requires considerable explanation, I will, with the permission of the House, enter more fully on the second reading. Heretofore, the policy of the department has been to interfere as little as possible with the deep sea fisheries; and therefore the license system, which has been in force so many years in the inland waters of Canada, has not obtained to any great extent on the sea coasts. We have, however, adopted the license system in connection with various matters, such as traps for cod and mackerel, and fixed fishing engines of different characters, regulating the number and position of the various engines on the coast, in the same way as we endeavour to regulate and control the fisheries of the inland waters. In reference to the lobster fisheries, the department has endeavoured in various ways for years to prevent what promised to be a speedy termination of that most valuable and important branch of the fishing industry. We have had the example of almost every country in the world suffering the loss of this very lucrative industry in consequence of failing to adopt proper regulations, or adopting them too late. Several clauses in this Bill have in view the Government taking charge of the lobster fisheries, which are in such imminent danger of extermination, and permitting no one to engage in that industry except under license. Under the old regulations we endeavoured to save the lobster fisheries by providing for close seasons, restricting the fishing to within a comparatively few months in the year. That has done some good; but we have found by experience that the officers, whom the provisions of the law allowed the department to employ, were wholly unable to cope with the various attempts made by those interested to evade and violate those regulations. We have found, every season since I have been connected with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that the unvarying experience in the different districts has been that the regulations have been systematically violated. Many of the packers intended to violate them, but the worse that would happen in their case would be a fine on the occasion of a visit from an officer. It would take an enormous sum to provide officers for all the different districts where this industry is carried on. We have never attempted to do that, and I would not be prepared to ask Parliament, and I do not think Parliament would be prepared to grant, a sufficient sum to make it certain that the regulations would be rigidly observed; but with the license system it is possible to carry out the law, because we can make the licensee give bonds to carry this out. I will not weary the House further, except to say that many of the sections relate to the machinery by which we propose to grant licenses. There are nominal licenses to be granted to the fishermen without fee, and there are licenses to be granted to the packers with a fee. We distributed a draft of these regulations to the various districts interested, and the department has the gratifying information from the majority of those who have communicated with the department on the subject, that the amendments would have a very good effect. There are also one or two necessary amendments to be made to the Fisheries Act. It has been found that the section providing that explosives should not be used for the killing of seals, porpoises and whales does not need the use of explosives, and particularly dynamite, which have been very improperly used for the killing of other fish, so that provision has been extended to prevent the use of explosives in any case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is that in the deep sea?

Mr. TUPPER. There is no special regulation in regard to the deep sea. The suggestion was once made in a State despatch that some evil-disposed fishermen might try to use explosives on the banks of Newfoundland in the deep sea, but that would give rise to a nice question of international law, and it might require us to wait until legislation was obtained from all nations on that subject. However, I am not dealing with any such deep question now. Another point is that we propose to increase the penalties, because up to this time the regulations have been almost nugatory because the delinquent finds that it pays better to violate the law and pay the penalty than to obey the law. We, therefore, propose to increase the penalties. Then, a decision was given a year or two ago in one of the courts in which the construction of a section was very different from the intention of Parliament when the Bill was introduced. The court held that the terms "materials, implements and appliances" did not cover the boat itself. There is a clause here to make that clear and to show that it does cover the boat. Then there is another perhaps unimportant amendment, substituting the word "and" for the word "or" in the case where the Minister has been authorized to set apart any water for the artificial propagation of fish.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) to amend the Pilotage Act. He said: Some years ago Parliament exempted vessels of 80 tons or under from the payment of compulsory pilotage dues, with the view of encouraging the building of vessels of about that tonnage for the fishing trade. The vessels that came from Gloucester were about that size, and they had a great advantage over the Canadian vessels on the banks of Newfoundland and in the fisheries common to both, because of their larger capacity. We found that our vessels

were being built of small tonnage in order to avoid the pilotage dues, so Parliament fixed the maximum at 80 tons. Since that, however, in the competition and rivalry and experience which has been gathered, our builders have increased the tonnage, and now it is considered that we should propose to amend the clause which exempts vessels of 80 tons by providing that it shall apply to vessels of not more than 120 registered tons, so that the construction of vessels of a larger class may be encouraged in order to compete with those which come from a foreign country.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FISHING VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 11) respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States. He said: This Bill is an old friend, and relates to what is popularly known as the *modus vivendi*. I may state that the only difference between this Bill and the Bill we have heretofore adopted, is that instead of coming annually to this House for the purpose of authorizing the Government to issue licenses to American fishing vessels, we now propose to clothe the Governor in Council with power to issue these annually. That is the only difference between this Bill and the Bill of last year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) respecting the departments of Marine and Fisheries. He said: The object of this Bill is practically to put the departments as they were in the beginning, and under one head.

Mr. LAURIER. You acknowledge your mistake.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not saying that the Government is not prepared to rectify any mistakes that experience has shown they may have made. At any rate, in my humble judgment I believe that the consolidation of those two departments under one deputy, and as they have always been under one Minister, will not only tend to relieve the Minister charged with the responsibility of administering those two branches, but will be in the interest of the public in every way, and in the interest of efficiency and economy, as the expression goes. That, shortly, is the object of this Bill. We propose to take no further powers, except to go back to the position in which these departments were first organized, so that there shall be one Deputy Minister instead of two.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE RECENT GERMAN TREATY.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish, with the permission of the House, to ask the Minister of Finance a question on a subject of some general interest. In the *Times* of 26th February, I find the following despatch from Hamburg, dated 25th February :—

"The diversity of opinion entertained by the mercantile press and public, as to whether the most-favoured-nation clause, by which Great Britain shares in the recent German Treaty arrangements, extends also to the British colonies and possessions, has now been definitely settled in the affirmative. In consequence of an attempted levy of the old duty of 5 mills per 100 kilos by the Altona customs authorities, upon a cargo of wheat just arrived from India, a telegraphic appeal was at once made by the receivers to the Imperial Chancellor claiming payment on the reduced treaty rate of 3m. 50pf. This has now been answered by the Minister of Finance in favour of the receivers. Instructions have at the same time also been addressed to the various provincial authorities of the Empire, to the effect that the most-favoured-nation clause applies in its entirety to all British colonies and dependencies."

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he is aware of this, and whether the statements made in this despatch are to be relied upon? I consider the matter of great public importance.

Mr. FOSTER. The extract that the hon. gentleman has just read seems to be a satisfactory answer to his own question, if we may rely upon that telegram to the *Times*, as I think we may. If the hon. gentleman will look at the treaty between Great Britain and the German Zollverein, he will find that one of the articles read something to this effect: that every favour in tariff duties, either on importations or exportations, which one of the parties may concede to a third party shall be immediately and unconditionally conceded to the other party to the treaty; and another article of the treaty includes all the dependencies and possessions of Great Britain. These two read together, I think, make it certain that the item which my hon. friend has read is a practical proof of that reading of the treaty by the German authorities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it for granted, however, that a special clause would have to be inserted in each treaty. If my memory serves, this point was raised with respect to the treaties with Spain and France; and I think, at any rate, in the case of France, that the British colony did not get the advantage of the concessions which were made to British merchants.

Mr. FOSTER. Because that was specially exempt in the French treaty.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

The Order being read for resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Macdonald (Huron) for an order of the House for a statement respecting all Government contracts let by tender from 1st July, 1867, to 1st July, 1891,

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) moved for leave to withdraw the said motion.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) moved for :

Statement showing all contracts given in the Departments of Public Works and Railways and Canals, exceeding in amount $5,000, since 30th June, 1887, to June 30th, 1891. 1. Those awarded to the lowest tenderer and those given to others, with the amount in each case. 2. The difference between the price given and that stated in lowest tender. 3. The reasons for not accepting the lowest tender. 4. Were deposits required to accompany each tender; if so, what percentage of tender. 5. Were the deposits, or any of them, returned to tenderers who withdrew their tender, or who refused to accept the contract when awarded them.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of all reports of Ministers of the Crown upon which any Governor General's warrants have been issued during the recent recess of Parliament, and of the Orders in Council authorizing such issue.—(Mr. Mulock.)

STATEMENT OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With the permission of the House, I would like to say to the Minister of Militia that I understand that yesterday, on an Order which asked for the exports and imports being moved, he intimated it would take a very long time to prepare it. Now, it is possible that if imports, the products of Canada, are distinguished from those of other countries, it would take a long time, and although that information is valuable, I do not want to delay the return too long, and I would suggest to the Minister—I suppose he is acting for the Minister of Customs—that it would be convenient to the House if the exports and imports, in the form of the statement usually published in the *Gazette*, were brought down first, and the products at such time as may be convenient for the department.

Mr. BOWELL. I think probably the hon. member did not understand distinctly what I said. I said the return was brought down to the 1st March, and it will be some time before information would be in the department to enable the Government to comply with the Order of the House. But I have no objection to have the return brought down in the manner suggested, for it is important that all this information should be laid before the House at the earliest moment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want the information obtained by the Customs Department within a few days of the commencement of each month, for its own use. I do not know whether that information distinguishes products or not; I rather think not.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will consider the matter for a moment, he will understand that a longer period than a few days is required to obtain these returns. I have been compelled to make a similar explanation to the hon. gentleman every year for the last six years. However, the information will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 9th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of the Hon. James Colebrooke Patterson, for the electoral district of the West Riding of the County of Huron.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That a select committee, composed of Sir Adolphe Caron and Messieurs Amyot, Cockburn, Davies, Davin, Desjardins (Hochelaga), Desjardins (L'Islet), Edgar, Fraser, Kirkpatrick, Laurier, McNeill, Mills (Bothwell), O'Brien, Rinfret, Scriver, Weldon and White (Shelburne), be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament in so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, namely, Messrs. Amyot, Bergin, Bourassa, Chapleau, Charlton, Davin, Desjardins (Hochelaga), Grandbois, Innes, Kaulbach, Landerkin, Mackintosh, McLean, McMullen, Patterson (Huron), Putnam, Rider, Somerville, Stevenson, Taylor and Tisdale, will act as members on the part of the House on said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Annual report of the Department of Indian Affairs, for the year ending 31st December, 1891.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

ADMISSION OF CANADIAN FLOUR INTO NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. HUGHES moved for:

Return of correspondence showing the action taken by the Canadian Government to secure the admission of Canadian flour into Newfoundland under fair regulations.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The motion as it stands would authorize the Government only to bring down the communications of the Canadian Government. I think it is highly desirable that the communications which passed between the two Governments should be laid before the House.

Mr. TUPPER. I might say to the hon. gentleman, that really this motion and all the hon. gentleman wishes and all the House could desire are practically covered, as I understand, by the resolution adopted last session, because the correspondence respecting flour is connected with the correspondence touching the fisheries question. Accordingly, all these papers will be included in one return.

Motion agreed to.

THE RETURNS OF POLLING AT THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved:

That a map of the Dominion be laid upon the Table showing the boundaries of townships, counties and electoral divisions in each province, and the number of votes polled in each township for each candidate at the general election in March, 1891.

He said: If it is more convenient that separate maps for each province, or any map prepared by the departments of the Government should be utilized, that may be done. I ask that this motion

be adopted with a view to requesting the Government to provide that the map so brought down shall be distributed for the use of members, so that when we come to discuss the Government proposition for a redistribution of seats, we will have before us a map of the country and the electoral vote polled, to enable us to give more intelligent consideration to the subject than we would be able to do without such a convenience.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to call attention to the requirements of the Order in regard to townships. I think it would be very difficult to obtain the votes of the townships, and I do not know at present any method to adopt to ascertain accurately the vote polled in any particular township, because the divisions do not run by township boundaries.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They do so with us. The electoral divisions and townships, I think, in every case correspond, provided different townships are not put together in the same electoral division.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. So far as that can be avoided; but there may be circumstances in which the rule has to be departed from for the purpose of making sub-divisions. Then, again, in some of the provinces there is no such divisions as townships. In Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the divisions are by parishes, and I think the purpose will be served if a map is prepared showing the boundaries of the electoral districts and the counties, and any further information that is available can be given by schedule appended.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that the object of having the map by townships and villages, which should be embraced as far as possible, is that if there is to be a redistribution measure in which county boundaries are to be regarded, it is very important to know what was the electoral vote in the townships. If the Government propose to revert to the scheme of redistribution laid down in 1871, that parts of different counties should not be in the same electoral division, then the importance of having the vote in the minor municipalities would not be of so much consequence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I fancy it will not be so difficult to procure information as to the electoral vote in the township as it will the actual vote polled.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the actual vote polled that is of consequence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not see any objection to the motion being passed as it is, and we will follow it out as far as possible.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing the total quantity of Canadian flour exported to Newfoundland in each of the years 1890 and 1891; the law and regulations of the Newfoundland Government relating to the importation into that colony of flour; the total quantities of Canadian cattle, beef, pork, hogs and cheese exported to Newfoundland in each of the years 1890 and 1891.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 10th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of William Humphrey Bennett, Esq., for the electoral district of the East Riding of the County of Simcoe.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: This Bill covers certain questions that have arisen in the management and inspection of steamboats from time to time. For instance, the improvements that are being made in the motive powers that are resorted to, render necessary some additional language so as to cover vessels where the motive power is other than steam. We use the same language in the definition of a steamboat that has been adopted in the international conference at Washington. Then again, it has been found in practice that following the strict line of the present Steamboat Inspection Act, it was obligatory upon the board to hold a meeting, at least one once a year, at certain points, whether there was anything for them to do or not. In view of the desire on the part of the steamboat owners that the expenses should be kept down as low as possible, and that the rates for the inspection of steamers should also be kept down, it is proposed to change that provision so as to leave it optional with the board to meet whenever and wherever it is necessary, so as to avoid the necessity of their travelling to various parts of the country when there is no need; and when they travel at all it should be remembered their expenses are charged to steamboat inspection. Then there are several other sections which I will fully explain on the second reading; but I may just mention a proposition to meet the difficulty in connection with lifeboats, and regulations of ocean steamers, and those for vessels on the inland waters. It is found, for instance, that the regulations were entirely too drastic and would not allow a vessel with a boat which was, in the opinion of experts, quite sufficient for the purpose of a lifeboat, to sail from port. There is a provision to enable the department to impose a fee for the inspection of barges carrying passengers, and which are subject to inspection, and also several provisions in reference to those barges which carry a large number of passengers, and which, under the present law, must be inspected. As the law now stands the inspector is obliged, at considerable cost, to travel to certain points to examine these barges. But there is no provision to compel the barge owners to pay any fee, and the expenses comes out of the fund, towards which it is considered in fairness these owners of barges, which are towed behind tugs, should contribute their share.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BOUNDARIES OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, memorials, departmental orders, and Orders in Council respecting the north-western, northern and eastern boundaries of the Province of Quebec, received or passed during the last five years and not already laid before this House, together with all reports of surveys or explorations ordered thereon by the Government of Canada during the same period.

He said : In submitting this motion to the House, I desire to make a few observations respecting the measure which was passed three years ago in this House, relative to the boundaries of Ontario. At that time a measure was presented by the then First Minister, Sir John Macdonald, on 17th April, when he introduced a resolution. The order was postponed to a subsequent day, when the measure was introduced and discussed. Sir John Macdonald, in bringing it before the House, said :

"This boundary carries out the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to whom was referred the settlement of the boundary between Ontario and Manitoba. Besides establishing that line, the Judicial Committee described a portion of the northerly boundaries of Ontario, although, perhaps, that was not a portion of the reference to them—we will not raise that point just now; and if at any time a question should arise as to the northerly boundary, they would uphold the judgment then given."

Then Sir John Macdonald continued, and showed that the description of the boundary as determined in the resolution, which was finally adopted by the House, was exactly, or almost word for word, the decision which was given in England, and that it also followed the award made by the three commissioners. The member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) assented to the measure. Then Mr. Dawson, the then member for Algoma, made a long speech on the subject, showing his knowledge of it, and at the same time not concurring entirely in all that had been done. Then the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) put, in French, certain questions regarding the boundaries of Quebec, and he wondered why the two boundaries were not settled by the same measure. I was called upon to answer the hon. gentleman, and I said :

"In reply to the hon. member, I must say that the Government has not lost sight of the petition which has been presented on the part of the Legislature of Quebec, and by its Government at various times. The question was discussed with the delegates from the Province of Quebec, but we have not come to a final decision. The difference between us is not great, but still it has not been impossible for us to come to a perfect agreement before the submission of this resolution before the House on behalf of the Province of Ontario. I do not think it would be to the interest of the Province of Quebec to discuss the question here at this time. I think that it will be better if the hon. member, having confidence in the Administration, as I know he has, should leave the matter in the hands of the Government, in order that we may during the recess, probably, settle the question. In any case, the hon. gentleman may rest assured that the interest of the Province of Quebec will not be neglected."

The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) then said :

"I trust, at any rate, that the Federal Government will not be stopped by every demand which may be made in a non-conversant and ill-considered manner upon the boundary settlement proposed."

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) then said :

"Before this resolution passed, did I understand the Prime Minister to say that there were some slight variations?"

Sir John A. Macdonald answered :

"The line is precisely the same in this resolution as is staked out on the grounds up to Lake Témiscamingue. This description is approved of by Mr. Deville, the Surveyor General, and by Mr. Taché as being the proper description under the statute.

"Mr. LAURIER. I merely ask for information. Does the resolution clearly follow the boundary as defined by that commission?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, word for word.

"Mr. LAURIER. With regard to the boundary north of Lake Témiscamingue to James Bay, is that satisfactory to the Government of Quebec?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government of the Province of Quebec said : We would rather that the question was left over open until the boundaries of the two provinces are settled, and they said, they would rather enter a formal protest against our proceeding at all, but they permitted and allowed Mr. Taché to settle the boundary with Capt. Deville.

"Mr. LAURIER. I do not pretend to be familiar at all with this part of the question, but I understood that the contention of the Quebec Government was that north of Lake Témiscamingue, instead of determining such a boundary as this, which would have to be laid down on the ground there, they would prefer to have some natural boundary, such as the course of a river.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. They admitted that the line must run due north from the north end of Lake Témiscamingue until it strikes James Bay. The report of the Committee of the Legislature of Quebec says that the 52nd parallel is the northern boundary, but they say that line is an inconvenient boundary and an expensive boundary, and they suggested that the River East Main, which rises somewhat to the north of the 52nd parallel, should be adopted as a better boundary than a degree of latitude. We discussed that point a good deal and we made this offer: That the 52nd parallel, which is stated to be the northern boundary, should be followed, running eastward. They said the height of land, which they claimed in some portions going eastwards, runs to the north of the 52nd parallel, and we said that we would follow the 52nd parallel until it strikes the height of land, and then follow height of land if it runs to the 53rd parallel and until it comes back to the 52nd parallel. After that following the 52nd parallel until it strikes the Newfoundland coast of Labrador, and following that until it comes to Ile aux Sables.

"Mr. LAURIER. I take some exception to what was stated by my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) a moment ago, that this award of the Privy Council and the arbitrators in 1878 granted anything. They declared what were the existing boundaries merely.

"Mr. DESJARDINS. I know it was not a grant, but it went far beyond what we claimed."

Then, Mr. Mills continued to discuss the matter, and finally the resolution as reported was adopted. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of that year interviews took place between the members of the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada. I was entrusted by my colleagues to meet the delegates of the Province of Quebec, in order to see in the first place, how far we could come to an understanding. The difficulty was not about the boundary between Quebec and Ontario ; that boundary is the same as was fixed by the Order in Council in 1791, in connection with the passing of the Constitutional Act, when Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada, the dividing line being thus defined :

"To commence at a stone boundary on the north bank of the Lake St. Francis, at the cove west of Pointe à Baudet, in the limit between the township of Lancaster and the seigneurie of New Longueuil, running along the said limit in the direction of north thirty-four degrees, west to the westernmost angle of the said seigneurie of New Longueuil ; thence along the north-western boundary of the seigneurie of Vaudreuil, running north twenty-five degrees east until it strikes the Ottawa River, to ascend the said river into Lake Témiscamingue and from the head of the said lake, by a line drawn due north until it strikes the boundary line of Hudson Bay, including all the territory to the westward and southward of the said line, to the utmost extent of the country commonly called or known by the name of Canada."

We find that in all the documents afterwards, and in the commissions to the Governors when the boundary was mentioned, it was always stated to be in so far as that portion of the boundary line is concerned. It was always the line coming to the head of Lake Témiscamingue from the south; from the head of Lake Témiscamingue going due north and striking the southern point of Hudson Bay or James Bay. Well, that seemed to have been accepted, and was accepted by this Parliament in 1889 when my late hon. friend Sir John A. Macdonald brought the resolution before the House and founded upon it an Address to the Queen, to have an Act passed in the British Parliament. When the discussion came between the Government of Quebec, represented by their delegates to Ottawa, and the Government of Ottawa, it was conceded that that portion of the line from the head of Lake Témiscamingue to James Bay was the line that should be admitted to be the east boundary of Ontario and the west boundary of Quebec. I do not think, that on that point there was any difficulty between the two Governments. The main difference of opinion was on the northern boundary, and the contention was this: That at the point where the line coming from the north end of the Lake Témiscamingue struck James Bay, from that point following the shores of James Bay until you came to the 52nd degree of north latitude, and then the question arose: Shall we follow the 52nd degree, as stated in the resolution of the Legislative Assembly of Quebec? The 52nd degree of latitude was admitted by the Government of Canada, as well as by the Government of Quebec, to be the most northern point where the boundary of the Province of Quebec should go, but the Government of Quebec represented strongly to the Government of Canada—and I must say, with a good deal of force and reason—that the 52nd degree, if adopted as the northern boundary of Quebec, would be a very difficult boundary to follow; it would be a purely imaginary line, and you would have to determine that line by putting boundary marks or monuments, as I might call them, all along the line, which would be a most costly undertaking. The delegates from Quebec represented that at no great distance north of the 52nd degree there was a river called the East Main River, which flowed from east to west and which should be the boundary, as it was the natural boundary, of the Province of Quebec. The East Main is a large river, and is, I understand, 5,000 feet wide at its mouth. It is not a navigable river all the way up, but it is navigable for about 15 miles, without any rapid or any portage. Above this there are certain portages. The river is very long, flowing, as far as is known, from west to east for a great distance, and it was contended very strongly by the Quebec delegates that that river is and should be the natural boundary; that the difference in territory would be very small, perhaps 12 to 15 miles at the very most, and that at the end of the Main River there are other rivers and lakes that might be followed until you came to a point where perhaps you would have to take the 52nd degree as a boundary, as you might not have a river or lake to go by. However, that would only be for a short distance, and from that point you could easily reach the Labrador boundary of the province by extending a line from Blanc Sablon northwards, Blanc Sablon being the east boundary of the Province of Quebec. I will read a portion of the description of the boundary of Ontario, as adopted by this House:

"Commencing at the point where the international boundary between the United States of America and Canada strikes the western shore of Lake Superior, thence westerly along the said boundary to the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, thence a line drawn due north until it strikes the middle of the course of the river discharging the waters of the lake called Lake Seul, or the Lonely Lake, whether above or below its confluence with the stream flowing from the Lake of the Woods towards Lake Winnipeg, and thence proceeding eastward from the point at which the before-mentioned line strikes the middle line of the course of the river last aforesaid, along the middle line of the course of the same river, (whether called by the name of the English River, or, as to the part below the confluence, by the name of the River Winnipeg) up to Lake Seul or the Lonely Lake, and thence along the middle line of Lake Seul or Lonely Lake to the head of that lake, and thence by a straight line to the nearest point of the middle line of the waters of Lake St. Joseph, and thence along that middle line until it reaches the foot or outlet of that lake, and thence along the middle line of the river by which the waters of Lake St. Joseph discharge themselves to the shore of the part of Hudson Bay commonly known as James Bay, and thence south-easterly following upon the said shore to a point where a line drawn due north from the head of Lake Témiscamingue would strike it."

Hon. gentlemen will see that in settling the boundary line of Ontario the Government and Parliament of this country took great care to follow, as far as practicable, the rivers and lakes, in order to avoid a large expenditure afterwards to determine the boundary. Hon. gentlemen know that if the boundary follows an imaginary line, with monuments, &c., there will be, first, a large expense necessary to settle that line, and secondly, difficulties are almost sure to occur—for example, in case of a riot or a murder—in determining whether it took place on the one side or the other side of that imaginary line. Now, when the country is a wilderness, it is very easy to determine the line, even if we have to add a few miles between the 52nd degree of latitude and the East Main River. The conclusion to which the two Governments came at the time was that there should be a survey or an examination of the country there, especially with the view of locating the mouth of the East Main River. That survey has taken place, I understand, though I do not know whether or not the final report has been made. I think a preliminary report was made by the officer in charge, who had great difficulties to contend against when he made that survey, owing to floods, bad weather and fogs. I hope that report is finished, and that it may be laid before us. I trust, also, that the Government will be in a position to let us have a small map, in order that we may see exactly how the case stands; and, as was stated by Sir John Macdonald when he brought forward the measure settling the boundary of Ontario, I hope that, when the line is determined, we shall not only follow the course of a river, but that if the height of land is between the 52nd parallel and the 51st, the line will follow the height of land, and then come back to the 52nd degree, in order to reach finally the end of the boundary by forming a junction with the line from Blanc Sablon. I have another hope to express, which is, that the Government may be able, and may find it convenient during the session, to bring down a resolution regarding the boundary in the same sense as that presented in 1889, and that during the session we may pass an Address to the Queen, in order that a measure may be adopted by

the Imperial Parliament in good time to determine finally the north-western, northern and north-eastern boundaries of Quebec.

Mr. DEWDNEY. On behalf of the department which I have the honour to represent, I may state that there will be, of course, no objection to bring down to the House copies of any reports which have been made on this question. I may state also, for the information of the hon. mover and the members of the House, that about the time the deputation from the Government of Quebec waited upon this Government in reference to this matter, information had reached me through some of the surveyors belonging to the geological branch of my department, who had been surveying in the Hudson Bay region, that there had been a great error in regard to the location on the charts of the eastern shore of James Bay. So confident were they that the error was a large one, that I considered it necessary to suggest to the Government that we should send one of our most experienced surveyors into that country in order to determine whether the error was as great as it was supposed to be. I think there is no question, in regard to the northern portion of the shore of James Bay, as shown on the only charts we have, which are those of the Hudson Bay Company, that it must be something more than 50 miles out of the proper location, but the error decreases as it comes south. However, it seemed of such importance—as the boundary between Ontario and Quebec had been defined at that point, and the definition was that the eastern boundary of Quebec should run from Lake Témiscamingue in a direct line north until it struck James Bay—that it was thought, if the shore line varied as much in the southern part as it did in the northern part, James Bay might be missed altogether and all the work which had been done would be useless: so we sent Mr. Ogilvie there, and he went from Témiscamingue to James Bay, and he found the line to strike the southern portion of James Bay. As near as he possibly could, he has defined the position at that point. Of course there is no telegraphic communication and there may be a slight error, but it will be almost unnoticeable. He traversed the shore of James Bay up to the 52nd degree of latitude, and went on to the mouth of the East Main River and established that point, and he found that the mouth of that river was nearly as was represented on the charts. I mention this to show in what way my department has been connected with the matter. It is shown that the line from the north of Lake Témiscamingue strikes the south shore of James Bay and that the mouth of the East Main River is in the locality it was supposed to be. Mr. Ogilvie also received instructions to make an investigation as far as he could of the East Main River, but the season was late and he had no time to go up that river, so we knew nothing of it except the information we have from what he did at the mouth, and from what he gathered from an Indian whom he met there and whom he believes to be the only Indian on that river. I think it is desirable that some information should be obtained in regard to the direction in which that river runs. On some charts it appears to run in a north-easterly direction, and pretty far to the north, and it is impossible to say from the information we have what it would cost or what time it would take to determine the course of that river and to determine the boundary in the way proposed by the hon. member, if it has to go to the height of land or to where the 52nd parallel meets the height of land. As I have said, I shall be prepared to bring down the report of Mr. Ogilvie and a plan showing what has been investigated.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I ought to express my regret at the absence of my colleagues from the Province of Quebec, who, I know, would like very much to speak on this question, but I am aware that no member of the House understands this question more fully than my hon. friend who has made the motion, because no one has followed it with more care and interest in the past. We have not admitted that the height of land was not the proper boundary for the two provinces, but I think the state of the case as presented on the part of the Province of Quebec was not so much that the height of land should be departed from as a matter of right, as the fact that it was departed from in the case of the Province of Ontario and that consequently very much enlarged limits were given to that province. The limits given to the Province of Ontario, as every member who followed the question will recollect, were not entirely those settled by the decision of the Privy Council, which left undetermined a very considerable portion of that boundary, but the object of this Parliament in concluding the boundary was to follow as much as possible the principle of that decision and at the same time to establish a boundary which would be a convenient one, and therefore the Albany River was followed as the boundary to the waters of Hudson Bay. The resolutions which were passed in the Legislature of Quebec subsequently, looking to the extension of that province in a northerly direction, asserted it as a right that the boundary of that province northerly should be the 52nd parallel, and, when we met the delegates of that province in Council, we were prepared to concede their contention in that regard, in view of what had been done for the Province of Ontario, and, notwithstanding that we were thus prepared to recommend to Parliament the adoption of the line which the Government of Quebec upheld as the true northern boundary of the province, we found that they came prepared to claim a further northern boundary still, mainly on the ground of convenience, and, as the hon. gentleman has stated, they claimed that the East Main River should be selected as the northern boundary. We found that not only would the delegates from the Provincial Government, on the ground of convenience, ask the adoption of the East Main River, excepting where the height of land goes northward of that, and then giving the province a further extension by following the height of land, but that the delegates desired that the East Main River should be followed up to its sources, and that would involve a cession of territory to the Province of Quebec far beyond what they had ever claimed as a matter of right, and far beyond what would be required, we thought, as a matter of convenience in the delimitation. Perhaps Parliament would not attach so much importance to including a large portion of territory which is unsettled and which is probably incapable of ordinary settlement, but we felt that we could not, without grave consideration, concede so much as that demand involved. Of course, as

my colleague has stated, the papers will be brought down giving the latest report and showing the extension north from Lake Témiscamingue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand, from the observations either of the leader of the House or the Minister of the Interior, that the Government are prepared to deal with this question at the present time, as the necessary geographical information is not yet in the possession of the Government. I would therefore suppose that the most suitable time for the discussion of this whole subject will be when the papers come down and when the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) makes his motion based on the information which they contain. I mean to say this much, however, that I do not think there is any ground for contending, as the representatives of the Province of Quebec who were in the Government then contended, that the height of land upon the north of Quebec was at any time ever regarded by any legal authority as the proper boundary for that province; nor am I prepared to admit what the Minister of Justice has just stated, that the Province of Ontario was enlarged by the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. On the contrary, I think that the decision, taken in connection with the historical facts which led up to that decision, shows that the Province of Ontario was greatly restricted in its boundaries by the decision which was given. I think it could be shown beyond all room for controversy, according to every principle of history and of public law, that what is now called our North-West Territory was, before the conquest of Canada, embraced within the Province of Canada, and that when the Province of Upper Canada, under the proclamation of 1791, was extended northward to the shore of Hudson Bay, and southward and westward to the utmost extent of what had been known and commonly called Canada, it embraced everything which France had surrendered as a portion of New France to the Government of Great Britain, under the treaty of 1763, west of the eastern boundary. Then, Sir, there is this fact, that is worthy of note, that at no period of the history of England, and in no state paper, has the Government of England admitted that the height of land was the natural boundary which must be taken into consideration in the settlement of any dispute between sovereign states owning territory on opposite sides. There is not, from the beginning to the end of all the discussions that took place between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of France upon the subject of boundaries on the Continent of North America—and the correspondence is very voluminous—a single instance, in which the English Government admitted the principle that the height of land was the natural boundary; and in no case did they admit this in the discussions with reference to the boundary between Canada and the English possessions on the Hudson Bay, when that subject was in controversy. The reason is obvious: there was another boundary, of far more consequence to the Government of Great Britain, that was in dispute at the same time, and that was the boundary between New France and the English colonies which lay to the south of New France. Now, the Government of England, so far from admitting the principle that the height of land was the boundary, claimed the territory, in consequence of their settlements upon the Atlantic, to the shores of the St. Lawrence and to the shores of the Great Lakes; and when the Government of France proposed to limit the old colonies of England to the Alleghany Mountains as their western limit, the Government of England declined, and they declined on two or three grounds that are stated in the correspondence which will be found collected in a work called "Craig's Olden Time." Now, in that correspondence the Government of England, resisting the pretensions of France in consequence of the discoveries in the Valley of the Ohio, stated this: We do not admit that we are limited by the height of land, so long as it is possible for the colonists on the east to cross that height of land and to continue their settlements, it is not an insuperable barrier against the extension of settlement, and they also said: We claim to go beyond the height of land on the Alleghany Mountains, because, from the progress of our settlement, which is much more rapid than yours, a reasonable extent of territory may properly be claimed; and in the second place, we claim it because it is necessary to the protection of the colonies which we have established upon the continent; and, in the third place, on the ground of contiguity. Therefore, looking at the whole subject, and in the correspondence that has taken place, there was never any such rule recognized in any English state paper as that the height of land is a natural boundary. A reasonable extent of territory may be claimed, and in all the correspondence and controversies that the English Government have had with other states, they have always looked to the purpose for which the territory was occupied in order to determine the extent of territory that might properly be claimed. Then, in the correspondence that took place between England and Russia on the subject of the Alaska settlements of Russia, the English Government pointed out that the settlements were for the purpose of fishing operations, that the coast range offered a suitable barrier for the protection of those fisheries, and that not having acquired the territory or made a settlement with the view of extending those settlements and occupying the interior of the country, ten leagues from the shore was a reasonable extent. If they had recognized the height of land the coast would not have been the barrier, but it would have been the height of land known as the Rocky Mountains lying hundreds of miles in the interior, a height from which the rivers drained the western slope into the Pacific Ocean; so that as far as the height of land is concerned, it may properly be set aside as one not to be taken into consideration in this matter. Then, when we look at what the Government of England did, and the Government of Franch did, we find each undertaking to extend their sovereignty over the country with the view of retaining the fur trade. England occupied the Hudson Bay after 1670, and in 1697 the southern portion of that went into the possession of France under the treaty of Ryswick. That was accordingly established as the boundary, and the boundaries that are now proposed, the Albany River on the west, which has already been accepted, and the Rupert River, or the Slave River upon the east, were spoken of as proper boundaries under that treaty. Well, in 1713, after two or three years war between England and France, and the fortunes of war had gone against France, there was another

boundary agreed upon, under the Treaty of Utrecht, and two commissioners were to be appointed to carry that into effect. Now, the French proposed that their boundary, they claiming the whole of the Labrador coast at that time, should begin at the Strait of Labrador and be extended in a straight line in a south-westerly direction so as to be midway between the French fort on the upper part of the Rupert River, and the English fort that was nearer the mouth of that river; the middle distance between those two forts was to determine the southern portion of the line, and that line was to extend southward until it struck a line midway between the French fort on Lake Abitibee and the English fort on the shore of Hudson Bay, which would be about the 51st degree of north latitude. Well, the English drew a line beginning at Cape Partridge, 58½ degrees north latitude, and about 2 degrees further south of the French line, and extended it to Lake Mistassin, and through Lake Mistassin to the southern shore of that lake. That proposition was first made to them by the Hudson Bay Company, and they made it to the French Government in 1701, and subsequently in 1711. Now, that was the last proposition made by the English previous to the Treaty of Utrecht. That line was drawn upon the map; it is mentioned in the correspondence that took place between Lord Bolingbroke and Mr. Prior. They both said: That map has these two lines drawn upon it, and there can be no great difference between the two Governments, because the English and French commissioners which are appointed to settle the boundaries, will settle the boundary somewhere between these two lines, not going further north or west than the French line, and not going further east or south than the line drawn by the English. In 1714 this, mind you, was the year after the Treaty of Utrecht was made, and after it was out of the power of either party to vary the terms of the agreement, the Hudson Bay Company made a proposition to England, which England conveyed again to the French Government, proposing that the line which extended through Lake Mistassin from Cape Partridge, should be extended to the 49th degree of north latitude, and then run westward along the 49th parallel. That is the origin of the proposition that the 49th parallel should be the northern boundary, and it was carelessness and ignorance with respect to the matter that led to its adoption as the northern boundary of the United States and the boundary between England and the United States, because it was supposed that that was the southern delimitary line of territory belonging to the Hudson Bay Company. But the company never had any such legal claim. The French had never acquiesced in any such proposition; the English had never made such a claim, until after the Treaty of Utrecht had been agreed upon, and that treaty, until it was terminated by war, was equally binding on the two parties. There were various times when it was proposed that some understanding or settlement should be had, that commissioners should be appointed for the purpose of laying down this line. This was not done. The English commissioners who met in 1748-49 suggested a line two degrees further south on the coast of Labrador than their instructions authorized them to demand. Anyone who will read the instructions to Col. Bladen and his associates will see that they disregarded their instructions, and that they made a demand for a larger extent of territory than they were authorized to ask. The result was that, after a good deal of controversy and correspondence, no settlement was had, and the provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht remained, so far as the establishment of a fixed boundary was concerned, a dead letter. That was the condition of affairs until the conquest, until Canada was ceded; and Canada was ceded to Great Britain with those boundaries which the French Government had claimed, and the extent of territory which the Government of France possessed at that time as Canada, that was all the continent of North America lying north of the sources of the Mississippi River indefinitely westward. After that period we have claims put forward at various times by the Hudson Bay Company. The western limit of the Hudson Bay territory before 1774 never extended 100 miles from the shores of the Hudson Bay. The territory midway between Hudson Bay and Lake Winnipeg was regarded as a portion of Canada which the French surrendered. The French had forts all over the North-West; they had fifty soldiers and several hundred traders in the territory, who were paying rent to the Government of France at the time the surrender took place. So far as the Hudson Bay Company's claim was concerned, it is true that the claim was created in the form of letters patent making conveyance in fee simple of certain undefined territories with the rights and obligations of settlement and colonization imposed on the company. These charters have been the subject of discussions from time to time by the English law officers, by the English Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs, down to a comparatively recent period. We never look at the terms of the charters to see the extent of the territory conveyed. On the contrary, the rule has been universally adopted by the Lords of Trade and Plantations, and later by the Secretaries of State, of looking at what the companies did on the ground under the authority of their charters. These charters in many cases were given, and this of the Hudson Bay Company was one of them, to certain parties who were subjects of the Crown, that had no claim to the country whatever. They were given because the sovereign had not yet acquired dominion over the country, and they were given as instruments through which that dominion was to be acquired. I could give the House several instances of this. Take, for instance, the early charters which extend from the Atlantic coast to the South Seas. They ran entirely across the continent; but the Government never seriously regarded the claims of parties under those charters beyond what their actual occupation and reasonable extent of territory in the vicinity of the settlement would convey to them. Take, for instance, the case of the charter or patent conveying Connecticut. It extended to the Pacific Ocean; but two years later a charter was given to the Duke of York conveying New York, which ran right across the territory conveyed to Warwick and others in the Province of Connecticut. This question came before the Lords of the Privy Council subsequently, and they decided the middle distance between the settlements of the two provinces as the western limit of Connecticut and the eastern limit to New York. So at another period a charter was given to Attorney General or

Solicitor General Heath, conveying what was called the Province of Carolina, a very large extent of territory. It was given in fee simple. The territory conveyed to Mr. Heath and his associates was subsequently assigned to a certain nobleman and merchants in England. Thirty-two years later the King gave a charter for exactly the same territory to Lord Clarendon and persons associated with him. The question as to the rights of the parties receiving charters covering the same territory came before the Lords of the Council. What was their decision? They declared that due diligence not having been exercised by Mr. Heath and his associates in the settlement of the country, although the conveyance was in the form of letters patent in fee simple, nevertheless no actual conveyance had taken place: that they had done nothing to maintain the King's dominion, and having failed to exercise due diligence, they had lost their rights. The same doctrine was laid down by West with respect to certain charters conveying territory in fee simple in the West Indian Islands. The rule was established—and I could give a number in instances in which it has been recognized—that these charters being given for the purpose of acquiring property for the King, other subjects of the King were not at liberty to undertake settlement, so long as due diligence was shown to establish settlement within the limits of those charters; but it did not interfere with the right of any other country to acquire dominion within the same territory, if it saw proper. There is an illustration of that in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which were given by Henry IV of France to a Frenchman. They were conveyed by James I, as King of Scotland, to the Earl of Stirling. They were also conveyed by James I, as King of England, to a company of merchants in London. Here were three charters covering the same territory granted by two different sovereigns, all in existence, whether one or other of these individuals acquired and right to the territory, depended upon the fact as to which of them first took possession and made settlement, which would uphold the authority of the sovereign by whom the authority was given. So, whether Acadia became Scotch, English, or French, depended entirely on which of those who had received charters first secured possession and exercised diligence in making establishments. That being the case, when we look at the Hudson Bay Company and the French settlement, in order to ascertain the boundary between the two countries, we are obliged to look at what each has done, at what progress, settlement or dominion has been made under the respective authority of each. That was the condition of affairs down to the time of the conquest. Well, the hon. gentleman who has made this motion refers to the extension of the boundary of Ontario northward to the shore of Hudson Bay. That, I think, is true. If you look at the papers that were conveyed to the House of Commons when the subject of the Constitutional Act was under consideration with a view of advantage to the Province of Quebec, you will see that the King was anxious to maintain the prerogative of dividing the province. He did not put that in the bill nor was it provided for, but he, having exhausted his authority by establishing a Government, had to rely upon the action of Parliament to create a a Government other than that which had been already established within the dominion. So, it was proposed to embrace, as the correspondence shows, not only all the territory that was retained after the treaty of 1783, westward to a certain line, but if possible to embrace a considerable extent of territory that the treaty had nominally conveyed away, because it was said that the Americans had not fulfilled their obligations, and that the federation was so loosely constituted that it was in danger every moment of going to pieces. It was intended, therefore, when Upper Canada was established to embrace not only the whole territory to the Hudson Bay, which is actually provided for by a paper that the King laid upon the table of the House of Commons, but to embrace, as far as possible, the territory that had been conveyed to the United States. Why, in the first Legislature of Upper Canada, the man who was elected for the western district lived in Detroit, and a vast majority of the electors lived in what is now the city of Detroit and voted for the election of that member. Magistrates were appointed and dominion was exercised as far west as the French settlement at the mouth of the Wisconsin River. Now, the boundary by the Quebec Act was the delimitary line I have mentioned as agreed upon by the Treaty of Utrecht. The boundary under the Act of 1791, so far as Ontario was concerned, was a line further north. It was not the intention of the King or of his advisers that Ontario on the north should be bounded by the line fixed by the Act of 1774. The Act of 1774 said that territories were to extend northwards to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchant Adventurers trading in Hudson Bay. As I have said, there were two papers laid before the House of Commons with regard to the division of the Province of Quebec in 1791. The one paper divides the province by a line running north to the boundary line of the territories granted to the Merchant Adventurers of Hudson Bay. That was the line dividing the province, which before had been one province, but when the western portion of that territory came to be constituted into the Province of Upper Canada, there was another paper that referred to that, and followed the same boundaries in precisely the same words until it reached the southern limitary line of the Hudson Bay territory. It did not stop there, but it went on to the southern boundary of Hudson Bay. The words were different. They were intentionally different, and they embraced into the Province of Upper Canada territories lying north of the boundaries of the territories which had before been included in the Province of Quebec. Now, that rule did not apply to the Province of Quebec. I am not making this statement with the view of opposing a more convenient boundary, for I admit that a natural boundary is very much better than an artificial one running through such an inhospitable country, as much of this country may be found to be. There is no doubt, whatever, that if a natural boundary is found in the vicinity of the 52nd parallel, the north-eastern part of the Province of Quebec will be cut off and the province will have added to her territory on the north-western portion of her possessions, and so will lose some territory to the north-east. If you begin at Cape Partridge, in the 58½ degree of north latitude, which was the most southern limit proposed prior to the Treaty of

Utrecht, and draw that line southward to Lake Mistassin, that is the most restricted boundary that you can legally give to the Province of Quebec unless you apply to it the rule of acquiescense which the Privy Council applied to us with regard to our western bounds. The Privy Council excluded us from the North-West Territory because we had acquiesced in the exercise of dominion by some other parties for a long series of years. Whether Quebec will lose anything under that rule or not, if it were applied to her, I will not pretend to say at this moment; but I do say, that if you follow the line as suggested by the English, and follow the line that is suggested by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), you will see that a good deal of the north-eastern corner of the Province of Quebec will be cut off; perhaps as large an extent of territory will be added on to the north-western portion of the province. A more convenient line, no doubt, would be had if we had full information on the subject as to whether the River Slade could be taken as the proper boundary, than by our undertaking to establish the line suggested in 1711. I wish to call the attention of the House to this, and I am doing so very briefly just now, because I have been only able to take a mere bird's-eye view of this very large subject. I think that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) will see that the position which the Opposition are taking now is very different from the position which he and his colleagues took with reference to us on this subject. The hon. gentleman and those who were then associated with him, repudiated the arbitration that sat for the purpose of determining this matter. The hon. gentleman did all that was in his power, as did also those associated with him and those who supported the Government, to deprive the Province of Ontario of a still larger portion of the territory which rightfully belonged to her. I am not going to adopt the hon. gentleman's tactics so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues then complained that my friend and leader who sits now beside me had not properly regarded the interests of Quebec in undertaking to uphold the decision that was given by that arbitration. The hon. member for Three Rivers sees now, that if his proposition is carried out, Quebec has been put in a better position than she was before; and she is being put in that position, not because that she is entitled to the boundary which she is now asking to establish, but because my hon. friend had agreed to a reasonable and fair settlement of the boundaries of the Province of Ontario. We are prepared to regard from a perfectly fair standpoint, the claims that are now being made on the part of the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman will see, I suppose, from what the Minister of Interior says, that neither the Government nor the House is in a position to accept this proposition at this moment, because the necessary information with regard to the course and direction of the river which he proposes as the boundary, is not known, and until that is known I suppose he will not press the House to take a leap in the dark. But there is no doubt whatever, that the interests of Quebec will not be jeopardized by delay; and what is more, the disposition to deal fairly by the province has not been lost because the hon. gentleman and those who associated with him have in former days undertaken to deal unfairly by the Province of Ontario. I supposed, Sir, when the hon. gentleman made his speech that he would have made a handsome acknowledgment of his mistake in this particular, and would have been disposed to apologize for the attempt which had been made to commit a wrong on the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman has not done that; but even though he has not done it, so far as I am concerned I do not propose to take my revenge on the Province of Quebec. I notice that the hon. Minister of Justice said that the House had gone a good way beyond the adjudication of the Judicial Committee in regard to the boundary. Well, Sir, the Judicial Committee decided the question, following the decision of the arbitration in so far as the question was before them. It was supposed that the whole question would have been before them; but at the last moment the Government of Canada backed out as a party. After pressing to re-open the question before the Judicial Committee, they would not submit the question to the decision of that Committee, so far as it was one between them and the Province of Ontario. But the decision of the Committee indicated very clearly that whenever the question should go to them for adjudication, the Albany River would be declared to be the boundary of Ontario on the north down to James Bay; and I suppose the Government, like Mr. Crockett, saw in what direction the decision pointed, and came down in time, in order to save their dignity; and the hon. gentleman, as one of the Administration, of course, did precisely what his colleagues did in that matter.

Motion agreed to.

SOULANGES CANAL—TENDERS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved for:

Return of all tenders received by the Department of Railways and Canals for Sections 11, 12 and 13 of the proposed Soulanges Canal. Such Return to comprise:

(*a*). The aggregate amount of each tender;

(*b*). The quantity of each class of work in the schedules of each section:

(*c*). The amount of each tender in detail as "moneyed out" by the product of the quantity and price of each item:

(*d*). Copies of all reports to, and Orders in Council relative to said tenders:

(*e*). Copies of all reports of engineers on each of said sections:

(*f*). Copies in detail of all estimates of engineers on each section, showing quantity, price and amount of each class of work in schedule;

(*g*). Copies of all correspondence relative to said tenders.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no objection to the motion being carried and the papers being brought down at a future time; but at present there are some undetermined proceedings in relation to these contracts, and a good deal of this information will have to be treated as confidential until these matters are determined.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 11th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

WILLIAM HUMPHREY BENNETT, Member-elect for the Electoral District of East Simcoe; introduced by Mr. Bowell and Mr. Haggart.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 15) to amend the Act to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. Robillard.)

Bill (No. 16) respecting the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company.—(Mr. Robillard.)

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate W. C. Edwards Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 18) respecting certain Railway Works in the City of Toronto.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 20) respecting the British Columbia and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I acknowledge with sincere thanks the Address you have loyally adopted in answer to the Speech with which I opened the session of Parliament, and I rely with confidence on the assurance that the important measures submitted to you will receive your careful and full consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 10th March, 1892.

ORDNANCE LANDS—TORONTO.

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

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to convey to the Corporation of the City of Toronto, certain ordnance lands in that city, for such price and on such terms, and such provisions and conditions as the Governor in Council deems proper.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

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

That it is expedient to impose a fee of ten dollars for each inspection of a barge, boat, bateau, scow or undecked vessel required by "The Steamboat Inspection Act."

Motion agreed to.

FEE ON CANNED LOBSTERS.

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

1. That it is expedient to impose a fee of fifty dollars for each license granted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to can, preserve or cure lobsters, or to keep them alive in ponds or other places.

2. That it is expedient to impose a fee, at the rate of one cent for each case containing four dozen one-pound cans of lobsters, to be paid by the packer to the person directed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to mark, label or stamp such case.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 5) further to amend Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes, intituled: "An Act to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels." (Mr. Tupper.)

GALOPS RAPIDS.

Mr. REID moved for:

Return of all surveys, plans, specifications, contracts, reports and papers connected with the new channel in the Galops Rapids; 2nd. All reports of engineers as to the striking of steamer *Traveller* in Galops Rapids, in October, 1889; 3rd. All reports from any steamboat captain who may have reported as to the state of said channel; 4th. Statement of cost of investigation by engineers in 1891; 5th. Reports from engineers sent to investigate said channel in 1891; 6th. Copies of evidence given as to the depth, quantities, &c.

He said: Before moving this motion, I would like to explain the reasons why I ask for it. A number of years ago the Government decided to construct a new channel through what is commonly known as the Galops Rapids. I consider that this work was a great necessity, as the Galops Rapids are at the head of navigation of the St. Lawrence, and therefore, had this channel been laid out and constructed in the proper manner, it would have been of great value to the forwarders. When it was decided to construct it, an engineer, Mr. Tom S. Rubidge, was appointed to survey the rapids and ascertain the exact depth of water throughout the rapids. After he had made this survey, he was appointed to lay out the channel, and then he was made engineer in charge of the works, remaining there from the time they were started until they were completed, or said to be completed, and were taken off the contractor's hands. Now, Sir, while these works were being constructed, the forwarders and the people of my constituency were led to believe that the rock excavated would be deposited in bays or in deep water, where it would not be dangerous to navigation. But after the works were completed rumours were afloat that a great quantity of the rock, instead of being removed, was thrown at the sides of the channel, and that a large quantity had not been dredged out at all. Now, Sir, the cost of this channel has been in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars, according to the Auditor General's Report, which was for making a channel 200 feet wide and 17 feet deep; and included in this sum is something in the neighbourhood of $95,000 or $100,000 for extras in going below the grade to ensure a depth of 17 feet. I understand that there is a further claim verging on a quarter of a million dollars now

in the department for other extras of some kind, although what they are is a mystery to me. Now, Sir, that channel has been completed two years, and I would like to state what the experience of the forwarders with it has been thus far. Shortly after its completion the barge *Condor*, owned by the Kingston Forwarding Co., was coming down the river in tow of a tug, and stuck in what was known as the north channel or old channel. This, of course, made it impossible for other vessels to use the channel as they had been doing for a great number of years. A few hours afterwards the steamer *Traveller* came down the river with a raft in tow, and not knowing that the *Condor* was there went ahead until it was too late to turn around, and she was forced either to ran into the barge and sink it or to make the first attempt to pass through the new channel. The captain chose the latter alternative, and the result of his attempt cannot be better explained than it was by what appeared in the Toronto *Empire*, 24th October, 1889, as follows:

"TROUBLE AT GALOPS—A STEAMER AND TOW GO DOWN THROUGH THE SOUTH CHANNEL AND HAVE A NARROW ESCAPE.

"Captain Gaskin, of the Montreal Transportation Company, was down at the Galops Rapids yesterday and while there saw a sight of a lifetime. The Kingston and Montreal Co.'s barge *Condor* is stuck in the north channel, and thus navigation is obstructed. Some time ago the Government expended $1,000,000 in making the south channel navigable, but mariners are afraid to take a boat down it. While the captain was standing at the rapids, he saw the *Traveller* approaching with a raft in tow, and making for the north channel. The pilot evidently not being aware that the *Condor* was in the way, when he saw her he took a turn for the south channel, and was thus compelled to make the first attempt to navigate. His feelings can be better imagined than described, when he saw he was about to make the first run of this channel and with $50,000 worth of timber after him. About halfway down the tug ran on a rock, and slew around as if she were on a pivot. The raft rushed down and struck her on the stern, wheeling her about, and then went on pulling the steamer off the rocks, and towed her stern first down the rapids. It is not known whether she is seriously damaged. Had she been struck amidships she would have been smashed to pieces. Her escape was a narrow one. The *Traveller* left Garden Island with a raft on Tuesday evening at six and arrived at Montreal at three this afternoon, making the fastest trip on record."

This was the first test of the new channel, and it was made by a steamer drawing only 4 or 5 feet of water. Previous to the channel being made, there was a depth of 9 feet 6 inches in any part of the rapids, yet here was a steamer drawing less than 5 feet that piles up on the rocks when attempting to enter the channel. The next test was in 1891, after we had asked for an investigation of the channel. The steam barge *Niagara*, with a barge in tow, attempted to run the channel, and the result was stated by Mr. Rubidge in an interview with a reporter of the Ottawa *Citizen*, which appeared in that paper on the 17th of October, 1891. Mr. Rubidge said:

"It is true, there are at present a number of grain-laden boats tied up at Prescott, on account of low water in the old channel at Galops Rapids, but there is not the least necessity for them remaining there. The new channel, commenced by the Government 12 years ago, and completed at no little expense of cash and skill, is now available for vessels. It has a clear depth of 14 feet, and as there are beacons at both ends, is perfectly easy of navigation. To prove the practicability of the channel, I had the big steamboat *Niagara* tow one of the largest-sized Whitehall barges laden through the channel. There were several pilots on board, and all were satisfied of the navigability of this channel. Of course it had never been formally opened, and not having been pressed on the notice of the forwarders, they seem unwilling to somehow have their barges proceed through it, although the channel is straight and easy to run."

Now, Mr. Rubidge stated that this was one of the largest-sized barges. On the contrary, it is one of the smallest barges that navigate the St. Lawrence; and yet, in order to secure its safety in going down the channel, the large Government tug was placed beside the barge; but, instead of going down safely, as Mr. Rubidge states in this interview, when they were in the centre of the channel, from some accident or other, the hawser broke, and the tug and the barge turned around and went down backwards. The next attempt was made by the steamer *Ocean*, and she did go down safely, but afterwards the captain preferred using the old channel rather than the new, in fact coming down the canal, one time instead of risking the new channel. I never heard of the *Niagara* going down the channel a second time after her first attempt. The next test was made by the steamer *Cresco*, on the 17th December, 1891. Although drawing only 6 feet of water, she struck the rocks, and the captain told me that he had no hesitation in saying that his boat struck on rocks which were piled up on the side of the channel when this channel was made. Now, Sir, this is the experience of the forwarders with that channel. Mr. Rubidge tells us that the channel is straight. I would like any member of this House who is acquainted with any captain who navigates the River St. Lawrence, to enquire about it, and if they do they will find that it is one of the meanest channels to enter, and to get out of, that there is in the river. It is placed in the meanest part of the rapids possible. Now, if you refer to the Montreal *Gazette* of 17th October, 1891, you will see that Mr. D. G. Thomson, the manager of the Montreal Transportation Company at Montreal, complains bitterly in regard to this channel. If you refer to the Kingston *News* of 23rd October of the same year, you will find Captain John Gaskin also complains, and if you refer to the meeting of the Canadian Marine Association reported in the Toronto *Empire* of 4th February, 1892, you will see that the Marine men all complain in regard to this channel. Last fall the forwarders' vessels were detained at Prescott for days and days at a time, and they were forced to bring an elevator from Kingston to Prescott and lighten their barges to 8 feet; and though there should be 16 or 17 feet in this channel, yet they were forced to go down the old channel, and by these delays great loss was caused to them. I am satisfied that a great wrong has been done by some parties, but I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am not finding any fault with the Government. I asked the acting Minister of Railways and Canals, before the present Minister took that office, to investigate this matter, and I believe he did everything in his power to get at the bottom of the difficulty, and I think the present Minister has been doing his best to find out the trouble. I have no fault to find with the Government and am satisfied that they will do all they can to rectify the matter. I therefore hope that they will not object to bring down the papers, and that as soon as possible, in order that the forwarders and public may see how this matter stands.

Mr. HAGGART. I am sorry to hear from the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that the expenditure which has been made by the country on this

canal has not had the result expected, but I think the hon. gentleman must be misled when he says that, notwithstanding the large expenditure on the Galops Canal, the water has so much decreased. Complaints have been made that the expenditure made by the Government had not brought about the result anticipated, and my predecessor, the late acting Minister of Railways and Canals, ordered an enquiry to be made into the subject. The report of the engineers is in the department, and, while that does not justify the expectation which the Government had at first, and while the depth of water was not as great as the engineers had reported to the Government it would be, still it is to the effect that there is a sufficient depth of water to take down all boats that navigate the canal, that is, about 15 feet of water. I intend to have a further examination made of this particular work to see what the actual depth is. I can only say now that the latest reports are that the channel is of sufficient depth, and that, if it were not for the side current, it could be successfully used. I think the hon. gentleman must be mistaken as to the extras, because no payments have been made in the cases to which he referred. I will have much pleasure in bringing down all the papers the hon. gentleman asks for.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing what agreement or decision has been arrived at between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, regarding the railway bridge at Fenelon Falls.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 14th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of HUGH MCMILLAN, Esq., for the Electoral District of Vaudreuil.

Of Hon. JOHN CARLING, for the Electoral District of London.

Of EUGENE A. DYER, Esq., for the Electoral District of Brome.

Of LOUIS DUGAS, Esq., for the Electoral District of Montcalm.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

HUGH MCMILLAN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Vaudreuil; introduced by Mr. Ouimet and Mr. Bergeron.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 21) for the suppression of obscene literature, and to secure the punishment of certain immoral and criminal practices.—(Mr. Charlton.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Bill (No. 15) to amend the Act to incorporate the McKay Milling Company. (Mr. Robillard.)

Bill (No. 16) respecting the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company. (Mr. Robillard.)

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate W. C. Edwards Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 18) respecting certain Railway Works in the City of Toronto. (Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada. (Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 20) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. (Mr. Mara.)

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government during the present session to amend the Controverted Elections Act, so that the judges of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick can give decisions on the six months limit for trial in conformity with the decisions of the judges of Ontario and Quebec and of the Superior Court of Canada? If not, why not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no such conflict of decisions as the question assumes, and therefore there is no necessity of introducing a Bill on the subject.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, Whether the Government have considered the advisability of enforcing regulations against Newfoundland fishermen fishing in Canadian waters, similar to those which Newfoundland enforces against Canadian fishermen fishing in Newfoundland waters?

Mr. TUPPER. The subject covered by this question is receiving the consideration of the Government.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, Whether the attention of the Minister of Marine has been called to a letter published in the Montreal *Witness* of 9th February? Is it true that the Canadian Government promised the Newfoundland Government to divide the proceeds of licenses given in Canada to American fishermen, and which licenses were to run in Newfoundland as well as in Canada, and to return part thereof to Newfoundland? Has the Canadian Government since been asked and has it refused to make such division and return, or is there reason to believe that the Newfoundland Government collected upon licenses granted by them to Americans, recognized in Canada and retained to the use of the colony, as large an amount for license fees as Canada collected?

Mr. TUPPER. My attention was called to the letter mentioned. After the Washington treaty of 1888 was negotiated, and legislation was obtained for the granting of licenses under the *modus vivendi* proposition, the understanding between Newfoundland and Canada was to this effect: that the two Governments would issue licenses to fishermen for the privileges mentioned in the *modus vivendi* proposition, and that an account of the fees collected should be kept by each Government, and a division

of those fees should be made at the end of each season. In accordance with that understanding, a strict account of those fees was kept by the Department of Fisheries in Canada, and a copy of each license issued was sent by that department to the Government of Newfoundland. At the end either of the first or the second season, the Newfoundland Government, having made no return of the fees collected for licenses issued by them, a request was made by the Canadian Government on the Newfoundland Government for a statement of those collections and the licenses issued by that Government. That information was not given, and on the second application being made the Government of Newfoundland refused to give the information desired, as to the number of licenses issued or the amount collected. Consequently, it has been impossible to make any tender of a division of the proceeds from those licenses, on the part of the Canadian Government; and, for that reason, it might be assumed—though the Canadian Government have not dealt with the last subject referred to—that the amount collected in Newfoundland was larger. I may say that I have reason to believe, from information obtained, that the Newfoundland Government did collect a larger amount from the sale of these *modus vivendi* licenses, than was collected by Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has just made a very important statement of which, for my part, I was ignorant up to this moment, that is, that there was an agreement entered into between this Government and the Newfoundland Government, and that correspondence on the subject followed. It would be important to the House to have that correspondence. I suppose there will be no objection to bringing it down.

Mr. TUPPER. I think there will be no objection to laying on the Table the despatches relating to the subject at once, and I will select them and bring them down.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, Whether the attention of the Minister of Marine has been called to the statement made by the Hon. A. W. Harvey, a member of the Newfoundland Government, before the Board of Trade at Halifax on Monday last?

Mr. TUPPER. My attention was called to this statement, and I regret that I cannot agree with Mr. Harvey in the statement made by him concerning the facts of the case in dispute.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, Whether the Government of Newfoundland has ever made to the Government of Canada any formal complaint or produced any evidence that Canadian vessels obtaining bait in Newfoundland under the Bait Act of the colony, violated the provisions thereof by selling bait to the French fishermen of St. Pierre?

Mr. TUPPER. With the exception of a general allegation that Canadian vessels had violated the provisions of the Bait Act, no complaint or evidence to that effect has ever been made or produced by the Government of Newfoundland or from any other source.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Was that general allegation made in a despatch?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, but no instance was given.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, Whether the Government of Canada has ever offered the Government of Newfoundland to secure the enactment of such legislation as would enable the Government of Newfoundland to enforce in Canadian courts the penalties provided in bonds given by Canadian fishermen, in order to secure bait in Newfoundland, in case the condition of such bonds were violated, and has the Government of Newfoundland ever asked such or any other legislation in this connection?

Mr. TUPPER. The Canadian Government have on several occasions informed the Government of Newfoundland of their readiness to obtain any legislation enabling the Newfoundland authorities to obtain any remedy under the bonds contemplated by the Bait Act, as soon as Canadian vessels were accorded the privileges of that Act, and allowed to take out licenses as they did originally.

Mr. LAURIER. Will this correspondence also be brought down?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did not answer the last part of the question.

Mr. TUPPER. In reply to the last part of the question, I may say that the Government of Newfoundland has not asked for that legislation, because the period was not reached when the assurance of the Canadian Government expired when this legislation was had which produced the Bait Act.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne) asked, Whether the Government of Canada is aware that the Government of Newfoundland, when endeavouring to obtain Her Majesty's consent to the Bait Act passed by the Legislature of that colony, distinctly promised that the provisions of such Act should not be enforced against Canadians? Is it a fact that since the present Government of Newfoundland came into office, such promise has been violated continuously and that such promise was violated in 1890, prior to any protest by the Canadian Government against the proposed arrangement between the United States and Newfoundland?

Mr. TUPPER. The Government of Canada is aware that the Government of Newfoundland, when endeavouring to obtain Her Majesty's consent to the Bait Act passed by the Legislature of that colony, distinctly promised that the provisions of such Act should not be enforced against Canadians, and therefore in this form it was an assurance given by the representatives of that colony to Her Majesty's Government, and also communicated directly and formally to the Canadian Government, that the Bait Act should be applied equally to the citizens of Newfoundland and the citizens of Canada, that there should be no difference in its enforcement against our own citizens and theirs. As to the last part of the question, I will not allude to the date, because I am not sure at what time the present Government of Newfoundland came into power, but long anterior to the Bond-Blaine negotiations, that is anterior to the date when the Canadian Government learned of them, which was in the fall of 1890, and in the beginning of that season, there was a complete departure from the position the Government of Newfoundland had assumed in regard to the subjects to which I have referred. Canadian vessels were prevented obtaining licenses on the same terms as those of Newfoundland or of the United States, and at the beginning of the season a tonnage fee was exacted from the Canadian vessels which was not exacted from the others.

Mr. LAURIER. Has the hon. gentleman any record of that?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes. All these points will be included in the papers brought down. I suppose these questions have been asked by the hon. gentleman in view of the statements which were made by Mr. Harvey, because on some points the papers we have are at variance.

Mr. LAURIER. I asked the question because it is obvious that mere verbal statements would not be quite satisfactory when we may have the documents laid before us.

Mr. TUPPER. I recognize that, and therefore I purposely made my reply brief.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the papers will be brought down at an early date.

Mr. TUPPER. At a very early date.

COPYRIGHT RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to arrange a reciprocity of copyright with the Government of the United States at an early period?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We think that the copyright enactments of Canada already give to foreigners all proper facilities. The United States has very recently settled its copyright policy, and we have no reason to expect an early change.

GOVERNMENT SHORT LOANS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What is the total amount now borrowed by the Government for periods of less than three years? From whom have the said amounts been borrowed, for what time, and upon what terms?

Mr. FOSTER. The total amounts are itemized as follows:

London Joint Stock Bank	$ 973,333 33
Messrs. Hambro	243,333 33
Bank of British North America	243,333 33
Bank of British Columbia	243,333 33
National Discount Co	243,333 33
London and County Bank	1,216,666 67
Messrs. Raphael	486,666 67
National Provincial Bank of England	973,333 33
Messrs. Baring Bros. & Co. (Ltd)	1,460,000 00
do Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co	1,460,000 00
Bank of Montreal	243,333 33
do do	1,966,666 67
Total	$9,753,333 32

All of these are at 4 per cent for one year, except the last item which is only for six months and bears 4½ per cent interest.

CACOUNA PIER.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the Government expended the grant of fifteen hundred dollars voted last session in favour of the pier at Cacouna, in the County of Témiscouata? What has been done with this sum? When has this sum been paid out by the Government? To whom has it been paid?

Mr. OUIMET. None of this money has been expended as yet. It still stands to the credit of the work.

THE ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1893, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE.
OTTAWA, 14th March, 1892.

Mr. FOSTER moved that His Excellency's Message, with the Estimates, be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

DEEPENING CANALS.

Mr. DENISON moved:

That whereas the new United States canal at Sault Ste. Marie is being constructed at a depth of 18 feet, and whereas it is proposed in that country to deepen their canals on the Great Lakes to not less than 20 feet, and whereas the proposed increase in depth has already been made at the mouth of the Detroit River; in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the Soulanges Canal and the other canals of the River St. Lawrence should be deepened to 20 feet.

He said: In moving this motion, I confess that I approach the subject with some diffidence, as I am not an engineer, nor am I specially acquainted with matters of this kind. Still it has appeared to me for some years back that I ought to bring the subject up in this House, and that something ought to be done towards deepening our canals on the St. Lawrence River to a proper amount. When I say a proper amount, I mean making them of such a depth that it will suffice once for all, instead of doing the work piece by piece as heretofore. I may say that between the town of Port Arthur and the city of Montreal the only obstruction that exists to a 20 feet navigation, is the insufficient depth of the Welland Canal and the canals on the St. Lawrence River. In making this motion I would like to say that it is not an entirely new idea, for I hold in my hand a report to the Hon. Mr. Pope, made by Mr. Robert C. Douglass in 1884, in which he advocates an enlargement of the canals. As long ago as that date he then showed that in 1882, when the Welland Canal had just or barely been completed, seven vessels passed through which had to be lightened before they could get through. In 1883, 62 vessels had to be lightened before they could go through that canal; and no less than 17,411 tons had to be taken off the vessels, or 25 per cent of the whole amount, at a cost of $12,759. I have also here the opinion of Mr. W. L. Frost, President of the Ogdensburgh and Lake Champlain Railway, who says:

"As to my views on the subject, in brief, they are that you should deepen the Welland Canal to 16, 18 or 20 feet if possible; to stop at 14 feet, while it will help, will not put the route on a level with the Buffalo and Erie Canal, with their free canals. If the Welland Canal can be deepened to 20 feet, you would command the trade of the lakes, in my opinion, and as you decrease from that point you only come into competition with Buffalo and will only be partially successful. Any increase in the depth is a move in the right direction, but I trust you will not stop at less than 16 feet."

Again, in the same report it is pointed out that one great advantage in having the canals deepened to

a proper amount is that it would allow a large amount of shipping to come down to the sea which now has to lie in the harbours of the upper lakes for five or six months in the year, and these vessels would be enabled to trade with the West Indies, or with any other country where they felt disposed to venture. I will read the charges, in several countries, for the carriage of grain by railways :—

	Miles.	Cents per ton mile.
Great Britain.		
North British Ry	169	1·60
Great Northern Ry	190	2·00
Great Southern and Western Ry	250	1·40
The Continent.		
France—Northern Ry	186	2·78
Belgium—State Ry	200	0·84
Holland—State Ry	240	1·52
Saxony—State Ry	250	3·28
Belgium—State Ry	250	0·74
Sweden—State Ry	500	2·18
Austria—Southern Ry	500	2·06
America—West of the Mississippi.		
Chicago, Rock Island and Pac. Ry.	183	1·53
do do do	358	1·40
do do do	500	1·00
America—East of the Mississippi.		
Lake Shore and Michigan Southern	183	0·87
Michigan Central	285	0·70
do	345	0·60
do	520	0·60
Baltimore and Ohio	494	0·63
do	609	0·54
do	840	0·53
Canada—State Ry	689	0·612
Chicago to New York (regular rates)	980	0·510
do (cut rates)	980	0·306
Water Transport.		
Detroit to Buffalo	255	0·260
Chicago to Buffalo	900	0·125
do (cut rates)	900	0·060

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to show the enormous amount of commerce that is going on on the upper lakes, and in doing so I will be compelled to quote some statistics, which I will ask the indulgence of the House for doing. I have obtained the most of these statistics from a very interesting paper written by Mr. E. L. Corthell, of Chicago, which he read before the Society of Engineers in Canada ; it is a very exhaustive report. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the very rapid increase which has taken place in the number of large ships sailing on the upper lakes. In 1859, 36 of the largest vessels on the lakes averaged a tonnage of 700. In 1890, the fleet doing business on the great lakes had increased to 2,055 vessels, with a net registered tonnage of 826,360, valued at $58,125,580. Since I took these figures from Mr. Corthell's paper, I have learned that the value is not placed so high by the census bureau, which values them at about $48,809,750, some $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 less. But those figures are startling in their enormity ; it is startling to think that in the upper lakes there should be such a vast volume of trade as would require vessels worth $48,000,000 to $58,000,000 with which to do it. The Canadian marine, I may mention, in the upper lakes consists of 647 vessels, with a tonnage of 132,971 tons, and a value of $3,989,130. The total coast and inland shipping of Canada consists of 7,153 vessels, with a tonnage of 1,040,481, valued at $31,213,430. The traffic through the Detroit River, through which pass the produce and ships of both nations, is very large. In 1890 the tonnage was over 23,000,000. In the eastern canals it is a little different. While the tonnage has increased so enormously in the west, and while the tonnage of the vessels passing through the canals shows an enormous increase, the tonnage going through the Erie and St. Lawrence Canals has been stationary, or has fallen back ; and the reason is, undoubtedly, the insufficiency of water in the canals. On page 49 of his paper Mr. Corthell says :

"The waterways out of the eastern end of Lake Erie and beyond to the sea, have had no appreciable increase, in fact there has been a decrease during the last fifteen years. The Erie Canal is carrying no more than it did many years ago, and through the Welland and St. Lawrence River canals there has been practically no increase. In 1883, the total tonnage on the Welland Canal was 880,950 : in 1887, 787,307 ; in the St. Lawrence canals in 1883, 1,847,865, and in 1887, 1,715,295 tons."

Then he goes on to say :

"The freight service on the great lakes is 22·6 per cent of the total freight service rendered by all the railways of the United States. At the average rate of all the freight moved in 1889 (according to the statistician of the United States' Commerce Commission, 9·22 mills per ton per mile) the cargo carried on the lakes in that year would have cost the shippers $143,079,283.51. Adopting 1½ mills per ton per mile as the average cost of lake transportation, the entire cost for the season of 1890 was $23,177,540.70. The saving to the public, therefore, by water transportation on the lakes in that single year was $119,901,742.81.

That is the statement made by Mr. Corthell, an eminent engineer, that by having the canals and the waterway on the upper lakes there was a saving during the year of $119,000,000, which would be sufficient, I dare say, to complete this work twice over. The cost per ton of freight going through the lakes, the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals to Liverpool, is $3.97, and the route is open 225 days ; by all-rail to Montreal and thence to Liverpool the cost is $6.25, and route open 234 days. I should like to trace the course of a vessel from Port Arthur through the lakes and canals to Montreal. Lake Superior, I need hardly mention, is 412 miles long by 167 wide, and a vessel drawing 18 feet of water can leave Port Arthur and sail, with uninterrupted navigation, for a distance of 273 miles to the Sault, where it will pass through a canal of one mile, and St. Mary's River, which is about 55 miles more. The Sault, or St. Mary's Canal, was originally built in 1852 as a 12 feet canal ; in 1882 the depth was increased to 16 feet, and, as we all know, in 1886 it was further increased to 20 feet. I believe it was proposed on our own side of the river to have our canal an 18 feet canal ; but the Government very wisely changed their plans and made it correspond with the canal on the other side, and thus they have provided a canal for vessels drawing 20 feet. Passing through Lake Huron, which is 265 miles long by 101 miles wide, the vessel will pass through the St. Clair River and lake and the Detroit River, in all about 72 miles more, and arrive at Lake Erie. The canals in this 72 miles, like at the Sault, have been repeatedly increased in depth. The St. Clair Flats canal was in 1866 proposed to be 13 feet ; in 1873 it was deepened to 16 feet, and now the project is completed by a 20 feet channel. The Lime Kiln crossing has been deepened at different periods, for in 1858 it was 9½ feet, and in 1871 it was increased to a depth of 12 feet, in 1874 to 13 feet, in 1885 to 16 feet, and in 1890 the depth was increased to the standard of 20 feet. Passing through Lake Erie, which is 250 miles by 60 miles, we come to the

Welland Canal. This canal, like all the others, has gone through the same experience of enlargement at different times. In 1824, when it was proposed to build it, the projectors looked for a depth of 8 feet. In 1841 it was enlarged, and in 1843 it was enlarged to give 9 feet on the sills and 11½ on the sills in the entrance locks; in 1880 it was enlarged to 14 feet, and is now, as I have already stated, altogether too small. In fact, the Welland Canal had not been enlarged to a 14 feet canal before it was discovered to be altogether too small. I believe I am correct in saying that the last Welland Canal enlargement was projected for 12 feet, but during its construction the Government saw their way clear to increase it to 14 feet, and it was done. After being enlarged to 14 feet, so long ago as 1884 the canal was found to be too small. Notwithstanding this last increase in size, the vessels passing through the canal in 1889 were obliged to reduce their cargoes from a tonnage of 71,502 to 63,283 tons to enable them to pass through the canal to Lake Ontario. This was a serious loss to vessel owners, in compelling them to meet this heavy expense. Passing through the Welland Canal, 26¾ miles connecting with Lake Ontario, which is 190 miles by 54 miles, a vessel can sail on to Prescott 229 miles, where the first canal on the St. Lawrence is met. I am not quite safe on my ground when I say that a vessel drawing 18 feet can sail to Prescott, because I am not aware of the exact depth of the St. Lawrence between Kingston and Prescott, but I am told that 18 feet of water is found throughout that distance. I have shown that a vessel going from Port Arthur to the head of the Prescott Canal can make the passage all that distance, 1,154 miles, drawing 18 or 20 feet of water, except in passing through the Welland Canal which has only 14 feet. In connection with the St. Lawrence, I should again like to point out that the works on these canals have been proceeded with step by step, as is the case with the other canals, and have been enlarged bit by bit. The intended depth of the St. Lawrence canals in 1841 was 9 feet. In 1871 it was decided to enlarge to 12 feet throughout, and shortly afterwards it was decided that the ultimate depth should be 14 feet on the sill. As to the Lachine Canal, as far back as 1804 the Government of Lower Canada constructed a 3-foot channel there. In 1821 it was increased to 5 feet in depth and 28 feet wide at the bottom, and since that time it has been enlarged and enlarged. I am satisfied with respect to the new canal at Soulanges, that it will pass through the same stages. We are going to construct it with a depth of 14 feet, but before it and the other canals are finished we shall ascertain with respect to this canal, as we have ascertained with regard to every other canal, that we were not abreast of, but behind the times. This, if possible, should be avoided in the future. It seems to me that we should, in building a new canal, construct it of such size and depth as to answer for all time, and this finality would be attained by making it 20 feet deep. I may be met with the question of the feasibility of constructing 20 feet canals on the St. Lawrence. I am informed by good engineers that it is quite feasible, that it is only a question of expense. We Canadians believe we have done a good deal in regard to canals, and are doing a good deal still. No doubt such is the case; but at the same time we should look at what other countries have done. England has 2,800 miles of canals: Ireland has 300 miles; Russia 900 miles; Sweden 300 miles, two of them being 50-mile canals. Germany in 1871 had 1,250 miles of canals. In Holland they have 930 miles of canals; France has 3,123 miles of canals, on which she has expended up to 1872 the enormous sum of $231,474,867, for internal water improvement, and France has now one of the most magnificent internal waterways of any country in the world. The Briere Canal in France, connecting the Rivers Seine and Loire, is 34½ miles long. The Caledonia Canal in Scotland has a depth of 20 feet, and the Gloucester and Berkeley Canal is 16½ miles long with a depth of 18 feet. Then we come to the Suez Canal, of which it is hardly necessary for me to mention the size; that canal has a depth of 26 feet. In looking over the work that has been done in canals in other countries, it encourages us here to pursue a policy which will be equal to the future requirements of the trade of this great North-West country. It is only necessary to point out the instance which we have now in England, of the great Manchester Ship Canal, to see that the merchants and citizens of Manchester in building that canal for ocean-going shipping, which will cost, I believe, $50,000,000, have faith in the undertaking. I think that is conclusive proof that the age of canals has not passed, and that they are as important, I may say, as ever. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall give the House some facts as to public opinion being in favour of canals. Last December in the city of Detroit they held, what they called, a Deep Water Convention, comprising engineers and others throughout the United States, and they passed there some four resolutions. They asked Congress for:

"The speedy completion of a channel not less than twenty feet deep, and of sufficient width, between Chicago, Duluth, Superior and Buffalo; second, surveys, examinations and estimates with a view to the construction of a waterway through our territory of sufficient capacity to float vessels drawing twenty feet of water, connecting the upper lakes with tidewater; third, the improvement of the Hudson River to a navigable depth of twenty feet from Coxsackie to Troy; fourth, liberal appropriations for needed lighthouses, &c., to give added security to navigation throughout the entire chain of lakes."

The Chicago *Tribune*, published of course in a great railway centre, and on that account, I suppose, opposed to canals, stated a short time ago as follows, in reference to the Deep Water Convention:—

"It was either to deplete the Treasury; or a deliberate attempt to make them pay the large expense of diverting the commerce of the North-West through Canada."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we in Canada can stand that part of it very well, and anything we can do to convert this enormous traffic of the lakes past our doors and down the St. Lawrence to the sea must be of great benefit to this country. I might say that Toronto is interested in this work, as last year some 2,407 vessels came into our port; and, some time ago, a reporter of the Toronto *World* called upon some of the ship-owners and asked their opinions with reference to this matter. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read what a few of them say:

"Captain Sylvester said this proposition by the United States was a step in the right direction. It showed that they were alive to their own best interests. The deepening of the St. Lawrence canals would of necessity benefit both countries. Any improvement which tends to cheapen transportation benefit both producer and consumer. * * * The owners made more in those days than they do now. So in the same way the deepening of the canal would

probably still further reduce their profits, but it would also help them by allowing the vessels to leave for other waters in times when trade is slack here. It was a proposition far ahead of the times, but it was sure to come some time in the future."

"Capt. J. H. Hagarty said there was not a vessel-owner in the country who would go against the proposition. They wanted the canals deepened, no matter who did it. He did not hold the opinions of some people, who seem to think that the deepening of the canals would make every town on the lakes a seaport."

"Mr. W. A. Geddes was glad to see the brighter prospects of the realization of the vessel-owner's hopes. It was just what they had been working for for years. Not that they had ever met with opposition. It had always been Sir John A. Macdonald's desire to improve the canals of the St. Lawrence, and he had assured them it would be done as soon as the money was forthcoming. It would give the inter-provincial trade a great impetus, for vessels carrying flour and grain cargoes to the Maritime Provinces would be able to bring back coal at a figure far below the Pennsylvania product."

"Mr. William Ince said the deepening of the canals would encourage the building of larger and better-fitted vessels and as a natural consequence the shipping trade would have to assume greater proportions."

Since I put this motion on the Paper, I had sent to me the sixth annual report of the President of the Port Arthur Board of Trade, and he, also, very strongly advocates the enlargement and the deepening of the canals. As to the expense of such a great work, I have been told by a gentleman who is not an engineer, that it might cost from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000, but supposing that it cost as much as the Canadian Pacific Railway, I contend that it would be of as great an advantage, on the whole, as the Canadian Pacific Railway has been; and it is unnecessary for me to dwell on the immense benefits conferred on this country by that railway. Our Canadian waterways are the property of everybody, while a railway is the property of the company to which it belongs. Any person who wishes to invest his money in shipping can make use of our canal system, and he can derive benefit from the money expended in improving our waterways. I think that in this matter we should not make two bites at a cherry. We should enlarge these canals so as to answer the purposes of our trade for a long time in the future. Some may think that my scheme is too ambitious, but, if it is found that it would be too costly an operation to carry out at once, there is no reason why the Soulanges Canal should not have its locks constructed of such a size that it could afterwards be deepened from 14 feet to the depth I am advocating, namely, 20 feet. The Soulanges Canal is a new work, and it seems to me a great pity, in view of our past experience, that we should go through again as we have done before on this plan, of first building the canals and enlarging them afterwards. It is needless to point out that it would be much more costly to enlarge an old canal, than to construct at first one sufficiently large to meet all requirements. The Canadian Pacific Railway, I understand, is now taxed to its utmost to carry the grain of the North-West to the seaboard. Last year that country had a surplus of twenty or thirty million bushels, and we are told that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company contemplate doubling the track between Winnipeg and Port Arthur. Even supposing that project is carried out, the railway will still be totally inadequate to carry out the surplus grain of that enormous region, the development of which is only in its infancy. I have no doubt that instead of twenty or thirty million bushels, not many years will pass before there will be two hundred or three hundred million bushels exported from our North-West. Some of the finest wheat land in the world is there, and all that is required is the large immigration which we are now hoping for. Then, the mineral wealth of the Sudbury district has only just been discovered, and is now being opened up; and there is no knowing what vast dimensions the products of those mines will assume in the future. It is said that the most magnificent nickel mines in the world are there. Capital is beginning to go in, and the development of those mines must enormously increase the traffic of our waterways. This traffic, which I hope to see promoted by the deepening of the canals to an adequate depth, will help not only Kingston, Cobourg, Toronto, Hamilton and all the ports in the upper lakes, but all parts of the North-West, by cheapening transport to the seaboard. Every cent saved in shipping a bushel of grain from Port Arthur to the sea, is practically a cent added to the price of the wheat of our North-West farmers. If our canals are deepened, there is nothing to prevent our maritime friends coming in with their ships and doing a large proportion of the trade of the inland lakes. I am told that it now pays well to transport coal from the Maritime Provinces to Montreal and somewhat west of Montreal: but owing to the want of sufficient depth of water in the canals, it has not hitherto paid to bring it as far west as Toronto. But with a depth of 18 or 20 feet of water in the canals, I am told by vessel owners who know, that they would guarantee that the Maritime Provinces would supply Toronto and its district with all the soft coal they required, and do it at a cheaper price than we pay for it now. If we could bring coal from Cape Breton to Toronto, there would be a profit in a return cargo made up of flour and other farm produce for the Maritime Provinces. In that way the inter-provincial trade which we all anxiously desire would be opened up. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I need say much more at present. I will merely reiterate that here we have one of the most magnificent waterways in the world, in the path of travel from the great wheat-producing country on the west to the mother country on the east. We have a chain of lakes, with a great river which only requires the expenditure of some money to be sufficiently deepened to bring past our doors the enormous trade of the west, which now seeks other channels for the want of this work which I advocate. I will conclude my remarks by quoting again from that excellent paper of Mr. Corthell:

"Government must now provide these new and enlarged channels of commerce, or see the vast amounts already expended practically lost. Through its inability or unwillingness to meet the demands of commerce, it will inevitably see the greatest commerce of the world diverted from its natural channel and taken out of its domains into artificial channels of its neighbour's territory to enrich and develop a country lying along these artificial routes. The commercial and financial importance in every way to Montreal and to other cities, both Canadian and United States, situated on this enlarged natural waterway, can scarcely be over-estimated."

He goes on to say:

"Direct trade with Europe should be the demand of the North-West and all the country tributary to it. The direct pecuniary advantage to the people should not be estimated at less than $2,000,000 per annum."

Mr. BERGIN. Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) I think amply justifies me in supporting his resolution. I do not propose to enter into a

discussion of the commerce that will be created, or of the amount of freight that could be carried, and that certainly would be carried, if the lakes and rivers afforded a channel of 20 feet in depth. The hon. member for West Toronto has shown the House that from Port Arthur to Kingston there is an ample depth to afford passage to vessels drawing 20 feet. I propose to show that at a moderate expenditure it is in the power of the Government to give to the commerce of this country a channel which would enable vessels drawing 20 feet of water to go from Kingston to Montreal. The distance from Kingston to Montreal is 119 miles, of this 75 miles is composed of various reaches in the river between the different canals. The canal mileage is 43¾ miles. From Kingston to the foot of Wolfe Island, a distance of 14 miles, there is a channel nowhere less than 20 feet deep, and in some places nearly 200 feet—a channel straight and wide, and presenting no difficulty whatever to navigation. From the foot of Wolfe Island to Brockville, a distance of 30¼ miles, there is in the American waters a channel nowhere less than 20 feet deep. That channel, owing to its crooked nature, is 1¼ miles longer than a channel which could be provided in Canadian waters. But a straight one can be provided between those two points, where there is not less than 20 feet of water. What would make that channel navigable on the Canadian side would be to remove some of the lights, so as to avoid running around some shoals which are in the way of the channel as at present used. From Prescott to the Galops, about 17 miles, with the exception of 3 miles of a north channel that will require to be provided, there is ample water for vessels drawing 18 feet. The new channel in the Galops will at present afford passage to vessels drawing 14 feet, and there is no engineering reason that I know of to prevent its being increased to 18 feet. From the Galops, through the Rapide Plat, to the head of the Cornwall Canal there can be no difficulty in getting 18 feet for vessels descending the river. I admit that further deepening would be required for vessels going up. What would be required to be removed in these reaches are some small shoals here and there of no very great size and not likely to cost any very large amount of money. From Cornwall to Coteau, 31¼ miles, there is nowhere less than 20 feet of water, and in some places, at all events for a long stretch, 80 feet of a channel. I admit that vessels have occasionally gone ashore at Lake St. Francis, and between Cornwall and the Lancaster lights, but, except in the case of a short distance near the Lancaster lights, which could be deepened at very small cost, there is a channel nearly 1,200 feet wide and from 20 to 80 feet deep all the way to Coteau du Lac. The Soulanges Canal will afford the necessary water, if so built, from that point to Lake St. Louis. Lake St. Louis, I have reason to believe from the statements of the engineers, can be improved at two or three points so as to give the necessary depth of 20 feet. Thus I have gone over that portion of the river between Kingston and Montreal, and I think that the number of points to be improved are so few and the quantity of rock or other obstructions to be removed is so small in comparison with the great advantage that it would be to this country to afford passage to vessels drawing this amount of water, that I think we are sustained in asking the House to carry this resolution of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Denison). No one, I think, who has paid any attention to the commercial interests of this country, who has paid any attention to the difficulties which have been and are now in the way of the marine of this country, in the transport of grain from the west to the seaboard, but will admit that there are other difficulties in the way beside the natural difficulties, that the only difficulties placed in the way of the marine of this country have not been the rocks and the shoals and the shallows which exist in the river, but that a great deal of the difficulty is due to the want of knowledge or the want of attention, the want of study and of proper examination made previous to the construction of our great canals. I have on the floor of this House, three or four years ago, shown in great part where and why these difficulties have arisen. The marine of this country require to have the trade of the country facilitated in every manner possible. The works designed to overcome natural obstructions ought to be constructed in such a way as to promote, not to hinder, the navigation of our canals. Take at present the capacity of the locks in our canals. A tug with two or three barges, such as the *Condor*, would be unable to get through except with two or three lockages. The tug and these barges could not be accommodated in one lock. In a little while, should the canals be enlarged, or when these canals are enlarged and deepened, as is proposed under the present plan, to 14 feet, the trade of this country will be hindered in getting to the seaboard from Kingston. When they reach the canals, they will have 5 or 6 or more barges of at least the capacity of the *Condor*, which will then be one of the smaller vessels, and, instead of passing through a canal like the Cornwall Canal, in 4 hours, they will take from 12 to 20 hours, and, instead of the tug having only one lockage, she will have five or six or eight lockages, according to the number of barges she has in tow. I know it may be objected that these great cargoes of grain will be brought from the west in propellers. I do not for a moment credit that anything of the kind will be done. It will be found that these vessels cannot do the work as cheaply or as efficiently as it can be done by barges, and when the trade find that it will require such a length of time to get through the canal, that it will be such a hindrance to them and will increase so much the cost of transportation, they will cry loudly to have the locks increased to the proper dimensions. We have before us an example that ought to influence us very strongly. We have before us, as has been shown by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), the state of the Sault Canal, which was first of a depth of 12 feet, then enlarged to 16 feet, then to 18 feet and now to 20 feet, and we have in connection with that a lock that will almost pass a fleet through at one time. Now we require on the St. Lawrence Canals and on the Welland Canal, perhaps not quite so large locks as those on the Sault Canal, but locks not less than 600 feet in length and from 67 to 70 feet in width, so as to allow a tug with her consorts to pass through in a reasonable time; and, when I add that in the Welland Canal and in the Cornwall Canal, the gates are closed and the water let into the locks in the same old-fashioned way of years ago, that men are seen there with their breasts

and their arms on a bar, walking round and round until they are giddy, and working in the old capstan and bar style, I think we may fairly ask the Government to abandon the old system and adopt a method of emptying and filling the locks which will occupy a very short time in comparison with this antiquated mode. The lock on the Sault is opened, filled and emptied in an almost incredibly short space of time, considering the size of the work and the magnitude of the lock; and so it will be, I understand, upon our own "Soo" Canal. Then, again, in addition to the hindrance that is experienced in the length of time that is consumed, we have also this further fact, that there are other causes of delay. Take the canal at Cornwall. A great deal of time is consumed, and a great many accidents have happened, for want of proper light. On all other canals, I understand, we have the electric light. After the new locks were constructed at the foot of the Cornwall Canal, vessels ran upon the pier at the entrance to the lock because there was nothing to show to the marine of this country that there was a safe and proper channel on the north side of the St. Regis and Cornwall Island. When that is properly beaconed and buoyed, as it ought to be, a deep and safe channel of 20 feet, leading directly into the lock at the mouth of the canal, will be obtained, and no accident of that kind would be likely thereafter to occur. Then, again, if an accident did happen in the canal, it could be remedied in a short time, for information could be given to the proper officer. Now, it is very often necessary to send a man twelve miles on horseback, or by carriage, from the head to the foot of the canal where the superintendent or proper officer may happen to be. A telephone line costing a few hundred dollars would avoid all that difficulty. The locks that have been constructed on the Cornwall Canal during the past two or three years are of the size which I have just described, and do not afford, I maintain, proper facilities to trade, but on the contrary are actually a hindrance, and will be a still greater hindrance when they come to use these large vessels. Now, in connection with the time lost in opening and closing these canals, it should be mentioned that the cost of the maintenance of these locks might well be considered. At present there is a staff of six men at each lock, whereas if the gates were opened and shut by hydraulic power, one man, under ordinary circumstances, would be sufficient; and there is no canal where such power could be more advantageously employed than the Cornwall Canal, for there is a sufficient fall from the banks to the river to enable this to be done. Under those circumstances the cost of maintenance would be reduced to a minimum instead of being, as it is now, the large sum that is required for the opening and the closing of the gates. Now, not the least of the benefits to be conferred upon this country by giving to it a canal of 20 feet, is that upon which the member for Toronto touched a few minutes ago. I refer to the growth of inter-provincial trade, without which this country can never be cemented into the great nation which we wish it to become. It seems to me this great difficulty would be largely removed by our sending our products to the provinces down by the sea, and by bringing their products back here and carrying them to the North-West. When we shall have established a proper inter-provincial trade, which this project will tend to establish, when we know our brethren down by the sea more intimately, as our greater business connections will make us know them, and as they come to know us better, I think that the spirit of nationality for which we all pray, and without which this country can never expect to become a great nation, will be fostered and strengthened in such a way that we shall no more hear men talking of "our province," of "my province," but they will speak of Canada as a whole, and we shall be known abroad, not as North-Westerners, not as Prince Edward Islanders, not as New Brunswickers or Nova Scotians, but we shall be known as Canadians only. This motive, if there were no other, ought to induce the Government to send the best men they can find, not only in Canada, but in England and the United States, to see whether this scheme is feasible, to ascertain whether it is true that the engineering difficulties are so tremendous that we cannot overcome them. I think the Canadians, as a people, are quite able to hold their own with any other people in the world: I think we are as capable of performing great engineering works as Americans or Englishmen. But there always has been, and there always will be, I fear, a set of men who have no faith in their own people or in their own country; and if Canada is suffering to-day because of unskilled engineering, it is because the commissioners who were appointed to build these canals had no faith in Canada, and they sent to the United States for men because they thought the engineers of that country had greater skill and would be better able to construct our canals than the engineers of our own country. But time has brought its revenge. True, they are not alive to know it, but the two able men who planned these canals, who prepared, at the instance of the Government, plans and specifications, and location also, for these canals, were they alive to-day, would find that time had vindicated them, that time had shown that the American talent that was employed was unequal to the occasion, and that events had proven to the world that the ability, and the skill, and the genius of these two despised Canadians were of a nature to throw entirely into the shade the abilities of the American engineers who were employed, and to-day Canada has to mourn many, many millions wasted in the construction of these canals.

Mr. REID. I must take issue with the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) and the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). Neither of these hon. gentlemen have carefully traced the route from Prescott to Montreal and return. The hon. member for Cornwall tells us that he has consulted engineers on this matter, and they say that there are no difficulties between Prescott and Montreal that cannot be overcome. Now, I think if he had consulted the mariners, those who are using the rivers, he would have found that there are a great many difficulties. The hon. gentleman says that after leaving Prescott, and before coming to the Galops Rapids, about three miles of rock excavation would have to be done. Now, Sir, that three miles of excavation is solid rock, and judging from the cost of rock excavation elsewhere, it would require an enormous amount of money to make it. Then the

hon. gentleman says there is a channel of 14 feet draught in the Galops Rapids, which, by a little more expenditure, can be made navigable. If the engineer who gave the hon. gentleman this information would study the matter thoroughly, he will express the opinion that the channel to which he refers, even if deepened, is no good, and that the construction of a proper channel there would cost an enormous sum. When we come to the Cornwall Canal we have 12 miles to be deepened from 14 to 20 feet. The cost of that work would be very great. At several points in the different locks between Cornwall and Montreal miles and miles of rock excavation will be required, and I have been informed by one of the leading forwarders that the greater part will be rock excavations. Coming west from Montreal we have first the Lachine Canal. Then there is the Soulanges Canal, the whole length of which has to be excavated. After passing Cornwall we come to the Farran's Point Canal, one mile long, which would require to be enlarged. Then we have the Williamsburg Canal, 4 miles, and next 7 miles of Galops Rapids Canal. The cost of these enlargements will be very large. Not only so, but between Cornwall and Prescott there are a great many points where excavations will have to be made. But apart from all this, I claim that a cargo of grain loaded in Chicago for Montreal requires to be discharged or handled in order to preserve it. I believe the distance is so great that the grain is liable to "heat," and the slight cost of handling it in that way is so beneficial to the grain that it is much better to have it put into barges at Kingston. I think that if the locks in the canal were made 600 feet long, that would be of great assistance, for the reason that the barges and steamers passing both ways are delayed for the lack of increased locking accommodation. Time is of great importance to forwarders, and were the locks larger, the fact that we would then be able to lock through a whole tow, or two or three barges at a time would be of great importance. If the locks on the Welland Canal had been built 600 feet long, and those on the St. Lawrence Canals 600 feet long with a depth of 14 feet, it would still be found advantageous for vessels to discharge a part of their cargoes at Kingston and to steam down the river with 14 feet draught. I hold that it would be almost impossible for a large vessel, say 600 feet long drawing 20 feet of water, to come up the St. Lawrence between the different ends of the canal, on account of the swift current. Vessels of the length of 500 or 600 feet could hardly come up the river. Under these circumstances, it would be found necessary to construct one long canal. Again, the St. Lawrence canals are constructed along the banks of the river, and they are so crooked that large vessels could scarcely pass through them. I, therefore, think the expenditure involved would be so large as compared with the benefits which would result, that I do not feel justified in voting for the motion proposed by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison).

Mr. MACDONELL. It strikes me that the way to look at this question is in a practical common-sense light. I do not think the hon. gentleman who spoke first on this subject would for a moment dispute the fact that the expenditure would be large, to carry out the improvements advocated by him before the House to-day. But when you look at the system of canals in the Dominion of Canada, and trace them from the time they were proposed until the time they were enlarged, you find that the sole argument recognized by the Government was the exigency of trade requirements, which needed that the canal system of the Dominion should be enlarged in order to give facilities for larger vessels. No one will dispute the fact that the enlargement of the canals would be of immense advantage not only to the marine section of the Dominion, but to the people at large. The fact that the Government recognized the necessity of enlarging the canals is obvious from the canal now in construction at the Sault, a canal whose locks will be 900 feet long and over 60 feet wide, thereby emphasizing the fact that it is clearly in the interest of the carrying trade that the locks should be increased in size. There may be a difference of opinion as to the expenditure involved in carrying out this work. I do not think my hon. friend who advocates the prosecution of this work would say for a moment that such a gigantic undertaking should be completed at once. I believe it can be done in sections; as money comes in, and as money can easily be borrowed by the Government, certain portions of the work can be prosecuted. There is a canal now projected on the St. Lawrence not many miles away from here. If it is not possible to deepen that canal to a depth of 19 feet, such as the depth of the Sault Canal, could not at least this be done—to have the locks of that canal deepened to 19 feet and the rest of the canal made uniform with the other canals of the Dominion? No one for a moment will dispute the fact, that it is economical to spend the amount of money necesary to carry out this undertaking. For instance, the locks in the old canal to-day are 270 feet long, 42 feet wide and 14 feet deep, and allows a vessel to go through carrying 2,000 tons. If we secure 19 feet of excavation, which I believe will give 20 feet on the mitre sill, we allow a vessel to pass through carrying 5,000 tons. The cost of carriage is much less in proportion than the cost of building the vessel and of deepening the canal. I am told on good authority that the Americans have spent on their system of waterways, from the Detroit River to the head of navigation, about $30,000,000; but if they have done so, it has saved to the country at least $150,000,000. So if the work proposed by the hon. gentleman for Toronto (Mr. Denison) was prosecuted slowly and gradually, and if it did cost $80,000,000, the country generally would be recouped at least double that amount. With respect to the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, I find that the engineer quoted by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison)—Mr. Corthell declares that the St. Lawrence waterway, outside the canals, could be improved, provided the canals were 16 feet in depth, to allow vessels of that draft to pass through, for about $27,000,000. I, therefore, think the improvement of the St. Lawrence cannot be considered as an insuperable difficulty by any means. I do not think anyone disputes the fact that prosperity in the west is very largely owing to the size of the Sault Canal, through which vessels of very large tonnage can pass. For instance, I find that during last year there passed through the Sault Canal about 2,500,000 tons of coal, 3,780,000 barrels of flour, 39,000,000

bushels of wheat, over 21,000,000 bushels of grain, 70,000 tons of pig iron, 235,000 tons of salt, 70,000 tons of copper, and 3,560,000 tons of iron ore. With the small canal which was at their disposal previous to the construction of the new canal, they could not in three years have forwarded the immense quantity of traffic that went through the Sault Canal last year. It is now found, however, that the traffic is so great on the upper lakes that they are obliged to construct another canal, to provide for the immense and growing trade up and down between Lake Huron and Lake Superior. Sir, I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), and I trust that in the near future we may see something done by which the wants of the carrying trade of this country may be met by the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, permit me, as a member from a North-West constituency, to give my support to the motion of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison). I am, Sir, as much opposed as any member in the House to adding to our debt, and there can be no doubt whatever that this is a big job, and that the proposal of my hon. and gallant friend cannot be carried out without adding seriously to the debt of Canada. But, Sir, we know this also: that the most economical thing a country, or a firm, or a man can do, is to incur an obligation, if the incurring of that obligation is of a fruitful character and redounds to his or to their income. The proposal of my hon. friend is a proposal to make our canal system more useful and more fruitful than it is at present. His first proposal, as I understand, is that in building any new canal such as this proposed Soulanges Canal——

Mr. BERGERON. Which is not built yet.

Mr. DAVIN—which is not built yet. My hon. friend's proposal is that in building any new canal you should build it to the capacity that would look to a canal system capable of accommodating vessels of far larger draught than our canal system can at present accommodate. The day must come when our canals built at present will need to be repaired—we know that the repairing of a canal is a very costly undertaking—and when that day comes it would be just as well to build new canals. The United States engineer who has written the pamphlet which has already been referred to, calculates that the cost of deepening the canal system of Canada to 20 feet would be from $62,000,000 to $67,000,000. That certainly is a large sum, but it need not be necessarily expended at once. Look, however, at what would be the advantage to that great country of the North-West, which the people of Canada are beginning more and more to see is the future greater Canada; look what advantage a canal system would be that would enable a ship to be freighted at Port Arthur or Fort William and to go right through the canals and waterways to the ocean and to the great market of Liverpool. It could not make less than 3 cents difference on the cost of a bushel of grain, and that, with the 20,000,000 bushels of grain we have at the present minute to export would put a very large amount indeed in the pockets of the North-West farmers. As my hon. friend who proposed this motion said, the day is at hand when instead of 20,000,000 bushels we shall be exporting from the North-West 300,000,000 bushels or 400,000,000 bushels.

Mr. LANGELIER. Tupper said 600,000,000 bushels.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says that Tupper said 600,000,000 bushels, and I repeat that the day will come when 600,000,000 bushels will be exported from the North-West.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Say 800,000,000 bushels.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend asked me to say 800,000,000, and he smiles a smile of derision. Mr. Speaker, I think that my friends of the Opposition have received a severe lesson in hopefulness. I think that recent events might have scared away all their pessimism and left them wiser and more hopeful, though sadder men. Now, Mr. Speaker, the proposal, therefore, of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Denison) is one looking to the future, and we cannot have too large or too extensive views of the future of this country. I remember nearly nineteen years ago, being shown around these buildings by a man who then held a very prominent position in Canada, and I said, after I had looked at the three great structures that make up our Governmental and Parliamentary buildings: The man who built these was on imperial thoughts intent, but he said to me: What a waste of money? They are altogether too costly and too large for Canada. I was astonished, and this House would be astonished, if I told who it was that made that remark. It so happens that the buildings are not large enough to-day, and if the right hon. gentleman, the great man who built them, had been allowed his way, as he himself often told me, instead of having the grounds we now have we would have had far more extensive grounds, which could have been got for a mere song at the time. Now, Sir, in the same way it may strike a man who looks at our present position, as a very serious thing to contemplate an expenditure of $67,000,000. I would go even further than that, because I want to be perfectly fair, and state that I believe $67,000,000 would not complete this work, because after you had deepened these canals, I expect that the harbours on the lake shores would have to be deepened also, and that probably it would make a good hole in $100,000,000. But, Sir, I say that there is before us in the future an amount of commercial activity, an amount of wealth to be sent to buyers in foreign markets, that would entirely justify a large expenditure. Anyway, we ought not to abandon the idea of enlarging our canals; and if my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) should prove to be just in his estimate of certain difficulties to be met, even then I should support the motion of my hon. friend. But I hope that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will get the opinion of an expert in regard to those difficulties. We have blown away a great deal of rock in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The history of that railway is instructive by way of illustration. We all remember the lions in its path. We had some of the best engineers in Canada stating that it could never be made to pay. We had some leading politicians stating that it could not be constructed, and that it could not be run on a paying basis. We had it stated on very high authority that it could not be built within the time. It was built some years before the time, and to-day we have that line pay-

ing a large dividend in the very year that it was to have been completed. Now, just as those who could not take a hopeful view of Canada's future were wrong ten, twenty years ago in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the same way those who are doubtful of what the needs of Canada and the North-West would be in regard to our canal system in the near future, will be proved not to have been just or statesmanlike in their views, and that not many years hence. Of course, the immediate and practical proposition of my hon. friend is that any new canal that would make one link in our system of canals should be built deep enough and with capacity enough to meet the demands of large and just and prudent hopes as to what this country is to be.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in reference to the interesting discussion raised by the resolution of my hon. friend from Toronto. My hon. friend has not painted in too glowing colours, but rather the reverse, the great benefits resulting from the waterways which we have at present and from those which have been constructed by the United States, along the line of the St. Lawrence navigation. He states that the Mississippi represents an actual cash value to the people of the United States of from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year, which I believe is not an overstatement of the case. The statisticians of the United States state that the benefit accruing to the United States alone from the lake navigation amounts to the sum of $119,000,000; and they estimate that the full value to this country of the waterway navigation along our great lakes ought to be at least $200,000,000. My hon. friend has described to you the immense benefit to this country of the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, and the immense extent of tonnage which passes through it, exceeding that of the Suez Canal. Some of the figures in reference to that trade are really extraordinary. When you consider that the tonnage which annually passes Detroit alone exceeds that which leaves all the seaports of the United States by nearly 10,000,000 tons, and is 3,000,000 tons in excess of the immense traffic which leaves the two principal ports of the greatest maritime country in the world, Liverpool and London, you get some idea of its enormity, and this does not include the trade which passes from Lake Superior to Michigan and *vice versâ*. But if we look further into this question, what we need particularly to consider is what proportion of that enormous traffic moves eastward. If you examine the figures, you will find that of every 22,000 tons of freight which passes Detroit, only about 7,000 arrive at Buffalo. The central point of the great consuming portion of the United States is moving so far westward that very little of that enormous trade comes further eastward than the great lakes themselves. There is another thing to be considered when it is argued that it is necessary for this country to increase the length, depth and breadth of our canals. That very question was thoroughly gone into by a commission of engineers appointed for the purpose of enquiring into the trade. There is a medium between the two classes of vessels, the canal boat and the ocean steamer, and the question was gone into whether it would be cheaper to enlarge our canals to such an extent that the vessels which crossed the ocean could be utilized for carrying freight up the St. Lawrence, and *vice versâ* to Liverpool and London: and the unanimous opinion was that it was far cheaper to bring down the produce of the west in canal boats of a certain dimension to Montreal, owing to the enormous expense and the number of men required to work the large ocean ships. The conclusion arrived at was that for the removal of the traffic of the western States and our own western country to the seaboard, a canal of 16 feet depth would be sufficient, and that if a canal of larger size were built, to enable vessels to carry coal westward and grain eastward, it would not be used by the larger vessels. In any case the expenditure would be enormous. The deepening of the Welland Canal alone to 20 feet would require $35,000,000. The deepening of the St. Lawrence Canals to 20 feet would require $27,000,000, and that is over and above the amount required to deepen these canals to 14 feet, which will be $15,000,000. In addition to that there would be required the deepening of the River St. Lawrence in long reaches. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) said the expenditure on these reaches would be trivial, but the deepening required in Lake St. Louis alone, from the terminus of the Beauharnois Canal to the Lachine Canal, for 14 feet navigation will require an expenditure of nearly $1,000,000. What would it amount to if we had to deepen it 6 feet more? There are numerous other places along the St. Lawrence where the channels would also require to be deepened, so that the actual expenditure on the canals would amount to about $77,000,000 to increase the depth to 20 feet, in addition to what would be required to deepen certain portions of the St. Lawrence. And, if this were done, what would be the use of a depth of 20 feet of navigation? There is not a port from Port Arthur down to Montreal that a vessel drawing 20 feet of water could go into. We would have to deepen all the ports along Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, and though there might perhaps be some places in the centre of the St. Lawrence from Wolfe Island to Kingston where that depth would be found, it would be impossible for the vessels there to get to their wharves. This is, no doubt, a matter of great interest when you consider the immense trade which is interested on the upper lakes, but you must consider whether this is required at all, or, if the additional depth were given, whether the canals would be used by a larger fleet than those which draw 14 feet of water, 270 feet long and with 45 feet breadth of beam. I do not believe it would. I think the canals as now constructed will meet the needs of the country for many years to come, and that if the depth contemplated by the hon. gentleman were provided, the vessels that navigate the ocean and come to Montreal would never be used to bring freight from Montreal westward or from Chicago eastward to the ocean. The hon. member for Cornwall complained of the manner in which the locks were built on the Cornwall Canal, and of the old-fashioned way of opening and shutting them. I have not been long enough in my department to have very much experience of it, but I certainly think the most modern means ought to be used for the purpose of opening and shutting these locks. I had a conversation with the engineers the other day, I think it was on the subject of the Beauharnois Canal and the new canals that are being built, and I am seeing that the most modern appliances shall be used upon them. The gates are to

be opened and shut by water power and electricity, and will be lighted also by electricity. I will make all the investigation I can in regard to this subject and inform the hon. gentleman as fully as possible of the expense and of the engineering difficulties which would be incurred, but, as his resolution asks for an expenditure of nearly $100,000,000, I hope he will be satisfied with my explanations and will withdraw his motion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure we are glad to hear that the Government does not contemplate the addition of $100,000,000 to our public debt. Unquestionably it would be desirable to have deep water navigation from Montreal to Port Arthur, but there are many desirable things which are not attainable, and I am afraid this is one of the unattainable things which we might desire. The effect of construction of these works, if it were undertaken, would be very largely to advance the commercial interests of another country. That country is now proposing to construct a line of deep water navigation for itself, and no doubt, whether this scheme were carried out or not, their project would still be proceeded with whenever they might feel inclined to do so.

I should not have risen to my feet but for one statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I was struck by the unconscious testimony borne by that hon. gentleman to the enormous advantages resulting to the communities on the two sides of the great lakes from inter-state trade. He depicted very graphically the enormous volume of commerce passing Detroit; the enormous volume of tonnage passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal; he informed us that the great bulk of that trade expended its force on states, communities and points well to the west, that it was not a through trade, that a very small proportion of that trade reached Buffalo or passed to the east. He was, in fact, making a statement to the House which set forth in the most striking manner the fact that the great advantages derived from the trade of the lakes are not advantages in the line of foreign commerce but in the line of an interchange of productions between the different states of the American Union, a point which has been often emphasized on this side of the House when it has been stated that we stood outside of the commercial activity of 44 states, that we were not permitted fully to share in that vast volume of commerce on the great lakes which, as he says, exceeds the whole commerce of the Suez Canal from the countries of Europe, Asia and Africa. I have stated on a previous occasion that the inter-state trade was of a fabulous amount; but, while our total commerce with the United States amounts to only $90,000,000, while our exports were less in 1891 than they were in 1866, and while eighteen of the years have since elapsed our exports to them are less now than they were during the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty, yet their inter-state trade amounts to thousands of millions annually, and we stand outside of that mighty tide of commercial intercourse and that source of commercial wealth. There is no reason why, if the commercial barriers were stricken down, our exports to the United States should not be $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 annually, instead of only about $40,000,000 as was the case last year. I hope the hon. gentleman will remember his own statement and that his colleagues will consider it and will begin to realize the vast importance of that trade which the American states enjoy with each other and which we desire to enjoy with them; that they will realize that if unrestricted commercial intercourse between 44 states has conferred such enormous benefits upon them, and that in proportion to the extension of the theatre for the operation of that intercourse, the blessings derived from it have continued to grow greater if, instead of being between 44 states, it were between 51 commonwealths, that is, the 44 states with our seven provinces added, we would share in its advantages and derive untold benefit from admission to a continental sphere of free commercial intercourse. I do not know what success my hon. friends had at Washington.

Mr. COCHRANE. About the same as you had in the constituencies.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very likely we shall hear that they had no success at all, but, if so, it was probably because they wanted to drive too sharp a bargain. Whether the negotiations are still pending or not, whether we are to have an opportunity of sharing in any of the great benefits depicted by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals or not, I do not know, but I hope his statement will have weight with the Ministers who are to go to Washington, if they are to go there again.

Mr. DENISON. After the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and looking at all the facts, I will ask leave of the House to withdraw my motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before you put that motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I do not concur in the declaration of the motion that it is expedient to do these things. The expediency depends not only upon the amount of the benefit that the country will derive from deeper canals, and from the facilities afforded to navigation, but upon the actual cost, and I think, Sir, that the cost will be even very much more than $100,000,000. However advantageous it might be to the commerce of the west to have the canals deepened, I think this country cannot afford to make so large an expenditure, at all events, at the present time. I was not a little amused at the observations addressed to the House by one of the hon. gentlemen from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). That hon. gentleman never fails to tell us of his extraordinary sagacity and foresight, when he has an opportunity of addressing himself to the House. The hon. gentleman has told us how he has predicted, and how he foresaw, all the great improvements, and the necessity for them, that have taken place during the past twenty years. He says an hon. gentleman occupying a high position told him twenty years ago that these buildings were larger than were required, and the expenditure had been very much greater than was absolutely necessary, but the hon. gentleman in that case, with that sagacity which never deserts him, told that distinguished statesman, whoever he was, that the growth of the country, its increasing wealth and prosperity, would be such as that at no distant day these buildings would be too small for the requirements of the country; and the hon. gentleman points to the present condition of things as an evidence of his sagacity. He tells us that there will be within a very short time, 600,000,000 bushels of wheat to come from the North-West Territories to European markets, and that would

be, I suppose, at least sixty times the amount that is produced at the present time for the purposes of commerce. Whether the North-West Territories will produce at an early day 600,000,000 bushels of wheat for the market, besides the very large amount that will be required for home consumption, will depend, I suppose, upon whether it has, at an early day, sixty times its present population. But, Sir, there is another consideration. There is required, somewhere, a capacity for consumption, and as that capacity does not exist in Europe at the present time, it may be that the hon. gentleman will be able to tell us, with his usual sagacity and foresight, in what particular portions of Europe this very large consuming population is at an early day to be located: for it is very clear that it is not only necessary that there should be a large population to produce such an extraordinary amount of grain for exportation, but it is also necessary that, upon the other side of the Atlantic, there should be a very large population for the purpose of consumption. Sir, I never knew an occasion where it was proposed to expend a very considerable sum of money, when the hon. gentleman did not show his liberality by declaring his readiness to give his sanction and approval to such an expenditure. Well, I do not know what view the hon. gentleman takes as to the means by which this expenditure is to be met. I remember that some years ago, when a very distinguished member of Parliament, Sir Alexander Galt, was discussing this question, he pointed out that the expenditure upon our canals had not been a burdensome one, because the diminution in the cost of transportation had always been greater than the increased burdens that were required to meet the interest upon the sum expended upon those public works; and that, in fact, the principle of free trade was not at all departed from in the imposition of duties and tolls for the purpose of meeting the expenditure that had been incurred. Well, Sir, let me say that I believe that the Government have, for some time, departed from the principle of imposing tolls, that is, of putting upon the particular classes of property that have been benefited by the expenditure, the burdens which that expenditure renders necessary. I am pleased that on this subject, at all events, the Government are prepared to call a halt, that they are not prepared to act upon the somewhat extravagant views, as it seems to me, of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), who proposed by this motion to add so large a sum to the public debt as that which would be necessary by the improvements he favours. Not only would a large sum be necessary, according to what I have heard from engineers, for deepening the canals, but the effect of the alteration in lowering the level of the bed of the river by this attempt to deepen the waters that are navigable, would render the water in other portions of the river more shallow and would render excavation necessary in large sections where such excavation is not necessary at the present time; in fact, it has been stated that it would lower the level of the whole of Lake Ontario, to undertake to secure 20 feet depth of navigation in the River St. Lawrence.

Mr. DENISON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask if that is the statement of any engineer?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So I understood from engineers here some years ago. I do not know how far they had made an inspection of the work, but I certainly have understood that there was a possibility, even, of lowering the surface, or the level, of Lake Ontario if you were to carry on the excavations necessary for a 20 feet navigation in the River St. Lawrence between Montreal and Kingston. If so, it would render a still larger expenditure necessary in the harbours of that lake, still larger than is necessary at the present level of the lake. However, as the Government do not propose to engage in this vast enterprise, and to add, as I think, at least one hundred and twenty millions or more to the public debt of this country, it is not necessary to go into a minute discussion of the matter. The hon. gentleman for Assiniboia has referred to the fact that our numbers are somewhat fewer on this side of the House than they were last session. That is true, and pity 'tis 'tis true; but, Sir, there is one consolation which we may derive from the disasters that have overtaken us, and that is that the hon. gentleman is not likely to be quite so discontented with his own side of the House as he has been during the past two sessions. I think that the misfortunes which have overtaken us have had a wholesome influence on the hon. gentleman himself, and I have no doubt whatever that he will hardly single out the Minister of the Interior now for his adverse criticisms, he will rather direct them to us than to the Treasury benches. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, feels that his great expectations are not likely to be fulfilled very soon, and as misery loves company, I congratulate the hon. gentleman that he has found company and endeavours to appear in high spirits under very trying circumstances, and you know that adversity sometimes makes bedfellows of very different people—he may now expect eulogies upon his colleague. And the hon. gentleman has found, at all events so far as his feeling of misfortune is concerned, that he is rather with us in sympathy than with the hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman now is in a more healthful mood, and is directing his criticism to those with whom he differs and not to those with whom he is, so far as his votes go, however it may be with his speeches, always inclined to act.

Motion withdrawn.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE (Translation) moved for:

Copy of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the appealed case of Barrett *vs.* the City of Winnipeg, commonly known as the "Manitoba School case."

In moving for this, Mr. Speaker, my intention is not to enter upon the merit of the question itself. My object is simply to cause to be brought before the House another document relating to this important question. During last session I had the honour of asking for other documents also relating to the same case, and to-day my request is that the judgment which has just been rendered by the Supreme Court be also put before the House, so that the hon. members may be in a position to judge the question on its merits. The difficulty is a purely constitutional one, and consequently all the members of this House and the country in

general are interested in studying it in all its bearings. The Constitutional Act of British North America authorizes the establishment of a system of separate schools in the provinces where such a system does not already exist, and the same Act also guarantees the system where it already obtains. The Constitutional Act of Manitoba also guarantees the same privileges to the minority in that province; but the Provincial Legislature has thought fit to pass an Act which is unquestionably in conflict with the very constitution of the province. This legislation was appealed from. Before the lower court this appeal was dismissed, but the Supreme Court reversed this decision by sustaining the claims of the minority. To-day, I believe the case has been carried to the foot of the Throne, and the Privy Council is to be called upon to give its opinion on this provincial legislation. I repeat that this question is of general interest, and all the members of this House have a right to the information available thereon. Therefore I ask that the judgment recently rendered by the Supreme Court be brought before the House, so that we may be possessed of all the documents relating to this important matter.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copy of all petitions of the Messrs. Allan and all other persons asking for a decrease of the Customs' duties on iron.—(Mr. Laurier.)

1. Copy of the circular issued on the 10th June, 1891, by the Department of Marine relative to Sick Mariners' dues in Canada; 2. A list of persons to whom such circular was addressed; 3. Copy of all answers received.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Return showing the quantity, value and kinds of fish, fish oil and fish products imported into Canada from Newfoundland, each year, for past five years; also amount of duty thereon which would have been paid if the duties levied upon similar imports from other countries had been levied.—(Mr. White, Shelburne.)

Return showing the number of Newfoundland vessels and men therein, and number of fixed fishing establishments owned by Newfoundlanders, with number of employés, engaged last year in fishing, in whole or in part, within the waters adjacent to Canadian Labrador and Magdalen Islands.—(Mr. White, Shelburne.)

Return of all correspondence, engineer's reports, petitions or other documents relating to the survey or deepening of the channel of the Galops Rapids, and for a statement of the work performed by the Chain Tug *Iroquois* owned by the Government, and of the services performed by one John Stitt, in connection with said tug.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Correspondence between the Government of Canada or any member thereof, and the British Government, or between the Government of Canada and any person or persons, relating to the admission of live cattle from the United States. Also for copies of all Orders in Council relating to the same.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Return of copies of all tenders received for engraving and printing since 1882, and of all contracts entered into for the same, including the contract beginning in this present year; also, all correspondence relating to the subject since 1882.—(Mr. Somerville.)

All the original lists and papers, including all declarations, notices of appeal, objections to preliminary lists, and relating to all other proceedings, now in the possession of the Revising Barrister or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in any way affecting the voters' lists for the Electoral Division of the County of Lennox as settled by the Revision of 1891, together with a certified copy of the Revised Voters' List of 1891 furnished by the Revising Barrister to the Returning Officer.—(Mr. Wilson.)

ADJOURNMENT—LOBSTER FISHERIES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LRAIVIÈRE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the House adjourns, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the resolution respecting lobster fisheries which he introduced the other da yand which he proposes to move next Wednesday. The hon. gentleman introduced a Bill a few days ago—I was not in the House then, but I had the pleasure of reading his remarks--for the purpose of placing the lobster fisheries of the Dominion under license, a very important question which will likely give rise to a good deal of controversy, and on the provisions relating to penalties he intends to move the House into Committee on Wednesday next. The Bill itself is not printed.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman wishes time to consider it——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not only that, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to lay on the Table of the House before Wednesday the regulations which the hon. gentleman drafted and submitted to the lobster packers throughout the Dominion last December. I notice in the remarks he made when introducing the Bill, that he spoke of the fact that these regulations had been more or less assented to, in some particulars fully assented to by the lobster packers. I understand that some of those regulations were strongly dissented from.

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that the dissent has been recognized by the hon. Minister and that he does not propose to confirm these regulations which have been dissented from. I would ask the Minister if he would kindly lay on the Table of the House at an early date the original regulations as drafted by him and submitted to the lobster packers' conventions, as well as the regulations as he has altered them, and what he now proposes to pass; because the operation of the Bill will very largely depend upon those regulations which the hon. gentleman has already power by statute to pass and make them in point of fact law. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to lay them on the Table before he proceeds with the resolution of which he has given notice.

Mr. TUPPER. Of course I shall try to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes in that respect. So far as the draft is concerned I may say it was the result of the recommendations of various officers submitted to me. I directed that draft to be distributed so as to obtain suggestions for myself. I alluded to that the other day when I said I was gratified with the number of approvals that came from those interested in the business. Of course I do not wish it to be supposed that the lobster packers or the fishermen were any more enamoured with the proposition to restrict their operations than fishermen generally are in that respect. I quite see that it would assist this House in the consideration to lay on the Table the original draft and some of the suggestions that came before me. I will be glad to do so, because, while these regulations should be in the form of a Bill, hon. gentlemen will see that coming to the House is largely for the purpose of consultation, as many of these regulations, if not all of them, could be included in an Order in Council, without any reference to the House of Commons. My object is to meet, as far as possible, the views of those connected with the business.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman would not object to bring down all the reports; those in favour and those dissenting.

Mr. TUPPER. I will try to give you all the information desired, if it does not take too long to prepare.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 15th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. JOHN CARLING, Member for the City of London; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Bowell.

EUGENE A. DYER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Brome; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Cleveland.

THOMAS E. KENNY, Esq., Member for the City of Halifax; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Tupper.

Hon. JAMES COLEBROOKE PATTERSON, Member for the West Riding of Huron; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Haggart.

LOUIS EUCLIDE DUGAS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Montcalm; introduced by Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Ouimet.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company. —(Mr. Monerieff.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the High River and Sheep Creek Irrigation and Water Power Company. —(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Company. (Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Montreal Board of Trade. (Mr. Curran.)

THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would ask the Minister of Finance whether he intends to make his Budget speech before going into Committee of Supply, or whether he intends to proceed as we have done for some years past, and go into Committee of Supply and make his Budget speech at a later period?

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to go into Committee of Supply as soon as hon. gentlemen opposite are ready, that is, I suppose, in a day or two. The Auditor General's Report will be laid on the Table to-day, but I doubt whether copies of it will be ready for members until to-morrow. I may as well say now, that, if nothing happens to prevent it, I propose to make the financial statement on Tuesday next.

FISHERY BOUNTY.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 5) to amend Chap. 96 of the Revised Statutes to encourage the development of the sea fisheries and the building of fishing vessels.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not here when the Minister moved the second reading of this Bill, and I can only say that I regret that the hon. gentleman has seen fit to introduce it. As I gather from the remarks of the hon. gentleman in introducing the measure, he introduced it because a certain clause in the Bill as it now exists is practically obsolete, because the third section of the Bill which he seeks to repeal provides for the distribution of $150,000, or, as I think it was increased last year, of $160,000, with the provision that the mode in which that is to be distributed shall be submitted to Parliament each year, and that the money shall not be distributed until Parliament has approved of the mode of distribution, and that further, after the distribution has taken place, an account of the distribution shall be laid before Parliament so that Parliament may see that its instructions have been carried out. The hon. gentleman now proposes that the previous assent of Parliament shall be abolished altogether, and, if the House accedes to the proposition of the hon. gentleman and passes this Bill, the department itself will have the sole control over the distribution of that bonus without asking the consent or assent of Parliament to the mode of distribution. Well, Sir, I would submit to this House that the hon. gentlemen is taking a step in the wrong direction. My own humble judgment is, not that the control that this Parliament now possesses should be abolished, but that the control should be made more effective. Why, Sir, it has been charged in this House almost ever since I became a member of it, that the distribution of this money is made an engine of political wrong-doing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hon. gentlemen cheer that sentiment. It is well known. It may not be very creditable to the Administration and to the Government for the time being in power; it may not be very creditable to any leading politician who is responsible for it, that large sums of public money should be yearly distributed in the form of a bonus, or the mode and manner of the distribution should be made subservient to political interests. Sir, that has been the case in times gone by, and if I understand the Act aright, the third section of which the hon. gentleman seeks to repeal, the motive and object in passing that Act were to keep the distribution of this money so under the control of Parliament that, if possible, political exigencies should be eliminated. Now, what has been the case? I think I can state without fear of contradiction that for years back there has not been a Dominion election held in the spring or winter of the year, but the distribution of this money has been decreed by the department to be made just at that time when it would help most the ministerial candidates. Just before the election takes place, down come the cheques, and the canvassers for the Conservative party go round canvassing through the districts with these cheques in their hands, and it is generally considered to be a pretty effective mode of canvassing. Sir, I do not think Parliament intended that; I do not think it is for the benefit of the public service that it should be continued. In some years you will find, notwithstanding the immense amount

of labour which we are told is involved in the signing and distribution of these cheques, that if an election takes place as early as February, the cheques are there in time, in every district throughout the Maritime Provinces, for distribution among the voters. If the election takes place in March, the cheques are delayed until March. If a local election, as has been the case, takes place in Nova Scotia, as it did, I think, two or three years ago, in the month of May, you find the cheques, not issued in February, or March, or April, but issued just before the local election in May. For what purpose? Well, because we are members of Parliament we have not renounced our common sense, and we know for what purpose that is done, we know very well that it is for the purpose of wrong-doing, of improperly influencing the election. Now, the hon. gentleman says that he has not submitted to Parliament, and Parliament has not exacted from the Minister for the time being, the statement which the Act requires. Well, Parliament may have been derelict in its duty in that respect, but I think the framers of the Act had a good object in view. I think the mode of the distribution should be submitted to Parliament, and I think that the hon. gentleman would be legislating more in the public interest if, instead of repealing the section entirely, he made it more stringent and declared that this distribution should take place on or before a certain period in each year. That would, to some extent at least, eliminate the political element from the distribution of this money. Meritorious as the distribution may be in the abstract, when it is done under the circumstances and with the motive which I fear have animated those who controlled it in times gone by, it ceases to be meritorious. The hon. gentleman now asks us to repeal that section of the Act which prescribes that the mode of distribution shall be submitted to Parliament beforehand, and after the distribution is over he will, in the following session, submit a statement of the manner in which the distribution has been made. That part of the Act, as it will then stand, will give Parliament no effective control whatever. The money will be distributed as the Minister for the time being sees fit, in the mode that he wishes, in the mode that he believes will best subserve party interests, irrespective of the interests of the country. I say Parliament should not surrender, even if it had not been made heretofore an affective political engine, Parliament should not surrender the control which the section now proposed to be repealed gives them, that is, the control and determination of the mode in which this large sum of money shall be yearly expended among the fishermen. I will not occupy any further time, but will submit these few observations to the House, believing as I do that the principle that the hon. gentleman embodies in this repealed clause, is a bad one, and that the results will be vicious, and calculated to perpetuate and amplify the evils which heretofore have characterized the distribution of that money.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has shot pretty wide of the mark, as he very often does, in the criticism he has advanced upon this Bill. It is quite clear to me that the hon. gentleman, in his desire to discover political objects solely upon the part of the Government, has failed to give that consideration to this short Bill now before the House that certainly he should have given before making the charges which neither he nor any other member in this House can substantiate. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has stated to-day, only a little more loudly and a little more emphatically, but with no more novelty, the charges that have been made from time to time in this House during the last two or three sessions: and on each of these occasions the House, and the hon. members who were then present, will remember that I defied the hon. gentlemen making those statements, to substantiate them. I threw that challenge across the floor, and hon. gentlemen were dumb. The hon. gentleman has made these charges from that period in reference to the fund being managed for party purposes, but for these charges I am glad to say there is not a vestige of foundation. The object that I had in view in the early distribution of the bounty, was to meet the expressed wishes, the expressed desire, urged most strenuously by the members from the Maritime Provinces on behalf of the fishermen, that in order to obtain that benefit which it was desirable to obtain from the distribution of this bounty, the distribution should be made early. From the time when it was ascertained that there could be an early distribution of that bounty, down to the present time, I have never had occasion to give instructions in reference to by-elections concerning the distribution of that bounty in favour of particular counties as against others. But under general instructions and under general directions, my officers have gone to work and have succeeded in meeting the wishes of the fishermen so as to make it possible that the distribution of that bounty should take place in winter instead of summer, as was done heretofore. Now, if the hon. gentleman knows anything about the distribution of this bounty he must know that the late distribution which took place up to two years ago, was the cause of dissatisfaction in all the fishing counties of the Maritime Provinces; and instead of the hon. gentleman being generous enough to-day to congratulate the Government on having been able to meet the wishes of the fishermen, he advances this miserable imputation and unfair insinuation in reference to the conduct of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the management of that matter. So far as the distribution is concerned, I may say, without a desire to boast, that the management has been more successful than I supposed possible when I undertook to meet the desire of the fishermen for an early distribution. None of these charges, I am glad to say, that the hon. gentleman has made to-day, can be substantiated. I say he is not in possession of any evidence to substantiate them, and if he is in possession of such evidence it has come to him late in the day, for he is only too willing and too free to bring forward charges that have been formulated; I never denied that in the administration of this fund an officer may do wrong and an irregularity may occur. I have known of irregularities myself, and I have punished those who have attempted to defraud the country or the fishermen in this respect. I have directed that stringent measures be taken, whether it was a fisherman who resorted to fraud to obtain that bounty or an officer, and I challenge any hon. member in this House or out of it to show that in deciding claims to that bounty I ever acted on political

grounds, or ever endeavoured to ascertain the political complexion of the individual pressing a claim for payment which may have been denied. I may state that in the administration of this fund, the first steps taken are instituted by officers of this department, and to a certain extent are independent of me. I have of necessity to leave the distribution or settlement of numerous claims to responsible officers, who are instructed to act upon rules well defined and clearly laid down. These rules are published, they are notorious, they are laid upon the Table of the House—they are on the Table of the House now, and they are known to all who care to study this question. The manner of the distribution is no secret, and no effort has been taken to make it a secret. Under these rules the distribution takes place, and the cases submitted to me are mainly for non-compliance, or disputes as to claims under investigation; and in the distribution of these moneys I have been guided solely by my interpretation of the statute and the Order in Council under that statute, and by no other consideration whatever. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) made the mistake of suggesting that the only desire I had in pressing this measure before the House was to rid the statute of an obsolete clause. The fact of its being obsolete gives force to the argument in favour of the adoption of the Bill. But it was not the only argument I advanced, nor the only reason I gave to the House. I gave to the House specifically another reason, and I press it now, and that was, that this clause, which the hon. gentleman in his argument confused with another, and read with another clause which I propose to leave on the statute, is now not merely obsolete, but is a clause which has stood on the Statute-book without compliance being made with it, without any hon. gentleman asking that compliance be made with it. It is a clause which would lead to great inconvenience, and what is of more importance, of great loss to the fishermen and those interested, if we were strictly to comply with it. Before attempting to comply with that clause and with the strict letter of it, I come to Parliament and ask, not because it would rid the department of any trouble, not because it would rid the country of any expense, but chiefly in the interest of the fishermen themselves, that, in order to the proper administration of this statute, the Government and the department should be left free to meet the wishes of the fishermen. I am not able to say whether I stated it previously, but I desire to say now, that in the management of the funds from 1882 down, it will be found, if hon. members look at the Orders in Council adopted under provision 2 of the main Bill, that those Orders in Council and those regulations took effect in the fall of the year, instead of in the spring. Every hon. gentleman knows that Parliament sits in the winter and spring, not in the fall of any year. So that if a strict compliance were made with that provision, we would be in this position: that having arrived at the time for the reception of claims, when it became our duty to define the manner and mode of distribution, we would be compelled to act on the Order in Council laid on the Table and approved by the House at the previous session, no matter how inconvenient it might be, and whatever might be the difficulties placed in our way. I put it to the hon. gentleman who attacked the Bill—because I wish him to understand that in this matter I am pleading the cause of the parties interested in the fund, and of the fishermen generally, so that we may be able to meet their legitimate wishes and expedite the distribution of this money—that with the next clause standing, with which strict compliance is made, the hon. gentleman's object is gained, publicity in this matter is secured: and, if any individual is defrauded, any hon. gentleman seeing that statement as to the manner and mode in which the bounty was distributed a year previous, could raise the question during the parliamentary session, before the vote for next year's bounty was granted, and could suggest a remedy, and if there were irregularities under the old method, then he could explain to the House the manner in which those difficulties could be overcome. I do not wish to remove any proper check or remove a guard against abuses: but I tell the hon. gentleman that all he desires in connection with this matter, namely, the oversight of Parliament in regard to the mode of distribution, can be secured, because we have placed on the Table of the House the Order in Council showing the regulations, and also a statement as to the manner of distribution. That is necessary under section 4, which I leave in the main Act, and if that is not sufficient this session or in any other subsequent session, then it is open to any hon. member to attack the system and suggest a better plan. In the meanwhile, all the information that Parliament has desired has been given, all the information that Parliament could desire has been given, and this measure did not come up to serve those paltry or improper purposes which the hon. gentleman suggests: but I dare say, since that point occurs to him, he will accept this explanation from me, that this Bill is introduced at the suggestion of the officers who are charged with carrying on the work. When my attention was called to the fact that the clause in question was not complied with, I directed that a return be made in compliance with sections 4 and 5, so that I could present it within 20 days of the opening of Parliament. The officers connected with the distribution then urged that not only was section 3 obsolete but unnecessary and served no useful purpose, but tied the hands of the department in regard to the distribution of the fund. When claims came in during the fall it might be found that the fund was larger than was required, if paid at that rate, and yet we would be unable to meet the changed condition of affairs that had happened since last session, and in this regard it proved a great inconvenience. We would be compelled to distribute a fund at the same rate that had obtained during the preceding year, no matter whether the circumstances were the same, or whether the claims were greater or less. This Bill is simply for the purpose of getting rid of that difficulty, by laying before Parliament each session all the material that is necessary to enable it to exercise that supervision which it is only right that Parliament should be able to exercise over the distribution of all sums of money.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, I submit, has not attempted to grapple with the

facts as I placed them before the House, but has set up a number of straw men and then set to work to knock them down. He talks at some length about his disposition to suppress individual frauds when practised in the distribution of this money. I have never myself made any charge against the hon. gentleman that he has tacitly or otherwise lent himself to these individual frauds. I go further, and I say that I do not believe he has done anything of the kind, and I never heard of a charge made by anybody in this House or out of it that he approved of such a fraud. Then, why does he set that up and discuss it, and say that he has exerted himself to prevent individual frauds? I suppose he would do so: I have confidence enough in him to believe that he would. That was not the charge I made. The charge I made was that the mode of distribution was made subservient to political interests, and that when elections came on the time for distributing the money was selected as the week anterior to the election. That statement of mine is true, and the hon. gentleman knows that each general election that passes this practice is carried out.

Mr. TUPPER. I ask the hon. gentleman whether he does not think that to be fraudulent conduct: the distributing of this money for political purposes?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is very highly improper conduct.

Mr. TUPPER. But not fraudulent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not fraudulent. I do not think it is the intention of this House to place in the hands of the Minister of Marine $150,000 which can be used for political purposes in this sense: that its distribution is dependent upon his whim and is made to take place more or less just before an election. The hon. gentleman tried to make the House believe that he had introduced a system of early distribution. I am in favour of that. I never objected to an early distribution of the money. The earlier the hon. gentleman can distribute the money the better, but what I was seeking to do was to make the time of distribution a permanency, either by statute, or to leave it as it is now, under the control of Parliament. The hon. gentleman does not make it a permanency and he withdraws it from the control of Parliament, so that hereafter it is left solely and entirely to the Minister himself. Now let us see how this thing will work. Parliament appropriated $160,000 for division among the fishermen as a bonus. Parliament decrees that the Governor in Council shall determine the times and the instalments in which the money shall be paid. Parliament goes on to declare that an Order in Council or something equivalent to it shall be laid before Parliament and adopted, and the subsequent year a return of what has been done shall be placed before this House. So we have an anterior control and a control subsequently when the facts are laid before us. We have the power to direct in the first instance how it is to be appropriated, and the power to condemn if not appropriated as directed. What is the hon. gentleman now doing in this Bill? He is leaving the clause in by which the Governor in Council shall have power to fix the time and mode of distribution, and he declares that hereafter it shall be unnecessary to lay that before Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. TUPPER. Clause 4 enacts that we shall still place that before Parliament.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly: but clause 4 relates to the previous distribution, and clause 3 relates to the mode in which it is proposed to distribute it.

Mr. TUPPER. That is what I say is inconvenient.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is the whole point of difference between us. I contend that when Parliament has voted money and vested in the Governor in Council power to fix the time and mode of distribution, that the Order in Council shall be laid before it, before the money is expended. Parliament retains its control and does not confer on the Governor in Council the power to do what Parliament should itself do. The Minister of Marine proposes to take that power away from the House, and I am opposed to it. I am prepared to support any well-considered measure which the hon. gentleman may bring in, fixing the distribution of that money at as early a time as experience shows it may be done, but let that time be fixed.

Mr. TUPPER. It is practically now fixed to be done before the 1st of March.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let the Minister decree that by statute and then we will know what should be done.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will be glad to hear this piece of information. I succeeded in doing that last year, and it was stated then that the distribution was on account of the general elections. The hon. gentleman will see as between man and man that that was not the purpose, because this year the distribution took place at the same time, and so far as I can make it a permanency I will do so by adopting the same system. If the same plan is carried out which the hon. gentleman will see discussed in the Auditor General's Report; so long as Parliament approves of that we can distribute the money before the 1st March every year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will see that the two instances to which he refers only bear out what I have said. Last year the money was distributed before the 1st March, and the general election happened to be on the 4th March.

Mr. TUPPER. How do you account for the distribution before the 1st March this year?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This year the by-elections took place.

Mr. TUPPER. We will have by-elections every year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman took care to distribute the money before the by-elections, so that the statements I made in the House are not ill-considered statements but facts, and the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) knows that to be the fact.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is not serious in stating that it is a fact that the bounties were distributed before the by-elections. I can quote him some elections which took place before the distribution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state that the distribution did not take place right in the throes of the elections? I know one case

where some of the distributors went to the meeting, and placing their hands on the bounty cheques, stated: No matter how strong the arguments of the other side may be, I have arguments stronger than these in my pockets.

Mr. TUPPER. Give me the names.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I could give you the names too. Let us see whether the proposition involved in this Bill is one to which Parliament ought to give assent or not. As the law stands Parliament has retained control over the distribution of this money. Of course, in the hands of an immaculate purist like my hon. friend, as he claims to be, no wrong would be done; but supposing a man not so immaculate and pure as the hon. gentleman got there, what a great political wrong might be done.

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman opposite got there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This is a very serious matter; it is no laughing matter when a sum of money representing a sum of $160,000 should be placed in the hands of a Minister for distribution, and that he should have the power of determining the time and the manner in which the money should be distributed. If Parliament chooses to accede to such a proposition, of course nothing more can be said or done. The hon. gentleman is all-powerful, I am aware, just now, but at the same time I think Parliament will be slow to adopt these amendments, which are not in the public interest, which are in party interest and which will prejudice the distribution of this very money, because the hon. gentleman knows well, that if he goes on to use this money in the future as he has done in the past, there will be an agitation one of these days for a repeal of the bounty altogether, which will certainly be an unpopular thing in the Maritime Provinces and will not receive very many votes there. If, as the hon. gentleman says, he is guided by the advice of the officers of the department, I think he has acted hastily and in a manner that I do not believe Parliament will approve of. I think that he should not only leave the clause as it is, but make it more stringent by fixing a date on which or before which the distribution must take place, and to that extent the difficulty will be eliminated.

Mr. TUPPER. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman gave expression to the suggestion of his present supporters from Ontario, that the bounty should be suppressed altogether.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not give expression to an opinion. I said, that if you went on in your present course the bounty might be done away with.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman gave a little life to that excuse that there was fraud connected with the distribution, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) must be delighted that he has almost an ally in the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) in his threats against the bounty. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman again, if he will allow me, in reference to a misapprehension on his part. In the first place, the hon. gentleman cannot press so strongly on the attention of the House—as he has pressed some arguments in reference to the regulations,—the great value of section 3, since he has not met the statement of fact I gave, that since 1882 there has never been a compliance with it, and no hon. gentleman has ever suggested there should be. What better argument, that the clause is not required, than that such a vigilant representative as the hon. gentleman is in this House never directed attention to it since 1882. The hon. gentleman is unfair in his remarks as to the distribution. I gave the statement as to what we were able to do with an experience from 1882 down to the present in connection with an early distribution of the bounty. When the hon. gentleman suggested that as a general election occurred in March, 1891, and as the distribution took place on or before the 1st of March and was nearly all completed by that time, excepting outlying districts—that it was solely for political purposes, I very frankly told him that in so far as endeavouring to win the confidence of the people by meeting their wishes wherever it was proper to do so was a political object, I had that desire: but as to any effort being made simply for the general elections, I denied it *in toto*, and I told him that the suggestion was made to me long anterior to any thought in the mind of any man as to when the general elections would take place. That suggestion came from the provinces interested, and I met it; and our experience last year has shown that it was part of a well-considered plan, adopted in the interests of the fishermen, to have the early distribution made annually. Now, I am able to assure Parliament that so long as we are permitted to act on the novel plan adopted in 1891 and continued this season, which is fully discussed in the Auditor General's Report, I am quite confident that the distribution can be made every year on or before the 1st of March. But if the hon. gentleman wishes to cripple the hand of the department, I can tell him that we shall be face to face with this difficulty, that if we complied with clause 3, we should not be able to make a distribution until we got statutory authority and had our plan approved by this House in the following winter, after the season's fishing was all over.

Mr. FRASER. There does not appear to be much difference between the arguments of the two hon. gentlemen. But what I would press on the Minister is that the plan adopted in 1891 should be made binding. Although the hon. gentleman says that the distribution will be made in March, yet at some time it will be found that the overworked officials of the department will not be able to get out the bounties until May or June if there happens to be an election in May or June. I think the date of the distribution should be definite. It is a cruel act to the fishermen who need this bounty, to send it to them simply when there is an election. I can see a good deal of force in what the hon. gentleman says as to repealing the section: and if he will make the Act definite by providing in it that the bounty shall be paid on or before a certain date, there would be no trouble about it. I think the fishermen themselves should know when they are going to get the bounty. Let it be March, or May, or June, giving the Government full time, so that there will be no similar scenes enacted in future. I have had to meet the same difficulties in my constituency. I think we should hold the elections without taking advantage of the fishing bounty or any other influence of the kind, leaving men free to exercise their better judgment. Now, the Minister has made the statement of his intention, and so far as he is concerned, that binds him; but let it be made definite by the provision of Parliament,

and then repeal the section, and we shall have a good Act.

Mr. TUPPER. No other pledge could be given than that which I have given. Up to the year before last it was found impossible to distribute the bounty until June, at which time many vessels had gone to sea, and when they came back the bounty was of comparatively little use to the fishermen. It was simply added to their surplus earnings, and was not spent as well perhaps as it would have been at an earlier period. We found that it was quite impossible to go over all the claims, numbering 30,000 or 40,000, and make out and distribute the schedules, by means of temporary clerks. But under the plan adopted last year, practically a bounty was given to the regular clerks for working overtime and on condition that they would have this work done by a certain time. Parliament sanctioned the paying of these men for overtime, and the plan adopted by the department gave them an inducement not to earn so much an hour, but to make their hours as short as possible, by doing a great deal of work in a comparatively brief period. It was a tremendous strain upon them, but they have undergone that strain for the reward offered them. So long, therefore, as you can get a regular staff to work that hard for the period required, so long will it be possible for the Minister to give the assurance that there will be an early distribution year after year. But I do not suppose that any Minister would be prepared to say to Parliament that he would compel those trained officers in his department to work as late and as long every year as is necessary in order to do this work, although they have done it, and I believe will continue to do it for the consideration given them; and so long as that plan is approved, it is not only possible, but the intention, to distribute the bounty at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So far as the hon. gentleman has succeeded by any departmental arrangement in facilitating the early distribution of this bounty, I think the discussion has shown that it meets with general approval. We all agree that the distribution should take place as early as the department is able to get the cheques out, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has done his share in furthering that object. But the point is this: the hon. gentleman is withdrawing from Parliament the control it possesses by the third section; he has assented to the suggestion that the cheques should be distributed before the 1st March; he leaves it to the Government to determine the time when the instalments shall be paid; let him consent that a provision should be made in the Act, that the distribution shall take place not later than the 1st of March.

Mr. TUPPER. I have given the reason why it is impossible to bind the department or the Government as to when an unknown quantity of claims shall be met.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That objection does not apply to the suggestion I am making. The second section provides:

"Such grant shall be appropriated for the said purposes at such times and by such instalments in each year as the Governor in Council directs."

The Governor in Council this year and last year directed, and expects in the future, that the bounty shall be distributed before the 1st of March. Then, let it be provided that the distribution shall take place within a fixed date—not later than the 1st or the 10th or the 15th of March, or even the 20th, if the hon. gentleman assures us that that is as early as it can be done.

Mr. TUPPER. That would not meet the hon. gentleman's wish. The appropriation is not what we are discussing, but the distribution. The hon. gentleman will see that it is not the appropriation which is concerned, but it is merely an allotment for us to distribute in a certain manner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I take the meaning of the second section to be that this money shall be appropriated, which I understand to be equivalent to the distribution of it at the time and in the instalments the Governor in Council may decide.

Mr. TUPPER. The provision practically is that we are not to distribute that $160,000 without an Order in Council. The moment that Order in Council is passed, the department is free, but the Order in Council has never yet directed the department to make the distribution within a certain time, because it is impossible to tell the Governor in Council, as it would be impossible to tell Parliament, how long it would take a certain number of men at a certain rate of speed to make that distribution. I made what was practically a bet with the officers of the department, and they took the risk of distributing this bounty within a certain time in order to earn the money, but it would be difficult to put that in a statute, because you would have to find your men every year instead of getting, as I have done, volunteers from the regular service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not see any difficulty in it. When you admit that there should be an arbitrary date every year when the money should be distributed, and the hon. gentleman has shown that for two years that distribution has been completed before the 1st of March, I do not see why a date should not be fixed.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say that the whole distribution had taken place by the 1st of March, but the bulk of it.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) If experience has shown the hon. gentleman that it is difficult to get it done by that date, then he might extend the date fifteen or twenty days longer, but he should give Parliament some assurance that the date will not be left simply to the discretion of the Government for the time being.

Mr. TUPPER. It might be that, no matter whether we were negligent or not, a man might not receive his bounty by that date, and then he would not be entitled to it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is refining the point, because he sends out these payments by cheque from the head office, and therefore there need be no delay.

Mr. TUPPER. But suppose we were derelict in our duty?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I could not suppose that. The hon. gentleman says he has succeeded in doing this before the 1st March this year and last year, by the application of diligence and other qualities, and being supported by a volunteer staff. What he has done in the last few years he can do in the future, and I submit that, if he thinks that would

be running the time rather close, he might extend the time.

Mr. TUPPER. For what object?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So that Parliament may have an assurance that the money will be distributed by a certain time, instead of leaving it to the discretion of the Government, because, as I have shown, it may be used for political purposes.

Mr. TUPPER. Then you might make the fishermen suffer for the neglect of the department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no reason for that, if the cheques are sent out by a certain date.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the objection the hon. gentleman made is thoroughly impracticable, and I do not think he has met my criticism. That limit of time would only have one consequence. No doubt an effort would be made to comply with it, but in the event of failure it would punish the very people we want to assist.

Bill reported.

WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. BOWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) respecting aid by United States wreckers in Canadian waters.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the Minister allow this to stand for a few days? I understand that some parties in the west desire to communicate with him on the subject.

Mr. BOWELL. Will Friday do?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not sure whether that will give sufficient time or not.

Motion postponed.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) to amend the Pilotage Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman explain this Bill?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman was not present when I explained this Bill before. Some time ago Parliament exempted all vessels of not more than a tonnage of 80 tons in order to encourage our fishermen on the coast to build larger craft. The vessels had been built very small in order to escape pilotage dues, and the effect of that provision has been, as reported to me, to encourage our fishermen and small coasters to build up to 80 tons. Now, their competitors are building larger craft, and in order to encourage a healthy rivalry, it is said that, if we slightly increase the tonnage, our fishermen will be encouraged to build as fine craft as come from the Gloucester ports. That is the reason why I ask to make the limit 120 tons instead of 80 tons. In the St. Lawrence all craft are exempt up to 250 tons, so that it does not affect them, and in several states of the Union they have encouraged the building of these small coasters.

Mr. HAZEN. I do not desire to delay the passage of this Bill, but as a number of people in the Maritime Provinces and some of my constituents have written to me asking for information concerning this Bill, I would ask the Minister to let the Bill stand until we have had an opportunity of hearing from those who are more especially interested in its provisions. At the present time I am not in a position to say whether I shall support it or not, until I get more information.

Mr. TUPPER. If the House will take the second reading to-day, I have no objection to let the Bill stand before it takes another stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ORDNANCE LANDS TORONTO.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider resolution (March 11th) respecting conveyance of certain Ordnance Lands to the Corporation of the City of Toronto.

Mr. LAURIER. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what are to be the conditions of this transfer?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Ordnance land which is the subject of this resolution, was transferred to the Agriculture Department in 1870, and has been in their occupation ever since: it became the property of the Government in 1867. The City of Toronto made application for this land, I believe, for the purpose of a cattle market, and the valuation of the property was made by experts, and the Government agreed to sell it provided Parliament would give the necessary authority. The hon. gentleman knows that Ordnance lands can only be sold by public auction, unless with the special consent of Parliament to the contrary. The Bill which I propose to submit to the House explains the whole circumstances and also describes the limits of the property. There were two valuations made, one by Mr. Whitney and one by some other party, at $52,000 and $54,000 respectively. The Bill proposes to sell the property to the municipality of Toronto for $54,000.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On paragraph 1,

Mr. LAURIER. As I understood the hon. gentleman, all the conditions under which this land is to be transferred, are set forth in the Bill.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, they are all in the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but it is convenient that we should know generally what particular property you propose to deal with, what is the extent of the land, and for what purpose you desire to convey it to the Corporation of Toronto.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is explained in the preamble of the Bill. The Corporation of the City of Toronto requires the lands for the enlargement of a market, known as the Western Cattle Market, and applied for the grant of said lands, and have offered to give the sum of $54,000.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. $52,000.

Mr. DEWDNEY. So it is; I was under the impression it was $54,000. I have a plan, which I will lay on the Table, showing the locality of the property, if necessary. There is nearly five acres.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This land, we all know, is held by the country in trust for certain purposes. It was transferred by the Ordnance Board of the Imperial Government to Canada upon trust for certain purposes, and it is not in our power to give away the land at all. The statute relating to the

Ordnance lands of the country specifies that if any land of this kind is sold it must be sold by public auction, except in cases of leases, or in cases where a Provincial Government may require it for provincial uses. This is not either of those cases, therefore I think that, as it is proposed to deal with it by special Act, we ought to have some knowledge and some information as to how this value is arrived at. At the present moment we do not know the quantity of land or the value, yet we are called upon to say that it is expedient to transfer it to the City of Toronto. Now, the City of Toronto has no more right to that land at an under-valuation than any other town or city in the country, and we ought to take care that this property, which is held in trust for the purposes of the defence of Canada, is carefully guarded. If there is a valuation, if we are to give it at a fair valuation, of course there can be no objection, but I think that before passing this resolution we ought to have some evidence of that valuation.

Mr. DENISON. I quite agree with what has been said by the last speaker about the need of carefully guarding the interest of the public. This land, I suppose, has been occupied for twenty years by the Immigration Department for sheds and other Government purposes. It is not used now by the militia of Toronto in any way, and has not been for a great many years. The cattle market which adjoins the land has outgrown its present site, and the city requires more land for the enlargement of the market. The cattle trade with England has increased so much of late years that the city absolutely requires more land for the purposes of this market. As to the value of the land, I may mention that the Government obtained the most reliable person that could be had in the City of Toronto to value the land, a man who has been in that business forty or fifty years—I refer to Mr. Whitney, a man who stands at the very head of his business or profession, and one who has the confidence of every citizen of Toronto. In addition to that, I understand that the city also had a valuation made by Mr. Maughan, a most respectable citizen of Toronto, and one in whom we all have confidence. Mr. Maughan, I believe, assessed it at $3,000 or $4,000 less than the value placed upon it by Mr. Whitney, but I understand Mr. Whitney's valuation is the one the Government proposes to act upon. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that any opposition should be made to the passage of this resolution, because the land is wanted very badly by the city. If the land was used by the militia in any way, I would be just as strongly opposed to selling it as is the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). We have another piece of ground, the Garrison Common, and the city has made overtures from time to time to the Government to get it from us, but I have vigorously opposed anything of that sort. I fancy that the hon. member for Frontenac has in his mind the Garrison Common, which is used by the militia, but that is quite a different piece of ground from the one mentioned in this resolution.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. My hon. friend has misunderstood me. I do not oppose the sale of this Ordnance land, but I said we wanted to get evidence of its real value, we do not want to be acting in the dark. We are asked to give our assent and to declare that it is expedient to transfer this land to the City of Toronto, when we know nothing about its approximate valuation, we do not know whether this sum is more than its value, or whether it is only one-tenth of its value. We want to hear the evidence of its value.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I find I was in error in stating that one valuation was for $62,000 and another for $64,000. I find by another memorandum I have here that a valuation was made by Mr. Payton, of the London and Ontario Investment Company, placing the land at $45,000 and buildings at $5,000. Messrs. Whitney & Son were asked to make a further valuation, and they placed the value at $52,000, including buildings; and $52,000 was the amount arranged with the municipality of Toronto.

Mr. LAURIER. The proposition of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) seems to be a perfectly fair one. The hon. gentleman suggests that all the information be laid on the Table of the House, so that the committee may be in a position to peruse it before the resolution is passed.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have no objection to that course being taken.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I submit that a more convenient course would be, especially as explanations have been satisfactory, that the resolution should be passed, and the Bill not proceeded with until the documents are on the Table.

Mr. LAURIER. That will be perfectly satisfactory.

Resolution reported.

UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) respecting fishing vessels of the United States of America.

Mr. LAURIER. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman would have given the House some reason for departing from the course that has been adopted with respect to this Act. The hon. gentleman, in introducing this measure the other day, simply stated that it was a measure for the purpose of conveying to the Governor in Council the power to issue these licenses to American fishing vessels. But, if my memory serves me, he failed to give any reason why there should be a departure from the policy which we have hitherto followed. The policy we have pursued with respect to this measure has been simply this: Since the treaty of 1888, the Parliament of Canada has chosen to revive the *modus vivendi* from year to year, by which we have escaped the difficulty which has arisen in consequence of the interpretation of the Convention of 1818. The legislation was certainly very proper: it has always met the consensus of opinion on both sides of the House, and I fail to see for what reason we should now be called upon to vest such extraordinary powers in the Order in Council. There seems to be no adequate reason why these powers should be vested in the Governor in Council; indeed, I think they should be kept strictly under the control of Parliament, so long as the difficulty exists between the United States and Canada as to the interpretation of the Convention of 1818. It appears to me preferable to keep the matter in abeyance as it is, that is to say, to have temporary

legislation from year to year on the subject, and that the Government should ask from year to year the power to issue those licenses, rather than to vest at once and forever in the Governor in Council the privilege of issuing those licenses. This measure is of a permanent character, while the Act has been for years temporary in its character; in other words, the Act passed yearly was kept in force simply while the present difficulty between the two countries remained unsettled. If the difficulty is terminated, there is no longer any necessity for this legislation, and unless the hon. Minister can adduce good reason why he should depart from the course he has followed since 1889, it seems to me the wiser policy to pursue is to adhere to the present system and not vest such large powers in the Governor in Council.

Mr. TUPPER. In answer to the hon. gentleman's enquiries as to the reason for changing the form of the Bill, I may say that it has been found necessary to act in the manner indicated nearly every year, certainly last year and previous years, before Parliament met. United States fishing vessels would reach our ports *en route* to the fishing banks, and would ask for these privileges, and it became incumbent upon us either to grant or refuse them. Then the occasion came to consider what policy should be adopted for the whole season, because, obviously, we could not make rules for the early fishermen starting for the banks that we would not apply afterwards. Accordingly, as the hon. gentleman will remember, the Governor in Council authorized my department to issue interim licenses, subject to the Act being adopted at the next Parliament, and from force of circumstances the rule acted on was that now embodied in this Bill. So in reference to the other remarks of the hon. gentleman, as to this being a permanent instead of a temporary measure: it is true that this Bill vests authority in the Governor in Council to grant these privileges, but we do not place ourselves in the position of having to amend or repeal an Act on an occasion when it might be desirable to take some other course in the management of our relations with our neighbours over the fishery question: and I think in every way, and especially so far as our international relations are concerned, it is more desirable that we should have this power and that there should be a discretionary power to this extent vested in the Governor in Council, instead of a statutory obligation interfering somewhat with the provisions of the treaty of 1818. There is really in practice no very great difference proposed in this Bill from the course we have been following the last few years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The House will remember that this Bill had its origin in the proposition made by the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain when they met in Washington some years ago. If I recollect aright, the provisions of the annual Bill which has been introduced ever since were permissive, and not compulsory. The objection which the hon. gentleman suggests as possible, could not arise under the former Bill. The Governor in Council is not bound to so act, and if circumstances render it undesirable, they need not do so. The objection to the Bill is that formulated by my hon. leader. It is one affecting our national obligations and rights, and it is highly desirable that Parliament should not designate to a committee of Council matters over which it should, above all others, retain control. The hon. gentleman remembers that year after year, when the Bill has been introduced, the House has been given to hope that some arrangement would be made which would render the passage of this Bill another year unnecessary. We gave the Government these large concessions at the time of the Washington treaty, because it was thought that reasonable time should be allowed for the United States Senate to consider that treaty and consider our objections, and it was never contemplated in the first instance that the measure should be made permanent. So far as I am personally concerned, I have never felt or expressed the slightest opposition to granting these concessions, but I believe that may not be the general opinion of Parliament. It does seem to me that in a matter affecting our international rights and obligations and privileges, Parliament should be allowed to retain the control of it, in the sense that the Bill should not be passed for more than one year, and from year to year, and that it is undesirable to delegate these powers to the Governor in Council.

Mr. TUPPER. As I understand, the leader of the Opposition suggested that we should adopt a standing measure.

Mr. LAURIER. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this legislation is not such as the House ought to encourage, and that it would be right and proper to have a parliamentary committee to enquire into and report upon the whole subject. The hon. gentleman knows, and the House knows, that we never admitted that the Americans have any legal right to the concessions that we make by this Bill. These concessions were made in consequence of contemplated negotiations of what it was supposed would at an early date be consummated, but there are no negotiations pending, and there is no prospect of any immediate settlement of this subject, and unless we are prepared to abandon our rights altogether in this matter to the Americans, and to allow the Government of the United States to make such a claim within our territories as they think proper, I believe it is time that we should ascertain precisely what our rights are that we are prepared to stand by, and that we will insist upon maintaining as against them. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to deal liberally with the neighbouring Republic in everything relating to our commercial relations with them, but with regard to our sovereign rights I would not surrender to them a piece of territory if it were fit for no other purpose than for the fishermen to dry their nets upon. I am disposed to maintain our rights, and to ascertain these rights to their full extent. Look at the difference between the conduct of our Government in this matter and the conduct of the neighbouring Republic with regard to another matter in dispute. Take the case of their claim to sovereignty over the Behring Sea. Here is a body of water that is four thousand miles in width. It is part of the open ocean that has been recognized from the time of its discovery until the time that Russia put up a certain pretension, as being a part of the open sea, equally open to the ships of all nations. Now, within the past few years, the Government of the United States claimed a sovereignty over that sea, and they have seized our vessels, they have confiscated the pro-

perty of seal-hunters in the open sea, far beyond the limits that international law usually recognizes, and this new pretension, this pretension contrary to the ancient practice, and contrary to law, has been allowed to go practically into operation, and is continued down to the present hour. Well, Sir, on our eastern coast there are land-locked bays, and what is the pretension of the United States with regard to these? The pretension is: that if a bay is more than six miles wide, that that portion which lies at a greater distance than three miles from the coast is a part of the open sea and is equally accessible to the ships of all nations for every possible purpose. They do not admit any such right with regard to the land-locked bays upon their coast. They assert this pretension as against us, and they assert it as founded upon a treaty that undertakes to enunciate the very terms that are usually recognized by writers on international laws, and which they themselves say are based upon the principles of international law, when it is simply a declaration of what the law is with regard to these matters. The hon. gentleman is making very large concessions by the continuance of this rule.

Mr. TUPPER. For a price.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For a price. Such a price. The Americans are not making any corresponding concessions.

Mr. TUPPER. They have nothing corresponding to sell. We sell them these privileges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They do not pretend to give you license over the disputed waters of the Behring Sea, upon the like terms. They make no corresponding concession, and it seems to me that we are just in this position: that we are asserting our legal right which we are trying to keep alive, but which we have not the courage to assert effectively. That is our position, and the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill practically to make this a continuous policy. It is no longer to be a temporary arrangement until negotiations are had, but a permanent arrangement. It is a species of acquiescence in the pretensions of our neighbours, under which in the course of a few years, they may set up a right. I do not think this is a good policy, nor do I think it is a policy that this House ought to encourage. We went quite far enough before, further than I think we should have gone. It is not by illiberal trade arrangements, it is not by blustering on the election platform that we are going to maintain our rights. They have got to be asserted in another and more effective way, and I think this can be done perfectly consistent with goodwill towards our neighbours and with benefit to our own interests.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree, and I am sure every member of the Government agrees, with the views expressed by the hon. gentlemen opposite: that this is a concession to the United States on behalf of their fishermen, and that it is one that we are by no means bound to make. I quite agree also that any concession of the kind ought to be temporary, but I disagree with our friends opposite when they say that the Bill proposes to make it a permanent concession, and I likewise differ from them when they say that we are surrendering any right whatever which we possess in regard to our fisheries. On the contrary, Sir, when we require the fishing vessels of the United States entering our ports for the purposes named in this Bill, to take out licenses from this Government, and to purchase that license from this Government, I say that instead of surrendering any right to the fisheries we are upholding that right; and every license to a fishing vessel of the United States strengthens the claim of Canada to the sovereignty of our fishing grounds. I feel bound to take issue with our friends opposite when they contend that in any respect we are, by an Act of this kind, surrendering the sovereignty of our fishing territories. There are two or three practical views to take of this question which I think have been overlooked for the moment. One is, that this is a very convenient mode of administering our sovereign rights in these fishing grounds. We preserve, as I have said, our sovereignty; but at the same time and to the utmost extent that is compatible with the rights of our own fishermen in these fishing grounds, we admit foreigners; but we require them to take the licenses for two reasons—in the first place, in order that their vessels may be watched and identified, and poaching prevented; and secondly, in order to establish a fund which will to some extent, if not entirely, pay for the policing of those waters. That has been the practical result during the last few years. The purposes of convenience have been served, and the fund which has been realized from this source, while not to be considered adequate compensation for the rights which have been granted under it, has been a source, not of revenue, but of income, almost, if not entirely, sufficient to meet the police expenses which devolve upon us in guarding those waters for the benefit of our fishermen. As to the question of convenience, the point to be considered by the House, irrespective, at the moment, of whether negotiations are proceeding on this subject or not, is that the course should be adopted and continued for some time to come which is most convenient for the administration of our rights in those fishing grounds. I think everyone will agree that this method prevents collision; and if there are not at present on foot negotiations to be settled with regard to the fisheries, there are other important questions between Canada and the United States which are pressing for a solution. In view of these questions, it is very desirable that anything that might interrupt good feeling and good neighbourhood should if possible be avoided, while at the same time we preserve, as the hon. member for Bothwell desires that we should, our sovereign rights. There are questions, such as that relating to Behring Sea, and questions with regard to the Atlantic fisheries, unsettled, and more or less the subjects of occasional negotiations. We desire that the most friendly settlement of all these questions should be arrived at; and the way to promote friendliness between the two countries is to avoid collision by assenting, for a time at least, to the slight sacrifices involved in the adoption of the *modus vivendi* for the administration of our fishing rights. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken against the Bill seem to entertain the view that this measure will delegate powers to the Governor in Council to make permanent this Act which has hitherto been annual. That is a mistake, because practically the Bill requires that there shall be an annual proclamation of the *modus vivendi*. The first

clause provides that the Governor in Council may from time to time issue licenses, but it goes on to say that the licenses shall be good for a year only; and this Parliament, sitting annually, can at any time give the Governor in Council instructions to discontinue the *modus vivendi*. But the practical inconvenience of the passage of an Act annually by Parliament is this: that early in the year, even as early as the month of January, we received enquiries from Washington as to whether the *modus vivendi* is to be continued in force for the current year. The fishermen of the United States require to know that before they leave their homes, because if they have to return to their homes for supplies and transhipment, they must, when they go out, provide themselves differently from what they would otherwise do. If we have to answer every year that the Act has expired, and that the session of Parliament has to be awaited before it can be renewed, the result is to put off these fishermen without any definite answer, until they have departed for their fishing grounds, because it is likely to be a month later before Parliament meets and a Bill can be passed and assented to: so that, as my colleague has explained, the Government is obliged, for the sake of convenience and in order to maintain the policy of friendliness which this Parliament has instructed it to observe, to exercise the powers which this Bill has conferred, by authorizing our officers to issue licenses to those fishing vessels, subject to the approval of Parliament when it meets. We think it better to take power to proclaim the *modus vivendi* year after year, and even then it will continue to be under the control of Parliament each session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 12) respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that a measure of economy or expediency?

Mr. TUPPER. Economy and efficiency.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. The principal change is in the schedule, which enumerates practically all the subjects administered by the two departments.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had not the pleasure of hearing the hon. gentleman when he introduced this Bill. I have the pleasure of supporting it, because it fulfils the prophecies made at the time the hon. gentleman or his friends introduced the measure dividing the department. We know that the department originally existed as the Marine and Fisheries Department, with one deputy head, and that it was conducted with considerable economy under that deputy. We thought that no reasonable excuse was given for dividing the department, and I think I heard it stated pretty frequently on this side that it would probably suit the exigencies of the Goverment to re-unite the two departments. How much has been paid to the Deputy Minister of Fisheries in salary, and how much in superannuation, so that we may ascertain how much the country has paid for the little freak which the Government indulged in a few years ago in dividing the department?

Mr. TUPPER. I think the division took place in 1885, and since that time the Deputy Minister of Fisheries has been paid $3,200 a year. He had $1,800 previously as an officer in the service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Had he a secretary?

Mr. TUPPER. Not until last year, when one of the officers was given an additional $100 for acting as his secretary. The superannuation allowance is $1,400 odd or $1,500. He has given the country twenty years of his service, and when an office is abolished the practice, as the hon. gentleman knows, is to superannuate the officer instead of cutting him off altogether.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should have thought that the gentleman superannuated, being in good health and in the prime of life, should have been assigned some other official duties in the department, so that the country would have had some benefit for the $1,500 which will be paid to him annually during life. I understand he is a gentleman under 50 years of age.

Mr. TUPPER. I never asked him so delicate a question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) At any rate he is in the prime of health, and I believe he never showed any failure of mental vigour. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this gentleman was superannuated simply because of the change in the department, and for no other reason?

Mr. TUPPER. The Order in Council states that, it having been decided to abolish this office in the interest of efficiency and economy, it is recommended that this officer should be superannuated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood that there was some charge brought against that gentleman, and that there was an investigation by a Committee of Council, that a report was made, which it was understood outside was not unanimous, in regard to that, and I think the House is entitled to full information on the subject.

Mr. TUPPER. There were charges made against the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, involving some irregular conduct. I investigated these myself and brought them to the notice of the Government, and they were examined into again, and the conclusion of the Government was that, while irregularities had existed in the department under his direction, and for which he was responsible, they were not of so grave a character or so serious as to render any extraordinary action necessary in connection with the case, and considering his long period of service during which his conduct as an officer had been all that was desirable. Perhaps, under these circumstances, as these charges of irregularities were not deemed to be of very serious moment, the hon. gentleman would not consider any further notice necessary to be taken of them; but, of course, if he should do so, he can have all the information brought down.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask if the hon. gentleman as the head of the department, concurred in that conclusively?

Mr. TUPPER. As the hon. gentleman is aware, I am not at liberty to state what the action of the individual members of the Government was.

We took executive action, and, unless I concurred in that, of course I should not be here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman inform the House whether any number of years were added to the service of this officer, or whether his superannuation was simply based on the period he served?

Mr. TUPPER. It was simply based on his service.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were the charges to which the Minister has referred, charges of irregularity that occurred recently, or were they in regard to irregularities of some years ago?

Mr. TUPPER. They came to my notice and, speaking from memory, I think covered a period of only about a year. The moment they came to my notice, I went into them.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know that a committee investigated certain charges in connection with the duties performed by the gentleman referred to when he was the accountant of that department.

Mr. TUPPER. The Public Accounts Committee dealt with that, I believe, and it was before I was connected with the department, but I think that the Deputy came out of that stainless. I am not sufficiently familiar with the details to speak positively, but I never heard any expression of opinion on the part of Parliament adverse to the Deputy on account of that investigation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I remember well the investigation, and I remember that he did not come out of it in such a way as would warrant the House in concluding that he was not implicated to a very serious extent. The matter was allowed to go at that time though irregularities of a very grave kind had occurred. That was passed over then, but it seems that, instead of having the punishment he deserved meted out to him, he was told to go up higher and was made Deputy Minister, and that warning was not sufficient, but it appears that since then he has not performed the duties of the office to which he was appointed without getting into trouble in regard to something else. I do not think it is desirable, if we are to continue in force the superannuation system, that men whose career has not been of such a character as to show that they have performed their duties faithfully should be put on the superannuation list. I think it is wrong to have such a list at all, but certainly men who have not performed their duties with care and economy and attention should not be put on the retiring list and allowed to live for the rest of their lives at the expense of the country.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I remember the investigation my hon. friend has referred to, and I remember that the Deputy Minister of Marine appeared before the Public Accounts Committee at that time, claiming that the expenditure of a very large sum of money which had taken place in that department had never been audited, and he claimed that it should be audited. I would ask the hon. gentleman, as I understand the health of that Deputy Minister is such that the country cannot hope for his long retention in office, whether, before the superannuation was granted to the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, those expenditures which had taken place some years before and which involves so large an amount of money, were audited or not?

Mr. TUPPER. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that some years ago the Deputy Minister of Marine spoke to me on that subject, and at his instance it was brought to the attention of the Treasury Board. Of course, I am unable to say what steps have been taken, but I spoke to the Deputy again some time ago, and found that he was now perfectly satisfied as to the position of the accounts. I am unable to say whether an audit took place or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Deputy Minister of Marine may have been satisfied, but Parliament ought not to be satisfied until some investigation of that expenditure takes place. We are not ignorant that charges were made and were bandied about amongst the officials in regard to this expenditure. Personally, of course, we know nothing as to this expenditure. Everything may have been perfectly right or it may not have been perfectly right, but it was alleged by some of the officials that everything was not perfectly right. At all events these moneys were not spent under that check and supervision under which all public moneys are now generally spent. I think a lump sum was voted and was not accounted for to the auditor or to anyone else.

Mr. FOSTER. A great many accounts were not audited.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But it seems that this expenditure was not under the control of any third person who could audit and check it. It was in the hands of two or perhaps three persons in the Marine Department. The result was that charges and counter charges were made and suspicions were abroad, whether just or unjust I do not know. At any rate it amounts to this, that if the Deputy Minister now is satisfied he was very much dissatisfied a year or two ago, and expressed that dissatisfaction before the Public Accounts Committee in very strenuous language.

Mr. TUPPER. It is only fair to the late Deputy Minister to say, that when I had a conversation with the late Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he never gave me reason to suppose that while the Deputy Minister of Fisheries was under him, as accountant, he had misappropriated any funds. As that subject had come up in the Public Accounts Committee, he felt uneasy, in the event of his death and of other disclosures occurring, lest he should not have an opportunity before he died of having such an audit as would prevent any such possibility arising, but on no occasion did he give me any ground for suspecting that the Deputy Minister of Fisheries had been guilty of other irregularities in respect of money. While I am not in a position to say how it was that the action of the Treasury Board was taken, I am quite confident in stating that the Deputy Minister of Marine informed me a short time ago that his anxiety in connection with that matter had ceased, and the difficulties arising out of the want of audit of the late accountant's affairs, had been adjusted to his satisfaction.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This matter came up hastily and I had not turned it over in my mind, but my recollection of it is that that sum of money to which the Duputy Minister of Marine made reference, and which he claimed before the Public Accounts Committee should be audited by a public official, had reference not only to expenses in that

department, but to the collection of fishery revenues, that these moneys were collected and paid in and paid out, and nobody knew anything about it; in point of fact, there was no system about it.

Mr. TUPPER. I was not on the committee the hon. gentleman refers to at that time, and I have no recollection of what occurred.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Nor did we know very much about it. The facts were as I have related them to the House, that large sums had been collected for a series of years and had never been audited. They may be right or they may be wrong. But that did not seem proper bookkeeping; it seemed that the control which Parliament required should be exercised over the collection and expenditure of money, had not been extended to that department in the collection of these moneys. I think the Public Accounts Committee had a pledge given to them at that time -although I will not speak with absolute positiveness- that the accounts would be audited by the then Minister of Marine, the late Mr. McLelan, and on that pledge the Public Accounts Committee let the matter rest. I think myself that in a matter involving many hundreds of thousands of dollars, the Minister would be acting in the public interest to have an audit made of the collection and expenditure of this money. I want to say that I would be the last man inferentially to impute to anybody wrong-doing. But in process of time some of these gentlemen may die, charges may be made and they may not be here to explain them, and partly on their account and partly in the public interest, when there is an enormous receipt of money and an enormous expenditure in any department, care should be taken that the operations should be surrounded with the proper checks to secure that the money shall be properly received and expended.

Mr. HAZEN. I feel that some statements have been made that are not quite fair to the gentleman who lately occupied the position of Deputy Minister of Fisheries. Any one listening to this discussion and to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Wellington (Mr. McMullen), would almost come to the conclusion that wrong-doing had been proved against the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, and that it was in some degree owing to that wrong-doing that he no longer occupies the position which he held a short time ago. Of course we have nothing before the House of an official nature, no papers upon the matter, and the only statement we have respecting this matter is that of the Minister of Marine, who says that any irregularity proved against the Deputy was of such a very slight character that it is not considered worthy of punishment in any degree. In view of that statement, and in view of the absence of any official papers, it seems to me unfair to reflect in any way upon the conduct of that official regarding the charges which were mentioned in the newspapers during the recess. As I understand it, certain charges of irregularity were made to the Minister, who investigated them and referred them to Council; the Council appointed a committee to investigate them, and on a report of the committee, after investigating all the facts, it was found that the irregularities, if irregularities they can be called at all, were of the slightest character, and would not justify, and would not warrant the imputation of wrong-doing. I may say that during the last session of Parliament, which was my first session here, I often had occasion to go to the Department of Fisheries about matters in which my constituents were interested, and I always found the Deputy Minister most obliging in discharging the duties of his office, and, to my mind, a most efficient officer. I cannot help expressing the regret that if an amalgamation of these departments is going to take place in the interest of the public service, a position in the public service cannot be found for this gentleman whom I always found so uniformly obliging, courteous and efficient in the discharge of his official duties. I regret that that gentleman is to be blamed on such slight foundation, when we have before us no information whatever warranting any suspicion of wrong-doing. As I understand the matter, this affair that occurred a few years ago and was investigated in the Public Accounts Committee, has been disposed of altogether, and there is now absolutely nothing to warrant the slightest suspicion of wrong-doing on his part.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have before us a Bill proposing to abolish the Department of Fisheries and to unite it again to the Department of Marine. The hon. gentleman, in proposing a measure of this sort, to some extent at all events, reflects upon the deputy head of the department. The hon. gentleman's predecessor in office asked the House to divide the Department of Marine and Fisheries and to constitute two departments, and to put Mr. Tilton at the head of the Department of Fisheries, the House complied with the wishes of the Minister, the division took place and a new department was created of which Mr. Tilton was made Deputy Minister. It is impossible to believe that if the arrangement had worked satisfactorily, if the Deputy Minister had discharged his business efficiently, the hon. Minister would have proposed, while the Deputy is in the prime of life, to unite the departments and place them both again under the charge of a gentleman who is nearly fourscore years of age -an efficient officer, I have no doubt, a thoroughly upright officer, I have no doubt, an officer in whom, I believe, every Government and every Parliament have had confidence, believing him to be in every respect a gentleman of the very highest integrity. I say, when the Minister comes down with such a proposition as this, to put out of office a Deputy Minister who is in the prime of life, and to place the department of which he is in charge under the control of an aged Deputy Minister, he is himself reflecting upon the efficiency or upon the uprightness of the party who has been deputy head of that office. The Minister has also informed the House that charges were made against this deputy, that an investigation has taken place, and that those charges and investigation were followed by the Bill before us. I am not going to discuss the conduct of the Deputy Minister who is about to be removed by this legislative proceeding from office, as the Minister has promised to bring down the papers relating to that investigation.

Mr. TUPPER. No; I made no such promise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the papers would be brought down. I think it is very important that they should be brought down before this Bill is carried, and the two departments are again united into one department. The superannuation of the gentleman can

hardly take place, after these charges have been made and an investigation has taken place, without Parliament seeing the papers in order to determine whether that superannuation is a proper procedure or not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What has been added to this schedule?

Mr. TUPPER. It is difficult to state off-hand. We have made the schedule cover everything we now administer. We have added nothing to our work, nor to the jurisdiction of the department. The schedule simply includes all the subjects administered by the department——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand the hon. gentleman to say that nothing has been added except subjects covered by Acts of Parliament.

Mr. TUPPER—or were being administered by the department; in other words, all subjects over which we have now administration either by vote of Parliament or by some statute.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not propose to raise any question in that regard. I desire to call attention to the winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and to ask the hon. gentleman what he proposes to do in that respect. The year before last the Government re-let the contract for the construction of the wharf on the mainland side. I think it was let to a Toronto man named Murphy, or to some one from Ontario at least.

Mr. FOSTER. How does this come up at the present time?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The schedule enumerates, among the subjects to be dealt with, "communication with Prince Edward Island." This wharf is being built in connection with communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FOSTER. It is under the Public Works Department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is in connection with maintaining the service now regulated by the Marine Department. Cape Tormentine wharf is approaching completion, and last year or the year before, pledges were given by the Minister of Public Works that a wharf on the island side would also be completed. We have expended a large sum of money on the mainland side, and it will be worse than thrown away unless the Government construct the complement to it on the other side. I want to ask the Minister whether he has taken the matter into consideration, whether he has asked an appropriation for the construction of a wharf on the island side to enable a line of steamers or boats or any other means of communication to be placed between the island and the mainland. I do not know what amount has been expended in the construction of a wharf at Cape Tormentine, whether it will exceed $100,000 or not, but at all event it is a very large sum. The wharf on the island side must of necessity be built, or the present expenditure will be lost. I desire to ask the Minister whether he has any policy in regard to the matter, whether he proposes to have this wharf constructed, whether he has recommended its construction in order that a line of steamers may be placed there in summer or winter, or both? We had the subject discussed last year; but that project seems to be in abeyance for the time being, although I understand the Finance Minister, in reply to an hon. member, stated the other day that the matter was still under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. It is much the same as in abeyance.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And it will so remain, I suppose, until an election comes on. What I want to ask, is, does the Minister of Marine propose to establish a line of communication between the wharf now approaching completion at Cape Tormentine and Prince Edward Island at Cape Traverse? If so, does he intend to have it in operation this season? Does the hon. gentleman propose to ask Parliament for a vote to build another wharf and put on a line of steamers? The matter will have to be thoroughly discussed, if we do not obtain the information now.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not desire to entrench on the jurisdiction of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, especially in his absence; but I may tell my hon. friend, that I will mention to the Minister the interest he has evinced in the matter of the wharf, and no doubt when the Estimates are considered, the Minister will be all the more prepared to give my hon. friend the fullest information. Frankly, I have not that information.

Bill reported.

REPORT.

Report of the Auditor General for 1891. (Mr. Foster.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 16th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Arthur Joseph Turcotte, Esq., for the Electoral District of Montmorency.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

A. J. TURCOTTE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Montmorency; introduced by Sir Adolphe Caron and Sir John Thompson.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1891, and the Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts for the same year, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA.

Mr. KAULBACH asked, Whether the Government have given orders for the strict enforcement of the bonding privileges in respect to Newfoundland fish, and are such fish to be stored and re-shipped in the same condition as when received?

Mr. BOWELL. In July, 1889, instructions were issued (*vide* circular No. 315 B) requiring strict enforcement of the law in respect to the warehousing of foreign fish. In December, 1891, instructions were issued (*vide* No. 522 B) in *re* Newfoundland fish, pointing out that it was subject to the provisions of the Tariff and Customs Acts then in force. Taking these circulars in conjunction, officers of Customs have been informed that Newfoundland fish is subject to the warehousing law. But it does not follow that warehoused fish shall be re-shipped in the same condition as when received, as section 83 of the Customs Act provides that owners of warehoused goods may sort or repack the same while in bond, in order to the preservation thereof. I have the circular here which I will hand in, as follows:—

"I have, by direction of the Hon. the Minister of Customs, to call your special attention to the provisions of Section 89 of the Customs Act as amended by the Act 52 Vic., Chap. 14 (last session), and now in force, which provides that goods entered for warehouse shall be immediately, after entry, transported to and placed in the designated warehouse; and of Section 96, which provides that if goods so entered are not duly carried into and deposited in the warehouse, or having been so deposited are afterwards taken out without lawful permit, &c., such goods shall be seized and forfeited; and to point out that under these provisions of law the practice which has heretofore existed at certain ports, of permitting foreign fish which has been so entered for warehouse to remain on the wharf for the purpose of being further cured, packed or repacked before entry ex-warehouse for consumption or exportation, can be no longer lawfully allowed, but such fish must immediately, on being entered, be placed in the designated warehouses and there secured in the same manner as any other bonded goods; this, however, does not prevent the packing or repacking of such fish under Customs supervision within the bonded warehouse, under the terms of Section 83 of the Act; but no privileges can be given further than within the section hereinbefore referred to."

Mr. KAULBACH asked, Whether the Government of Canada has taken steps to ascertain the amount of duty collected from Canadian fishing vessels upon fishing outfits in Newfoundland ports, and has the Canadian Government notified the Newfoundland Government of its intention to demand a refund of all such duties paid by Canadian fishermen on salt and other outfits upon entering the ports of Newfoundland, for the purpose of fishing or preparing to fish in Newfoundland waters, or waters adjacent thereon?

Mr. BOWELL. No representations have been made to the Government of Canada that duties have been improperly collected upon fishing outfits in Newfoundland ports; consequently, no refund has been demanded.

Mr. KAULBACH asked, Whether the Government of Canada has made a request for, or received from Canadian fishermen, any statement or evidence as to the truth of the charges made against said fishermen in respect to the alleged selling of bait to the French fishermen of St. Pierre?

Mr. TUPPER. The Canadian Government has not been in possession of any specific information on that subject on which such a request could be founded, and consequently, no such a request has been made.

Mr. KAULBACH asked, Whether it is the intention of this Government to demand from the Newfoundland Government the amounts paid as license fees by Canadian fishermen to Newfoundland, during the fishing seasons of 1890 and 1891?

Mr. TUPPER. The Canadian Government is now endeavouring to obtain through process of law a refund of the license fees exacted by the Government of Newfoundland from Canadian fishermen during the seasons of 1890 and 1891.

Mr. LAURIER. Who is the suitor?

Mr. TUPPER. The suit is taken on behalf and with the authority of the fishermen from whom this amount has been exacted.

CENSUS—ORIGIN AND CREEDS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN asked, Whether that part of the last census showing the figures under the heads of Origin and Religious Creeds of the population of Canada, will be laid before this House?

Mr. CARLING. This work is proceeding at the rate of about 200,000 names per day; and it is expected the whole will be finished about the middle of April.

LETTER POSTAGE—REDUCTION.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to reduce letter postage from 3 to 2 cents?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that it is not the intention of the Government to reduce letter postage from 3 to 2 cents.

LITTLE MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER.

Mr. YEO (for Mr. PERRY) asked, What action, if any, has been taken by the Government with respect to a petition of the fishermen and others of Little Miminegash, P.E.I., praying for a breakwater at that place?

Mr. OUIMET. The matter is under the consideration of the department.

BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN—DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government in future, to distribute the moneys given as bounties to fishermen in such a manner that those fishing in vessels belonging to Digby, Yarmouth and Halifax counties, shall receive a sum equally as large as those fishing in vessels in other counties of the Dominion?

Mr. TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government to depart from the principle of uniformity which now obtains in connection with the regulations for the distribution of the bounty.

THE SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON moved for:

Copies of engineers' reports which led to the building of the Beauharnois Canal; of engineers' reports in favour of the building of the Soulanges Canal, and of reports, letters, &c., from engineers, masters or pilots, objecting to the building of the canal at Soulanges.

He said: In making this motion, I beg leave to give some reasons why I ask for these papers. Last year when we were going through the Estimates there was a sum of money wanted for the explorations and engineers' fees in connection with the Soulanges Canal, amounting, I believe, to $300,000. I then objected, as a member of this House, to voting such an amount until a committee of engineers had been called upon as experts to consider the report upon which the Government based their action in asking for that money. I then asked that the report of Mr. Monro, upon which the Government seems to base their policy, should be submitted to some engineers, either belonging to the staff of the Government, or any others, who should judge, for themselves and for the public, of the merits of his report. At that time I was answered by the Minister of Customs, then the acting Minister of Railways and Canals, that all precautions had been taken, and that it was after due study and deliberation during the last ten or fifteen years, that the Government had come to the conclusion to accept Mr. Monro's report as conclusive and final. Still, there seemed to be a doubt at that time, and I opposed the vote, although I had to contend against the Government, who had decided to adopt the north shore of the river for the canal, and against gentlemen sitting on the Opposition benches who thought they were helping the then representative of Soulanges, Dr. Mousseau; I happened to be alone in defending what I thought was the best interest for the country. Since then, we saw not long ago that tenders were called for the construction of the Soulanges Canal. Many things have been said concerning these tenders, and it has been charged that probably politics had something to do with them, seeing that they were called for during election time. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I never believed those stories. I was convinced then, as I am now, that the Government did not need to take any such steps to carry the County of Soulanges. But tenders were asked for. Naturally those more particularly interested, like the people of my county and the navigators who pass through the Beauharnois Canal, had a good deal to say upon the subject, and a demand was made for a further enquiry before the Government decided upon such an immense expenditure. I intend now, Mr. Speaker, to go into the whole question of the construction of that canal on the south side, and of the reports of the engineers in favour of building it on the north side. I am very sorry that I shall have to bother the House, as it may be somewhat tedious to the members, but I am doing it for two purposes, first, because I think it is my duty as representative of the county through which the Beauharnois Canal now passes, and in the second place, and chiefly, because it is a public question of great importance, and I think every member of this House should express an opinion upon it, and at least try to find out whether we are not going to expend an immense sum of money in a work which, later on, may turn out to have been undertaken without proper study and care. I have here a book which was written in 1872 by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) who is now sitting in this House. It is a complete study of the construction of the St. Lawrence Canals, particularly that portion of them between Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis. It was written after a careful examination of all the engineers' reports, and of everything which might have been written or said upon the subject. I am sorry that every member of the House has not got a copy of this most interesting production. I shall read certain parts of it which bear most directly upon the subject I am treating now. This question of building the canals between Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis, began to be discussed as long ago as 1804. Naturally it was then very small. It was carried at a small expense and served the purpose at that time. But the real question of building canals between those two lakes originated during the period between 1830 and 1844. Public attention was then, as it has been lately, directed to the question, as was evident in the discussion which took place in this House the other day, and it was considered most important to use in this country the water stretches, the lakes and rivers for which our country is noted. Naturally the question of building canals arose as a means of overcoming the obstacles created by rapids. So between the years I have mentioned this question was very much agitated, and the administrative authorities of the time became convinced that the future of our country depended largely upon the construction of canals. Surveys were made resulting in our present chain of canals. I desire now to read extracts from a report prepared by Mr. Girouard. I may say to those unacquainted with the work that Mr. Girouard is a citizen of the county of Beauharnois, and, as he was a leading lawyer in Montreal, he was called upon by the people, who had heard a great deal regarding the contention as to the building of a canal on the north shore, to study the question, and his report belongs to the public. Mr. Girouard says in this work:

"The Hon. Mr. Killaly is reported to have said in 1842 that the first survey in connection with this enterprise had been made about three years previously by a French engineer, who, after having examined both sides of the river located the work on the south side."

Perhaps there is some ground for controversy on that point: but we know that so far back as 1804 some reports were made by an engineer from France. The writer continues:

"Three different surveys were made on the north bank of the river in 1833 by Mr. J. B. Mills, with whom were associated Mr. David Thompson and Mr. Samuel H. Keefer, the latter having been subsequently engineer in chief of the department, under the direction of the Commissioner of Public Works, which included Messrs. Harwood and DeBeaujeau, respective proprietors of Vaudreuil and Soulanges, both of which gentlemen, it is well understood, were in favour of constructing a canal on the north bank of the river."

There are some paragraphs here which I need not read to the House, for I wish to detain it as short a time as possible. Mr. Girouard had a controversy with several gentlemen, with Mr. Lanthier, who was the parliamentary representative of Soulanges, and with other gentlemen who were personally interested in the matter, and of course Mr. Girouard was obliged to defend himself; but I will omit those paragraphs which do not have any direct bearing on

the discussion. The historical part of the record may be summed up as follows :—

"On the 10th February, 1834, a Committee of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada adopted Mr. Mills' report; but it does not appear that any steps were taken to carry it into effect.

"It is Mr. Mills's route which the present partisans of the north shore canal (among whom are Mr. Lanthier, member for Soulanges, and Mr. Harwood, member for Vaudreuil) desire to see adopted by the Dominion Parliament. This route was surveyed under the special directions of Messrs. Harwood and DeBeaujeau (both personally interested in the north shore canal), and was selected without any examination been made on the south side of the river, but was recommended solely from the military point of view which prevailed over all other considerations at the time the survey was made. What weight should such a report have at the present time, when commercial interests and considerations are deemed to be all-important in the examination of public works of this nature?

"In the months of September and October, 1834, Mr. Alexander Stevenson, accompanied by Mr. Trudeau, surveyed the south bank of the river at the joint request of the Commissioners of Public Works for Lower Canada and the Hon. Edward Ellis. His report, made on the 10th February, 1835, was in favour of the line of the present Beauharnois Canal. It does not appear that Mr. Stevenson examined the north bank of the river at that time: but he did so subsequently, and in the same year at the request of Messrs. Harwood and Simpson, and the opinion he gave those gentlemen was, that a canal on the north bank of the river would cost a great deal more than one on the south bank.

"In 1842, speaking of these two routes before the special committee, Mr. Stevenson said: 'I have seen Mr. Mills's report and estimate, and from what knowledge I have of that side of the country, I must say that I cannot approve of the route chosen by that gentleman.'

"A sixth survey was made in 1834 for the Seigneur of Beauharnois, by N. H. Baird, a member of the London Engineers Society. He also shared in the opinion that the south shore was the best adapted for a canal, but, going further than Mr. Stevenson, he suggested the propriety of using the small river St. Louis on the score of economy. This suggestion was not generally approved of owing to the length of the route—15 miles; but the superior advantages of the south shore were nevertheless acknowledged.

"In 1836, Messrs. A. LaRue and Henry G. Thompson made another survey, under the directions of a special commission, presided over by Mr. Jno. Jones. The examination of the two lakes was entrusted to Mr. LaRue, while Mr. Thompson applied himself to that of the St. Lawrence; and the opinion of those gentlemen was not unfavourable to the south shore canal. Their survey never having been entirely completed, the Commission made no report.

"However, Mr. Jones informed the special committee, appointed in 1842, that his colleagues and himself had agreed to recommend Mr. Mills's route, from Coteau to the Cedars, and a continuous line along the river bank from the Cedars to the Cascades. 'The lower part of this route,' Mr. Jones said, 'that is, from Pointe-au-Moulin to Pointe-à-Coulonge, recommended by Mr. Mills, was condemned by the commission, there not being sufficient water.'

"In 1838, Colonel Phillpotts received instructions from Lord Durham to proceed with a survey of the localities in question. This gentleman's opinion was that the canal should be located on the north side of the river, purely from military considerations. 'I am, however, induced to believe, says the colonel, 'that, in any case, it may be found possible to construct a canal on the south shore cheaper than on the north.'

"In 1839, Mr. David Thompson was authorized to make a new survey. This also resulted in favour of the construction of the present Beauharnois Canal.

"In 1841 an estimate of the cost of a canal by the 'Mills's route' (prepared by Samuel Keefer) was laid before the House of Assembly, the total cost of which amounted to £255,900. In presenting this estimate, Mr. Keefer stated that if the south side of the river were selected for the location of this canal, a saving of at least £50,000 would be effected. And in 1842 Mr. Killaly stated before the special committee that this estimate was presented with the distinct understanding that the canal was to be located on the south side. Moreover, it is well known that Lord Sydenham then recommended the south shore as being the best for the construction of the canal.

"Under all the circumstances, and considering the contradictory nature of the various reports submitted, the Government resolved that a new survey should be made, superintended by some disinterested person. This task was naturally entrusted to Mr. Keefer, Engineer-in-Chief of the department, a gentleman known to be utterly disinterested one way or the other in the locality. In the month of January, 1842, therefore, Mr. Keefer was instructed to survey both sides of the river, and to report upon the best route with as little delay as possible. In this survey he was assisted by Mr. Cowley.

"On the 17th of February following, Mr. Keefer reported to the department, remarking: 'The best route to unite the waters of these two lakes has long been a subject of consideration with me. You are aware that I assisted Mr. Mills in the survey of the three routes on the north side, and should, therefore, have a perfect knowledge of them: and I have now no hesitation in expressing the opinion that Mr. Stevenson's route, or one corresponding very nearly with it, will be found not only the cheapest but the best in every respect.'

"This report was, moreover, confirmed by Mr. Chas. M. Tate, who was instructed by the department to examine the south channel of the river at points lying between Grande Isle, St. Timothée, and Valleyfield. In his report Mr. Tate says: 'I beg to conclude with one general observation: Considering the distance between the two levels of water in the lakes, and the extent of the fall which has to be overcome, it appears as if nature had in a singular degree, made compensation for the great impediments in the watercourse, by affording on the land by its side unusual facilities for establishing at a moderate expense, an efficient and permanent artificial navigation.'

"With a view to forming his own estimate of the value of the objections raised by the seigneurs of Vaudreuil and Soulanges, and by Mr. Simpson, the county member, against the contemplated south shore canal, the Chairman of the Board of Works deemed it his duty to accompany Mr. Keefer over the most important portions of the survey he was about to make on that side of the river. This was Mr. Killaly's second visit to the locality in question, his first having been made in 1840. A most experienced engineer—familiar with all the features of the north bank of the river—a stranger in the country, and therefore free from local prejudices of any kind whatever—Mr. Killaly's opinion was not only worthy of all respect, but of itself it was an authority. He pronounced in favour of the route recommended by Messrs. Stevenson and Keefer. 'I declare,' he said before the special committee, 'upon the honour of a gentleman, that my firm belief, after having anxiously reflected upon this subject for more than a year, entirely concurs with the opinion of those gentlemen.' Consequently on the 15th June, 1842, the Executive Council adopted the route of the present Beauharnois Canal: and, on the same day, the action of the Council was confirmed by the Governor in Council."

I also find here another fact which I will read. It is as follows :—

"The resolution of the Canadian Government having been transmitted to England on the 19th July, was approved by the Imperial Government on the 26th August. In his despatch to the Governor General on the subject Lord Stanley, the Colonial Secretary, remarks: 'I confess that it is not without regret that I assent to the sacrifice of the military advantages which would have resulted from carrying the canal on the north bank: but I am bound to admit that on the grounds stated by you the inconvenience will be considerably less than would at first sight appear.'"

We have also another opinion which is as follows :—

"It may further be stated that in 1871 the Hon. Mr. Langevin reported that the commissioners had declined to consider this question, and had recommended the enlargement of the Beauharnois Canal. 'With reference to this canal,' said the hon. gentleman, 'while declining to consider the question as to whether it should be located on the north or south side of the river, the commissioners recommend its enlargement to the standard fixed for the Welland Canal.'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, this at all events shows that there has been a great controversy about the selection of a site for this canal, as to whether it should be on the Beauharnois or the Soulanges side, and until we find some other proof, we must come to the conclusion that the majority of the engineers who had studied both sides of the river at that time, agreed that the cheapest and most practicable route would

be the route on the south shore, that is to say, the Beauharnois Canal. If anyone should doubt the reports of the engineers, I have other proof here to show why we should follow the example of those who preceded us and accept the route on the south shore, on account of there being a longer period of navigation there. It must strike every man both in this House and in the country, that if we build a canal we should build it so as to make it as useful as possible and to maintain its benefits during as long a season of the year as we can. This authority continues:

"The Stevenson line was adopted on account of its superiority over all the proposed lines, considered either as to trade and navigation, or in point of economy. Its entire length being only eleven and one-quarter miles, proves it to be the shortest route. This fact cannot be denied, and was admitted by all engineers concerned, including Mr. Casey himself. The following is a tabular statement of the length of the respective routes:

	Miles.
The Mills's route, inland and river	14·54
Entire land route along the north bank	14·52
The Harwood route	15¼
The Stevenson route or, Beauharnois Canal	11¼
The Beard route, *viâ* River St. Louis	15·60

"Not only is the distance shortest, but the number of locks is also less: consequently, navigation through the Beauharnois must be more expeditious than it would be through a canal on the north shore. The Mills's route is an admitted impracticability, owing to the strong river current and insufficiency of water at the ravine at Pointe-au-Moulin: and a north shore canal should be entirely inland along the bank of the Rivière-au-Moulin: and a north shore canal should be entirely inland along the bank of the river. The following is the number of locks shown in the respective proposed routes:

	Locks.
Beauharnois Canal	9
Entire inland route along the north	10
Harwood route	11
Mills's route	9
Baird route	9

"Notwithstanding the statements made to the contrary by Messrs. Lanthier, Harwood and Masson, the Beauharnois Canal affords longer seasons of navigation than could be obtained through any north shore canal, because the ice takes sooner and remains longer in the calm shallow bay at the foot of the Cascades. These facts have been proven, not by inhabitants of St. Zotique, who loudly clamour for the construction of a canal at the Cedars, but by strangers who are equally familiar with the peculiarities of those localities. The circumstantial affidavit of Mr. Monarque, of Lachine, the evidence of Mr. D'Aoust, of Montreal, a native of Isle Perrot, Mr. Ouellette, of Lachine, one of our oldest pilots, of Mr. J. B. Auger, president of a powerful forwarding company—one of our oldest and most experienced river navigators, and highly interested in canal improvements—(published in the *Minerve*)—will defy the combined statements, contradictions or denials of my opponents."

That was written in the year 1872, and it was the opinion of the engineers then. I wish now to remark about the construction of locks. At that time the idea was that the deepening of the canal would not be to the extent to which it is found necessary to-day to deepen it to. In the south shore canal they intended to make less locks than there are in the Beauharnois Canal, but any man of common sense, whether engineer or not, can see that if they could build a canal on the north shore with a certain number of locks, they could do the same thing in the south shore. There was before this commission many questions, and the one which particularly refers to this case was as follows:—

"To the 83rd question asked by Mr. Lanthier, then member for Soulanges, before the special committee: 'What do you think is generally the difference of time in the breaking up of the bordage ice on the north and the south side in the spring and in the formation of the ice in fall?' Mr. DeWitt said: 'That the navigation is open two or three weeks longer on the Beauharnois side in the fall, and opens two or three weeks earlier in the spring.' The fact was also established by Messrs. Manuel, Leduc, Larocque and others.

"In a comparative statement of advantages and disadvantages of the two river banks, Mr. Keefer observed, on the 10th October, 1842, 'that a canal on the south side can be navigated two or three weeks more every season than on the north side.' In his report dated 14th February of the same year, Mr. Keefer states, in alluding to the south shore: "The line is continuous and away from the river, free from the disturbing causes of ice and high water.'

"What does Mr. Mills himself say on this important point? 'It is generally agreed,' said he, 'that the St. Lawrence is open two or three weeks earlier in the spring and later in the fall than the Ottawa—the St. Lawrence passing through a more southern latitude.' This accounts for Mr. Mills recommending the river route and condemning the inland route on the north shore of the river."

Mr. Mills was the gentleman who located the canal on the north shore from military considerations. Now, Mr. Girouard, in writing this, wanted to furnish all possible proofs of his statements, and he has given the following dates of the opening of the Lachine, Beauharnois and Cornwall canals, respectively, as follows:

	Lachine.	Beauharnois.	Cornwall.
1846	May 6	April 16	April 20
1847	" 5	May 5	May 1
1848	April 24	April 12	April 7
1849	" 21	" 19	" 1
1850	" 22	" 26	" 20
1851	" 12	" 25	" 25
1852	May 7	May 2	May 1
1853	" 20	April 29	April 29
1854	" 16	May 1	" 30
1855	" 1	" 1	" 30
1856	" 1	" 1	" 28
1857	" 4	" 2	May 1
1858	April 25	April 26	April 26
1859	" 21	" 19	" 20
1860	" 20	" 19	" 21
1861	" 24	" 24	" 24
1862	May 4	" 30	May 1
1863	" 4	May 2	" 4
1864	April 25	April 24	April 27
1865	May 1	" 25	" 26
1866	" 2	" 30	" 30
1867	" 1	" 20	May 1
1868	April 27	" 27	April 27
1869	May 3	May 3	May 3
1870	April 29	April 28	April 28
1871	" 24	" 24	" 24
1872	May 1	May 1	May 1

We can see from this statement that with regard to the opening of navigation the Beauharnois Canal has always been, if not ahead of the others, yet never behind them. Now, I want to call attention to a very important point. Last season, principally in the fall, we read a great deal in the newspapers about the lowness of the water in the St. Lawrence. In Montreal we saw what I do not remember ever seeing before, the steamer *Laprairie*, crossing from Montreal to Laprairie, being compelled to stop her trips very early, I think in October. The Cornwall Canal could not take vessels drawing more than 8 feet of water, and the canals above the Cornwall could not take vessels drawing more than 8 or 9 feet of water. But a very important point is that there has always been the same height of water on the sills of the Beauharnois Canal. The papers from which I will read show that the navigators—and I do not know one who is not opposed to a canal on the north shore—testify that they have never had any trouble in taking through the Beauharnois Canal any vessels drawing 9 feet of water. Mr. Girouard's statement of the comparative depth of water on the upper mitre sills of the three canals mentioned at lowest water is as follows:—

Year.	Month.	Lachine. Lock 5. ft. ins.	Beauharnois. Lock 14. ft. ins.	Cornwall. Lock 21. ft. ins.
1849	Sept.	9.10½	10.7	9.2
"	Oct.	9.10	10.4	8.6
"	Nov.	9.10	10.11	9.0
1850	Sept.	9.8	11.2	8.1
"	Oct.	9.10	11.2	8.11
"	Nov.	9.9	10.10	8.0
1854	Oct.	9.11	11.9	9.9
"	Nov.	9.10	11.6	9.3
1865	Oct.	9.4	11.3	9.4
"	Nov.	9.6	11.3	9.1
1871	Sept.	9.9	11.8	
"	Oct.	9.1	11.1	
"	Nov.	8.10	11.0	

Mr. Girouard goes on to say:

"Alluding to the water level of the Lachine and Beauharnois Canals in 1871, the Hon. Mr. Langevin observed: 'From the month of September, the St. Lawrence River was so low that the gates of the guard lock had to be kept opened during the day until the close of navigation to admit the greatest possible flow of water to supply the canal and mills.' According to the report of the hon. Minister, it would appear that no scarcity of water was felt in the Beauharnois Canal, for he states that 'the working of this canal was efficiently maintained throughout the season, notwithstanding the low water of the St. Lawrence.' This report was based upon that of Mr. Sippell, our worthy superintending engineer, who expressed himself in the following more precise terms:—"The low water in the St. Lawrence River had no effect on the efficient working of this canal, which was supplied with the full draught of 9 feet on the sills throughout the year, except at the lower entrance, where there was a difficulty which has since been removed.'"

Now, before I leave this report, I want to say one word about the cost of the canal. I find that it is shown everywhere in the estimates that the cost of the north shore canals has been heavier than the cost of those on the south shore. Not only did the Beauharnois Canal cost less in price than the other canals in proportion, but the cost of maintenance has been a great deal less than on any other canal on the St. Lawrence or the Ottawa:

"On the 1st July, 1867, the entire cost amounted to $1,611,424, of which sum $22,783 were paid for dams at Valleyfield and Isle-aux-Chats, and $254,807 for damages by inundation of farms at Hungry Bay. Up to the same period (1st July, 1867,) the Lachine Canal had cost $2,587,552; the Cornwall Canal, $1,933,152; the Williamsburg Canals, $1,320,665. All these canals were constructed about the same time; and, with the exception of the Lachine and Williamsburg, they all met with nearly the same difficulties. The Williamsburg Canals happened to be singularly favoured by the great natural advantages presented by the river bank, which will account for the comparatively low cost of their construction."

Many years before the report of the present engineer was made, we find this:

"But the inferiority of the north shore as compared with the south, is still more forcibly exhibited in the opinion of Mr. Mills himself, who considers it to be impossible to construct by land a canal along the ravines or on the river bank."

That is a report of Mr. Monro. Mr. Mills favoured the construction on the north side for military considerations. Mr. Monro preferred the same side for other considerations, but there is an answer from Mr. Mills which replies to Mr. Monro beforehand:

"Above the Cedars, the banks are from twenty to thirty feet high, composed of clay, with some veins of sand, frequently sliding off in very large bodies, showing the destruction which would be consequent upon constructing a canal along or near its foot, or upon the top. Here also, below the Cedars, it would be impossible, with any reasonable expense, to maintain a canal, either upon or at the foot of the bank of the river, on account of the great bodies of it which frequenty slide into the ravine.

"Mr. Mills's friend (Mr. Wright) also observes: 'The shores are a formation of clay and loam, underlaid with quicksand, which occasions, yearly, very considerable slides: and a canal carried on such ground would be in great danger if anywhere near the river.'

"And Mr. Casey says: "With reference to the wash of the ravine, the canal will require cleaning out ten times oftener than the ravine, owing to the great additional depth and width."

As to the military aspect of the matter, I do not suppose that is serious, because I do not suppose we would expose the treasury of this country to be unloaded in order to prevent the construction of a canal for military reasons. The conclusions arrived at in this book are as follows:—

"When a heavy expenditure of the people's money is about to be made for public improvements—such, for instance, as for the enlargement of a canal already in good working order, or the construction of a new one instead—it becomes above all things necessary that even a suspicion of serving private interests should be removed. If the deepening of the bay at Valleyfield is found to present difficulties of a more serious nature than those discovered to exist in the proposed canal at the Cedars, let the points be established by engineers who have no local interests to serve. The people have too much confidence in the integrity of the present Government, and in the intelligence of its Parliament, to suppose for a moment that Mr. Baillairgé's report will be adopted by either one body or the other.

"If the survey of the localities in question be only entrusted to competent strangers, I have no fears for the result—it will be as it ever has been before, viz., that the south shore is the best, whether considered in point of economy or in reference to trade and navigation. The words of Mr. Killaly, as stated before the special committee in 1842, may be here repeated—and he spoke then having a perfect knowledge of the subject:—'I am convinced that if twice the number of engineers were to make surveys and reports upon the subject, no other conclusion can be come to than that which I firmly maintain, viz., that the line of canal on the south side now in progress is greatly superior in point of efficiency to any line on the north side.'"

Now, these were reports made before it was decided by the Government of Canada to construct the Beauharnois Canal. Nobody would venture to say that there was any consideration in that other than a consideration of public utility and of public policy. What has happened since to change the opinion of the engineers or the opinion of the Government of the country? Nothing that I know of, to explain the change which has been proposed. I asserted at the commencement of my remarks, that this had awakened the anxiety of the people in the County of Beauharnois, and of the navigators who will be called upon to navigate the River St. Lawrence and its canals. The mayor of Valleyfield, Mr. Sullivan, who is also an engineer, has taken it upon himself to analyze the report of Mr. Monro, upon which the Government, I suppose, have acted, because I do not know that they have acted on any other report. In a letter which he addressed to the Montreal *Star*, of which I will read only certain portions, he says that Mr. Monro's report requires to be examined and should not be too much relied upon. He said:

"Mr. Trudeau, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, began by saying, as will be seen by referring to his report, that 'to enlarge a canal and at the same time keep it open for navigation during summer months, is attended with grave difficulties, and that the building of structures in the winter season should be avoided.' In so far as the statement goes it is correct, but have not the other canals been enlarged, and at the same time kept open for navigation, and why not the Beauharnois, were it necessary? But it is not so, for, by building about four or five miles of a new channel, all trouble can be avoided and the locks concentrated in that distance, to be built at any season of the year, and the rest of the canal can be dredged out easily. And in these five miles I include a new branch of canal from the basin upwards, passing in rear of Valleyfield to Knight's Point, leaving the full power of the present canal to be utilized for hydraulic power by construct-

ing a guard lock about where the Canadian Atlantic Railway bridge crosses the canal.

"Mr. Trudeau next says, quoting from Mr. Monro's report, 'that to the ordinary difficulties to be met with in dealing with the Beauharnois Canal, whether by way of enlargement or by the construction of an entirely new work, there is superadded one which has been revealed by test borings, &c.'

"Referring to these borings made in the entrance to the canal and along the line of the canal to St. Timothy, Mr. Monro says: 'The general characteristic of the excavations may be described as consisting of layers of boulder stones and clay, overlaying what appears to be a mixture of quicksand and clay in varying proportions, &c.' And Mr. Monro adds: 'It may not be quicksand, but experiments made with this material proves that it does not stand at any slope, however flat, under water, &c.'

"Now I cannot understand by what freak of nature a layer of this substance has been placed along the line of the Beauharnois Canal, from St. Timothy westwards, and just in such a position that though this canal has been sunk to a depth of from ten to twelve feet, and vessels have been passing through it for over forty-five years, and dredging has been done in it on different occasions,—yet this wonderful material was never discovered or known to cause any trouble."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious point, if it is true. Here is a Government engineer saying there is quicksand, that it is impossible to dredge that place and to keep it at a certain depth, because it will fill up again. I said last year, and I repeat now, that a proper examination was not made. Men were sent there who were not engineers, men who were paid $2.50 a day, and who were picnicking there instead of doing their work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Where?

Mr. BERGERON. At the head of Valleyfield.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When?

Mr. BERGERON. When Mr. Monro's report was made, about two summers ago. Now, here is another engineer who says under his signature that it is true.

Mr. SCRIVER. Who has lived there all his life.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and who knows the Beauharnois Canal from beginning to end, who knows the character of the earth through which it runs, and who knows that there was hardly any dredging between Valleyfield and St. Timothy, where Mr. Monro says there is quicksand. I say if that is true, is it not enough to raise a doubt in the minds of the Government and to cause them to hesitate before expending six or seven million dollars? They ought to do what I asked them to do last year, that is, to employ three or four competent engineers to see whether Mr. Monro's report is correct. If they find it to be true, everybody will be satisfied; if it is not true, the Government of this country will have performed their duty towards the people of this country as guardians of the Dominion treasury.

Mr. LAURIER. And to the County of Beauharnois in particular.

Mr. BERGERON:

"But when we have to sink that canal four or five feet lower Mr. Monro makes out that it is of such a nature that he cannot calculate what the probable cost may be to make an entrance channel though it, but supposes, or guesses, perhaps, that it might cost a million and a quarter dollars.

"Mr. Monro says no test of actual construction or excavation has so far been made, but I wonder what he calls the Montreal Cotton Company's works, the paper mills, and hundreds of wells that have been sunk along the line of the Beauharnois Canal? And has not the Canada Atlantic Railway Company constructed one of the finest bridges that span the St. Lawrence from Coteau Landing to Clark's Island at Valleyfield, without ever experiencing any trouble from that wonderful substance, which I presume must be quicksilver—not quicksand—for Mr. Monro, says it may not be quicksand, and I know of no other material than quicksilver which will not stand at any slope, no matter how flat, under water, and that might be bulged up in the centre of the channel by weight on the sides. How is it no trouble is anticipated from that extraordinary material on the north shore, for it must exist there also, as Mr. Monro says it has doubtless caused the land slides which have taken place along the north shore of the St. Lawrence between Coteau Landing and the Cascades——"

The very same thing you heard a moment ago, when I was reading from engineers' reports of 1840 and 1845.—

"—just close by and parallel with the proposed new canal. Yet not even a hint is given of any dread of its causing trouble there, though it cannot be possible to claim as good a knowledge of the line to be excavated as exists with regard to the Beauharnois Canal.

"On the south shore there are not over ten or twelve square miles of land to be drained under the Beauharnois Canal, whereas on the north shore there are three rivers."

Now, here is a very important point in this discussion. There are three rivers to be interfered with, if I may say so, three rivers which flow into the St. Lawrence. Any hon. gentleman who may visit that place will find that the water is nearly on a level with the railway track which blocks up the River Delisle. Mr. Monro proposes, in his report, to construct immense tubes through which to carry the water underground about 25 feet and bring it up again, so that it may reach the St. Lawrence. If to-day the water floods the station and the whole village of Coteau, what will be the case when it has to go through that immense tunnel which will be crooked by its nature? I have heard competent men say that the idea was perfectly absurd, and that if the Government go into the work they will be obliged to stop it after spending a large amount of money, and after giving out contracts which will have to be cancelled. This is what Mr. Sullivan says:

"Mr. Monro calculates to drain one hundred and eighty square miles of territory, but I think he might add to that as much more as is drained on the south side altogether, and he would not be over the mark. And then there is the River Rouge, about half the width of the former, and the River à la Graisse to be passed under the canal to be built on the north shore, besides any other drains and watercourses there may be, but Mr. Monro calculates about the same cost for culverts on each side, if I understand him correctly."

Now, Mr. Speaker, to show you how this report of Mr. Monro has been made, he calculates that it is going to cost no more money to drain these three rivers, one of which drains a land surface of 180 square miles, than it has cost on the south shore for culverts and drains which have been made and paid for, and ground and damages which have been settled. Does not that show that this report ought to be examined by competent engineers to see whether it is correct? I do not ask for anything improper, I only ask that before we go to such an expenditure we may be sure of what we are doing.

"On the Beauharnois Canal the deepest cutting does not exceed twenty feet, whereas on the north shore a depth of over thirty-four feet will have to be sunk on the very first mile, being the full depth of water required, more than the greatest depth on the south shore, and a great part of this is solid rock. The right of way for the Beauharnois Canal is owned by the Government in great part, and any that would be required for enlargement would be but a strip entailing no damages more than the actual value of the land, with the exception of that part from the basin up to Knight's Point, should that line be adopted, but even there the right of way would be

required along a line that could be purchased at a very moderate price: I would say about thirty-five thousand dollars, for which amount I would venture the purchase. On the north shore, there is a valuable church to be demolished on the very outstart, and then there are orchards and a nursery, before you come to Mr. Beaudet's mill privilege, which I understand has been arranged for at forty thousand dollars, if I am rightly informed, and this on the one-sixth part of the length of the canal, so that I am of opinion, when the right of way is obtained and all expenses attending it paid, Mr. Monro's estimate will be more than probably doubled, if it does not be trebled.

"Along the Beauharnois Canal, the buildings exist for superintendent, lockmen, &c., which is a considerable item, and there is the stone in the locks, with the advantage that all the material required for the reconstruction of the canal can be laid down on the spot without any cartage."

There are along the Beauharnois Canal three or four stone quarries from which have been taken all the stone necessary for the construction of the present canal, and where an unlimited quantity may yet be obtained very easily for enlarging or deepening the canal. Mr. Monro says:

"If the canal be built on the north shore the Beauharnois Canal could then be utilized for hydraulic power, but Mr. Monro knows well that by building the new line in rear of Valleyfield, from the basin to Knight's Point, and above referred to, the full power of the canal could be utilized with a water head of over twenty feet, thus giving all the advantages to be derived from the canal on the north shore, without the very great disadvantage of leaving a useless canal as a burden on the Government, entailing a considerable yearly expenditure without any return, but more probably claims for damages."

Now, I may say here that we do not look upon it from that point of view; we look upon it as a work of a higher importance. We have already to-day at Valleyfield water power for ten or fifteen factories, and it is useless to offer as a reason for taking away the canal, that the people can have water power to any amount, because they have already got as much as they can utilize.—

"Mr. Monro says the entrance from Lake St. Francis to the proposed north shore canal would be in a convenient, safe and easily approached bay—Macdonald's Bay.

This is a point to which I call the hon. Minister's attention. This is an engineer's report, and I will at a later stage read the opinions of navigators in regard to entering Soulanges Canal with a south-west wind.—

"Here very little ice forms.

There is no ice there because there is too much current. We can imagine what the position would be of a tow boat with eight or ten barges when there is too much current to allow the ice to take.—

"As to the latter statement he is right, as its being at the very head of the rapids, no ice forms in such places, but so soon as structures are built to still the water the case will be quite different, and its being so near to the head of the rapids will greatly increase the risk of vessels approaching, particularly in westerly or north-westerly winds, being blown down them. Mr. Monro says the westerly crossing to the Beauharnois Canal is one of danger, in the face of the fact that vessels have been crossing there since the canal was built, about forty-six years or over, without any accidents ever having happened. The only danger on the south side is of vessels being blown ashore, but on the north they would be blown down the rapids. Which would be the worst? Mr. Monro says the canal on the north shore will avoid the double crossing of the river above and below the three rapids; well, that might be a plausible reason if it shortened the distance, but Mr. Monro knows well enough that it does not, but much the contrary, for the Beauharnois route is over a mile the shorter, and when a vessel has to go to the centre of the stream it does not matter which side she crosses to after, and Mr. Monro knows also that the channel from the foot of the Beauharnois Canal to the first lightship in Lake St. Louis is the deepest and safest that can be had. There are shoals on the north shore line that will have to be dredged and that may always be a source of danger, whereas the Beauharnois route is almost a straight line, and I would wish to ask the Board of Trade and all persons concerned in the St. Lawrence navigation, how they approve of lengthening the distance between Montreal and all points west of Beauharnois by two miles on the round trip, but Mr. Monro does not say anything of this in his report.

"Mr. Monro says that the experience of several years shows that the formation of ice is certainly no greater a barrier to navigation on the north than on the south shore of the eastern entrance of the canal. Well, as to that statement, the writer of this can say that in the spring of the year 1888 he was commissioned by the Valleyfield Town Council to report on the state of the ice on both the north and the south shores, that is to say, at the entrance of the proposed new canal at the foot of the Cascade Rapids, and at the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal from Lake St. Louis, when having visited and examined on both sides he found that the steamer *Bohemian* had passed through the Beauharnois Canal to Montreal in the latter part of April, and made her return trip again, whereas what is called the Bruët du Loup was found on the 11th of May to be a solid island of ice completely blocking navigation on the north shore, and three days later, on the 14th, it had not yet floated off, the truth of which statement can be verified by Captain Baker, of the *Bohemian*, and by Mr. Plante, then mayor of Valleyfield, and Mr. Baker, mayor of Beauharnois, besides several others who visited the localities with the writer."

This is a known fact, it cannot be denied: I do not know how an engineer of renown, a man who wants to maintain his reputation, could make any such statement. It is well known by every one living near Beauharnois that the ice leaves the foot of the Beauharnois Canal about three weeks before it leaves the foot of the Cascades, where it is proposed to locate the entrance to the new Soulanges Canal.

"It is a well-known fact that what is called the Bruët du Loup is an island of ice that forms each winter at the foot of the Cascades, between the waters of the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa, grounding into the bottom, and completely blocking navigation in that direction, until the waters of the Ottawa rise high enough to float it off after the rays of the sun have lightened the top part, as is well known to captains of vessels passing up and down in spring time. And it will be easy for the Government to verify this fact next spring, by sending disinterested persons to the locality.

This is a good time to find out. The Government should send down engineers and ascertain whether the report of Mr. Monro or the statement of Mr. Sullivan is correct, and to find out where the ice lies, and he will then know whether it was on the south or the north side of the river.—

"It will doubtless be said that I am an interested party and that what I state should be taken *cum grano salis*,"—

That is stated by Mr. Sullivan, as he is mayor of Valleyfield.—

—"but that is just what I want, as I am stating facts, and I want them to be taken for what they are worth and no more. All we ask for in this district, and we believe we are only asking what the country desires, is that the whole subject be submitted to an independent and impartial commission of engineers, to decide which is the most favourable route, before millions of money be spent in building a new canal, taking from people along the old one their acquired rights, and leaving that canal as a useless burden on the country, and the people along it in particular; and, at the same time, needlessly destroying forever between seven hundred and a thousand acres of as fine land as is in the country, which alone would represent a capital of half a million dollars annihilated.

"A glance at Mr. Monro's estimates is sufficient to show what reliance may be placed on them when making a comparison of the probable cost of a canal on either side. When the building of six or seven culverts on Beauharnois Canal, draining about ten or twelve square miles of territory, can be estimated to cost as much as the culverts on the Soulanges Canal, draining about twenty-five times the area, an idea can be formed of the balance of the estimates."

Mr. Sullivan further says:

"With regard to the entrance channel there is not a man in Valleyfield who is not satisfied that Mr. Monro's estimate is too high, and that the quicksand theory is a farce, in as far as having the effect ascribed to it by Mr. Monro. I will ask any man of common sense if he can believe, or if he does not think it absurd, even admitting there were quicksand in some places, that it would have any such effect as ascribed to it by Mr. Monro on a channel three hundred feet wide, or that it could possibly bulged up in the centre of the canal from weight on the sides. Before terminating, I wish to say a word about a remark made by Mr. Monro in his report regarding the payment of over $400,000 for damages on account of the construction of the dam at Valleyfield. Now, Mr. Monro should know that all damages, past, present and future, have been paid for on the Beauharnois Canal, and the splendid water powers created by that dam remain and are a source of revenue to the Government, paying a pretty fair interest on the capital spent. And I will ask Mr. Monro or any other person who has visited the cotton factory, the paper mills, the water works at Valleyfield, if the money spent on that dam was not one of the best investments ever made by the Government for the country? What return can the Government ever get for damages that it will surely have to pay for on the north shore?"

We know that all these damages on the south shore have been paid, that every claim has been settled; and if the Government were going to deepen the canal, half the expense would be saved, because the only outlay involved would be that for construction. But in regard to the Soulanges Canal on the north shore we shall be called upon not only to pay for construction, but for all land and other damages, and I know what they are, for during the last 15 years I have heard this question of damages caused to the people by the construction of the Beauharnois Canal. The Treasury Board should know that very nearly $400,000 have been paid as actual damages caused by the construction of that canal. But the amount has been paid, it cannot be called for again, while the construction of a canal on the north side would involve claims for damages about twenty-five times as great, since the area to be drained is about thirty-five times greater than that drained by the canal on the south shore. I stated I would read opinions from some navigators, and I have such opinions here. I will read them and give the names of these people and the number of years they have been navigating, and I think that, although we are not engineers we pride ourselves on being men of common sense, and we will admit that those who have been navigating there for years, some as long as 48 years, ought to know something about the locality. I have the following statement:—

"We, the undersigned, from long experience in navigating the St. Lawrence, are of opinion that it is a great mistake on the part of the Government to build a new canal on the north side of the River St. Lawrence, through the County of Soulanges, instead of deepening the present Beauharnois Canal, as we feel certain there will be many causes of delay to shipping on the north side that do not happen on the south.

"We know—notwithstanding what engineers may say to the contrary—that the large field of ice which accumulates at the foot of the Cascades, particularly in severe winters, will always be a cause of delay to the opening of navigation. This field of ice is known around the locality under the name of the 'Bruët du Loup' and is the cause of the delay each spring in putting off the lightships on Lake St. Louis, as can be proven by referring to the date of the placing these lights.

"The captains and pilots of Kingston can prove that they have often made two and three trips through the Beauharnois Canal, with tows of barges, before these lights could be put up, as well as we the undersigned have often done. It is also well known that the entrances of the Beauharnois Canal are easier of access than what they can possibly be made on the north shore, more particularly in fog and smoky weather, which often lasts for months on Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis. There will always be danger in such times, particularly at night, to enter the Soulanges Canal from Lake St. Francis, on account of the strong current and proximity to the head of the rapids, and on account of the counter currents and the reefs at the Cascades, and it will be dangerous to pass tows of barges, so that it will be found—when too late—that vessels will have to lie up at great loss and delay to shippers. Vessels now can leave the foot of the Beauharnois Canal at any hour and steer by compass as the channel is not less than half a mile wide and from twenty-five to over fifty feet in depth, and the current is an advantage without being much of hindrance on the return trip, as advantage is taken of the stillest water. This channel is a straight one for over twelve miles to the first lightship on Lake St. Louis.

"There is also a straight course of fifteen miles to make the western entrance to the Beauharnois Canal, and notwithstanding anything that may have been stated by engineers to the contrary, we consider it one of the easiest entrances to be made, with tows of barges, of any of the canals on the St. Lawrence. We are of opinion that the surest way for the Government to act in this matter, is to submit the question to an uninterested staff of engineers and a delegation of captains and pilots, before commencing actual work on the new canal.

Capt. Julien Martin,	Valleyfield,	28	years	navigator.
Capt. Timothée Hébert,	"	16	"	"
Capt. Zéphirin Monette,	"	18	"	"
Capt. Narcisse Gamelin,	"	47	"	"
Capt. Louis Sauvé,	"	10	"	"
Capt. Etienne Lebœuf,	"	6	"	"
Capt. Alexandre Hébert,	"	19	"	"
Capt. Adélard Monette,	"	18	"	"
Capt. Léon Leduc,	"	18	"	"
Capt. Michel Lefevre,	"	48	"	"
Capt. Jos. Archambault,	"	9	"	"
Capt. Alfred Corbeil,	"	18	"	"
Capt. George Hurteau,	"	25	"	"
Capt. Joseph Lalonde,	"	21	"	"
Capt. H. Boyer,	"	26	"	"
Capt. M. Bissonnette,	"	27	"	"
Capt. L. Archambault,	"	20	"	"
Capt. Thos. Hénault,	"	20	"	"
Capt. Etienne Adams,	"	24	"	"
Capt. Alfred Delisle,	"	25	"	"
Capt. Jules Lalonde,	"	12	"	"
Capt. Julien Lalonde,	"	35	"	"
Capt. Alf. de Repentigny,	"	17	"	"
Fred. Robinson, Pilot,	"	15	"	"
Paul Bourgie, Pilot,	"	18	"	"
Pierre Lalonde, Capt.	"	12	"	"
Célestin Lebœuf, Capt.,	"	17	"	"
Edward Robinson, Pilot,	"	18	"	"
Louis Benoit, Capt.,	"	18	"	"
M. Robinault, Capt. & Pilot,	"	24	"	"
Emmanuel Leduc, Capt.	"	19	"	"
Joseph O. A. Leduc, Capt.,	"	10	"	"
Damase Latour, Capt.,	"	18	"	"
Maxime Lefebvre, Capt.,	"	18	"	"
Etienne Boivin, Capt.,	"	17	"	"
Octave Ladéroute, Capt.,	"	17	"	"

These are gentlemen who have been navigating the waters of that part of the country. They are respectable men, men who have no interest but those of navigating, and I think that although there is a question of engineering involved, it would be no lowering the dignity of the engineers if they accepted the recommendations of men like these whose names I have given. There was a meeting of the Board of Trade in Toronto when this matter was discussed, and a resolution was presented there signed by a number of navigators, most of whom come from Kingston, which is the great inland maritime port of Ontario. This is what these gentlemen say:

"We, the undersigned masters of vessels, captains and pilots, interested in the navigation of the St. Lawrence River, have learned with surprise and regret that the Dominion Government have decided on building a new channel on the north shore to be called the Soulanges Canal, instead of deepening and enlarging the Beauharnois Canal; and it is our firm conviction that the construction of the said canal will be often a cause of serious delay and danger to navigation.

"From experience we know that the Beauharnois route is at least two miles, on the round trip, shorter than any line that can be had on the north shore, and it is the straightest that can be had between Lake St. Francis and

Lake St. Louis deep water channels. We further know that the course from Lake St. Francis to the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal is a straight course which we can steer by compass even in foggy or smoky weather, particularly if extended to Knight's Point in rear of Valleyfield, which we can never do to make an entrance on the north shore, on account of the proximity of the entrance to the head of the rapids.

"The eastern entrance to the Beauharnois Canal is in a straight line from the first lightship on Lake St. Louis, a distance of over 12 miles where the channel is nearly half a mile wide all through and from 25 to 50 feet deep.

"Whereas on the north side the channel will be a crooked one through reefs and shoals, where there are eddies and counter currents, which will make it very difficult to pass with tows, and impossible to steer in foggy or smoky weather, which often lasts for months on these lakes.

"This we are certain will often be a cause of serious delay to shippers.

"We can also state that we have known two and three trips to have been made through the Beauharnois Canal, from Kingston to Montreal, before the lightships could be placed on Lake St. Louis, on account of the large field of ice which remains on the north shore and blocks what will be the entrance to the Soulanges Canal.

"We know also that errors have been committed in the construction of the Cornwall and the Galops Canals, and for that reason we would urge on the Dominion Government to submit the matter to an independent staff of engineers, or to such an engineer as Mr. Walter Shanly, before they commence the construction of the Soulanges Canal."

I have sent to each member of the House a copy of the plans of the Beauharnois Canal on the north shore. It was reported by the engineers last year that they were building the canal on the north shore to make it a straight canal, but any gentleman can see from the plan that the line which comes from Valleyfield to Knight's Point, would make the Beauharnois Canal straighter than the Soulanges Canal, which latter makes half of the circle. This is what these gentlemen refer to when they say that it is a straighter canal than the other side. These gentlemen confirm in this document the opinions which I have read from the navigators of Valleyfield and the County of Beauharnois and I will give the names signed to this petition as a protest against the construction of the Soulanges Canal. The names are as follows:—

"W. Lesslie, Manager Collins Bay Rafting Co.
"Thos. Murphy, Pilot.
"Jos. Murray, Master and Pilot.
"Wm. Scott, Master.
"J. A. McDonald, Master and Pilot.
"O. Patenaude, Master and Pilot.
"Wm. R. Taylor, Master Mariner.
"A. Dunlop, Master Mariner.
"Wm. Corrigan, Pilot.
"John J. Martin, Master and Pilot.
"Charles Martin, Master and Pilot.
"James Martin, Master and Pilot.
"James Murray, Master and Pilot.
"Alexander Milligan, Master Mariner
"Edward A. Booth, Master Mariner.
"Michel Kenady, Master and Pilot.
"Thos. Collins, Master and Pilot.
"P. J. McGrath, Master and Pilot.
"Peter McGlode, Master and Pilot.
"Ephrem Martin, Master and Pilot.
"David Lefave, Master and Pilot.
"Horatio Smith, Master Mariner.
"A. H. Malone, Master prop. *D. D. Calvin*,
"John Ferguson, Master Mariner.
"Joseph Achei, Master Mariner.
"Luke O'Reily, Master Mariner.
"William Scott, Master and Pilot.
"John Doyle, Master and Pilot.
"Michael Murray, Master and Pilot.
"Ozee Lantier, Master and Pilot.
"Wm. Simmonds, Master Mariner,
"John Saunders, Master Mariner.
"Wm. Daley, Master Mariner.
"Samuel Anderson, Master Mariner."

These are most of the navigators, either masters or pilots, who sail on that part of the river, and they are very much interested in having a short canal, and a canal on which there will be no danger to their lives or property. Now, to show that the ice leaves the south shore much sooner than the north shore, I will read the following affidavit:—

"We, the undersigned, living at Melocheville, declare by these presents that we have observed each spring the breaking up of the ice at the foot of the Beauharnois Canal on the south shore as well as at the foot of the Cascades on the north shore of the river. After these observations we certify that the Beauharnois Canal at the entrance and the foot is invariably free of ice at least fifteen days before the breaking up of the ice on the north side of the river at the foot of the Cascades; and that in case the Government should construct on the north side the projected canal called the Soulanges Canal, it would happen that the opening of this canal in the spring would only take place fifteen days after the opening of the Beauharnois canal. We make this declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true."

This is signed by Frédéric Monarque, a pilot for 45 years; Théodule Daulst, a pilot for 22 years; Hormidas Monarque, a pilot for 10 years; Edmond Groulx, a pilot for 9 years; David Lalonde, a pilot for 24 years; Toussaint Patenaude, a pilot for 12 years; Félix Robineault, a pilot for 16 years; Antoine Monpetit, a pilot for 10 years; Capt. J. Sullivan, a pilot for 24 years; L. Abel Patenaude, a pilot for 16 years. I know most of the pilots, and I know them to be all honourable men, who for no consideration would say this unless they believed it to be true and in the public interest. I said at the commencement of my remarks that some people had talked about this canal project being brought forward for election purposes. I say I do not believe that, because it seems to me that the Government were as much interested in keeping the support of Beauharnois County as in gaining that of Soulanges.

Some hon. MEMBERS. They had that already.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, I do not suppose the late Premier would have been willing to sacrifice me in order to gain another supporter. As a matter of fact, Soulanges county was lost in spite of the canal, and I carried my county by over 300 majority. Therefore, I do not believe that the election had anything to do with the canal. Afterwards, tenders were called for, though I see that there is some flaw in them, and the contract is not yet granted. During the last local election an old farmer in my county said to me: "It is perfectly foolish to call for these tenders: the people here do not believe in them, because—I speak as a farmer for thirty years—we never commence to dig a ditch at the top, and the fact that the Government are calling for tenders to begin work at the head of the canal shows that they are not very serious about it." Now, *Le Moniteur du Commerce*, on the 22nd of January, 1892, published the following editorial:—

"A USEFUL UNDERTAKING.

"If we are well informed, the Government has at last decided to build the Soulanges Canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, between a point near Macdonald's Point and another point not far away from Vaudreuil. This new canal will be 14 ft. deep, and, if we are to believe the lake navigators, it will be at once useful and economical and will complete to advantage the St. Lawrence system which unites the lower part of the river and the sea with the upper portion.

"This work ought to have been undertaken long ago, and when the question of extending our relations with the west and the ports of our great lakes came up, this undertaking ought to have come uppermost in the public mind.

"But nothing equals perseverance accompanied by a patriotic spirit. When he was a member, Mr. J. Bain devoted all his energies to the solution of the problem

which interested the commercial world in England and the United States as well as in Canada, and, to-day, the question has taken a most promising aspect.

"In April, 1890, a lengthy memorial on the subject was submitted to the Prime Minister of Canada, Sir John A. Macdonald. The authorities were at once struck with its importance, as is the case with all questions of public interest: but, to continue the parallel, it met with opposition arising from different motives, which delayed its execution.

"The above-mentioned memorial showed the advantage derived from the Soulanges Canal, which would do away with the risks and dangers of the actual journey from the St. Francis Lake Channel and the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal: if this work be executed, vessels, when leaving that channel, on the north of the river, will have but a small distance to go over before reaching the locks, and that in an almost straight line. This is a great advantage, the value of which will not escape any one interested in the lake navigation and in the extension of the traffic on the port of Montreal. Freight rates will be materially reduced owing to the lessening of the risks and the shortening of the trip. It is equally to be noted that the two ends of the Soulanges Canal offer vessels natural harbours which, at certain seasons of the year, will be most welcome to them.

"Everything being taken into consideration, this enterprise can be carried out at a less cost than the building of almost any other canal, as the character of the soil vastly diminishes the amount of work to be done.

"We will not mention here the local advantages accruing to the region through which this canal will run; nobody entertains any doubt about them.

"Any undertaking which has for its object to develop our resources is worthy of the approbation of the commercial world."

The man who wrote this knew a great deal less than the engineer who made the report; and many of his statements are not true. Everyone knows that the Beauharnois Canal is at least a mile shorter than the one contemplated, and that the latter will not lessen the cost of transport. On the 12th of February, 1892, *Le Moniteur du Commerce* published an answer to this article, as follows:—

"Editorial Note.—With a view to giving justice to all parties interested, and considering the importance of the questions involved, we think it our duty to publish the following letter. The whole trade of the Dominion and more particularly that of the port of Montreal, are concerned in this matter of the St. Lawrence Canals. Our article of the 22nd of January last was based on documents sent us by reliable persons of the county of Soulanges.

"Mr. EDITOR,—In your issue of the 22nd of January last, I was surprised to see an article entitled: 'A useful undertaking.'

"I would beg leave to write a few lines in your next issue so as to give some small scraps of information to the author of the article referred to.

"After having seriously gone into the subject I am led to think that, if the writer had no personal interest in the building of the canal in Soulanges, it was only his ignorance of facts and places which could make him write such a letter, or else he got his information from parties interested in the enterprise. The above-mentioned article says: 'If we are correctly informed, the Government has decided to build, at last, the Soulanges Canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence between a point near Macdonald's Point and another not far away from Vaudreuil.'

"Allow me to say that this point so very near Vaudreuil is, on the contrary, as far from it as it could possibly be, lying, as it does, at the foot of the Cascades.

"As to the question of economy, the enclosed plan will settle that by showing you that the canal by the north shore will lengthen the journey by 2 miles a trip more than would the Beauharnois Canal. Now, regarding the advantages which are said to be derived from the building of the Soulanges Canal, I leave you to judge of them in giving you the opinion of the pilots and captains of Kingston—an opinion which was expressed before a meeting of the members of the Canadian marine in Toronto, on the 3rd instant:

"'We, the undersigned captains and pilots, have learned with deep surprise and regret of the decision of the Government respecting the Soulanges Canal. Being perfectly acquainted with the river, we are unanimous in thinking that the canal by the north shore will never give as much satisfaction as the Beauharnois one.

"'First, this canal would make the trip two miles longer.

"'Secondly, on foggy or smoky weather, it will be impossible to effect an entrance by the west of the canal without running the risk of running ashore or being drifted into the rapids, whilst it is easy to reach the canal by the south shore in a direct line, by means of the compass.

"'Thirdly, the east entrance of the Soulanges Canal being situated at the foot of the Cascades, a place noted for its whirlpools, under-currents and shoals, and where the channel is narrow and crooked, it will be impossible to reach it by night or in foggy weather, with tugs towing barges behind them. On the contrary, by the south side, any one can leave the foot of the canal at any time, at night or day, a straight course of over 12 miles in length, half a mile in breadth and from 25 to 50 feet in depth stretching before him.

"'The Cornwall and Galops Canals give us a sad example of the errors which can be committed by engineers of reputed capacity: and, however, these errors fall into insignificance compared with the blunders we can foretell in relation with the construction of the Soulanges Canal.'

"Hoping that you will find a place for these few remarks in your interesting paper and thanking you, Mr. Editor, for your kindness, I beg leave to subscribe myself,

"Your obedient servant,

(Sd.) "J. H. SULLIVAN,

"*Mayor of Valleyfield.*"

I do not think I shall detain the House any longer. Every hon. gentleman here will understand the position which I occupy in this matter, and I want immediately to make everybody aware that it is not at all for the sake of getting votes or simply for the sake of the county I represent, that I make these remarks. It is simply on public grounds. I am convinced that the building of a canal on the north shore is an expenditure which we cannot know the end of. On the south shore we have already a beautiful canal, which every navigator says is the best equipped and the best managed of any canal on the St. Lawrence. There has never been any washing of the water as in the case of the Cornwall Canal or of the upper canals in Ontario. This canal is built through the centre of the farms, it is deep; it is well built in good, solid land. Everything connected with it on each side is in good condition, and the Government possesses 50 or 60 feet of land on each side of it. All the culverts are in first-class order, and all the other structures are in the best condition. The Beauharnois Canal costs less every year, as we can see by the blue-books, and it is the best in the whole system of canals on the St. Lawrence. The plan which I have put in the hands of every member, shows that the Beauharnois Canal, by a very small expenditure at Valleyfield, can be made shorter than the Soulanges Canal. It seems to me—I am not an engineer, but speaking from a common sense standpoint—that common sense should come into the consideration of this public work. Is it possible to believe that the building of a 15 miles canal in new land, where you have to arrange for the crossing of three natural rivers and where you have to pay for all the land you take, can cost less than it would to enlarge the Beauharnois Canal? I can hardly believe that any engineer could say so. Last year I asked what I think was very simple and very reasonable, that, before the Government pledged itself to an expenditure of six or seven millions on this new canal, it should put the report of Mr. Monro before the engineers of this country. I do not say that I have no confidence in Mr. Monro, but I think that, if there were a board of engineers before whom his reports could be examined and scrutinized and where people could express their opinions, the Soulanges Canal would not be built on the north shore, but the Beauharnois Canal would be enlarged and deepened. I heard before to-day a discussion dur

ing this session in reference to the deepening of canals. I did not take any part in that discussion because, after hearing the Minister, I thought whatever I could say would not amount to anything; but, if we are to use the beautiful system of canals we have and are to deepen them to 15 or 16 feet, I think we should do that without sacrificing the property we already possess.

Mr. BAIN (Soulanges). Mr. Speaker I have heard with pleasure the remarks of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) on the motion he has placed in your hands. He says that this question has not received the consideration it deserved. He must have forgotton that for a great number of years this question has been before the public. Even in the first days of the colony, the French made their canals on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and later on the English Government enlarged those canals. In 1834 Mr. Mills made a report favourable to the north shore, and after adopting the policy of enlarging the canals to 12 feet, the Government ordered surveys to be made. Mr. Baillairgé, the engineer, made surveys in 1872, 1873 and 1874, and made a report showing that the canal could be built on the north shore at less expense than the enlargement of the Beauharnois Canal would cost, though, of course, the depth was at that time intended to be 12 feet and not 14 feet. Since then, the difficulties as to enlarging the Beauharnois Canal have become greater, and the advantages of the north shore increased in proportion. After 1872 the Government thought fit not to continue as rapidly as was proposed the enlargement of the canals, because they were then engaged in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which swallowed up a considerable part of the resources at the disposal of the Government, and, therefore, that question was left in abeyance till lately. In 1888 I asked the late Hon. Mr. Pope, then Minister of Railways and Canals, if he would be good enough to order a survey to be made on both sides of the river so as to determine on which side the canal could be most conveniently and cheaply constructed. He told me then that as soon as the Welland Canal was completed he would send the engineer in charge of that canal to make an examination. This engineer was a gentleman of great experience, one who had been eighteen years on that canal, and who knew all that could be known with regard to the enlargement of canals to a depth of 14 feet. My hon. friend from Beauharnois says this question has not received the consideration of any other engineer but Mr. Monro. I may say that the late Mr. Page, who was then Engineer-in-Chief of Canals, gave it his most serious attention, and he was favourable to the construction of the canal on the north side. Moreover, the present Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals, Mr. Trudeau, who is also a distinguished engineer, and a very careful one, has given his approbation to the reports of Mr. Monro. Not only that, but last year, when a discussion took place in this House, my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence, who was then acting Minister of Railways and Canals, told this House that Mr. Shanly, the engineer, had spoken to him and told him that he highly approved of the project of constructing the canal on the north shore. This question, as my hon. friend says, is not a sectional one. It is not a question whether that canal should be constructed in the County of Soulanges or the County of Beauharnois; but it is a national question of the greatest importance, because it is of the greatest importance that our waterways should be constructed with all the improvements that it is possible to make in our inland navigation. This subject has not been sprung upon the Government, as has been intimated, but they have considered it during a great number of years. Mr. Monro made reports in 1889, 1890 and 1891, and it was only after careful consideration that the Government decided to construct the canal on the north shore. One of the reasons for constructing it on the north shore is that it is cheaper to construct a new canal than to enlarge the old one. Mr. Monro, in his report to Mr. Page, says with regard to the enlargement of the Welland Canal:

"As a matter of fact, the experience of other canals has induced you to adopt the principle, wherever at all practicable, of taking an entirely new route for enlargement. As for example that selected for the Welland Canal between Thorold and Allanburg."

My hon. friend from Beauharnois said that a canal on the north shore would be longer than one on the south shore. In the first place I may say that the advantage of constructing the canal on the north shore is, firstly, that it is in a straight course with the line of navigation, because the deep water channel is on the north shore of Lake St. Francis. The distance to the entrance of the canal would be only 800 feet from the shore, whilst to enter the Beauharnois Canal an artificial channel would have to be made one mile and three-quarters long from the deep-water channel to the entrance at Valleyfield, at a cost estimated by Mr. Monro of from $850,000 to $1,250,000, because the bottom of that channel is composed of boulder and clay, and underlying that is a bed of quicksand which will allow of no slope whatever. Not only does Mr. Monro say this, but his report is concurred in by Mr. Trudeau, the Chief Engineer of Canals. He says:

"To the ordinary difficulties to be met in dealing with the Beauharnois Canal, whether by way of enlargement or by the construction of an entirely new work, there is superadded one which has been revealed by test borings, a large number of which have been made in order to ascertain the nature of the material to be excavated.

"Referring to the borings made in the line of the channel at the Valleyfield entrance and also along a line surveyed to Knight's Point to the westward of the present entrance, as well as in the Beauharnois Canal itself as far as St. Timothy, Mr. Monro says:

"The general character of the excavation may be described as consisting of layers of boulder stones and clay overlying what appears to be a mixture of quicksand and clay in varying proportion."

Mr. Sullivan in his letter says that Mr. Monro does not know whether that substance is quicksand or not. It may be silt; but at any rate experienced engineers say that it will not allow of any slope. Mr. Trudeau goes on to say:

"In many cases the drill after penetrating with difficulty the crust of boulders, stones, &c., went down freely to a depth of about 25 feet below low water mark, showing a soft and unreliable bottom. Experiments made with this material proved that it does not stand at any slope, however flat, under water. To attempt its removal to the depth required to obtain a channel suitable for a 14 feet navigation in such a position, would be a formidable if not impracticable undertaking. The amount which would certainly slide in from the sides could not be even conjecturally estimated, whilst it might prove impossible to maintain the required depth at any cost. To keep vessels off the contiguous shoals in heavy weather, it would be advisable to protect the side of the channel with piles on cribwork backed up by the excavation from the cut—but

the cost of such a plan could not be approximately estimated.

"An element of uncertainty is thus introduced, the effects of which in working on the basis of a 14 feet navigation it would be impossible to forecast. It must be noted that no test of actual construction or excavation has so far been made, the height of water requisite to enable vessels to approach the present Valleyfield entrance having been secured by the construction of dams closing the south channel of the river and thereby raising the level of the water above; an operation which entailed the payment of compensation for flooded lands to the extent of over $40,000."

Now, with regard to this artificial channel, Mr. Page, who had a perfect knowledge of our inland navigation, says in his report of 1880, speaking about a depth of 12 feet:

"At periods of low water, or indeed at any other time, vessels drawing twelve feet of water, as contemplated for the enlarged scale of navigation, could not cross Port Louis Flats. Consequently the north channel must be used for at least two miles below McKee's Point, where a course may be steered of fully six miles towards the light situated about one and one-third miles above the head of Beauharnois Canal.

"From opposite Grosse Point to within about 2,000 feet of the canal entrance (a distance of one and one-third miles), the present channel is in many places narrow, intricate and difficult to navigate, even by the class of vessels now used.

"This locality, it may be stated, is open to the sweep of westerly winds, hence the waterway, to be all times serviceable, should be nearly straight, or at all events have flat, easy curves, and be from 250 to 300 feet wide, and have a depth of not less than from thirteen and a half to fourteen feet at low water mark."

Now, suppose that vessels had to navigate that narrow channel across the lake with a full sweep of wind; both Mr. Monro and Mr. Page say that in such circumstances the danger to our navigation would be very great indeed; whilst on the north shore vessels have a free channel and can immediately enter the canal. Moreover, at the other end of the canal, at Melocheville, the bottom is altogether rock, and the whole excavation would have to be made in rock. Moreover, no possible harbour can be made at the foot of the Beauharnois Canal, because the bottom is solid rock, and therefore cribs would have to be constructed to secure vessels in a storm. Mr. Monro in his report says:

"The entrance from Lake St. Louis is formed by two short piers, and affords but scanty accommodation for vessels and barges, the north pier being only 536 feet in length, whilst the southern pier is crooked and is built for the most part on rock in very shallow water. The bottom of the channel leading to the entrance lock is rock with only about 10 feet of water over it at low stages of the lake. It is, therefore, evident that the present works would be of little, if any, service in the formation of a harbour suitable to the wants of navigation on the scale now contemplated."

On the north shore the harbour of Coteau Landing is one of the best harbours at the entrance of any canal in Canada. With respect to this harbour Mr. Trudeau says:

"The western entrance to the proposed north side canal would be in a convenient, safe and easily approached bay—Macdonald's Bay.

"At this western entrance very little ice forms.

"The eastern terminus would also be favourably situated. The material to be excavated is mainly clay, and the engineering difficulties to be met with are few and of no serious character. The experience of several years has shown that the formation of ice is certainly no greater barrier to navigation at this eastern entrance (the Cascades) than it is on the opposite south shore at the eastern entrance of the present Beauharnois Canal."

Mr. Baillairgé in his report of 1874 says:

"The harbour of Coteau Landing, a short distance above McIntyre's Point, is sheltered from the north, north-easterly and north-westerly winds: these only could affect the navigation at the upper entrance of the projected Cedars Canal or could drift into the rapids vessels proceeding eastward to or westward from its entrance.

"It is capacious and offers good anchorage, the bottom consisting of clay and gravel."

With respect to the question of ice at that point, Cascades Bay, which will be the eastern entrance to the canal, Mr. Monro in his report says:

"The question of ice at this entrance was discussed in my previous report. Careful observations——"

And Mr. Monro has been there since 1889——

have been made of its movement for the last two seasons, which in the main corroborate the views previously expressed. About the time of the opening of the Beauharnois Canal this year, there was a good channel to the north of Cascades Point. Its position is shown on the general plan. From all that has been learned on this subject, it is safe to say that the open season at the Cascades is at least as long as that on the south side of the river at the lower entrance to the Beauharnois Canal."

But I have another authority. In 1873, Capt. DeWitt, who was one of the most experienced navigators on the lakes, was asked several questions, and his answers were to this effect:

"Question No. 1—Have you been engaged in the navigation on Lake St. Louis, between Lachine and Cascades, and between Lachine and the eastern entrance of the Beauharnois Canal, and during what time and in what capacity? Could you tell from your experience in that navigation, at what time was the port of Cascades opened and closed?

"Answer—I have been engaged in navigation on Lake St. Louis, between Lachine and Cascades and between Lachine and the eastern entrance of the Beauharnois Canal, and other places on Lake St. Louis, at first in 1842, and afterwards from 1845 to 1853 inclusive, as master of steamers. The time of opening and closing of navigation at the different ports varied according to the severity or mildness of the weather in fall and spring. I have (in 1846) commenced running between Lachine and Cascades about the middle of the month of April (and could have commenced earlier had our boats been ready). Generally before the 1st May, and have run as late in the fall as 17th December (in 1848).

"Question No. 2—Did you ever remark that it was opened in the spring and closed in the fall unusually late or early?

"Answer—Yes, as I have stated in my answer to question No. 1, but never was opened late.

"Question No. 3—Did you ever remark anything particular?

"Answer—No, except that ice remained on the shoals until the north water from the Ottawa River (*eau du nord*) rose and flooded it off. But I never found the ice to obstruct the channel after I could effect a landing at Lachine from Chateauguay, where our boats were usually wintered. The shoals referred to in no way interfered with the channel, which is broad and deep.

"Question No. 4—Did you ever carry the mails for the mail company to Cascades because the Beauharnois Canal was closed with ice?

"Answer—Yes: at the opening of navigation on Lake St. Louis during several seasons before the opening of the Beauharnois Canal.

"Question No. 5—Do you consider, from your experience, the Cascades Bay as a good and safe harbour, with deep water and safe anchorage?

"Answer—I do.

"Question No. 6—Do you consider the channel leading from Cascades Bay to Lake St. Louis as good, broad and safe?

"Answer—I do.

"Question No. 12—Did you remark the action of the ice at the eastern end of the Beauharnois Canal and at the western extremity, and what did you observe?

"Answer—The ice which accumulates on the shoals below Cascades Bay, commonly called '*Le Bruët du Loup*,' is, I consider, caused by the accumulation of anchor ice formed by the congealing of the water when the temperature of the atmosphere is highly rarified and necessarily when passing down the outlet west of or above '*Isle-aux Chevaux*'—lodges on the shoals east of Cascades Bay, but the deep water or channel is not any more affected by this

ice than any other part of Lake St. Louis; therefore, I believe, after thirty years' experience, that the best site or location for a canal is decidedly the north side of the St. Lawrence. I firmly believe that, with a canal on the north side of the St. Lawrence, the season of navigation would be at least two weeks longer than at present."

Now, my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) spoke about fogs, and let me call his attention to what Mr. Baillairgé in his report says with regard to fogs:

"Fogs are prevalent towards the latter part of September and beginning of October, and arise chiefly with the north-east and north-west winds. They seldom cause any serious detention on the north shore, as they are generally driven towards the south shore by the winds with which they arise. They are of very rare occurrence with south or south-easterly winds, because these winds are too warm to condense the moisture of the atmosphere."

Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact, that when the river is foggy, vessels coming down Lake St. Francis have to stop at the mouth of the Cornwall Canal until the fog clears up. Mr. Monro in his report says:

"From all I have been able to learn from those practically engaged in the St. Lawrence navigation, it appears to be the almost unanimous opinion of captains and pilots, that the canal between Lakes St. Louis and St. Francis should be constructed on the north shore, largely on account of the manifest advantage of placing its western entrance at Macdonald's Point in the position proposed, where the head of the canal can be made with ease in the heaviest weather; and once fairly in, there would be no difficulty in descending to the level of Lake St. Louis, with all convenient speed and safety. The locks at the Cascades end being in a straight line, it will doubtless be found practicable to introduce the cable towing system at this place, and thus lessen the danger of accident to the gates, which so frequently occurs when vessels are permitted to use their own steam in such a position. It is to be remarked that, towards the west, about half of the whole length of the canal is a straight line, while the curve around the bend at Cotean du Lac is of such large radius as to offer no obstruction to the rapid transit of vessels."

Another point which is in favour of the canal on the north shore is that it would be built in a much shorter time, and with less expense than the Beauharnois Canal could be enlarged at, because the work could be prosecuted both summer and winter, while, as everybody knows, the enlargement of existing canals can only be done in winter and any work of that kind that is done during winter is not sound, and is of great danger to navigation. Mr. Trudeau in his report says:

"To enlarge the canal and at the same time to keep it open to navigation during the summer months is attended with grave difficulties.

"The building of structures in the winter season should be avoided if possible. It would be preferable and less costly, in most cases, to build an entirely separate work."

According to all the eminent authorities, the canal on the north shore will cost a great deal less money than would a canal on the south shore. The calculations made by Mr. Monro and his staff of engineers, show that this would be the case, and that the difference in the cost of the work would be very considerable. It is as follows:—

"The cost of a channel of approach suitable to vessels 14 feet draught, and of the works necessary to protect it from slides, is estimated, so far as any estimate can be formed when dealing with so uncertain a material as quicksand, at from $850,000 to $1,250,000, and this must be added to the cost of the canal. The cost, serious as it would be, is, however, only secondary to the more important question of the practicability of constructing such a channel and works under the circumstances.

"The estimated cost of the works on the north and south shores, respectively, according to the most approved routes, is as follows:—

(1.)—Seven lock line through Valleyfield	$4,450,000
Conjectured cost of making a channel from entrance to deep water, Lake St. Francis	1,250,000
	$5,700,000
South Side.	
(2.)—Seven lock line with terminus at Knight's Point. (Two routes, each utilizing the central portion of the existing canal for a distance of about 8½ miles)	$4,000,000
Conjectured cost of making a channel from Knight's Point to deep water, Lake St. Francis	850,000
	$5,450,000
North Shore.	
Seven lock line including purchase of land for right of way, &c.	$4,350,000

Another point on which my hon. friend from Beauharnois dwelt to a certain extent was, that with a canal on the Beauharnois side, the navigation would open earlier and close later than with a canal on the Soulanges side of the river. Well, I have examined the reports of the Public Works and the Railways and Canals Departments from 1846 to 1887, and I find that the Beauharnois Canal has lost 291 days as compared with the Cornwall Canal. Moreover, we have got some data in the report of Mr. Baillairgé which were obtained from the Chateauguay Navigation Company, and these data show as follows:—

Arrival of Steamboat at Cascades.		Opening of Navigation at foot of Beauharnois Canal.	
1846	13th April	1846	16th April
1847	20th "	1847	5th May
1848	10th "	1848	12th April
1849	11th "	1849	19th "
1850	24th "	1850	26th "
1851	15th "	1851	25th "
1852	30th "	1852	2nd May
1853	23rd "	1853	29th April

It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that since a few years, and especially since this question has been prominently before the public, the town of Valleyfield, or some persons there, have obtained a boat to try and break the ice each spring at the head of the Beauharnois Canal. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) in his remarks spoke with regard to the question of national defence in the construction of the canal which I consider a question of great importance. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the day will never come when it will be necessary for us to take up arms against our neighbours on the other side of the line, and I hope that we will never have to suffer such a great calamity. Nevertheless, it is said that the best way to have peace is to be prepared for war, and in this connection it is of the greatest importance that our line of navigation should be completed on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. My hon. friend says: What would a matter of three miles do to prevent our friends from the other side coming over? If those three miles consisted of prairie or solid ground there might be some reason in that, but as it is three miles of water it makes a great difference. Nevertheless, it would be a great advantage to us to have our line of communication in such a position that it would never be cut off, and the only way of preventing that is by building the line on the north shore. Why, Sir, in the United States the construction of the Niagara ship canal is advocated at a cost of $24,000,000, and the great argument for it is the question of national defence. As it is cheaper to carry freight in large vessels than in small ones, and as the tendency of the day is to enlarge vessels, I

believe it would be good policy to construct the canal where it would cost least to enlarge it when necessary. At present we are not prepared as a country to grant the amount necessary for the work, but I have no doubt that the time will come before long when it will be necessary to deepen our canals to a depth of 18 or 20 feet. In a memorandum which I presented to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in 1890, I said :

"As it is cheaper to carry freight in large vessels than in smaller ones, and as the tendency is to enlarge vessels continually, it would be good policy to prepare for the future wants of the country : and as it will probably be necessary to enlarge and deepen our canals to 18 feet before 25 years, the canal should be constructed where it would be possible to do do that work for the least outlay."

My hon. friend said that they do not want any more water powers on the other side of the river, but I believe the construction of the canal on the north shore would not add materially to the country's debt, because the Beauharnois Canal could always be used for water powers, and instead of being a burden on the country, it would become a source of revenue. Mr. Monro, the engineer, has made plans with regard to the development of those water powers, and he says :

"Although my instructions from Mr. Page were to investigate this question of the St. Louis and St. Francis canal, mainly, if not exclusively, from an engineering standpoint ; still I may be permitted to say in conclusion that looking to the inevitable result that if the north shore canal is built of the enlarged dimensions, the present Beauharnois Canal will in a short time be of little or no further use in connection with the through navigation ; still its great capacity of development for hydraulic power especially towards the western end, would, if properly utilized, doubtless result in this canal ceasing to be a charge upon the public revenue, somewhat in the manner suggested in the numerously signed memorial sent to me recently for report."

This question, as I said before, has been agitated for a number of years, and in 1873 petitions were sent to the Government by a number of the principal merchants, forwarders, vessel owners and marine insurance agents of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and other cities of the Dominion, and also from the boards of trade of Montreal, Toronto and St. John, in favour of constructing the canal on the north shore. As the railway system of the North-West will certainly centre at Port Arthur, I believe the products, not only of our own North-West, but also of the American North-West, will come down the St. Lawrence ; and I believe that the Government should do everything in their power to improve the navigation of that river by every possible means. The St. Lawrence route, being more northerly and therefore colder than the route *viâ* the Erie Canal to New York, will always enjoy the preference of the carrying trade of both the American and the Canadian North-West. My hon. friend read a letter from Mr. Sullivan, whom he calls an engineer. I do not know whether he is an engineer or not. I have known him as a land surveyor only, and a great many land surveyors style themselves engineers. I do not believe, however, that this gentleman has ever constructed any canals, and, therefore, I do not see how he can know a great deal about them. Mr. Sullivan in his letter says the culverts and the bridges on the Beauharnois Canal could be used on a new canal. There is only one culvert that could be used ; the others would have to be destroyed. Besides, in enlarging the Beauharnois Canal, the culverts could not be built in winter, when it is impossible to make good masonry, but would have to be constructed at great cost to the country in April before navigation opens. Mr. Sullivan also says in his letter that the bridges on the Beauharnois Canal could be used because the locks would be of the same width as formerly. Well, if he were an engineer he would know that a lock which is 45 feet wide at the bottom must gradually be made larger towards the top, and, therefore, a bridge which would be sufficiently long for a canal 10 feet deep would not do for a canal 16 or 18 feet deep. Mr. Sullivan further says that Mr. Monro estimates the cost of the culverts on the Beauharnois side to be the same as those on the Soulanges side. Mr. Monro estimates the cost of the culverts and bridges on the Beauharnois side at $215,000 and on the Soulanges side at $150,000, a difference of $65,000 in favour of Soulanges ; but in that estimate the question of culverts on the River Delisle is not mentioned. In the same letter Mr. Sullivan says that there would be three rivers to cross. He has never been in that section, or he would know that there is only one river to cross : that is the Delisle, the Rouge is only a creek, and La Graisse is only an inlet. Mr. Sullivan thinks it is a costly work to pass over the River Delisle ; but that section has been let, and it does not cost much more than a section where there is no river. The only gain from an engineering point of view that would be made in enlarging the Beauharnois Canal, is that an excavation of 900,000 square yards would be avoided ; but when we come to consider that all the work done there would have to be undone and rebuilt again, it certainly would be cheaper to construct a new canal altogether. Now there is another question of which he speaks in his letter, and that is in regard to the rock on both sides. He says there is more rock in Soulanges. It is not so ; there are 205,000 yards on the Soulanges side and 339,000 yards on the Beauharnois side, making a difference of 134,000 yards in favour of Soulanges. Mr. Monro in his report says that :

"The diversion to Knight's Point involves so large an expenditure that an estimate has also been made of the enlargement following the present canal to its head, and deepening and widening the channel through Valleyfield ; also continuing a channel one and three-quarter miles to deep water. This line is objectionable in many respects, and as will be seen will cost about as much as that *viâ* Knight's Point. It appears therefore that there are no good reasons why it should be adopted."

Mr. Sullivan in his letter also speaks of the lengthening of the canal. The length of both canals is the same. The Beauharnois Canal is 12 miles long, but with the addition of 1¾ miles of subaqueous canal it would be 13¾ miles long, while the canal on the north shore would be the same length. It being nearly six o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons copies of documents relating to the negotiations at the conference recently held at Washington between the delegates from the Canadian Government and the Secretary of State of the United States, respecting the extension and development of trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and other matters.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE.
OTTAWA, 16th March, 1892.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.55 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 17th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADIAN WHITE PINE.

Mr. IVES. With the consent of the House, I would like to move:

That an Order of the House do issue to the Director of the Geological Survey of Canada, for a map of Canada showing the areas of white pine timber, respectively, now standing, and that the map be laid upon the Table of the House for the information of members.

I only ask to move this with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the Rules should not be violated, even with the unanimous consent of the House, unless there is some special reason why it should be done.

Mr. IVES. There is a special reason which I will explain. I have a motion on the paper with reference to the export duty on logs, and it is very important that this information which I ask for, and expect to obtain by this map, should be laid before the members of the House before the motion comes down.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not object to what the hon. gentleman asks, but we are only in the early part of the session, and I think it better to follow the usual course.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. BOWELL. With the consent of the House, I desire to submit a motion that certain members be added to the Standing Committees. I do this for the reason that the list is about being printed, and it will be well to have it as complete as possible. A number of new members were not placed on any committee, and in order to remedy this omission and with a view to make other changes suggested, I submit the following motion with the approval of the leader of the Opposition :—

That the following members be added to the Select Standing Committees :—Banking and Commerce : Messrs. Bain (Soulanges), Bowell, Turcotte, Carling, Dyer and Baird ; Standing Orders : Messrs. Bain (Soulanges), Dyer ; Public Accounts : Messrs. McGregor and McKay ; Agriculture and Colonization : Messrs. McGregor, Turcotte, Carling and Dyer; Printing : Mr. Sutherland ; Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines : Messrs. Bennett, Turcotte, Carling and Baird ; Miscellaneous Private Bills : Mr. Bennett ; Expiring Laws : Mr. Bennett.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 27) further to amend the North-West Territories Act. He said : The Bill which I have the honour to introduce deals with two subjects : one, that of duality of language in the North-West Territories, and the other the subject of education. The question of the languages, or of the duality of language in the North-West Territories, was very fully discussed in this House two sessions ago, and, as hon. gentlemen who were members of the House in that session, and who are still here, will remember, it ended in a compromise resolution, which was passed at the instance of the Government and acquiesced in by the great body of gentlemen, I do not think by all those constituting the Opposition. That compromise I did not accede to, nor do I now think it was a wise one. It may have been, perhaps, a political necessity, but I do not think that in the interests of the country it was a wise and judicious result. Before that time, the law was, and had been since 1877, that the French language as well as the English should be official in four different matters. That is, it was permissible either to use English or French in the debates of the Assembly which was constituted for the North-West : it was compulsory that the proceedings of the Assembly should be recorded in both languages ; it was permissible to use both languages in the courts ; and it was compulsory that the North-West Legislative Council, as it then was, should publish the ordinances they passed from time to time in both the languages. The compromise which was agreed to, and to which I have already made reference, provided that after the then coming and since happening election in the North-West the councillors for the North-West should have power to say how their proceedings should be conducted, and they should have authority to declare that the proceedings of the Assembly might be recorded in either one or both languages, but so far as the courts were concerned, and so far as the publication of the laws were concerned, the old provision remained. So that, although I do not think it is generally understood throughout the country, if there is an evil in the preservation or in the permission granted, or rather in the compulsion placed on the people of the North-West to use the two languages, that evil still exists. I did not complain, I do not know anybody complained, of the fact that members of the Legislative Assembly might speak in both languages or either language, or in any language. That was a matter, I think, which might be left to the Assembly itself. What I did complain of, and what those who thought as I did felt to be wrong, was that in the North-West Territories it was made compulsory on the people to adopt the two languages ; in other words, that the French language should stand, so far as the North-West Territories were concerned, on a par with the English language. I do not intend to do more than briefly state the history of this question, which will enable the House fully to understand it ; and I need only address those members who were not present two years ago, in regard to this double language question. In the early days in the French province, now the province of Quebec, there was the right claimed, and I do not think it was an unreasonable right, by the gentlemen elected to the Legislative Council of that province, to speak in their own language. It was impossible for them, probably, to speak in English or any other language, and the request was conceded, not as a matter of law but of right, to address their fellow members in their own language. I repeat that that appears to have not been at all an objectionable request. But the difficulty that

arose from that proceeding led in 1840—and I do not desire at this stage of the discussion to introduce anything of a controversial character, remembering the rebuke administered to me on the last occasion by the leader of the Opposition—to the perpetuation of race distinctions which unfortunately, owing to circumstances, existed in Canada. In 1841, in the Bill uniting the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada the French language was prohibited. That Act remained in force for six or seven years when its repeal took place in England, on the petition of the Parliament of Old Canada, and then again the French language became permissive. At the time of Confederation an Act was passed which declared that the French language should stand, so far as this Parliament was concerned and in the matters referred to in the statutes and in the courts of Canada, on an equality with the English language; and so the law stood in the Province of Quebec. But that law did not extend to the Province of Ontario, and, of course, it had no reference to the Province of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, nor did that law apply to the Province of Prince Edward Island when it became part of the confederacy, nor to the Province of British Columbia. It was, however, unfortunately as I venture to think, made a part of the law of the Province of Manitoba when a constitution was granted to that part of the North-West, and in 1877, when an amendment took place to the North-West Territories Act, it was made compulsory also in the North-West Territories. And so it remained without question until I had the honour to bring the matter before the House a session or two ago, when, after a long and rather acrimonious discussion, the compromise was arrived at to which I have referred. Now that promise was not carried into law until last year, but in the North-West Territories Act of last session, when very enlarged powers were granted to the people of the Territories, this particular provision to which I refer was enacted and is now to be found on the statute. The proposition is to eliminate that, to repeal that clause, and that is all, Sir, that I can say in order to make perfectly plain what the object of the Bill is with regard to the duality of languages. I have mentioned that it deals also with the subject of education. Now, the genius of our constitution is: that the subject of education belongs to the Local Governments, the provincial bodies. That is the general scheme of the British North America Act, and it is upon that basis that province after province which has been added to the Dominion, has been entrusted with the absolute and exclusive control of legislative matters. But between the old provinces of Canada there was an arrangement come to at the time of Confederation, by which, as we all know, separate school privileges were made perpetual so far as the constitution could make it perpetual upon the people of the Province of Ontario. I am not dealing with that question in the slightest degree. Of course we all know that this Parliament has no power to deal with it. It is an Imperial Act which this Parliament has no power to alter, change, or amend. But, when in 1875, the constitution was first conferred upon the North-West Territories, there was a clause with regard to education engrafted in that constitution. It is peculiar in this way: that it is not to be found in any other of our statutes or constitutions, and it enacted as follows:—

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education; but it shall therein always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the territories, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics may establish separate schools therein."

That, the House will perceive, confers upon the majority of every particular locality the right to determine what the school is to be. The language is very wide indeed:

"May establish such schools that they think fit."

Then the minority, no matter how small, may put up a rival separate school in any locality whether that minority be composed of Roman Catholics or Protestants, and they are free from the necessity or obligation of supporting a general school. I venture to say—and I do so, of course, merely speaking for myself and with no desire to raise a controversy—that no more mischievous provision is to be found in any Act of Parliament. If there is any part of the Dominion where schools ought to be not separate,—I am not desiring now to raise the question which divides us upon that point, I am merely speaking with reference to the sparseness of population in the North-West—it is in the North-West Territories. It seems to be an exceedingly unfortunate provision where there is a small population, that there is a provision made for two schools, one of the majority, and one of the minority. I contend that if there is any part of the Dominion where that provision ought not to be compulsory, it is in the North-West Territories. Now, we added very largely to the powers of the North-West Territories in the last session of this Parliament. We have conferred upon them, I think I am right in saying, almost every power that the ordinary constitution confers upon Provincial Legislatures. We have not given them power to amend their own constitution; we did not give them power to borrow money; we did not give them power to manage or to sell the public lands, nor was the power conferred upon that body for the establishment or maintenance of hospitals and so on, but there were enormous powers conferred upon them—power of direct taxation, power towards the establishment of territorial offices, and the appointment and payment of territorial officers, the establishment and maintenance of prisons and municipal institutions, in the territories; power to impose licenses for shops, saloons, taverns, and auctioneers and incorporation fees and so on, power to solemnize marriage in the territories, and power over territorial and civil rights. You will, therefore, see that we added very largely to their powers, but we did not enlarge their powers nor did Parliament remove the restriction with regard to education. That was left untouched. Now the proposition is to confer upon that body the power to deal with education as that body may see fit, not by any means to say there shall not be separate schools, not to interfere with them in that sense, but to see that the legislative assemblies of the territories upon whom we have conferred every other power that can be conferred upon legislative assemblies, may deal with the matter of education, as they are competent to decide other matters. These are the provisions which I desire to see incorporated in the law, and therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Denison, for leave to introduce this Bill. I may add one word further. It is with

some regret that I intrude this question upon the House at this time. I quite see, Mr. Speaker, that the proper opportunity to press these amendments would have been during the last session of Parliament when the subject of the added power to the constitution was conferred upon the North-West Territories. I can only say in excuse for not pressing it then, that I was not here at the time the Bill was before the House, and when I left the country on other business connected with my profession —because when I left there was practically no Government—I had every reason to believe that nothing would be done during the session, except to pass the Supply Bill and prorogue Parliament. I was assured when I got to London; I was assured by the High Commissioner, that he understood also that no further business would be done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the High Commissioner speak for the Government?

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, I think that he had some information. He gave me to understand that my opinion was correct about the business of the House. He gave me to understand that that was the programme, and I thought so myself when I left here, and he corroborated my opinion. However that may be, while I would prefer that this question would not come up session after session, notwithstanding, I had thought that no great mischief had been done by the delay because the language question was not at all before the last session of Parliament. This Parliament has in no way practically pronounced upon it, and the question of education was brought to the notice of the House last session by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), as I learned from the reading of the debates, with a protest and an intimation that at an early date it would be brought before Parliament: so that I do not think much harm has been done by the delay of one session.

Mr. LARIVIERE. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that this question should have been raised once more in the House by the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. McCarthy). He is only following the course that he has adopted in the past, and perhaps he is only pleasing the friends who have retained him in a case which is similar to the one that we have now before the House. We know very well that some trouble is now pending in the Province of Manitoba upon this very same question. That trouble has been raised in the province by the visit of the hon. gentleman at a time when the question was not before the people at all. Following the same course, the hon. gentleman, though having nothing to do with the representation of the North-West in this House, much less than I have, because I am much nearer the people who are affected by the legislation that he complains of—is again trying to raise this question of religious and national feeling. We have already settled that question. Two years ago it was brought before the House, and the legislation of last session was the result of what the hon. gentleman has termed a compromise. It was a compromise, and it should be treated as such. What was abandoned at that time as one of the rights of the people of the North-West was abandoned as a compromise, so that the question should remain at rest for all time to come. It was decided then that we should give to the North-West Council the liberty of deciding whether their proceedings should be conducted in one or both of the two languages which were then official. We know what has since been done by the majority of that council who do not understand the French: that language has been abolished. When this question is raised it is always contended that though certain privileges may be granted to the French-speaking population of the Province of Quebec and the Catholics of that province, those privileges should not be extended to the rest of the Catholic or the French population of the Dominion of Canada. When it is stated that the privileges which exist in the Province of Quebec do not exist elsewhere, I answer that when the Confederation Act was entered into, those privileges were well guarded on behalf of the French and Catholic population of the Dominion. Have we not the two languages in this Parliament? Are not the Dominion laws printed in both languages? And is not that in pursuance of the arrangement entered into at the time of Confederation? Why should we refuse to the handful of French people in the North-West the same privileges as those enjoyed by the French-Canadians of the Province of Quebec? Why should not both populations be treated alike? We have two leading languages in this Dominion: why should they not both be placed on the same footing? Does it injure anyone that I speak French or that I get the laws of the country printed in my mother tongue? Should we disregard rights and privileges for the sake of a few dollars and cents? But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the reason at all. The reason is that certain gentlemen, certain parties, wish to excite public feeling in some parts of the Dominion: because they have nothing else by which to raise themselves above the level of the common people, they adopt the ways of the demagogue, in the hope of making themselves appear to be of some consequence.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FORTIFICATIONS AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. PRIOR asked, 1. Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the discussion that took place in the British House of Commons, a few days ago, in regard to the fortifications that are proposed to be built at Esquimalt, British Columbia? 2. Is it a fact that the Imperial Government have signified their willingness to supply the guns and plans of fortifications, and that the Canadian Government is asked to build the fortifications and to supply the men for taking care of and manning the guns? 3. Is it a fact that the Canadian Government has refused to erect the fortifications? 4. In case the Canadian Government has not absolutely refused to build the fortifications, is it their intention to shortly ask Parliament for a sum with which to erect the said fortifications?

Mr. BOWELL. The subject-matter of this question is now receiving the consideration of the Government. The information, therefore, asked for must be considered for the present confidential.

POST OFFICE AT STADACONA.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to open a post office in the village of Stadacona, in the district of Quebec?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. member, I have the honour to say that an application was made to the department for the opening of a post office at Stadacona in 1889. The result of the enquiry then made by the Department in order to ascertain whether a post office was necessary at that place, was not such as to justify the opening of such an office; but the Government is now making a new enquiry, the result of which may be more favourable.

POSTMASTER AT CAPE ST. IGNACE STATION.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Why has the Government not yet appointed a postmaster for the office opened at Cape St. Ignace Station? Does the Government intend to appoint one in the future?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. member I must state that the post office at St. Ignace has not been opened for the reason that according to the representations made to the department there appears to be a difference of opinion as to the necessity of opening a post office at that place.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Am I to understand that the Government refuses now to open a post office at the station?

CLAIMS OF NORTH-WEST SETTLERS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether any satisfactory settlement of the difficulties that existed between the settlers on the Walrond Ranch Company's territory and the settlers thereon, as intimated by the Minister of the Interior in his reply to charges preferred against the company last session, as follows:—"Where persons got these large tracts of land for ranching purposes, it has been found that when settlement comes in a different policy has to be pursued, and now that this country is being opened up by railway both north and south of Calgary and that settlement is likely to rush in there, I believe a change will have to be made shortly in that respect, and I trust it will be made in sufficient time to do justice to the two young men whose cases were specially brought before the House by the member for Wellington." If no satisfactory settlement has been made with those settlers that have claims and were rejected by the company, why not?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The case to which this question refers is no doubt the case of the Dunbar family, who are settlers on the Walrond Ranch. The father of the family, as the hon. gentleman is aware, having been a settler before any lease was issued, obtained his homestead. The dispute is as to a claim made by two sons of Mr. Robert Dunbar. An effort was made after the last session of Parliament to bring about a settlement between the leaseholders and the Dunbars, but the terms demanded by the latter were so exorbitant as to render the negotiations abortive. Negotiations are now going on, and are making satisfactory progress, in the direction of making such arrangements as will enable the Government to grant homesteads to actual settlers on all ranching leases. When these are satisfactorily completed the Dunbars will be dealt with in the same way as other settlers.

Mr. FREMONT.

GEAR AND TACKLE INSPECTOR.

Mr. LEPINE (for Mr. CURRAN) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint an inspector of gear and tackle on vessels in the port of Montreal before the opening of navigation?

Mr. TUPPER. The Act under which such an appointment can take place comes into force on the 1st April. The Government will probably clothe one of the existing officers with the power of inspecting gear and tackle in addition to his ordinary duties.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would ask the leader of the House whether his attention had been called to a cablegram dated the 9th March and purporting to report a speech of Sir Charles Tupper before the London Chamber of Commerce, in which he is reported to have said:

"It would not be long before the people of Canada would show their loyalty to the integrity of the British Empire by striking the United States a vital blow in return."

I would ask if, in making this statement, the High Commissioner of Canada foreshadowed the policy or had the concurrence of the Government of Canada?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course we have read the telegram in the paper, and we were satisfied that the High Commissioner had not made such a statement. I saw a telegram from the High Commissioner a short time ago in which he said that, if any such statement were reported to to have been made by him, it was erroneous, as he had not made any such statement at all.

THE SOULANGES CANAL.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Mr. Bergeron for:

Copies of engineers' reports which led to the building of the Beauharnois Canal; of engineers' reports in favour of the building of the Soulanges Canal, and of reports, letters, &c., from engineers, masters or pilots, objecting to the building of the canal at Soulanges.

Mr. BAIN. Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock yesterday evening I was speaking on Mr. Sullivan's letter which the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) had quoted in regard to the length of the Soulanges Canal. Mr. Sullivan also said that there was no quicksand at the bottom of that artificial channel, because none was found on the line of the canal during the excavation. Well, the gentleman who was employed to make the borings, and who has had great experience in this kind of work, found the quicksand, and found it before the depth required for the deepening of the channel to Valleyfield. On the north shore the quicksand is found at a depth of from 80 to 100 feet, but the great question raised by my hon. friend was in regard of the ice. On that, Mr. Monro, who has been residing in the county since January, 1889, and has had every opportunity of observing that important question matter, says in his report:

"In the discussions which have taken place with reference to the suitability or otherwise of the Cascades Point for an entrance to a large canal, considerable prominence has been given to the question of the time at which the ice disappears from there in the spring, as compared with the date of its departure from the foot of the Beauharnois Canal. The most conflicting evidence is given on

this point, some persons alleging that navigation opens earlier on the north shore, while others as unhesitatingly affirm that the ice is clear from the south side a fortnight earlier than from the north shore. From what I can learn, and have observed, it appears that the time for its leaving from either side is so variable that both parties may be right if they found their conclusions on particular seasons. It is, however, quite certain that when there was a navigation to Cascades wharf, the records between 1846 and 1853 showed that steamers arrived there in each of those years earlier than the opening out of the channel to the foot of the Beauharnois Canal."

"This statement is corroborated by a large amount of evidence apparently trustworthy. It appears also certain that in severe winters anchor ice grounds on and around the shoals which lie between the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa off Cascades Point, and remains there until some time after the main channel is clear. The dates at which those ice fields leave are various and uncertain, but their presence does not seem to interfere with a deep water channel of entrance to the canal, as will be seen on examining its position as laid down on the map. This spring, I carefully observed the movement of the ice on both sides of the river. It cleared from the lower entrance of the Beauharnois Canal about the 10th of April, and from the Ottawa opposite Cascades Point about ten days later. On the 15th April, a steamer broke through the ice at Valleyfield in order to get into the head of the Beauharnois Canal; and there is no doubt that an entrance could have been effected to the foot of the Old Cascades Canal by similar means at the same date, the ice in both places being very rotten. My investigation of this question leads me to the conclusion that as regards the time of opening or closing of navigation on either side of the river, the western entrance to the Beauharnois Canal would naturally freeze up earlier and remain blocked later than either one side or the other at the lower end, where the ice would move out with the spring rise of the river; whereas it is firmly held in the area of still water created by the dams at Clark's Island and Valleyfield.

"It also appears as if no rule could be arrived at as to the probable movements of the ice where the causes of its formation, the fluctuation of the water, the direction of the currents of the river, &c., are ever varying. The phenomena of no two winters are alike, but there appears to be no reason why a canal constructed on the north shore of the St. Lawrence in the position proposed should remain closed by ice after the usual period of the commencement of navigation; whilst it is probable that the current created at the foot of such a large channel by the continued discharge of water from it would have a great tendency to keep the lower entrance clear."

Now, the point which my hon. friend tried to make was, that the whole right of way on the other side had been bought and would cost hardly anything, whilst the whole right of way would have to be bought on the north shore. Mr. Sullivan, in that celebrated letter, says that the right of way will be very expensive because a very expensive church has to be bought. Now, the fact is that that church has already been bought and paid for; the whole cost of that church, together with a large lot of land and all the property belonging to the church, have been bought and paid for by the Government at a cost of $7,000. Now, another point was raised with regard to the mill of Mr. Beaudette, which was estimated to cost about $40,000. I am sure, Sir, that half that money, even less than half, would buy that mill, but if the canal was made on the south side from the foot of the Beauharnois Canal, it would leave the Melocheville mill in the same position as Mr. Beaudette's mill. I contend that the Beauharnois Canal could not be deepened. The Beauharnois Canal is partly in the ground and is partly constructed with banks. The banks might be elevated and made higher; but it is to be remembered that the bank on one side of the canal would have to be destroyed. Every one acquainted with canals which are constructed by means of banks, are aware of the dangers attending navigation on account of leaks, and the breaking of the banks on the sides of the canal. Now, on the Soulanges Canal the whole canal will be in the ground, and there will be no necessity for any banks at all; so there will be no danger with regard to the breaking of the banks, and consequently no leaks and no damages done to the farmers of the surrounding country. Now, another contention of Mr. Sullivan was that there is an abundance of stone on the Beauharnois side, and that it would not be necessary to bring it from a distance. Well, I may say that the stone there is worth nothing except for rip-rap along the canal, and that all the stone for the enlargement and construction of a new canal on the other side would have to be brought from a distance; the same as for the north shore canal. But there is another question to be considered. If, as is the opinion of a certain number of men who are interested in the trade and navigation of this country, it will be necessary to deepen our canals before many years to a depth of 20 feet, that would be impossible on the Beauharnois side except by the construction of an artificial channel three miles long, which would have to be made across Lake St. Francis so as to obtain a 20-foot navigation. The channel necessary to obtain a 14-foot navigation would be only one and three-quarters of a mile long, but to obtain a 20-foot navigation the channel would have to be three miles long, at least. In the letter of this Mr. Sullivan, who is the authority which my hon. friend from Beauharnois cited all through his speech, that gentleman says that the canal does not terminate at Vaudreuil. Well, if that gentleman was acquainted with the country, he would know that this canal terminates in the County of Vaudreuil. He has also given us letters from captains, pilots, &c. Well, these men are captains and pilots of small vessels, and a great many of them live near Valleyfield and are interested, I suppose, in any kind of canals. They have never navigated the large class of vessels which will be used in the future when our canals are deepened to 14 feet. All the arguments of my hon. friend were based upon a pamphlet, which was prepared by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), who was born in Beauharnois, and to whom the people of Beauharnois applied for a defence after Mr. Lanthier, who had taken a great deal of interest in this question, had written a pamphlet. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who was not a member then, wrote a pamphlet in answer to that one; but as he is not an engineer, I consider the pamphlet is not worth the opinion of the distinguished engineers who have studied the subject for many years. My hon. friend said something about election stories. Well, I have heard some of those election stories myself, and I can assure the House that they were very far from being true. This canal question was decided by the Government before the election of 1891, and after it had been decided, I was defeated. I also saw in the papers that a great number of men had been employed this year in the County of Soulanges during the election. Now, no more men were employed than were necessary, and than are usually employed, but the Government engineers thought that they should continue the test pits so as to be able to give out contracts for other sections of the canal; and a few test pits were made. It was easier to make them in winter than in summer on account of the ground being frozen, as it was not necessary to prop up the sides

of these test pits. I may say, in summing up my arguments, that the advantages of the Soulanges Canal are, that it would be in a straight course with the line of navigation; that it would follow the deep water channel on the north side; that it would save the crossing from the north side channel of Lake St. Francis, to the head of Valleyfield, across the lake and from Molacheville to Lachine; and that on the north side the harbours are better. Moreover, a canal constructed on the north shore would be cheaper and safer, and better adapted to the wants of our future navigation, because it could be deepened at a less cost than on the other side. Moreover, it would not be subject to the danger attending navigation in the enlargement of canals, such as has been the case on the Cornwall Canal, and other canals which have been deepened and enlarged. This question, Mr. Speaker, was decided after very long and careful consideration by the Government; it was decided after several reports had been made by eminent engineers, and I think that no better conclusion could have been arrived at than the one they embodied in their report. I hope that the Government will complete, with the least possible delay, the enlargement of our canals, which are of vital interest to the trade and commerce of the country, and that before long we will have a 14-foot navigation from the lakes to the city of Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. There can be no possible objection to bringing down all the papers and reports of engineers on the interesting subject of the motion moved by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). That was one of the first questions that were mooted when I came to this House about 20 years ago. The hon. gentleman then representing the County of Soulanges used to get up nearly every session and make an argument in favour of a canal through his county running to the Cascades. We have had innumerable petitions to the department from persons interested in the canal, from nearly all the mariners in the country, from the Boards of Trade of Montreal and Kingston, and places that are most interested in the carrying trade of the St. Lawrence—all advocating the line which has been adopted by the Government. The objections which were made by the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to the location of the canal, I think principally centre in two or three points. One of them is, that the port of entrance on the north shore of the St. Lawrence is not so good for the purpose as the one on the south shore,—Valleyfield. The surveys of our engineers show that the channel between Prescott and Montreal follows the north shore, and for all purposes of navigation the entrance on the north shore is far better than that at Valleyfield. This is the case for two or three reasons. One of them is that as the channel follows the north shore a vessel has to cross from the neighbourhood of Coteau direct to Valleyfield in order to effect entrance to the Beauharnois Canal, and in some seasons of the year when the wind is in certain directions and very boisterous, it is perhaps a little dangerous. Another objection is that according to surveys, which the member for Beauharnois says have not been completed, it is almost impossible to secure 14 feet navigation at the entrance into Valleyfield. The reason is set out by the engineers in a report read by the member for Beauharnois, and also by the member for Soulanges, which shows that immediately under the river bed, which at present constitutes the entrance, is a layer of boulders and indurated clay, and this would have to be removed for the purpose of acquiring accommodation for 14 feet vessels, particularly looking forward to the day when the hon. member for Soulanges hopes we will have a 20-foot navigation, and further under this clay and boulders there is a formation of quicksand through which tools sometimes drop 25 feet. I have been assured by the engineers in the department that in order to make the entrance to Valleyfield, or a point immediately above it, of use for vessels drawing 14 feet, excavation would be required for nearly two miles, which would, in fact, render the Beauharnois Canal on the south side nearly the same length as the canal on the north side. If my memory serves me right, the length of the Soulanges Canal will be 13¾ miles. The length of the present Beauharnois Canal from its entrance at Valleyfield to its exit into the St. Lawrence is 12 miles, and the subaqueous excavations necessary to obtain an entrance into Valleyfield would add two miles to the distance. Another reason assigned by the member for Beauharnois in opposition to locating the canal on the north side is that it will have to cross three little streams. The hon. gentleman says that parties who have travelled in that section when the snow was melting in the spring, found the whole country flooded, and it would be impossible for a small aqueduct under the canal to carry away the water, and the work of drainage would be of such an expensive character as to oblige the Government to abandon the canal altogether. I have been assured by engineers who have examined that point that the quantity of water is known, that the extent of country drained by those three little creeks is well known, and there is ample provision for the passage of water under the canal, and there need be no danger apprehended on that account. The hon. gentleman states also that the canal on the south side of the St. Lawrence opens at a much earlier period than would the canal on the north shore. As to that I do not know why there should be such a difference in the climate between two sections of country only a few miles apart. Any person acquainted with river navigation knows that in a canal forming the connecting link between two lakes, the ice passes away at a much earlier period on the canal than it does in the lakes above and below; that is to say, that as regards Lake St. Francis above the Beauharnois Canal and above the proposed Soulanges Canal, the probabilities are that both of the canals would be open and fit for navigation long before the ice had passed from the lake above. The hon. member for Soulanges stated, and objection was taken to his statement, that the port at the entrance to the Soulanges Canal is open for navigation much earlier than at Valleyfield. The engineer reports that this is the case; but that I do not think makes the slightest difference whatever, because neither the one canal nor the other could be used for navigation until both Lakes St. Louis and St. Francis were fit to be navigated. Another objection made by the hon. member for Beauharnois, and it would be a serious objection if true, was that, on account of the Ottawa opening at a date much later than the St. Lawrence, the ice coming down the first mentioned river piled on the shoals lying in the immediate neighbourhood of the Cascades and remained there

for a long period, and that this would render a canal on the north shore useless for a long time, during which the canal on the south shore could be used. That question, if the hon. gentleman will read the report of Mr. Monro, has been fully answered. Enquiry has been made into it principally by those who navigated the river from Montreal to the Cascades from 1846 to 1853-54, and they declared that that portion of the river into which the Soulanges Canal will debouch at Lake St. Louis had been open long anterior to the part of the river where the Beauharnois Canal enters into the lake. The observations of engineers within the last two or three years, excepting one period mentioned, confirm this opinion, that the ice passes away at the Cascades at as early, if not an earlier period than it does at the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal. From the reports of the engineers, then, it appears that there are difficulties in regard to the entrance at Valleyfield, that the difficulty of excavation at the entrance from Lake St. Francis is almost insurmountable. The engineers show an expenditure of $800,000 to $1,000,000 fort hat work alone would be required, and with this they think it would be difficult to accomplish the object. If it should be desired to increase the depth of the canal at any time from 14 feet to 18 or 20 feet, they consider the obstacles on the south shore would be almost insurmountable. The canal on the north shore can be built for three-quarters of a million to $1,000,000 cheaper—so I am informed by the engineers—than the cost for which the Beauharnois Canal could be enlarged, or the alternative scheme of a canal from Knight's Point, a short distance above Valleyfield, could be carried out. Either of the two plans proposed the enlargement of the Beauharnois Canal, or the substitution of another entrance at Knight's Point would be largely in excess of the estimated cost of the building of the new canal on the north shore, and the building or enlarging of the Beauharnois Canal on the south shore could not be done in summer and winter continuously as it could be on the north shore, and such work would seriously interfere with the navigation of the canal. For these reasons, on account of the cheapness, on account of the navigable channel passing between Prescott and Montreal being on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and for other reasons, the Government has found that it would be better and cheaper to build the canal on the north shore. I trust that after the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) gets the reports and plans of the engineers, that he will be satisfied. He will see, if he looks at the report of Mr. Monro, that over 100 test pits were dug at the Valleyfield entrance. Mr. Shanly, Mr. Page and Mr. Trudeau, the head of the department, have recommended the adoption of the north shore route, and when the hon. member for Beauharnois gets the papers I think he will be convinced, as we were in the department, and as the Government was, that the selection made by the Government is the best in the interests of the country.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, I thought that perhaps some other gentleman might speak upon this motion, but before it is passed I wish to reply in a few words to what has been said by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Bain). So far as the remarks of the member for Soulanges are concerned, there is no use replying at length to him, because he has quoted entirely the report of Mr. Monro and has dealt altogether with that report, which I am contending against as not correct. However, I am bound to reply to the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals, who seems to be well versed on the same report of Mr. Monro and to take his opinion from that report. I contend that my remarks are confirmed by the speech of the Minister of Railways and Canals. He has based himself solely on the report of the engineer, Mr. Monro, and in fact the whole House of Commons, comprising 215 members, seems to be asked to rely on the report of this engineer without corroborative evidence. My demand is that the report of Mr. Monro should be considered and placed before a board of competent engineers for corroboration. I do not believe that Mr. Monro's report is correct, and the difference between us is that the Minister of Railways and Canals and the member for Soulanges (Mr. Bain) take that report as being entirely correct. The Minister of Railways says that the persons engaged in navigating that water route are in favour of the Soulanges Canal. The hon. member is not very much responsible for his opinion, because he has only occupied the portfolio for a few months, and the Minister of that department has been changed ten times at least since this question was mooted. The hon. Minister says that the shippers have asked for the Soulanges Canal. I contend, not that the Minister of Railways and Canals did not say the truth, but that his information is not true, and I contend further that the shippers are opposed to the Soulanges Canal. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal is dangerous, but he only says so because Mr. Monro says that, but the majority of engineers and of shippers are against this opinion of Mr. Monro. I tell the Minister again that when he bases his argument that the north shore canal will be of the same length as the south shore canal, he is taking his information from Mr. Monro, and that Mr. Monro is not correct. The south shore canal is shorter in every shape and form than the north shore canal.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I said the length of the canal on the north shore would be 13¾ miles and the length of the Beauharnois Canal is 12 miles. That, added to the subaqueous excavation which would be necessary to enter the port of Valleyfield, would add two miles, which would be 14 miles and would be in excess of the canal on the north shore.

Mr. BERGERON. That is only a question of detail; that is only one of the routes, and since they have decided to put the canal on the north shore they have selected three different routes. We have been speaking in this House of Commons of economy. The halls of this chamber are filled with talk about economy, and I contend that if economy is needed the Beauharnois Canal is two miles shorter, coming down and going up, than the canal on the north shore. If the Government want to make a canal two miles longer on the south shore, they can do so, but I contend that the Beauharnois Canal can be enlarged and deepened in the same place as it is to-day, and you can have a canal two miles shorter than the proposed Soulanges Canal. Now,

about that question of bringing in the vessels to the western entrance. There is not a boatman, nor a master of a ship, nor a pilot, nor a member on the Government side of the House who can say that it will not be more dangerous to bring a tow of barges to the entrance of the north shore canal than to bring to the entrance of the Beauharnois Canal. At the entrance to the Beauharnois Canal there is no current, whereas at the entrance to the proposed Soulanges Canal there is a great deal of current, and everybody knows that. It was only the other day that I saw a master mariner, interested in navigation, who told me that it was impossible to bring a tow of barges to the head of the Soulanges Canal, if there was the least south-west wind, because the tow would be blown into the rapids. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canal says he has the report of Mr. Monro to show that it is untrue. I say that the report of Mr. Monro cannot be correct, and what I ask is that that report may be put before competent engineers, men who know what they are talking about, and then we shall ascertain whether Mr. Monro is correct or not. Now, in regard to my statement about the flooding at Coteau, neither the hon. Minister nor the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Bain) have answered it. What I said yesterday, and repeat to-day, is that the water at Coteau Landing is at the height of the railway. There are three rivers there, and if they are forced into narrow channels, the water will rise above the railway before it reaches the St. Lawrence. The only answer we have from the hon. Minister is that Mr. Monro says that my statement is not correct. That is the Government's only ground for proposing to expend $8,000,000 for this work. Who is Mr. Monro? He may be a very good engineer; but I submit that we are not here for the pleasure of anybody. We are here to do our duty, and I ask that before we accept Mr. Monro's report, we should place it before other engineers to ascertain whether it is correct or not.

Mr. LAURIER. It is accepted.

Mr. BERGERON. Whether it is accepted or not, it is better to turn back and obtain something more serious than that report before going ahead blindly into such an enormous expenditure. I think the Government should do that, and I will tell you why. There has been talk enough in the country about these expenditures being made to win a contest. I never believed that, and I do not believe it to-day; but people will believe it if the Government, instead of placing the matter before competent engineers, go ahead on the basis of Mr. Monro's report and incur an expenditure of $8,000,000. In regard to my statement about the ice at the Cascades, the same answer is given. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, for whose judgment I have a deep respect, says it cannot be true, because Mr. Monro says it is not true I say it is true. I know it; I have been there. I am not an engineer, and I have read to the House a statement of about fifteen pilots, honest and respectable men, who say that at the Cascades the ice remains jammed for three weeks after it has gone from the south shore. The hon. Minister says he cannot understand how there can be such a difference of temperature within three miles. I can say like him, I do not understand it, but it is so. If the Minister believes the report of Mr. Monro on that point, I do not. From 1873 down to 1890, where were the reports of Mr. Monro? He has found that in one year the ice went from the north shore as soon as from the south shore; but if he had taken the seventeen years from 1873 to 1890, he would have found that that was not so. Mr. Monro knew very well that it was not so. He made his report, and he found some very good Ministers to believe it. Now my hon. friend from Soulanges says that the entrance to the Beauharnois Canal at Valleyfield will cost from $850,000 to $1,000,000; and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says the same thing. Upon what do they base their calculations? Upon Mr. Monro's report—always the same thing. I know that Mr. Monro says that; I read his report last year; but I contend that that report is not correct. This is not a question of having the canal in my county. The people of my county do not care for the canal for themselves; but as a matter of public policy, the building of a canal on the north shore would be a useless expenditure of money, and I am asking simply that the report upon which the Government base their calculations, should be put before competent engineers. The hon. Minister has spoken of Mr. Shanly. I can say that I myself spoke to Mr. Shanly on this subject when he sat in this House, and also in Montreal. He is one of the men who built the Beauharnois Canal, and he has always said to me that the idea of building the canal on the north shore was perfectly absurd. The hon. Minister says that he has Mr. Shanly's report. Let us see that report, and we shall then see whether Mr. Shanly's statement in writing is the same as his verbal statement to me. So far as Mr. Page is concerned, I do not want to speak of those who are gone. We shall have the old gentleman looking down from above on the Soulanges Canal which I hope will never be built. Mr. Trudeau, we know, favours the north shore, and like the Government, he bases his opinion on Mr. Monro's report. Now, I do not want to detain the House on this question, and I do not intend to speak about it any more. I have done my duty, not so much to my county, as to the House and the country. I do not want to see the day when the Government will come to me and say: "After all you were right; if we had followed your advice we would not have made this mistake."

Mr. LAURIER. There are few men in this House I am sure, who, after having listened to the very elaborate discussion which we have had yesterday and to-day on this question, would be in a position to say whether the location of the canal should be on the south shore, as contended by my hon. friend from Beauharnois, or on the north, as contended by my hon. friend from Soulanges. There seems to be conflicting testimony on both sides. The statements presented by the hon. member for Beauharnois are weighty, and certainly deserve attention. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman contends that the proper location of the canal is on the south shore, though that seems to be his opinion. But he makes the complaint, and the very serious complaint, that the Government propose to build another canal upon insufficient data. That is, I understand, the position the hon. gentleman takes.

Mr. BERGERON. Hear, hear; that is it.

Mr. LAURIER. He does not say that the canal should be built on the south shore or on the north shore. He simply says that the Government are proposing an expenditure of $8,000,000 based on an erroneous report, and that they should have more information than they have. There is a great deal to be said on behalf of that contention. If my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has spoken accurately, and I have no doubt that he has with the great attention that he has given to this case, the Government seemed to have taken action on insufficient information. I do not blame them for constructing a canal on the north shore, because I am not sufficiently informed on the subject, but the contention of my hon. friend from Beauharnois is that the Government have arrived at their decision on insufficient data. It appears to me that it is rather late in the day for my hon. friend to raise that point.

Mr. BERGERON. I made it last year.

Mr. LAURIER. The time to make the objection was when there was an election coming on. My hon. friend should have opposed the ministerial candidate in the County of Soulanges and should have said that the Government was committing the country to an expenditure of $8,000,000 on insufficient data, and no doubt his influence would have been felt, and I believe the Government would have been forced to take his views into consideration and perhaps to stay their hand. But it is rather late in the day now for him to raise the objection. He says he hopes the canal will not be built, but the contracts are already given.

Mr. BERGERON. Not yet.

Mr. LAURIER. About the time of the election the tenders were asked for, and I think the contracts have been let.

Mr. HAGGART. Two are awarded.

Mr. LAURIER. Two of them are awarded. The other is kept in abeyance. At all events, it is rather late in the day for my hon. friend to raise the point now, and I hope we will not have to come to the conclusion that the Government have acted wrongfully. If afterwards, however, it turns out that the statements made by my hon. friend as to the impracticability of this canal are correct, it will be evident that the Government have taken a very serious burden on their shoulders and will be entitled to severe censure, and I am afraid that my hon. friend from Beauharnois will not be entirely free from that censure.

Motion agreed to.

PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE COUNTY, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Statement showing the amount of money expended by the Government of Canada in the years 1890-91 on piers, breakwaters, &c., in Prince County, P. E. I.; the amount expended on each of these works, the work let by contract and to whom let; also showing the total amount voted during said years and the amount not expended.

He said: I desire to draw the attention of the Department of Public Works, and the House in general, to the fact that the Department of Public Works do not expend the money on the public works in Prince Edward Island which is voted by this Legislature. I find that, in 1890, $12,000 was voted for repairs, piers and breakwaters in Prince Edward Island, and out of that only $7,000 was expended. What has become of the other $5,000? No doubt the province has been charged, and hon. members opposite frequently charge that Prince Edward Island receives large amounts of money. No doubt those amounts look large, but I think they are small, and then we find that only about one-half of the amounts voted from year to year are expended. Was there no breakwater or pier or wharf in Prince Edward Island that required repairs to involve the expenditure of this $5,000? Why, at Tignish, it would require $20,000 to make that harbour anything like a decent harbour, and that is a harbour of refuge for the fishing vessels of Gloucester, New Brunswick, and others. There are a large number of vessels that come into that harbour from Tracadie, from Pokemouche, from Shippegan, from Caraquet, and from other places. On the eve of a storm these fishermen come to that port, and the entrance is then blocked so that our small local boats have to move up in order to make room for these vessels. We know that the catches of mackerel are generally made in the morning, but when our small mackerel boats want to get out, under these circumstances they cannot get out until 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The Government ought to see to this. There is room enough there to spend that $5,000. There should be a breastwork built there across the marsh and dredged in order to allow these boats to pass up towards the bridge and so to allow the smaller boats to get out. Then, in Cascumpec harbour the Government have neither a wharf, nor a pier, nor a breakwater. There is only a railway wharf there, except some wharves that are kept up by private enterprise or by the Local Government. Then, when we go to Malpeque, there was room there to spend $5,000, and there is room to spend $30,000 in Summerside, the capital of Prince County, the county which I have the honour to represent. When the Government was asked to spend some money there, the reply was that they had no money to spend. The people of Summerside and the people of Prince County do not support the present Government, and therefore they have no money to spend there. Summerside is the place where Her Majesty's mails are landed during the whole time of navigation, and yet the Government steamers have no wharf there, but have to go to private wharves or to those built by the Local Government. On the other hand, at Point du Chêne in New Brunswick, on the other side of the straits, there are Dominion Government wharves that have cost $100,000, while in Summerside not a single dollar has been spent to accommodate the whole of the shipping of Prince County. The harbour of Summerside, if not the first, is, perhaps, the second harbour in the Province of Prince Edward Island, and the people who are large contributors to the revenue of the country have a right to a fair share of the public money to be expended there, in order to facilitate their great traffic. But, Sir, they are tired of asking. It seems the Department of Public Works could not see their way clear where to expend this $5,000. I contend that the people of Summerside have a good right to ask for a breakwater. If a breakwater were built at the entrance to Summerside on the north side of the lighthouse, I claim that navigation could be kept open three weeks later in the fall and open three weeks earlier in the spring, because the passage would create more current,

and I think the ice would not take so early in the fall as it does at present, and it would clear out much earlier in the spring. I do not suppose the Government is going to vote us any money. I have looked up the Estimates laid on the Table, and I fail to see that one dollar is to be appropriated to improve the navigation in the harbour of Summerside now, nor do I expect that the Government will do anything for that county, unless, perhaps, in a moment of carelessness, when they do not think of what they are doing. Now we come to West Point. West Point had a wharf built there some years ago, when something like five or six thousand dollars was expended to build it. My colleague here at my right (Mr. Yeo) knows something about that, because he was in the Local Parliament and used his influence to get it built. This was a great benefit to the people of West Point. They live far from railway accommodation, and they made use of this wharf to ship their produce to Pointe du Chêne, and thence to its destination to some port in Canada or the United States. Now, the Government took possession of the wharf some years ago; they took possession of the shore, and what is the result? The result is that they never expended one dollar on the wharf, the whole work was destroyed, and has been carried away. When I asked here a few years ago, from my place in the House, of the Minister of Public Works, what he intended to do, he said it was not the intention of the Government to rebuild. Why, Sir, the best farmers of West Point asked me some time ago if I thought it was proper for them to turn to and open a subscription to get money, to ask the people to put their hands into their pockets and raise money to build the wharf. I told them: Gentlemen, I think you are mistaken: I think the first thing to do is to apply to the Government of Canada, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to get a license from him in order to enable you to build your wharf. But the people could not do it, because I understand the Government have not only taken the wharf but they have taken the ground, and if the people undertook to build a wharf there without the knowledge of the Government they would be trespassers. That is the way it stands today. I do not see a single dollar in the Estimates to enable the Minister of Public Works to repair that wharf or to build a new one. A few years ago, in answer to my question, he said that his engineer had made a survey and a report, and that the report recommended that the wharf should be built on the south side, at a cost of $10,000. Well, I suppose the Government got frightened at the prospect of expending $10,000. But they are not afraid to ask this country to vote money to commence a work that my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) says will likely cost $8,000,000, and he has told us that this work will be quite useless. But I can tell him that my constituents in West Point stand in this position: that every dollar expended there will not be useless, because it is badly needed. But I suppose it is there as in other parts of Prince County, because the people do not support the Government they must be punished in this way. Well, if the Government expect that the electors of Prince County are going to vote for them after such usage, they are very much mistaken. The more of such usage, the less chance the Government will have. Now I will leave that place and come to Miminegash breakwater. I am very glad to find that I have friends in this House, as well as in the Senate, supporters of the Government, who have busied themselves in regard to this matter; they have waited upon the Minister and asked him to place a sum in the Estimates sufficient to build a breakwater at Miminegash. I do hope and trust that those gentlemen, who are Conservative members, will succeed. We know well who they are. They are not the members from Queen's County, because the members from that county are sound Liberals. They must be the two members from King's County, and those two gentlemen never saw the breakwater. They know so little about it that they asked for a new breakwater at Miminegash. The breakwater there was built in 1878, in the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, to whom the fishermen of that place owe this great boon. Now, these two gentlemen had better attend to the wants of their own constituents; they have no business to trespass on my county. I would like to see them there as visiting strangers, but they have no right to come and try to take the ground from under my feet in the county I represent. They are trespassing on my privileges, and I hope and trust they will attend to all the breakwaters and piers in their own county which require to be looked after, and when they have got all they can get from the Government they will not have one cent too much. With respect to this breakwater at Miminegash, two years ago the House of Commons voted $3,500 to repair it. Well, Sir, there was a contract entered into. No tenders were asked for until late in December, in 1890, on the eve of the general election. At that time the Minister asked for tenders to do certain works, and a certain gentleman, I believe of the name of Macdonald, and a very good Tory, happened to be the successful tenderer and agreed to do the work for $2,500, within seven months, as the Minister of Public Works told us last year. Well, Sir, he deposited his money, and he asked for an extension of time, but the Government did not grant it. The elections were then over, and there was no longer any need of holding out the bait to the electors. The Government candidates had been defeated, and nothing in the wide world could be done to redeem the two Tory candidates. Therefore the work must be stopped. It reminds one strongly of the Stairs & O'Hanly transaction on the Esquimalt docks. After he had signed his tender, he was told he was too low. He had been told that he had better give up the contract. The deposit he had made with the department was returned, and he was told that his contract price was too low, that he would lose money, and he was advised to give it up. In accordance with the recommendation, he did so. He wanted an extension of time. Why could not the Government have granted it? The time has been extended, and the wharf is not yet built. Money has been uselessly expended, and the result is that the people of the locality suffer from want of accommodation, and during the spring most of the work constructed might be carried away by ice. Have the Government gained anything? No. What has become of the $3,500? I asked last year how much of the $3,500 had been expended? I was told that $550 had been spent on the breakwater, and $65 had been given to the inspector.

What has been done with the balance? In answer to my enquiries the excuse was made that the Government had not sufficient money to enter into a contract. No new contract, at all events, has been entered into. I believe it is not the intention of the department to ask for tenders. If it was their intention, it should have been done long ago. Why could not advertisements for tenders have been inserted at the close of the last session? It appears that the Minister of Public Works had not time to attend to it. The Government have not time to do what the country expects of them; but when an election is going on in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, Quebec or Ontario, we find these gentlemen, like flying birds, flock there by the dozen and score. They attend meetings and try to persuade the people by false promises, promises which they never intend to carry out, that they should give the Government their support; they humbug the people and induce them to vote for Government candidates. That is one of the chief reasons why such a sweep has been made at the bye-elections. When we ask them to attend to their business, to give us a *quid pro quo*, to recoup us for the $7,000 a year we pay them they are not to be found, they sit like dummies, they cannot move, they act like men who do not mean to do what is right. I am not going to speak of Queen's County, for the representatives are well able to speak for their county, but I merely speak for the county I represent. The Government is not giving a reasonable share of the public money in order to maintain the public works of my county. Is it proper to vote money each year and leave it unexpended? If the system of taxing each province according to its public works were adopted, it could be demonstrated in five minutes that Prince Edward Island fails to get its proper and lawful share. But the island is part of the Dominion, and whatever improvements are carried out there are not for the benefit of the island alone, but for the advantage of the people of Ontario also, for the benefit of the travelling agents who come down to the island trying to introduce articles and sell them to the islanders. The improvements are, in fact, as much for the benefit of people outside of the island as for the benefit of the people of the island themselves. I desire to ask the Government if they intend to carry out this policy which they have inaugurated; if they intend to do justice to the island; if they intend to follow out the principle of voting money year after year and not expending more than half, and then allow the matter to drift along during two or three years? I want to be assured by the Government that this money is going to be expended. When you read the Estimates, you are apt to come to the conclusion that the island is getting its fair share of the public money, but when you come to the expenditure you find that the money voted has not been expended. I might mention a good many other works in my county of minor importance, but it would be tedious for me to continue further. I hope the Government will learn a lesson from what I have said. My remarks may seem a little bitter, but they are made in the interests of my county, and I will receive credit for what I have said from the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I take advantage of the present opportunity to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to one or two public works in my county which I brought to the attention of his predecessor, last year and the year before. Although I had not the express promise that they would be attended to, yet the language used gave me to understand that the Government would expend sufficient money to place them in proper order. On the north side of Queen's County, right in the centre of the best fishing ground, are situated the two harbours of Rustico and New London. So far as Rustico is concerned, a breakwater was built eight or ten years ago which has been of very great advantage to the place, and it has been kept in very fair repair. With respect to New London, there were some new works required and reported upon. The hon. gentleman will find in his department a very excellent report from Mr. Brown, who was sent to the island some years ago, in which he recommended certain works as being essential in order to make the harbour what it should be, a proper harbour of refuge to the fishermen, and capable of allowing small schooners to enter and take away produce. I understood from the late Minister that the latter was under his consideration, in fact, he said so more than once, and the Government did build a small breakwater on one side of the harbour, but there still remains to be carried out the works which Mr. Brown reported as essential in order to make the present expenditure beneficial. I will press on the hon. Minister the importance of examining that report, and if he can succeed in obtaining money from his colleagues, the suggestion made by engineer Brown should be carried out. On the south side of the island there is Pinette harbour, which my hon. colleague many times has brought to the attention of the House, and I dare say he will take occasion to speak of it when he is in his seat. I will not refer to it further, except to say that there is a capital report on that harbour in the department. I want to call the hon. Minister's attention to Wood Island breakwater. It was commenced some years ago by the Local Government, but the Dominion Government assumed control of it and expended some money upon the breakwater, and they have gone on year after year expending money upon that breakwater, on a system that I have protested against time and again: that is, voting from $1,000 to $2,000 and having it expended by day work. The hon. Minister might as well take the money and throw it into the sea as to expend it that way. The breakwater has been for years unfinished. A dredge was sent some years ago and did effectual work as far as it went. It enabled a schooner to come alongside the breakwater so as to enable the people to ship their products. I went there about eighteen months ago and owing to a fearful storm the breakwater was in a very dilapidated condition. The ballasting has been washed out, and it was impossible for a man to drive a horse and cart down the breakwater at all. The breakwater was in such a condition that the expenditure of $1,000 by day's work was absolutely no good at all. The money might as well be in the public exchequer, and better, because there were no beneficial results derived from it. As I said, the breakwater is opposite Pictou and Pugwash, in a thickly-settled portion of the country, as the people, if they had anything of a harbour there—as it was the intention of the Government to build such a harbour

would be enabled to trade with the people on the north coast of Nova Scotia, and quite a large trade could be carried on. There is no railway within 30 or 40 miles. They have no natural harbour there from which to ship their produce, and I do not know any class of people who raise such fair crops as they do, and who are so deprived of the advantages that might result from the sale of the crops if they had facilities for shipment. The Minister of Public Works has reports in his department upon this matter. The Government some years ago built a breakwater there, which had the effect desired at the time, but it is now in a terribly dilapidated condition, and I myself have seen that the men who brought their produce in a schooner had to carry it on their backs until they landed it in the carts. I feel for the people in that locality. I laid the matter as fairly as I could before the former Minister of Public Works; but nothing was done. I know that claims are made by a large number of people in the Dominion, and that each thinks his claim is the strongest, but I hope that in this case the present Minister of Public Works will do something to remove the difficulties under which the people there labour. I was prepared to wait—being in Opposition—until my turn came, in order to do something for this breakwater. I have been waiting a good many years, and I trust now that the present Minister of Public Works will take the matter into his consideration. I am quite sure that if I could once get him down there and show him the condition of things, and how the farmers are deprived of the means of exporting their produce, that he would be anxious at once to take my case into consideration and do something in favour of it. I am sure the Minister will read the reports in his department, and I know that, if he does, his sense of fair-play will induce him at once to put that breakwater in proper repair. I do not wish that the hon. gentleman should pursue the former policy of the department in this respect. I hold that $1,000 spent now and again on this work is no good, but if the hon. gentleman should see his way clear to vote the amount which his engineer has reported as sufficient to put the breakwater in proper condition, he will be conferring a great benefit on a very large section of our people.

Mr. OUIMET. I must first say that I am thankful for the earnest lesson that has been given to me by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry). I say that it was a very earnest lesson, because the hon. gentleman spoke in such a tone as to deeply impress me with the very great importance of the grievances which he is continually bringing up year after year in this House. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that when the papers are brought down, I am sure the House will see that Prince Edward Island has been pretty fairly dealt with by this Government since it came into power in 1878. Curiously enough, I happened to open a book containing the Estimates of 1875-76, and, looking at what was voted, I see that in 1875-76 only $4,125 was voted for Prince Edward Island by his friends the Liberal party of which he was a great admirer at the time; while the Estimates of the present year contain an item of $14,000 for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman permit me for a moment to correct him. At the time the Minister of Public Works speaks of,

the piers and wharves of Prince Edward Island were repaired at the expense of the Local Government; so that there was no reason for that vote at all, but the Mackenzie Government spent $70,000 that year in constructing the breakwater at Souris.

Mr. OUIMET. That was for special works, and if I should open the accounts of the department since, we would see that under the present Government very extensive works have been constructed in Prince Edward Island. I am quite sure that when the Supplementary Estimates come down we will see that Prince Edward Island is not more forgotten than any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. I may add to what I have been saying that as to the works at Miminegash the information that I have had from the department, and from the papers I examined, does not quite coincide with what has been said by the hon. member from Prince (Mr. Perry). He says that the contract was not given because the people of that county returned him, and that the contractor was persuaded to withdraw his tender on account of it being too low. The information I have had from the department is that the contractor himself refused to sign the contract when he was asked to do so, for the reason that the signing of the contract had been delayed for some months after the elections of 1891. This will show that the department is not open to the accusation of giving contracts only for political purposes and to serve their friends during election times. If the Government had wished to influence that special county, the contract would have been given at once and the work proceeded with. But I suppose the compliment may be paid to the people of Prince Edward Island that they cannot be convinced that the Government are as corrupt as the hon. gentleman would wish them to believe, because they have not yet realized from past experience that if they elected members favourable to the Government they would receive greater favours than they have received while represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. I can assure my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island that so far as I am concerned that province will be treated just as well as all the other provinces. As to the representations which have been made by my hon. friend from Queen's, I may tell him that the case of the Wood Island breakwater is just now under my consideration, in consequence of representations that have been made to me in my office by his hon. colleague, and we will try to do what is fair towards that work and towards the people of that part of the island. He has stated correctly enough that those people are entitled to due consideration from the Government, because they are far away from any railway communication. I agree with the hon. gentleman when he says that it is not the policy of the Government to spend money piecemeal, or in small sums, on public works, and perhaps on some future occasion I may bring forward a plan indicating my view, that public moneys should be

expended on permanent works which would be *échelonnés* on the coast so as to serve as harbours of refuge for the fishermen. In that way, I think the people will be much better served, this policy will have to be accepted by the hon. members representing the Maritime Provinces, and they will have to cease pressing for small expenditures of $200 or $500 or $1,000 on purely local works. The papers will be brought down, and they will show that the money has been expended *bonâ fide*, and that no injustice has ever been done to Prince Edward Island by this Government.

Mr. PERRY. In answer to the hon. Minister of Public Works, I wish to say that last year when I asked whether tenders had been called for new works at Miminegash breakwater, the Minister of Public Works answered:

"Tenders were asked for by public advertisement dated the 10th of December, 1890, for extending and strengthening the south pier. The contract has been awarded to Alexander Macdonald for $2,000, and it is to be completed within seven months from the date of the contract."

That, I am sure, was ample time for the completion of the contract; but when the House was in Supply the Minister of Finance informed me that Mr. Macdonald had given up the contract because the time was too short. I say that when he refused to sign that contract, and humbugged the fishermen, the Government were wrong in giving him back his deposit. They should have retained that as damages for non-fulfilment of the contract. At the time the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was in power, the Government of Canada had not charge of 27 wharves and piers in Prince Edward Island as they have now. Those works were very well provided for by the Provincial Government, who used to spend $17,000 a year in keeping them in repair, whereas this Government is spending only $8,000 a year. The hon. gentleman tells us that we should get no more money now than we did then. It is to be supposed that we are standing still, that we are not progressing; yet we find these hon. gentlemen telling us every day how prosperous we are. I contend that the people of Prince Edward Island are taxed $2 per head per year more than we were under the Mackenzie Administration, and therefore we have a right to expect an equivalent for that increased taxation at the hands of the present Government.

Motion agreed to.

THE PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Return, in tabular form, of all persons, companies and corporations to whom have respectively been sold, granted or leased, in Manitoba and the North-West Territories of Canada, more land than one section or 640 acres. The return to give the following information:—

(*a*) The 1st column to contain the name of the province or provisional district;
(*b*) 2nd " " the name of the person, company or corporation;
(*c*) 3rd " " the number of acres;
(*d*) 4th " " aggregate price, if sold;
(*e*) 5th " " " rent per year, if leased;
(*f*) 6th " " amount paid to date;
(*g*) 7th " " due and unpaid to date;
(*h*) 8th " " nature of tenure, and if leased, the number of years yet unexpired, the total number of acres sold, leased and licensed, the total of columns 4, 5, 6 and 7 respectively.

The return to be accompanied by a map, on a scale of not less than — miles to an inch, showing all the surveyed and subdivided portions with the lands granted and sold for settlement, coloured light brown; the leased lands, green; the licensed lands, umber; the lands granted and sold to companies and corporations, purple; and the lands still remaining to the Crown, lake red; with the number of acres of each class figured on the map. Such map shall also indicate the railway reserves, the reserves for Indians and forest parks, and shall show all lines of railway built or under construction.

He said: The return for which I am moving will, I think, afford a great deal of very valuable information. We all know in a general way that large tracts of the public domain in the North-West have been granted or leased to various corporations, to land companies, railway companies, lumber companies, ranch companies, &c.; and also that considerable tracts have been leased or granted to private individuals. The first part of the return asks for a statement of all cases in which more than one section of 640 acres has been granted or leased to any individual or corporation. The second part asks for a map to accompany this return, which, if it can be prepared without too great cost or difficulty, will, I think, be of the very greatest value, because it will enable anyone to see at a glance what lands in the North-West have been granted, what reserved, what leased, and what are still open to settlement. I have left a blank in the proposed return, which I would like to fill in to suit the views of the hon. Minister of the Interior, as to the scale on which the map should be made. If it were made on a scale of six miles to the inch, that would give one inch to each square township. However, perhaps the Minister will see what scale would be most convenient. I should think it would be convenient, if they had maps in the department showing the different classes of lands this map would include, and if they were all put in one and coloured differently, that would be a great convenience to the members of this House. In reference to the wording of the resolution, I have use the words "licensed lands" as distinguished from "leased lands," but perhaps the term "leased lands" would be sufficient, and I would suggest the colouring of the map in regard to the other lands, though, of course, the lands which remain in possession of the Crown need not be coloured because all the others would be coloured.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The return asked for by the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution is, as he says, a very important one, and it would be very interesting as well as very useful if it were compiled, but the hon. gentleman must know that this is a very heavy undertaking and will occupy a very long time to prepare even the first portion of it. The books from which these returns would have to be taken are in use every day by the officers of the department, and it would be very inconvenient indeed if these books had to be utilized for the purposes of this return during office hours. The only men who could do this work satisfactorily are the permanent officers of the department, and, as hon. gentlemen know, they are precluded by the Civil Service Act from doing any extra work after office hours. I mention this only to show how long it will take to bring this return down to the House, if the hon. gentleman desires it should be prepared. I do not see much objection to the first portion of

the motion. With regard to the second portion, I really think that, if the hon. gentleman considers it in all its bearings, he will find that he is asking rather too much for me to promise. The last map which was issued from our department two or three months ago, was drawn on a scale of 12 miles to an inch, and it was about the size of the Clerk's table. To do what the hon. gentleman has asked properly, would require a map twice that size, that is, 6 miles per inch, and that would take a long time to prepare, at least five or six months. The information the hon. gentleman asks as to the surveyed and subdivided portions of the land in the North-West is shown on a map which has already been prepared. This work is always kept posted up, and this map I exhibit shows everything up to the first of this month. It showed every township that has been subdivided in Manitoba and the North-West, as well as in the Railway Belt of British Columbia. There is a fresh issue of these maps every month. Consequently, the hon. gentleman will not require that information. Then he desires to have shown the leases painted in green, and so on. There would be no objection to this, and not much labour would be involved, but these are continually changing, and it would be absurd to go to the expense of a map of this kind, which would be of no use after a certain date. The lands and leases are constantly being given up, and the railway lands are being changed continually, so that a map of this kind would be of very little use. Then, we have issued 47,771 patents of land, and it would require a great deal of labour to show these on the map. If there were any other means by which we could obtain what the hon. gentleman requires, other than what he proposes, whether by giving the maps we have already and placing the subsequent information on them, or in any other way, I would be very glad to do it, but to prepare a map for that special purpose I am afraid would be utterly impossible.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the hon. Minister must have misunderstood me if he thought I desired to accomplish anything out of his reach. I am glad to hear him say that the return can be made, even if it takes some little time. As to the map, he says there is in existence one recently made. Why should not that be utilized for this purpose? He says it is a map on a scale of 12 miles to the inch, and as large as the table. I am sure that will be a very good map and we need not have another. Then he tells us that he has a map which shows the lands granted and sold for settlement.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, I did not say that. I said all the lands subdivided. A great deal of that territory has not been surveyed yet.

Mr. EDGAR. As far as the map is concerned, I think a copy of the large map to which the hon. gentleman refers would answer very well, and I think the objection that the railway reserves are continually changing is no reason why we should not see what they are on the map up to the date when the return is made. The laying down of the Indian reserves, and the forest parks, and the lines of railway on this map, will be a very good thing to have done. I do not want to propose anything out of reason to the department, but I would like to know what other part except the grants the Minister thinks would be difficult to put on this map that is in existence. I think a map of that kind would be very useful.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am satisfied that on our present map all the railway lines are shown.

Mr. EDGAR. But not the railway reserves?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, the railway reserves are not shown. They could be shown very easily on any of our maps. Of course the leases could be shown without much difficulty, but to show all the lands patented would be impossible.

Mr. EDGAR. With the permission of the House I will leave out that part. I see there is a difficulty in that respect.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the hon. member will come to my office we can arrange it between ourselves, and I think I will be able to satisfy him.

Mr. EDGAR. I accept the suggestion.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DEFENCES OF ESQUIMALT.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copy of all correspondence between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government concerning the defences of Esquimalt.

He said: This matter has been a subject of debate on one or two occasions in the House of Commons at Westminster. I do not know whether the correspondence is in such a position that we can have it, but if it is in a position to be brought down, I hope the Government will give it to us at once, as it is very important.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the House when I answered the question put by the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior), in which I stated that this matter was now under the consideration of the Government, and that the correspondence which he asks for was of such a character that it could not well be laid before the House. The information that is asked for is important, and interests every man in Canada, particularly the taxpayers, and as soon as this matter has been fully considered, the information will be laid before the House. There is no objection to passing the motion, with the understanding, of course, that in a matter of this importance there is of necessity a certain portion of the correspondence which it will not be in the public interest to lay before the House.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return of the proceedings had at the trial of the recent election petition relating to the election of a member for the electoral district of the County of Welland, together with the finding of the judges who tried the said petition upon the same, and of all evidence taken thereat: also a certified copy of the case and factums filed upon the appeal from such findings or any of them with the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada. Also a copy of any report and communication made to Mr. Speaker by the said judges in reference to the said petition.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 18th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON presented a Message from His Excellency.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:--

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, copies of papers relating to the mutual recognition by Canada and Newfoundland of licenses issued to United States fishing vessels, under the *modus vivendi*, and the division of the fees collected by the same.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 18th March, 1892.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Co.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Nipissing and James, Bay Railway Co.--(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Co., Limited.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 31) respecting the *Globe* Printing Co.—(Mr. Innes.)

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Women's Baptist Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Co.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Co.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Co.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

THE LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. LISTER. As a matter of privilege, I beg to move:

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery do attend before this House forthwith, with the return of the last election in the City of London, in the Province of Ontario, together with all poll books and all other papers, letters, documents and memoranda which may have been transmitted to him by the returning officer and received by him since the despatch of the writ of election, and copies of all letters sent by him to the returning officer.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LISTER. In connection with the previous motion, I beg to move for:

1. Copies of the voters' list for the Electoral District of the City of London upon which the recent election for such district was held. 2. Copies of the judgment given by the revising officer on objections taken to the names of Lewis Allin, S. F. Glass and James P. Moore and 226 others on said voters' list, and which 229 names were subsequently struck off the said voters' list by the revising officer, on the hearing of the objections, but which were nevertheless printed on the said voters' list is the subject of an appeal, together with copies of the notices of objection to such names and copies of the evidence taken before and decision given by the revising officer on each such name. 3. Copies of all proceedings in appeal taken to the County Court judge from the judgment of the revising officer on any or all of such cases, together with any judgment or decision given by such County Court judge thereon. 4. Copies of the judgment of the Queen's Bench Division, High Court of Justice, Ontario, in the matter of an application to said court for a mandamus to said revising officer in respect of the said votes or any of them, together with copies of the judgment of the Court of Appeal (Ontario) in respect of the same matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think that this motion, reading it from the Notice Paper as I do, is not one of the character that the hon. gentleman can press as a question of privilege. The other motion, I think, is one which properly enough might be presented on the ground of privilege; but this motion, which is one for papers, ought to be moved, I think, when it is reached in its proper order on the Notice Paper.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you do not give any decision, but merely express an opinion. I think that if you look at the practices and precedents, you will find that my hon. friend is perfectly right. There is no distinction in principle between an Order of this House made to an officer over whom the House has control, for certain papers affecting the privileges of the House or the seat of a member, and a motion for an Address to His Excellency praying him to lay before us certain papers. The object of both motions is the same: it is to obtain materials on which action may be taken by this House with respect to the seat of a member, which comes distinctly and properly within the range of those questions known as questions of privilege; and there are so many precedents for this that I cannot conceive of my hon. friend being ruled out of order. I took occasion to look through the English precedents to-day, and I find that in all cases where the seat of a member is affected, motions of this kind are received—not moved substantively in any direction, but merely for the purpose of obtaining materials by which the House may form an opinion on the case. My hon. friend has moved that an Order of the House be issued, and it has been granted to him, instructing the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to produce certain papers before us; but when these papers are before us, another motion would have to be made on them. This is merely a formal matter, at any rate. When my hon. friend gets the materials which will inform the House of the facts, then I suppose he will be prepared to make some substantive motion, which may or may not be acceptable to the House, for enquiring into those facts. But, as I understand, he is now moving for papers to inform the House of the facts with respect to the seat of a member recently elected, who has taken his seat; and therefore it is not only distinctly a question of privilege, but it comes within some of the cases which have already been established. I would call your attention to the general rule laid down in May, at page 288:

"Questions of privilege, also, and other matters suddenly arising, may be considered without previous notice; and the former take precedence, not only of other motions, but of all Orders of the Day. But in order to entitle a question of privilege to precedence, it must refer to some matter which has recently arisen, which directly concerns the privileges of the House, and calls for its present interposition. When the question is *bonâ fide* one of privilege, the House will at once entertain it before any other business. This ancient rule was thus expressed in debate by an eminent authority:—Nothing can be so regular, according to the practice of this House, as when any member brings under the consideration of the House a breach of its privileges, for the House to hear it—nay, to hear it with or without notice—whether any question is or is not before it; and even in the midst of another discussion, if a member should rise to complain of a breach of the privi-

leges of the House, they have always instantly heard him. The latter part of this statement, it need scarcely be said, is limited to breaches of privilege committed during a discussion, or so immediately before it, that no earlier opportunity of making a complaint had arisen; as, for example, an insult or assault upon a member, or any sudden act of disorder. In such cases, debates have been interrupted by complaints of breaches of privilege. But in other cases, equally affecting the privileges of the House, but of less immediate urgency, the matter is ordinarily brought forward, without notice, at the commencement of public business. Such priority is conceded on the assumption that the earliest opportunity has been taken for bringing such a question before the House, which precludes previous notice; and that the dignity of the House demands its immediate consideration."

Then he goes on to say, at page 291:

"It has been said that a question of privilege is, properly, one not admitting of notice; but where the circumstances have been such as to enable the member to give notice, and the matter was nevertheless *bonâ fide* a question of privilege, precedence has still been conceded to it."

You, Sir, have already ruled that the matter on which my hon. friend is moving is a question of privilege. The House has passed a resolution that an officer appear before it with certain papers. The question being one of privilege, and the House having made that order, I respectfully submit that if it is necessary to obtain other papers in order to inform the House of the facts bearing on the question, my hon. friend is entitled to move for them without notice, the subject-matter of the motion being a question of privilege. The practice has been carried further in this Parliament than in England. Those who were here from 1883 to 1887 will remember the case of King's County, P.E.I., which was proceeded with without notice. The same was done in the case of Queen's, N.B., following the precedent of the Muskoka case some years previously. In every case the House has assented to questions affecting its privileges or the seat of a member being proceeded with at once. It will take some time to get these papers, and as the question affects the seat of a member, it seems desirable to have the facts before us, to enable the House to vindicate its privileges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose nobody doubts or misunderstands the rule which the hon. gentleman has referred to, that matters of privilege may be dealt with without notice, especially in cases of urgency. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had precedents covering this case. If so, he has omitted to mention them. The cases which the hon. gentleman has referred to, and which were dealt with in this House, with regard to King's, P.E.I. and Queen's, N.B., involved questions relating to the performance of duties by officers of this House, who were under the immediate and summary jurisdiction of the House. In those cases, or in any other cases of that class in which the hon. gentleman says we have extended the English rule, I think we have not extended the English rule. We have been guided by the fact that the proceedings and conduct of a returning officer were under review. In the New Brunswick case the ultimate object of the motions made was to bring to the bar of this House the returning officer, either for the judgment of this House for the manner in which he had discharged his duties, or to require him to amend his return. The same was the case in regard to King's, Prince Edward Island. With regard to the motion which the hon. gentleman has just made, that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery attend this House with the papers, that comes within the same rule, the Clerk of the Crown being an officer of this House. But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing, I think, to justify the hon. gentleman's argument that because the motion affects the seat of a member it should therefore have priority and be proceeded with without any notice. The hon. gentleman states the proposition that everything that affects the seat of a member of this House is a matter of privilege, and thence he argues that every step that may be taken relating to the seat of a member may be treated as a matter of privilege and be proceeded with without notice. In other words, without the slightest notice to this House, a member may rise and move that another member's seat be vacated. I do not think there is anything to justify a principle of that kind, or to justify a motion without notice for an Address to His Excellency for a document to be furnished by a person who is entirely beyond the control of this House. Even if it were so, I think it would be too important a step to take without notice. It is quite as much a matter of privilege with us that the House should be informed what is the business before it, and what proceedings are to be taken to assail our seats.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has just laid down a proposition which, if true, may warrant the conclusion he has drawn from it. He says that anything that affects the seat of a member is not a matter of privilege. I have always understood the rule to be that, if anything was brought to the attention of the House affecting the seat of a member, it was a matter of privilege and should be proceeded with at once, and you, Mr. Speaker, have already so ruled. My hon. friend has made a motion which is the first step towards the proceeding affecting the seat of a member. What is the use of the motion which has been carried unless it serves to bring to the attention of the House something that will affect the seat of the member? If that proposition is correct, and it seems to me it cannot be successfully controverted, anything connected with that as a matter of privilege must be proceeded with, and, in that case, the other motion of my hon. friend is also in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. In reference to the motion which has been passed by the House that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall attend, &c., on looking at the precedents, I came to the conclusion that that motion could be taken up out of its order, that is, because it was a command to one of our officers to appear with documents that might affect the position of a member of this House; but I have carefully examined the precedents, and I do not find any to justify a motion on the Notice paper ordering certain papers to be produced, some of which are not in our custody at all, being taken in the nature of a question of privilege and justifying its being taken out of its ordinary course. That is my conclusion, though of course it is for the House to say whether I am correct or not.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask you to reserve your decision on that until Monday.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the decision I have reached. If, on further examination, I find I am wrong, that will be another matter, but I have examined our own precedents and the English pre-

cedents as well, and I have not found any case where such a motion as this has been allowed to be taken out of its course. I suppose that some of these papers will be produced by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery when he appears here. It seems to me that the other papers are not of such a kind as to justify my ruling that the motion for them should be taken out of its ordinary course, and particularly because I do not think the question would be prejudiced by its not being taken out of the ordinary course, as no doubt it will be reached on Monday next.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As to the order for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to appear forthwith, I suppose it will be impossible to carry that out to-day.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

CANADIAN CATTLE IN ENGLAND.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would call the attention of the Government to a cablegram which was placed in my hands showing that Canadian cattle had been scheduled in England, and the dealer in Liverpool has telegraphed to the dealer in Montreal to see to this. This cablegram is dated the 17th, and it is a matter of great importance, so that I would be glad if the Government can tell us how the matter stands.

Mr. TUPPER. In connection with the part of the cattle trade which is concerned with the department over which I preside, that is, the shipping of Canadian cattle, I have had no intimation that such a thing has happened. I was handed a private despatch when I was coming into the House, of the purport the hon. gentleman has stated, but it appeared to imply rather that the prices had been affected by a possible fear that this scheduling would take place, but I have reason to doubt the truth of this because the most cordial relations exist between my department and the department in England as to the shipment of cattle, and we have no intimation from the English Government that such a thing is to take place.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This should be made known in the interests of the shipper as well as of the dealer, and it would be well for the Government to lay this before the House before it adjourns to-day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I understand that the hon. gentleman is interrogating us in reference to some private despatch which we have not seen, and consequently about which we cannot say anything.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This despatch is dated Edinburgh, and says :

"Diseased stock markets. Exercise great caution."

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 5) further to amend Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes, to encourage the development of the sea fisheries and the building of fishing vessels.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 12) respecting the Departments of Marine and Fisheries.—(Mr. Tupper.)

SUPPLY.

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

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Inspector..... $1,700

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the office of inspector has been abolished.

Mr. FOSTER. We had up to lately two financial inspectors whose duty it was to inspect the Government Savings Banks under the Finance Department, and the Post Office Savings Banks. For some time past we have adopted the policy, in the less important of these, upon the death or resignation of a keeper of one of these banks, of transferring it to the Post Office Department, and that has gradually lessened the number of banks under our control. Mr. Tims has, therefore, been superannuated, and we propose, from this time out, to do with one inspector.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount did Mr. Tims receive ?

Mr. FOSTER. $3,600, I think. I forget what his age was. No additions were made to his time. He has been in the service since Confederation.

Office of the Assistant Receiver General, Victoria..... $4,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do you obtain the saving here of $600 ?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Graham was superannuated last year, and the saving is in connection with appointments consequent upon that superannuation.

Country Savings Banks, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island—Salaries..... $11,650

Mr. McMULLEN. Could the Finance Minister state how many of these are in existence, what number have been removed during the last year, and are they decreasing, or is the number remaining about the same ?

Mr. FOSTER. During the last year, I think there has been but one transfer. We do not make the transfers arbitrarily, but only as vacancies occur by death or resignation. Year before last, several important transfers were made. No addition is being made to the number of banks under this management, and the transactions, so far as income and outgo are concerned, are shown in the *Gazette* reports.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much have the deposits in the savings banks been reduced since the 1st of July ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the hon. gentleman the deposits and the withdrawals from the 1st of July up to date. The deposits have been $6,753,567; the withdrawals, $7,553,799; so that the excess of withdrawals over the deposits in the eight months have been just about $800,000. This shows a decided change for the better, that is, so far as we are concerned, in these last eight months, as compared with the year period for the three years preceding.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What has been the reduction in the Post Office banks ?

Mr. FOSTER. In the Post Office the receipts were $4,622,982; the withdrawals, $4,701,713; it has been almost a balance, the deposits being within $80,000 of the withdrawals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, the total withdrawals all told are about $900,000?

Mr. FOSTER. $800,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $800,000 in one and $80,000 in the other, as I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. The total makes about an even $800,000. Taking the whole of last year, 1890-91, the withdrawals exceeded the deposits by pretty nearly $3,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a convenient time to ask another question. The hon. gentleman stated to the House the other day that he had borrowed about $10,000,000 in England at various rates, ranging from 4 per cent to 4½ per cent, most of which, I presume, expires within a few months.

Mr. FOSTER. On the 1st of July.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad to hear from the hon. gentleman what the policy of the Government is with respect to this sum of $10,000,000, which is maturing within a few months. Does he propose to renew it, and, if so, in what shape; or does he propose to negotiate a new loan?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say in the first place, with reference to the gross sum which is now on temporary loans, in round numbers, $10,000,000, that it was not all contracted for the purposes of the current year. As my hon. friend knows, last June, I think, when he asked me, I stated across the House that we had about £800,000, I think, on temporary loans, and towards the end of the year an additional £200,000 was taken on temporary loans; so that for the purposes of last year about £1,000,000 was taken on temporary loans. The remainder has been loaned during the present year and all expires, as I said, on the 1st of July next. I cannot say now very definitely what will be done at or near the expiration of the periods of the temporary loans. The reasons which largely influenced me in not making a permanent loan last year, still exist on the London market, and it is a question which will have to be decided within or about the time, as to whether it is better to renew or continue the temporary loans for another year, or go upon the market for a permanent loan. It will depend on the indications of the market at the time. I may say that, so far as I can see them now, I would be rather in favour of not going on the market for a permanent loan, but would rather be in favour of continuing these for another year, until the condition of the market had become more favourable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, the withdrawals from savings banks have not altogether been stopped?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They amount to about $100,000 a month, perhaps a little more. So by the 1st July, if they do not diminish, there will be $500,000 more to be provided, and of course something to be provided after that date. I note in addition, that the hon. gentleman expects to redeem $2,178,000 of debt that falls due in 1892-93, and he also asks for about $3,000,000 for capital expenditure on railways and canals. These sums together amount to between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000. It appears to me to be a rather questionable policy, having $10,000,000 floating loan, to increase it by $5,000,000 or $6,000,000. That may possibly be much more to the detriment of the public credit than to contract a loan, even on slightly unfavourable grounds. If the hon. gentleman had no debt to redeem, if he had no capital expenditure to pay and no probable deficit on sinking fund account, I do not know that it would matter so much; but it is quite clear that he will have a good many millions to provide for.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be something more to be provided, no doubt; but my remark holds good even in that event, and we shall have to depend on the temper of the market. If we go with a permanent loan at an unfavourable time, we shall have to stand the loss for a lengthy period. If we take a temporary loan, until there is a more favourable market, even if we pay higher interest in the end, it is more advantageous. The whole matter is being very carefully considered; we are taking the best of advice, and we shall have to be governed, I suppose, by the advice given us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with this matter, I should like to ask the Minister whether it is the case, as was stated, I do not know on what authority, in some of the English financial journals lately, that from some cause, probably from the collapse of the firm of Baring Bros., a considerable portion of the 3 per cent loan had been thrown back on the hands of the Government. I should like to know if that statement is correct?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand that no portion of the 3 per cent loan is in the hands of the Government, either directly or indirectly?

Mr. FOSTER. Not one dollar of the 3 per cent loan issued has come back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the whole was stated to have been issued.

Mr. FOSTER. No, the whole was not issued. We took power to issue so much, but we issued one million less.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the Government were authorized to borrow £4,000,000?

Mr. FOSTER. £1,000,000 less was issued than was authorized.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you issued only £3,000,000?

Mr. FOSTER. We issued £4,000,000, and we were authorized to issue £5,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then £1,000,000 remains on hand unissued?

Mr. FOSTER. £1,000,000 remained unissued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was under the impression that the loan was only £4,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. £5,000,000 were authorized, but £4,000,000 only were issued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the statement quoted is entirely unauthorized?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And no portion of the loan remains in the hands of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Not a dollar.

Commission for payment of Public Debt.$36,299 08

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this paid to agents as commission on payment of interest?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it is paid to our agents.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister stated that our contract with our financial agents would expire shortly. When does it expire?

Mr. FOSTER. 1st January next.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister, I suppose, is able to give the House some information as to what he is going to do. Do you propose to continue the present financial arrangement with Baring & Co., or is it intended to make any alteration?

Mr. FOSTER. The notice required under the arrangement, one year's notice, was given, so that we are placed in a position to make a new arrangement prior to 1st January, 1893. Steps have already been taken looking towards a new arrangement. I am not in a position to state at present what will be the result.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may remind the committee that when we appointed the High Commissioner in London, it was distinctly stated from the other side of the House that the intention was to effect a large saving in the management of loans through the agency of that gentleman. That was at that time the policy of the Government. On that point the hon. gentleman can inform us, no doubt, as to whether it is the intention of the Government to utilize the High Commissioner more than his services have been made available of late, or whether they propose substantially to continue the old arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. I may state to the committee that we use the High Commissioner's services as far as they can be made properly available; but I suppose the hon. gentleman will agree with me that the matter of raising and managing loans on the London market is a very delicate and very difficult one, and I am not prepared to state that we are going to make an arrangement which will render it unnecessary for us to have accredited agents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not dispute the wisdom of the conclusion; but it was not the conclusion foreshadowed when the question was up as to the use of our High Commissioner.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the question of the High Commissioner was before the House, I remember the First Minister stated that we would be able to utilize the High Commissioner's services in paying interest on the national debt, and in that way a large amount would be saved to the country. On that assurance the House gave its consent, without further criticism, to the appointment of the High Commissioner, and passed the items for salary and expenses. After that, the Minister of Finance stated that a contract had been entered into with a party in London to act as financial agent for payment of interest on the public debt, and that until the contract expired it would not be possible to utilize the High Commissioner for that purpose. That contract will expire on 1st January next. While I agree with the Minister of Finance that it is not possible to negotiate loans in London through the High Commissioner, his office and his staff can be utilized for paying interest on the national debt. A very large amount could be saved in that way. We find that no less than $36,000 is paid to the financial agents simply for handing over to bondholders interest for the half year on their securities. The High Commissioner's office can be well used for that purpose, and a considerable sum saved to the country, and anyone reading the reports must come to the conclusion that it would be easy for the High Commissioner's office to perform that duty, without any additional expense or additional staff.

Brokerage and Commission on purchases for Sinking Funds..... $12,941 86

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total amount of this 3 per cent loan for sinking fund purposes?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give you the information just here, but I will take a note of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to know exactly how it has been invested in the 3 per cents up to the 1st of January.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give you the information later.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Also, I would be glad to know from the hon. Minister in what fashion this very large purchase of sinking funds, amounting to about £400,000 sterling, are now made. Who are the commissioners at present for the sinking fund?

Mr. FOSTER. For the guaranteed loans, the trustees are: the High Commissioner of Canada, Lord Revelstoke and the two Under Secretaries of State for the Colonies and the Foreign Office. For the unguaranteed loan, the trustees are: the Receiver General for Canada, and the agents, Baring Brothers, and Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co. For the British Columbia loan, which is a small matter, the trustee is Sir Robert George Wyndham Herbert, K.C.B.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What arrangement has been made with these gentlemen? I presume the agents were sufficiently well paid by the brokerage and commission. Are you paying the other gentlemen specific amounts for their services?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so: I do not find any amount for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps not, but I would be obliged if you would enquire. I would be glad to know what the arrangement is. I would also like to know in what method this large sum amounting to $2,000,000 is invested in the purchase of the sinking fund. Are the commissioners or the agents in the habit of advertising to know at what rates they can obtain it, or do they just simply go to the market and buy from their brokers?

Mr. FOSTER. They purchase at the market rate through their brokers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In open market?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you quite sure?

Mr. FOSTER. That is my impression.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I will enquire later on about that. They have managed among them to preserve the most extraordinary uniformity in the purchase, I observe, for a very long period of time.

Mr. FOSTER. Stocks have been very even of late.

Printing of Dominion Notes..... $45,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Might I ask the Minister of Finance if the new contract has been made with regard to the printing of Dominion notes?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. I may say that tenders were invited and that the new contract has virtually been given. It is engrossed and ready for signature, and will be signed in a day or two.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was there more than one tender?

Mr. FOSTER. Two tenders.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did the lowest tenderer get the contract?

Mr. FOSTER. The lowest tenderer: practically the lowest tenderer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practically? That may offer room for wide difference of opinion. I would ask the Minister, are the sinking funds all held in stock, or is any part of them held in bonds?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a difference as between guaranteed and unguaranteed loans. For the guaranteed loans, debentures and stocks are held, and quite a large proportion of what is held are debentures. These are held by the Bank of England in trust for the trustees. With reference to the unguaranteed loans, the debentures are bought and cancelled and turned into inscribed stock, and the cancelled debentures and the certificates are sent here to Ottawa. The debentures are burned, according to the Audit Act, and the certificates held by the Receiver General, and this stock cannot be transferred without deed of transfer and presentation of the certificate, so that everything is safe.

Governor General Secretary's Office.....$10,562 50

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that there is nothing abnormal in this. The only increase outside the statutory increase being $100 for the messenger. He has been a very long time in the service, and his long services have been recognized in this way.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was his salary before?

Mr. FOSTER. $500 I think.

Privy Council Office..... $28,525

Mr. FOSTER. There are three statutory increases at $50, two promotions from third-class to second-class, involving increases of $200 and $350, and the appointment of two new clerks, one at $550 and one at $400; the total increases being $1,650. The decreases include $700, the difference between the salary of a second-class clerk and a third-class clerk promoted; $380, the difference between the salary of a clerk who resigned and that of his successor; $200, the difference in the payment of messengers; and $75 in the salary of a chief clerk; making a total decrease of $1,355 and a total net increase of $295.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What led to the need of additional officers?

Mr. FOSTER. The work of the Privy Council Office has increased very rapidly, as the records show.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what respect?

Mr. FOSTER. More documents and more transcribing. In the other departments—in my department, for instance—the number of officers is not increasing owing to an efficient head and an equally efficient deputy head, but the work has greatly increased. It is so in all the departments, and an increase in the work of the various departments naturally causes an increase in the Privy Council, through which the documents from all the departments have to pass.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The inference to be drawn is that the deputy head of the Privy Council is not equally efficient, because the increase of work there requires an increase of officers.

Department of Militia and Defence..$43,812 50

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see there is a decrease in this vote, and also in that of the Customs Department. Is this supposed to be accomplished by the reconstruction of the Cabinet? If so, perhaps there could be another reconstruction all round which would result in further economy.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the explanation, from which the hon. gentleman can draw his own inference. There were nine statutory increases amounting to $450, and one at $37.50. Then there is a decrease of $600 in the salary of a third-class clerk, and $75 in the salary of a chief clerk; the net decrease being $187.50.

Department of Printing and Stationery.....$22,842 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We would like some explanatien of the changes involved in this reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. There are thirteen statutory increases, $650, also one at $30 and one at $15; a new appointment, $500; and an addition to the salary of Mr. Roxborough, who performs the duties formerly performed by Mr. Bronskill; making the total increases $1,395. The decreases are the salaries of two chief clerks at $1,950 each, and those of two second-class clerks, $2,600. Then, there was a salary twice voted for 1891-92, which drops out; making the total decreases $7,700, and the net decrease $6,305.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the two gentlemen who are dropped?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Bronskill and Mr. Senécal.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is Mr. Roxborough paid the same salary as Mr. Bronskill received?

Mr. FOSTER. No. He formerly received $1,350, and he gets $200 additional.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that it is now possible to discharge the duties of this office with 21 clerks instead of 25 who were employed under the former regime? It strikes me that there must have been some extravagance in that department, when we find it possible to decrease the staff by nearly 25 per cent. My own conviction is that the functions of this department might

easily have been discharged without the gentlemen who have disappeared, and with great public advantage.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the place which was formerly held by Mr. Senécal now filled?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, Mr. McMahon fills that office at the salary he had.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that these reductions are to be permanent or only *pro tempore*?

Mr. FOSTER Oh, yes, permanent.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the position which Mr. McMahon formerly held, that of assistant superintendent, filled?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not think it is. I think he simply performs the additional duties, keeping his salary and place.

Department of the Interior..... $95,414 00

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When may we expect the report of the Commission appointed to investigate certain affairs in connection with the Interior Department?

Mr. FOSTER. That is, the report of the Committee of the Privy Council who were appointed to investigate the irregularities in the Interior Department? The report has been made and has been embodied in an Order in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Undoubtedly we are not in a position to discuss the details of Civil Government, until we have that report. When can it be laid on the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is no objection to lay it on the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When can that be done?

Mr. FOSTER. Before we come to concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Concurrence is generally taken in the last days of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we can lay it on the Table next week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some of these items should be allowed to stand over, so that we may be able to discuss them intelligently after the report is laid on the Table. This report may contain, and I hope it will contain, some important recommendations and information as to the working of the Civil Service. We have found great irregularities to exist, as was superabundantly proven last session, and it is important thet we should have some report before us from these gentlemen who are experts chosen for the purpose, so that we may see if any means have presented themselves to them by which the departments can be kept in better order, and as to the reconstruction of some of the departments. I have always thought that our system was very vicious, that we had too many men of mediocre ability who were well paid, and too few good men who were poorly paid. We might leave over one of these items in order to afford an opportunity for discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. It might take place on the vote for contingencies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that this discussion will not take place until we have that report?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to know from the Minister of the Interior how his department stands. We understood that the Deputy Minister was suspended, or was in such a position as to relieve him from the discharge of his duties as deputy. I understand that he has been re-appointed to the department, and we ought to know what his position is and what pay he receives, because that is not known to the House. The hon. gentleman should state what position the late deputy occupies, whether he was suspended, whether he has been reinstated, what position he occupies now, what salary he is receiving, and whether he is to be reinstated in his former position.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Deputy Minister was never suspended, but for a certain time he did not attend to the duties of the department. He placed a letter in my hands stating that, if I thought his resignation should be accepted, he was willing to hand in his resignation. I did not consider that his position was such that I should accept his resignation, and, consequently, after the report of the sub-committee of the Privy Council was made he returned to his duty, at my request, and he has been acting as deputy ever since. As soon as the report asked for by hon. members comes down, they will see the position he occupies.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then I understand that he has never been suspended, that he has never ceased to be deputy or to get the pay or discharge the work?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I said he has been acting as deputy, but he has received no salary from the time he placed his letter in my hands until the present moment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the resignation of the Deputy Minister was placed in the Minister's hands and not accepted, that this gentleman did not attend the office for a short time, but at the Minister's suggestion came back to work and accepted his old position? Of course, if he is doing that, he is receiving his old pay.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If the report were brought down, hon. gentlemen would see where the complication has arisen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Cannot the hon. gentleman tell us now what the complication is?

Mr. DEWDNEY. A recommendation was made that the deputy should be reduced to the rank of a chief clerk.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On what ground?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the grounds which appear in the report of the committee.

Mr. DEWDNEY. But it was found there was no provision for another chief clerk, and consequently there was no provision for his salary, so he has received no salary from that time to this, pending a reconsideration of the matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand you have no deputy at present? The Government propose to reduce the deputy to the position of a chief clerk, but I presume they intend to have a deputy head of the department?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, but it was found that there was no provision for another chief clerkship

and consequently he did not receive his pay, but I asked him to continue to act as deputy, as I had a right to do under the Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the committee degraded the deputy to the rank of chief clerk and then the Minister asked him to work as a chief clerk, he should receive the pay, but I do not see that the hon. gentleman is asking us to vote the salary of a chief clerk, though he is asking us to vote the salary of a Deputy Minister. It appears that he must be intending to pay this gentleman as Deputy Minister. I should like to know if it is his intention to ignore the recommendation of the committee and to ask the House to vote the salary for this gentleman as Deputy Minister?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not my intention to interfere with the report of the committee at all; but what I do intend to do is to ask that the deputy may be reinstated in his old position.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before that is done, I suppose, by the rules of the department which authorize the Minister to pay a clerk who is doing the work of an inferior officer, if the deputy has been appointed by the Minister as acting deputy, if he has been called upon by the Minister to discharge the duty of a deputy, although he is degraded to the rank of a chief clerk, he will nevertheless be entitled to the salary of deputy.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no rule of that kind. There is merely a rule that it may be awarded under certain circumstances, but nobody is entitled to it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the late Deputy Minister been drawing a new salary for some months past since the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I said a few moments ago that he has not drawn a dollar since he wrote me that letter.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the Minister explain to whom the Deputy Minister's salary has been paid?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has been paid to no one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand it, the Minister informs the House that after all that has passed, it is his intention to recommend his late deputy, or his acting deputy, or his interim deputy—I do not know what Mr. Burgess is just now—but it is his intention to recommend him to be reinstated in the full power, and pay, and perquisites of his former office.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, that is my intention.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not propose to discuss the matter, because we are not in possession of the information on which we could properly discuss it. The Committee of Council must have had some facts to go on, or they never would have taken the responsibility of degrading a deputy head down to the position of chief clerk. That may be assumed *primâ facie* by the House. Now, if the Committee of Council acted in that way and degraded this gentleman down to the position of chief clerk, I want to know why the hon. gentleman is asking Parliament to vote his pay for that office, or if he is going to ignore that recommendation for the past as well as for the future, and to pay his deputy head in defiance of that recommendation? I am not saying whether it is right or wrong; I do not know the facts. I want to know from the hon. gentleman what the facts are, and what his intentions are, and this is the proper time for him to tell us, without any evasion.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been no evasion, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to add a word to what my colleague has said. My colleague has not evaded the question. The facts are as he has stated: that on investigation, following the investigation by the Public Accounts Committee, the Council decided that Mr. Burgess should be deprived of his office and made a chief clerk. The Auditor General has objected that no chief clerk's salary was provided; the chief clerkships in that department were all filled; he could not, therefore, get the salary of a Deputy Minister because he had been deprived of that office, and he could not get the salary of a chief clerk because that was not provided by Parliament. I submit to my hon. friend that there will be time enough, when we ask the House to vote his salary, to discuss whether that salary is appropriated or not. In the meantime, nothing has been received from the committee, because the case has not come before Council. My colleague is stating his own views as to the position Mr. Burgess occupied.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I admit there was perfect frankness on the part of the Minister as regards the future, because he said it was his intention to reinstate, so far as he could, this gentleman in the position of deputy, and he was asking the House to vote his salary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But, from the statement of the Minister that he intends to recommend the reinstatement, we assumed, until the leader of the House intervened, that he was speaking the mind of the Government. I was desirous of getting some other information as to what rate the hon. gentleman proposed to pay Mr. Burgess for the work he has been doing as chief clerk.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not made up my mind what recommendation to make with regard to that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the late deputy ever acted as chief clerk? Has he not all along discharged the duties of Deputy Minister?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. He has never acted as chief clerk, because there was no chief clerkship vacant to appoint him to. If he had been appointed chief clerk, I should still have asked him to carry out the duties of deputy head.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In reality he has discharged the duties of deputy head.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The duties of deputy are very often discharged by a chief clerk when the deputy head is absent. Every clerk has to do the duties assigned to him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) After all said and done, it is rather making a burlesque of the enquiry and the report of the Committee of Council, because it is a rather important function which they assume of interfering with a gentleman occupying such a very high position as deputy head, and degrading him. Then we find the head of the department quietly but very determinedly ignoring that report, and reinstating the gentleman in the position from which he had been degraded. I am not saying whether the original recommendation was correct

or not, but I do mean to say that there appears to be a most marvellous discrepancy between the action of the Minister at the head of the department and the action of the Minister who reports on his deputy.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I consider that the public, the department and the Government would suffer if I had to dispense with his services.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Your colleagues on the Commission did not think so.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do I understand the Minister to say that Mr. Burgess was discharged from the position of deputy head, or only that he sent in his resignation? Was not Mr. Hall acting as deputy head some time during last session?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I said, for a short time, while that letter of Mr. Burgess was held by me.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long has Mr. Hall been discharging the duties of deputy head?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Perhaps a month or six weeks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I really think that before we proceed with this discussion as to the Department of the Interior, we ought to have the report of the Committee of Council before us. It is quite evident that though there may be no contradiction between the First Minister and his colleague, there is a strong conflict of opinion, and we ought to have an opportunity of judging for ourselves on what grounds the Minister at the head of the department dissents from the opinion of his colleagues, and my hon. friend intimates his intention of overriding that. Be that as it may, I think we really must have the report of the committee, because the question is one of great importance. I was present myself during the investigation which took place at the Public Accounts Committee, and I must say that there appeared to have been, for a long period of time, very great laxity of discipline in the control of that important department. It has swollen, as the House will see, to enormous proportions, it has great interests committed to it. My own judgment in the matter, *primâ facie*, would rather be with the Committee of Council, but I would like to fortify my opinion by knowing the reasons which induced the hon. gentlemen to arrive at their decision, and I trust the Minister of Finance will let this item stand until we get the report of the Committee of Council.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite agree with my hon. friend that he should have an opportunity of seeing that report in connection with the Interior, when it comes down. But there is no salary being voted here for Mr. Burgess or any other person; and whatever may be the outcome of that discussion, I suppose that my hon. friend will not deny that there must be a deputy head, and he must have a salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We do not deny that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is admitted that the officers are necessary, and whatever the result of the discussion may be upon the report, it will not affect the position of certain officers who are necessary in the department.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I must have misunderstood the Minister of the Interior when he answered my question with regard to the position that the late Deputy Minister occupied in the department. I understood him to say that Mr. Burgess had been discharging the duties of Deputy Minister all along, although he had been degraded to the position of chief clerk. Afterwards, in answering the hon. member for North Wellington, he said that Mr. Hall, who is the secretary of the department, had discharged the duties for about two months. Now, if that was the case, there must have been two Deputy Ministers during that time.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You misunderstood me altogether. I said it was only during the time that I held that resignation letter of Mr. Burgess.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I understand it, you still hold that letter, because he has never been reinstated.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That letter was disposed of by the report of the Committee being adopted by Council, which settled Mr. Burgess's position. But down to that time Mr. Hall was acting as deputy. There is no conflict between what I said and what my colleague said. I merely added an explanation that the view which he expressed to the House was his own opinion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then the two months salary would go to Mr. Hall?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. Mr. Hall has received nothing but his own salary as chief clerk. The department will require a deputy head. The salary is from 1st of next July, and the committee will see that it will suffer no prejudice by this vote being taken, when I tell the committee, as my colleague the Finance Minister has done, that we will be asking Parliament to vote a salary for Mr. Burgess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that it is quite proper to appropriate this amount of salary for the deputy head, as one would be required. But the Government have undertaken to show by their action during the last six months that such an office is not necessary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Government have called on a chief clerk to act as deputy, and they have allowed that system to go on for the past six months. Has the work of the deputy been efficiently and properly done? Surely the Government have had time to consider this question. Mr. Burgess has been degraded, upon the report of the Commission, to the rank of a chief clerk. The Minister of the Interior, the head of the department, says it is not his intention that Mr. Burgess shall remain in that position, but he shall be restored to the office which he previously held. Why has that question not been disposed of before this time? Six months have elapsed since Mr. Burgess was assigned to his present position. Why should the Government come down and tell this committee one story embodied in the report of a commission, which has been adopted by the Governor in Council, and the head of the department tell the committee a different story? This question should be disposed of by the Government before they ask for an appropriation of salary for a Deputy Minister. The committee may be inclined to agree with the Commission and not with the determination of the

Minister of the Interior. Whether the House should vote that appropriation or not, might depend entirely on the decision of the Government in the matter. A conclusion should be reached by the Government before they are in a position to ask Parliament to make an appropriation. It seems to me that this item should stand until a different practice has been adopted. From the facts elicited by the Public Accounts Committee which came before the House to a very limited extent, indeed, we know that Mr. Burgess was suspended, owing to the irregularities in the payment of permanent clerks for extra services, contrary to provisions of the law. Is it the intention of the Government, in the restoration of this deputy to his original position, to alter the law and to authorize that to be done? We ought to ascertain if the Government intend to allow permanent clerks to neglect their ordinary duties in order that they may do work after hours for an extra allowance. It is important that the House should know what the determination of the Government is, and if this House is to exercise effective supervision, we should know what the views of the Government are on this matter, not while the views of the Government are in the clouds, but after they have come to earth. I think the Government must decide this matter before they ask an appropriation. It is preposterous to come to the committee and say: We want this appropriation, although we have allowed the office to remain vacant for six months, on the plea that it is for an officer after 1st July. If the department was one just created there might be some excuse for coming to the House and asking for an appropriation. Of course, the Government might not have been able to secure a suitable officer, and wished further time. But no such statement is made now. The office has not been filled. The department is not properly organized; it has not been properly organized since the report of that Commission was made. It has been unorganized or imperfect ever since, and the Government now comes and asks the committee to make an appropriation for an imperfectly organized department, when they see the condition it is in at the present time. In my opinion, the committee is not discharging its duty, is not exercising sufficient control over these matters, unless it calls upon the Government to perform its duty before asking an appropriation for this office.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman is scarcely consistent in his reasoning. He spent five minutes in trying to impress on the committee the fact that during six months, or thereabouts, this department has been imperfectly organized. The hon. gentleman found fault because there has not been a deputy head, and then he complained because the Government has asked an appropriation for the purpose of perfecting the organization. The hon. gentleman wishes to know if it is intended that permanent clerks shall be paid for extra services, and before an appropriation is voted he desires that information. The hon. gentleman was informed, he believes and knows that whatever punishment was put on Mr. Burgess by making him a chief clerk in the department was punishment for doing that very thing, and that is proof which is plain enough and certain enough that the Government does not intend that permanent clerks shall be paid for extra services. If Mr. Burgess's name was here as deputy head and the amount was being voted in that way for salary, the hon. gentleman's objection would be good, that before this amount was appropriated the report should be brought down and discussed; but everyone knows that to have a department well organized and carried on there must be a deputy head, or some one doing the work of the deputy head, and we are simply asking for that vote and that organization. I think it is refined reasoning to ask that this item should stand for no better cause than that assigned.

Mr. FRASER. I see the force of the argument of the Minister of Finance. But this is really a vote for Mr. Burgess, because the Minister of the Interior, the head of the department, says he is bound to restore him to his old position. Had not the Minister specifically stated that it was his determination that Mr. Burgess should be restored —and the Government did not repudiate the statement—I would have had no trouble in the matter, and I would have looked upon it exactly as the Minister of Finance has done. I have no objection that this deputy should be continued. If the Government found they made a mistake in deposing him in the first instance, and if the report of the Commission shows that he acted wrongly, and they accepted that report, I am bound to admit that the Government saw their mistake and admitted that this Commission knew more about this department than they did. The Minister of Justice stated that Mr. Burgess was suspended only until the Commission reported, and the Government now seems to think they were wrong and he should be restored. Owing to the stubborn fight of the head of the department and his determination to restore this duputy, irrespective of the Government or anyone else, this vote is substantially made a vote for this particular deputy.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Were not other officers in the department, besides the Deputy Minister, degraded for the same reason that the deputy was degraded? I would like to ask him at the same time, if all the officers whose conduct was investigated before the Public Accounts Committee have been reinstated? We know some men there who had for years been drawing money in the names of dead men. There were also officers of the department drawing salaries under fictitious names, in the names of men and women who had no existence. Now I would like the Minister to state to the committee if all these men have been reinstated, and if it is not a fact that some of the officers other than Mr. Burgess have also been degraded.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No other officer was degraded from the position which he then occupied, and they are all still in the service of the department.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Were the salaries of some of the officers not reduced?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The salaries were not reduced, in any case.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was not the salary of Mr. Nelson reduced?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The salaries were not reduced, but they were docked half of their salary for two months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Finance has brought up a question of considerable importance, in the discussion of our Estimates.

The question which is before us at the present time is this: We are called upon to vote $95,000 for the Department of the Interior. This is the proper time—a time set apart by custom and usage in Parliament to discuss the proper administration of that department, and it is for that reason—not with any view to hamper or detain the House—that I desire to have the information which the Government have obtained from their Committee of the Privy Council as to the doings of the former head, and the gentleman, who, as I understand, is to be the future head of the department. That information is distinctly germane to this item, and I think we ought to have it. I repeat that this is the special time at which that information should be in the hands of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The question, as I understand, is, that the hon. gentleman was asked to allow this particular vote to stand, so that it might be discussed when the report comes down. Perhaps this would be the better item to allow to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. All right, let it stand.

Office of the Comptroller of the North-West Mounted Police $9,550

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that resolution is adopted, I may say that I notice that the increases are statutory, and I am not going to discuss that question. Let me ask, is this under the control of the Minister of Justice or the Department of the Interior?

Mr. FOSTER. Under the control of the President of the Privy Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was about to ask for some information with respect to certain proceedings that I see have taken place in the North-West in reference to the officer in charge of the Mounted Police. We may as well have the information in connection with it now, and also information as to what policy the Government intend to adopt with regard to that force. The force is to a large extent thoroughly military, and there is some sort of anomaly in it being under the control of a thoroughly civil department. I shall be glad to know what information the leader of the House, or whoever is in charge of that department, has to give on these two subjects.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that would come up equally as well on the vote for the service itself. With reference to the outcome of the Commission, I believe its labours are ended, but the report is not yet before the Government. With reference to the policy, that we can discuss more fully when we come to the vote for the main service, but I think I may say here, that the Government have in contemplation a gradual and prudent diminution of the force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had reference to the question of policy as to what department this should be under, and in connection with that I may say that I would be glad to understand to whom this investigation has been referred. Has it been conducted by civil officers or has any military officer been associated in any way in the investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Judge Wetmore was the commissioner, and he has carried it on solely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no desire in the least degree to impugn the capacity of the hon. judge who has charge of the investigation; but whether he is an able judge or not, is not altogether the question. It appears to me that in an investigation into the doings of an officer in charge of the force, it would have been expedient that one or more military men should have been associated with the judge. I am rather surprised to find that the matter has been wholly conducted by the civil authorities. The civil authority is an excellent authority, I have no doubt, in weighing the relative merits of the evidence submitted, but in a matter of this kind I think it would have been in the interest of the service if some military man of note and eminence should have been associated with the judge: for questions will arise as to military discipline which no ordinary civilian could be expected to be intimately acquainted with.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the House will be in a better position to judge of that when the report is laid on the Table, and when we see what the nature of the charges is. I can express the highest opinion of Judge Wetmore's competency, and in the faith the public would have in any enquiry he should manage. I think the House also will assume that confidence when they receive his report, and that they will come to the conclusion that he was thoroughly competent to carry on the investigation. I am quite sure that we will discuss the matter with more satisfaction when we have the papers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not proposing to discuss the report. I am merely raising the question as to the policy of investigating matters relating to the discipline of a military force wholly before a civil commissioner. It appears to me that was a very questionable policy, to say the least of it. I think it would have been better if a military man had been associated with the judge. When will this report be laid on the Table of the House? I presume we will not discuss the affairs of the Mounted Police until this is ready.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately military law does not apply to the North-West Mounted Police, and I do not think it would have been the least advantage to Judge Wetmore to have had a coadjutor of a military character. He had to enquire into certain charges that were not really cognizable at all by military law. I wish that military law did apply, and if so many of the evils that were complained of, and in Consequence of which that Commission was established, could not have existed. I had something to do with the conducting of the enquiry before Judge Wetmore, and I must say, that so far as I saw, he is a thoroughly capable judge and entirely impartial, as I would expect any judge in this country to be. But the charges are not charges which can be judged by military law—I wish they were. Some of the charges, if judged by military law, would at once call forth the strongest condemnation, because they would be a palpable violation of the established laws in military bodies. But the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police has a power exceeding the power of the Commander-in-Chief of the British army, as I have pointed out here; and as the military law does not apply, I do not suppose it would have been of any advantage to have had a military coadjutor. I hope, in common with the hon. gentleman, that we shall soon have that report. The evidence, I may

say, has been of such a character as I think to justify Parliament in expecting an early report, and early action on the report. The evidence before that Commission has been more conclusive and more full than we could possibly have expected, and I cannot myself possibly anticipate any other than one conclusion, and that is the conclusion consonant with the proposition that has been more than once laid down by myself in this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The report is not expected for five or six weeks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that it cannot be hurried up any sooner?—because that will bring it to a rather late period.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will ascertain more definitely by Monday.

Office of the Auditor General.....$26,037 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was there any special reason why the Auditor General's Report could not be brought down when Parliament met?

Mr. FOSTER. We were in session very late last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would not affect his work.

Mr. FOSTER. It did affect it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason I put the question is this. To all intents and purposes the Auditor General's Report has been converted into the Public Accounts; and unless some arangement can be made for placing that report in the hands of Parliament about the end of January, when I hope we shall meet in future, our work would be wholly at a standstill. This little *brochure* which we call the Public Accounts has practically discharged its functions. Therefore I desire to know if there is any likelihood in the future of the Auditor General's Report being delayed as it has been on this occasion, or whether this is purely an exceptional occurrence?

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is purely exceptional. I had a conversation with the Auditor General about it, and he gave me as the chief reason the lateness of last session, and stated that he would take steps to have his report brought out in normal years in good time. I hope that I shall not offend the sensibilities of my hon. friend from North Wellington, when I say that the Auditor General hopes in future years not to have it so large as it is this year.

Department of Customs..... $36,505

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it owing to the fact that that department has gone into other hands, that a decrease is brought about here? Are we to have more rigid economy than we have had?

Mr. FOSTER. The statutory increases, and the increases from the promotion of two third-class clerks to the second class, amount to $1,095. As against that, the salary of one chief clerk, amounting to $2,250, is dropped, and there is a decrease of $500, being the difference in the salary of a third-class clerk and that of a new appointment. The net decrease is $1,655.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was generally supposed that the Minister at the head of that department was one of the most economical we had, and it is surprising to find that there is to be a saving in this department. I see it has worked in both ways, because the Minister who has changed places has made a decrease in the new department as well. Perhaps the acting Minister of Customs will explain how he can do the work now with a chief clerk less than was there in the time past.

Mr. BOWELL. In the reorganization of the department, the commissioner was superannuated, the assistant commissioner was promoted to the commissionership, the accountant, who was a chief clerk, was made assistant commissioner, and the accountant's branch of the department hereafter, as provided for in these Estimates, will be carried on by two first class clerks, one to take charge of the expenditure and one of the income or revenue department. Now the work is being done by one first-class clerk and one second-class clerk, but it may be that in a short time the latter will be promoted to a first-class clerkship. In dividing the work in that way, with the supervision of the commissioner and assistant commissioner, I did not deem it advisable or necessary in the interests of the service that a chief clerk should be appointed. The third-class clerk to whom the Minister of Finance has alluded will be brought in at a lower salary, and in this way the saving will be effected.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then we are to understand that all these economies were made by the ex-Minister of Customs and not by the new Minister.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire to take any credit to myself in connection with the decrease. These arrangements took place before the change was made. When the new Minister returns and takes charge of the department, he will find it as now arranged, and no doubt he will administer it as economically as I have done.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand that these economies have been the result of the superannuation of the commissioner?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, and no doubt that will balance the account. The commissioner was over 70 years of age and had served about 35 years, and if anyone was entitled to a retiring allowance, I think he was. I cannot speak too highly, from the 13 or 14 years' experience I have had of Mr. Johnson, of his ability and integrity. Without any exception, he is an officer in whom anyone could place the most implicit confidence. I never knew him in that time to deviate from what he considered to be his duty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He almost bordered on stubbornness.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I see there are two second-class clerks more and two third-class clerks less. I suppose that is owing to promotion?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then after a while there may be two more chief clerks.

Mr. BOWELL. That could not be this year, unless an appropriation for them was made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly; but what the hon. gentleman speaks of now as a matter of saving and economy, there being only one chief clerk now instead of two, may possibly only be a

temporary condition of things which may be changed by promotion.

Mr. BOWELL. That does not follow. You are not going to cross the floor within a year, and consequently it will not take place.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was some investigation in regard to the customs in Montreal. Is the Government going to lay that report before the House? There was an investigation as to some irregularities or reorganization in Montreal.

Mr. BOWELL. That does not come under this heading at all. That would be a very proper question to put when we come to the general Estimates and are asking for a vote for the Montreal office; but this is the inside service. The only investigation that took place in Montreal was in order to see what economies could be effected by retiring the older men and allowing the younger men to do the work as they were doing, as I stated last year. When the hon. gentleman comes to that part of the Estimates, he will find that from $15,000 to $18,000 less is asked for the port of Montreal this year, as the result of that investigation, than was expended or asked for the year before. This was purely a departmental report, and is not of a character generally laid before Parliament. There may be no objection to laying it before the House, but all the hon. gentleman will find will be that an officer is too old and his work could be done by someone now in the service without any increase of cost, and that some officials at Point St. Charles or at the Canadian Pacific Railway station or somewhere else could be dispensed with.

Mr. McMULLEN. We will reach these items in a few days, and I was anxious to know, before we reached them, whether it was the intention of the Government to present that report to the House. We have heard to-day that important reports have been made which should be laid before the House. I do not wish to put a question which would trouble the hon. gentleman, but I think these reports should be in the hands of the House.

Mr. BOWELL. I say frankly that I did not intend to lay that report before the House. I did not consider it of a nature to lay before the House. There are scores of reports of that character in reference to various ports, but there may be no objection, if the House desires to have it, where they are not confidential.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think such an important report should be laid before the House. If Parliament is to deal with the affairs of the country in an intelligent way, it is desirable that all the information in the hands of the Government, or furnished to any department by any committee, should be laid before the House. We are labouring in the dark. What is the object of these investigations? No doubt the hon. gentleman thinks it is the duty of the Minister to deal with these Commissions and the House has no right to know anything about them. I say the people's representatives have a right to investigate these matters.

Mr. BOWELL. It is unnecessary for the hon. gentleman to get so excited or to fight a shadow. I did not object to laying this report before the House, but I may tell the hon. gentleman that, if every inspector's report is to be laid on the Table, the head of the department will not be so likely to receive the information he should receive in connection with the customs or any other department. This was not a special commission: if it were, I think the argument of the hon. member for Wellington would be quite correct. This was an ordinary inspection by the officers of the department, such as is made whenever they visit a port. There are many things in these reports that it would not be advisable to lay on the Table, because if an inspector or an officer does his duty faithfully, he will make statements in reference to the management of an office, which the probabilities are ten to one that he would not make if he knew they were to be made public, because it would bring him into contact with merchants and the affairs of almost every importer in the country. I think a moment's reflection will convince the hon. gentleman that unless it is a special case, and he wants special information, as a rule these reports should not be laid upon the Table.

Department of Marine $31,730

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman expect that he will be able to make a permanent saving in that department?

Mr. TUPPER. I think ultimately there will be a saving in the fusion of the two branches.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is apparently a decrease of $4,000 in both branches.

Mr. TUPPER. There have been vacancies of highly-paid officers, and their places will be filled by lower class officers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state, when he gets the department reorganized on the basis he proposes, whether there will be any saving, and if so, what, in its administration?

Mr. TUPPER. I am not in a position to state the exact amount, but the amalgamation of the two branches will, in my opinion, reduce the staff. In the first place, we do not require two deputy heads. Then with reference to the correspondence branch and contingencies branch, I think there will be a saving effected of a not inconsiderable sum.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) An accountant?

Mr. TUPPER. No, the accountant's branch will practically be required. We have not a very heavy staff in either the Marine or the Fisheries, and the accountant's work is so distinct that I think it will always be kept as it is. Indeed, I may say that the officers in both branches do a great deal of the work, and now work continuously after ordinary hours.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, if we allow for the superannuation allowance of the late Deputy Minister of Fisheries, there will practically be no saving at all to the country.

Mr. TUPPER. I say the opposite. I am only giving my opinion. I say the fusion of the two departments will enable us ultimately to manage the correspondence of both departments at a less cost than at present. The contingent accounts, I think, will necessarily be reduced by the amalgamation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman think the saving will amount to the amount of the superannuation?

Mr. TUPPER. Oh, yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. gentleman remember the year when these departments were divided?

Mr. TUPPER. In 1885.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the hon. gentleman feel any regret that he should ever have done so, in face of the protests of the Opposition, at a loss of some $4,000 during the past years?

Mr. TUPPER. What is a good rule for one year is not necessarily a good rule for another. I am dealing with 1892, not with 1885.

Department of Public Works. $51,117 50

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is Mr. Arnoldi drawing his pay now?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is anybody appointed in his place?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman taking a vote for the office here?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think we should have the report of the Commission that was appointed to investigate and report upon the service in the different departments, before we pass items of this kind. Now, here is an officer who was dismissed last year, and we are asked to vote a salary to pay another man to fill the same place, although another man has not been appointed. If we had the report of that Commission it might show us whether it was necessary that another man should be appointed in that position. We are asked in the meantime, virtually, to put the cart before the horse, and to go and vote salaries in face of the fact that the Civil Service Commission has been appointed to investigate the positions of all the civil servants. I think that while that report is in the printer's hands it is a very irregular proceeding for us to go on passing these items.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend suggest that we should pass none of these items until we get the report of that Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister should be a little more prudent, in view of the disclosures made last year, instead of rushing us into Committee of Supply and asking us to pass items in face of the fact that a report of vital interest to this House and the country has not yet been placed in the hands of the members. We should have that report to guide us before we pass any more of these items.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There are a number of other employés in the Public Works Department whose conduct was investigated before the Public Accounts Committee, and who, I believe, were either suspended or dismissed from the service. I think we ought to have the information contained in that report before we are asked to vote this money. We ought to know whether these men are still suspended or have been reinstated.

Mr. OUIMET. Every one of these men have been dealt with according to the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have other men been appointed in their places, and if so, who?

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. FOSTER. They were dismissed, and have left their offices.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is currently reported that a number of them have been reinstated.

Mr. OUIMET. My predecessor, the acting Minister, has taken back Mr. Dionne as a temporary officer, after an investigation before a magistrate, and he had been acquitted. That is the only one who has been taken back. I may state to the hon. gentleman that, being quite new in the department, I have not been able to ascertain the full particulars of that case. It was considered that as Dionne had been acquitted by the magistrate after an investigation, it is only fair that we should give him a chance to be reinstated.

Mr. LAURIER. If he is not to blame, he should be reinstated in his office instead of being made a temporary clerk.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the report of the committee was against Mr. Dionne, and he was prosecuted by order of the Treasury Board. The mere fact that the preliminary examination before the magistrate resulted in his getting clear, as it were, is no evidence that he is guilty or not guilty. It is true he was discharged at that preliminary examination; I should be very sorry to say that he was guilty of the crime charged—I do not know that—but the mere fact that he was so discharged does not establish his innocence. He may have been discharged for thirty or forty reasons, such, for example, as that evidence was not forthcoming; but if he stands reported on as guilty of dereliction of duty, the House is entitled to know why he is reinstated, and whether the particular charge against him failed to be established.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The charge before the magistrate was unsuccessful, and there was every reason to believe that he ought to stand in the position of a person against whom there was really no evidence of the crime from which he was discharged. He was fairly entitled, so far as that offence was concerned, to reinstatement. There had, however been looseness in his conduct and irregularity in another sense, and it seemed proper not to reinstate him, but to take him on trial as a temporary clerk.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me rather a curious course to adopt. I can hardly conceive the Government undertaking to prosecute an officer until they were fully satisfied that there was a clear *primâ facie* case against him. A report was made against this officer in the first instance. The Government adopted it, and then ordered him to be prosecuted. If prosecution was improperly instituted, a very great wrong was done the officer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Sometimes witnesses swear differently at different times, as in this case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then if the Government came to the conclusion that the prosecution was improperly commenced and the charge could not be sustained, the man should have been reinstated.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not propose to reinstate him for the present.

Mr. LAURIER. If he is not reinstated in his office, the only inference to be drawn is that, notwithstanding that Mr. Dionne was discharged by the magistrate, still there was reason to believe

that his conduct was not satisfactory. I would infer from the report of the committee which investigated the case, that his acts have not warranted the confidence of the Government in him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There were no new facts brought before the committee which investigated the case. We thought that the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee was sufficient to show that it was desirable, in the interests of the service, that he should not be reinstated.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What salary is he now receiving?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is now receiving $1,000 a year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What was his salary before?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. $1,400. He is a very good accountant, and quite capable of being a very efficient officer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). His employment is merely temporary now?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Department of Railways and Canals.. $54,912

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who is now secretary of the department?

Mr. HAGGART. The deputy head is at present performing the duties of secretary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was the former secretary dismissed from the public service?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is now filling Mr. Page's place?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Trudeau is acting as deputy head and chief engineer of the canals, the appointment having been given to him about two years ago. Only one salary is paid for both offices.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who is filling the position of secretary, in place of Mr. Bradley?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not filled. No one is filling the position.

Mr. McMULLEN. How long has it been vacant?

Mr. HAGGART. Since Mr. Bradley was dismissed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is discharging the duties?

Mr. HAGGART. I answered that before. The deputy head is acting as secretary.

Mr. McMULLEN. My object in asking this question was to ascertain how far it was necessary to appoint an officer to take the place of the gentleman who was dismissed. It appears that the deputy head is discharging the several duties of deputy head, engineer and secretary. I think it would be well to continue him, and give him only the salary of deputy head. When one man is able to do the work of three men, it is apparent that there is little for each of the three officers to do when appointed. Have all the several duties devolving on the deputy as engineer, as deputy head and as secretary, been efficiently performed during the last six months?

Mr. HAGGART. The deputy head, some time before I was appointed to my present office, was appointed as chief engineer as well as deputy head, and his salary was increased to $6,000 a year. He is at present supervising the duties of secretary; perhaps some one else in the office is doing the work, but he has made himself responsible for it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it the intention to appoint another secretary?

Mr. HAGGART. I intend to appoint another secretary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that our attention is called to some proceedings connected with railways and canals which require consideration. If I understand the difference of opinion between the Department of Railways and the Auditor General correctly, it appears that considerable sums of money have been advanced to different contractors for works that have not been executed. I should like to know from the Minister on what grounds these advances have been made, and whether the Auditor General has stated the matter correctly to the House, because it appears to me that the Auditor General is correct in saying that in making advances for work that is not performed the door is opened very wide to all manner of abuses, and there must be very great difficulty in exercising proper supervision over expenditure, if the Auditor General is overridden, as he appears to have been by the report submitted.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to three items: one to Davis & Son, $60,000, another to Isbester & Reid, and a third item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a further payment to Davis.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will discuss this question at a future time, I will have full information in my possession.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a question of policy, as to what the Government have been doing in the way of making advances.

Mr. HAGGART. The matter is not within my personal knowledge, because I was not at the head of the department when these advances were made, except, perhaps, the last one, to Isbester & Reid. That, however, was not an advance; it was payment of money due under contract.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should not discuss this question under this item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot admit that it is not our right to discuss very fully a question of policy connected with administration when such an item as the present comes up. I claim we have the right to do so, and I intend to exercise that right. This is the proper time and place to discuss the general question as to whether advances should be made by the department for work not actually done. I do not propose to discuss the details of the matter; that I am willing to leave over. But the question that has been raised by the Auditor General is a question of principle of the broadest sort: Whether the Government of Canada are going to make advances for work that has not been performed? That is the question which he raises, and that is the question which I submit comes fairly enough in connection with this Department of Railways and Canals. The details will be before us when we come to

consider the special item for which this advance may have been made.

Mr. HAGGART. As to the remarks of the hon. gentleman in which he states that an amount was paid for which there was no work done, I may say that no knowledge of that has come to me since I have been head of the department, and it is but justice to me to give notice of it. On another item I will be able to give the information.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let the item stand.

Mr. HAGGART. How can this vote affect the question at all. There are 100 items afterwards on which the matter can be brought up.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There can be no objection to pass this item.

Mr. LAURIER. Very well.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the High River and Sheep Creek Irrigation and Water Power Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Montreal Board of Trade.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Office of the High Commissioner of Canada—Salaries..... $7,834

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance, when he expects the report of the High Commissioner to be laid on the Table of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the High Commissioner has been received, but I have thought it better that it should be printed for the information of members, and it is now in the printing office.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is in accordance with the proceedings of this afternoon in general. We have been first passing items and then the information which Parliament should have, before voting the money, is promised afterwards. I think this item should be left over until we are in possession of the report, so as to see the duties devolving upon the officers in the London office. There is considerable expense attached to this office, and I think we should have all the information before us before we are asked to pass this item.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my hon. friend should be unreasonable in this matter. I do not see how the information he would obtain in the report would throw any light upon the question of passing this item, for the salaries of the officers of the High Commissioner in London. If the question of the policy of retaining the office of High Commissioner were before us, and there were information in the report bearing particularly on that question, I could see the force of the objection. But that I understand is not a question that would come up at this stage.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister will admit that the duties performed by the High Commissioner in England are a proper subject of discussion in this House. If we are to discuss intelligently the expenditure, it is necessary that we should have before us all the information regarding the duties performed by the High Commissioner. The question of the continuation of the office altogether depends upon the value of the services rendered by him to the country; and the moment that the House considers that the services rendered are not worth the expenditure, I fancy that it will dispense with the High Commissioner and his staff.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think this is the proper time to discuss that question of policy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under what item would the hon. gentleman propose to discuss it?

Mr. FOSTER. If we are going to discuss that question, I think it should be brought up in another way than under an item for the necessary expenses of the office.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it not a good opportunity, when you are asking for the salaries?

Mr. FOSTER. It may be a good opportunity, but I do not think it is customary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it understood that these officers of the High Commissioner are paid the salaries when they are absent on business not connected with the office?

Mr. FOSTER. These officers, I understand, are not absent on business not connected with the High Commissioner's work. It is possible that some of these officers may have to do the business of the office outside of the office itself; but these gentlemen give their whole time to the duties of the office, and are paid accordingly.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I suppose that the Minister of Finance will agree with me that if the head of the office follows such a course as that, it is altogether likely that those under him do likewise. If he turns to page 218-D of the Auditor General's Report, he will find that the High Commissioner set a bad example to his officers, having been paid $10 a day for 78 days' travelling expenses out to this country, as well as $243.33 for his fare from Liverpool to New York, $266.65 for his fare from New York back to London, and $266.65 for other expenses, details not given. Now, if the High Commissioner is allowed to desert his office, being paid his salary and all his travelling expenses, in order to come out here to engineer the elections for the party to which he belonged before he became an office holder, then I suppose the officers under him would be entitled to do likewise. I think we ought to have particulars in regard to these matters.

Mr. FOSTER. The items are separately detailed in the most explicit way. Under commercial agencies, Sir Charles Tupper has been paid his passage out and back, and the regular subsistence, and my hon. friend knows quite well that Sir Charles Tupper visited Washington on two occa-

sions last year in connection with the Trade Delegation.

Mr. LAURIER. Is that the price you pay for your electioneering agents?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows that they are paid better than that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to know whether there are any outstanding accounts not yet settled in connection with this trip?

Mr. FOSTER. There are none.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understand that Sir Charles Tupper incurred a bill of about $1,000 for railway travelling which has not yet been paid. At least, that statement was made in evidence at an election trial.

Mr. BOWELL. There was no evidence that it was incurred on account of the Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do the Government expect to pay this bill?

Mr. BOWELL. They do not. The account came to me when I was acting Minister of Railways, and I refused to recognize it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, if the Government refused to pay that account, I think they ought to refuse to pay the other expenses of the High Commissioner.

Mr. LAURIER. It is impossible to regard this payment as anything but a simple outrage.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, nothing else. Sir Charles Tupper is an ambassador to England, and it is a disgrace for a man in his position to descend into the political arena and stump the country as he has done. We discussed that last year and were overruled; but no one expected to find this year that Sir Charles Tupper was paid $10 a day while electioneering for the Government. If the negotiations at Washington had had anything to do with his visit, there would be nothing to say; but it is simply a blind to say that he was here for the purpose of negotiations at Washington. When Sir Charles Tupper delivered ten or twelve addresses in different parts of the country, and then claims $10,000 from the people, I say it is a thing the people ought not to stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think we ought to have some expression of opinion from the Government with reference to this class of expenditure. I do not believe the Government themselves will defend the action of Sir Charles Tupper in this matter. So far as his coming to this country to take part in international negotiations at Washington is concerned, no objection has been taken, but, while holding a diplomatic position and ostensibly holding the reins between parties, he descended into the political arena and took part in political discussions. He opened at a meeting in Halifax, where he abused the members of the Opposition with all the force of which he is capable. Then he tried to reach Prince Edward Island, but fortunately or unfortunately, as the case may be, he was prevented by the weather. He then travelled all the way to Toronto and delivered a party harangue in that city, and so he went throughout the country, and we find that he is paid his expenses, not while going to Washington on this international matter, but when he was engaged in this party warfare in Canada. What is the difference between Sir Charles Tupper and anyone else who enters into the political arena? The distinction is against Sir Charles Tupper, because common decency should have prevented his taking this course. It is impossible for one of the great parties in the country to have any respect for our High Commissioner when he has descended into the political arena in this way. It is bad enough to have to pay him $10,000 or $12,000 a year, but we are asked to pay his expenses when he is brought here to abuse his political opponents, when he is taken from place to place to support the party in power. The money is spent now and cannot be recalled, but I think we have a right to a declaration from the Government that this evil course will not be followed hereafter. I do not believe that any hon. gentleman on the other side looks upon this expenditure as anything but an outrage of the worst kind, as it has been described by the leader of the Opposition, and when the people of the country are called upon not only to pay Sir Charles Tupper's salary in England, but also to pay his expenses as a political stumper, carried from place to place to denounce his opponents, they will say that it is an outrage. I think, therefore, we should have some statement from the Government in regard to it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The best way of meeting the desire of the hon. gentleman is to state what occurred with respect to Sir Charles Tupper's being called to Canada. It is not correct to say that he was imported into Canada for the purpose of abusing his political opponents. At the time he was summoned to leave England and to come to Canada, the prospect of negotiations at Washington was very imminent, and then, so far from his being imported for the purpose of taking part in the general election, there had been no dissolution of Parliament and a dissolution was not resolved on though it might have been regarded as possible at that period of the parliamentary term. The late Premier desired Sir Charles to come, not only to take part in these negotiations, but also to consult with the Government as to trade negotiations with other countries, in which he had previously taken part, and to inform the Government with respect to them. Sir Charles had hardly arrived at New York when the dissolution took place, and after that a later time was appointed when he and the delegates who went with him would be met at Washington by the Secretary of State for the United States. The circumstances which delayed the visit of those who went to Washington were explained to the House last year. The Secretary of State, even at the late date at which he eventually fixed the meeting, was unable to meet those from Canada at that date, and Sir Charles Tupper, after waiting from day to day expecting that a day would be fixed in place of that which had been fixed, went to Washington to see whether it was possible that the date of the conference could be fixed or whether, his business in England being urgent, he should return there. The circumstances have already been fully explained, and I think it is unnecessary for us to say what course we will pursue in the future, because we simply meet the statement of the hon. gentleman by saying that Sir Charles Tupper was not imported for the pur-

pose of the elections but in connection with these negotiations, and that, when he was summoned, the elections were not necessarily imminent at all.

Mr. LAURIER. The statement of the Minister of Justice is not, I think, characterized by his usual accuracy. I see here that Sir Charles Tupper charges his expenses at $10 a day from the 20th January to the 15th April. I assume that the 20th January was the day he left England.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I think that is the date of his arrival in New York.

Mr. LAURIER. I think that must have been the date of his leaving England. Parliament was dissolved at the end of January, and, moreover, if Sir Charles Tupper had left England for no other purpose than to negotiate with our neighbours to the south, the moment he took advantage of his presence here to step down from his position as ambassador of Canada and to enter upon the political arena, in all decency he should not charge the country for the stumping he did then. If he came here simply as an ambassador, there would be nothing more to say in regard to him than in regard to those who accompanied him to Washington. They were discharging their duty to the country and no one has any fault to find in regard to them, but there is a great difference between the position of Sir Charles Tupper and the position of those who accompanied him. It was their right and privilege to address the electors and to give their opinion to the electors on the questions at at issue, but, as far as Sir Charles Tupper is concerned, there is not a man in this House who values the dignity of his office who can sanction such a charge as this.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My impression is that the leader of the House is mistaken in what he says in regard to why Sir Charles Tupper was summoned to this country. My impression is that last year we secured the frank admission that he was sent for to give his aid in the election. I speak subject to correction, but I have sent for the *Hansard*.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The First Minister of that day took the whole responsibility upon himself and admitted that he asked Sir Charles Tupper to address his constituents in Kingston. I am stating the facts, however, when I say that when Sir Charles Tupper was called to this country the dissolution had not been decided on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has confined his reply to the statement that Sir Charles was not imported, as it is said, for the specific purpose of entering into the elections. Whether he was or not, we are not in a position to prove just now: we are bound to take the hon. gentleman's statement when he says that he was not. Assuming all that to be true, what answer has he got to make to the statements of the leader of the Opposition that he did come here, and when he came he entered into the fray, that he had special cars placed at his disposal at the public expense, and travelled from one end of this Dominion to the other in special cars? He travelled in a special car to Toronto over the Government road, and then over the other roads at the public expense, for the purpose of delivering violent political diatribes against his opponents. It is absolutely and utterly indefensible, and the hon. gentleman knows it well.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have merely to say that that question was very fully discussed last session.

Mr. McMULLEN. It would be necessary to discuss such questions every session. If hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to perpetuate this kind of thing it will devolve upon the Opposition to see that this question is plainly brought before the House and before the country. It appears that Sir Charles Tupper is sufficiently barefaced to ask this country to submit to an imposition of this kind, paying him $10 a day to cover travelling expenses, while at the same time he charges, I see by the way, for his car fare, $265. While he is crossing the Atlantic I am quite sure his fare on the steamer included meals and attendance, and he still goes on drawing over all that $10 a day in addition to his salary. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman has constituted himself a kind of political Belshazzar who assumes all the dignity, and the position, and the responsibility of the one who lived years ago. Now, I do not think this is a matter to be laughed at; it is a matter that concerns the people's burdens. If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to assume the responsibility of saying that the expenditure of these items is to continue in the future as it has in the past, then it will only devolve upon us to bring it more forcibly before them year after year, until we either shame them into discontinuing it or deprive them of their positions and put other better and more economical men in their places. Now, last year the Finance Minister promised, or at least he gave a kind of idea, that it was the last time he would ask us to vote a sum of money to keep Professor Fabre at Paris.

Mr. FOSTER. I promised no such thing.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was a statement made that some alteration would be made in the office.

Mr. FOSTER. None at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think you will have to turn up *Hansard* on that question.

Mr. FOSTER. You have to turn it up a long while before you find that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, we can refresh the hon. gentleman's memory, because there was a long discussion about it. However, we will take one item at a time. Now, with regard to the High Commissioner, I contend that we should not proceed with these items at all. Last year I carefully read over his entire report, and I saw nothing in it that would warrant this country in continuing to pay the services of that gentleman in London, unless it was some very flattering remarks that he made with regard to the peculiar flavour of Canadian poultry that we sent over there. He said it was so very sweet and that it had such a kind of wild taste, that it would be very attractive to Englishmen, and he thought that we would have an immense market in England for Canadian poultry. Now, for bringing that before the people of this country, we are paying him the magnificent sum of $15,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. That is better than writing a bad letter to the *Economist*.

Mr. McMULLEN. I contend that this charge of $10 a day, when he came over to Canada, is an unreasonable charge and one that we should not be asked to pay. If he had acted courteously, and treated his opponents with that courtesy which one gentleman should extend to another, it would not be so bad. But as my hon. friend in front of me says, he abused his opponents in the most violent manner, with everything that he could lay his tongue to, while all the time he was quietly drawing out of the treasury of this Dominion our money as well as the money of hon. gentlemen opposite, they were paying a special train to take him about the country. It is an insult to the Opposition of this House to ask them to consent to a continuation of an expenditure of this kind.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Last year I see this is the information I got with reference to this matter:

"Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the question is too broad to ask whether Sir Charles Tupper was brought out at the request of the Government. But we will narrow the question down. I see that Sir Charles Tupper held a meeting in Kingston, at the close of which he said, according to the supplement of the *Empire*:

"I must not conclude without expressing to you Sir John Macdonald's deep regret at not being able to be present here to-night. Nobody here regrets it more deeply than the humble servant of Sir John Macdonald's Government, who has been endeavouring to-night briefly to outline the position of our country. But in not coming here Sir John only showed that he thinks of the country before himself. He would have given anything to stand here to-night, to enjoy the pleasure of witnessing your beaming countenances and listening to the rallying shouts of warm support of the Liberal-Conservative party."

"Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

"Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I quite agree with that. I know that Sir John would receive the warmest reception from a great many of the electors of Kingston. But here is the point I am at:

"He directed me to say to you that he was so busily engaged at Ottawa, sending telegraphic messages all over the country, making arrangements for the undoubted security and success of the great party to which he belongs, that he found it impossible, except at an enormous sacrifice, to be here. He felt that if he was able to come, he might be returned by acclamation; but he would subject himself, at this inclement season of the year, to the hardships of a contest, rather than fail in a single duty to the country. (Applause.) That is why I have the pleasure of standing here to-night before this magnificent meeting of the electors of this noble constituency, which for so many years has returned to Parliament a statesman who was looked up to, throughout the Empire. (Loud applause.) I envy the electors of this noble constituency the privilege which they possess, of holding the services of so distinguished a gentleman as Sir John Macdonald."

"Might I ask the First Minister, did the High Commissioner tell the truth to the people of Kingston; did he say truly when he said that Sir John Macdonald had sent him to that meeting and had sent a message with this gentleman who is a leading civil servant of this country? That is a question that can be very easily answered, and if the First Minister will favour us with a reply, then perhaps we might be able to follow it up with enquiries in other directions.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot resist the seductive tones of my hon. friend, and I may answer him: Sir Charles Tupper did go there at my request, and he made the speech at my instance, and I fancy that his speech must have had a considerable influence, because in the previous election I was elected by a majority of seventeen, and after Sir Charles Tupper made this speech I was elected by a majority that only wanted seventeen of 500. You see I was pretty wise in my generation in asking Sir Charles to go there and make a speech for me.

"Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You would be wise if you stopped him at that point.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will go a little further, and I will say that Sir Charles Tupper came out from England to give us the advantage of his skill and influence and eloquence, at my special request."

Now, all that skill and influence and eloquence were not intended, I think, for the mission at Washington; I think it was to be used in another part of the globe, I think it was to be used at Kingston, in Nova Scotia and other places. I find also that when we came down to other accounts, the question was asked with reference to the contingencies of Sir Charles Tupper at that time, and I asked this question:

"Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to these contingencies, I wish to ask for information to which I think we are entitled. When the High Commissioner was taking his tour through Canada, it was stated in the press that he travelled by special train. I would like to know whether that was the case, and if so, what was the cost of that train and out of what fund it was defrayed?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not aware that any of the High Commissioner's expenses were paid out of the public service, but I will enquire."

That is about what transpired last year with reference to this matter, and it would appear that the then First Minister thought that some of the items would not again appear in the Public Accounts. But it appears they are still in the Public Accounts, and that is why information is being asked for.

Contingencies.....$10,200

Mr. McMULLEN. On page B 475 of the Auditor General's report these items are detailed. They are increasing every year. The postage of the London office of the High Commissioner is $833, or about 100 per month. Can the Minister of Finance give any explanation of this item.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is all unreasonable, considering the amount of correspondence and number of documents that are posted at the High Commissioner's office. We must recollect that immigration literature which is meant for a certain portion of Great Britain and for the continent is all posted at his office. Innumerable letters are received for information as to different parts of Canada. Pamphlets are kept at his office, and these are sent out in reply. I have no doubt at all as to the perfect legitimacy of the item for correspondence and postage. This is what the High Commissioner writes this year with respect to the increase in that item:

"Respecting the item for postage and stationery, the work of the office is increasing. A further sum for postage and stationery is required. The utmost economy will be exercised in this expenditure compatible with efficiency, but an extra sum is considered absolutely necessary. The increase in correspondence necessitates an additional amount for postage, and our quarter's post office account is increasing."

The High Commissioner is not engaged in writing letters simply for the purpose of paying postage on them. I suppose the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has scarcely an idea of the number of letters that come from all parts of Great Britain to London asking for information, and this information must be supplied.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the statement read to be found in the High Commissioner's report?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I remember last year looking over the High Commissioner's report in order to ascertain what work is performed in connection with immigration. In order that members can discuss these items intelligently, the High Commissioner's report should be in our hands.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Last year when a discussion took place regarding contingencies in the High Commissioner's office, the Minister agreed that the $2,000 paid for contingencies should be added to the High Commissioner's salary.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, as was the hon. member for Wellington.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When Parliament first voted a sum for contingencies, it was understood that the High Commissioner would pay certain amounts, such as those for the Botanical Garden and the Colonial Institute out of his personal expenses, but these are all included in the item for contingencies. I understood last year that the Minister of Finance agreed that this $2,000 was really an addition to his salary of $10,000, and in future it would be so paid in the Estimates. The amount of $2,000 paid for contingencies strikes me as being an addition to the High Commissioner's salary. I desire to call attention to one item in the contingencies—distempering the High Commissioner's room, $14.60. I suppose, that means disinfecting the room. At what time did disinfecting take place? Was it after his visit to this country, after he had associated with members of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not certain, but I think it was shortly after several members of the Opposition paid a visit to his office.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is an item of $70.30 for "Women of the Day."

Mr. FOSTER. That is contemporary literature.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I should like the Minister of Finance to carry out the agreement respecting the $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like the hon. gentleman to show the agreement.

Board of Examiners, Civil Service Act, $3,700

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister give some idea with respect to the duties performed by the Civil Service Examiners last year. How many candidates are on the list, how many have received certificates, and how many were added last year?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the number, but I will bring him the information. We hold one examination each year, besides the promotion examinations, which are for quite a different purpose. I suppose the usual crop of candidates came up for examination.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand that this covers the expenses of the promotion examinations.

Mr. FOSTER. It covers everything.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There must be hundred's of candidates who have passed the civil service examination waiting a chance to enter the service.

Mr. FOSTER. Thousands.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I thought about 800. The question was considered in the House, and it was received somewhat with approval as to the desirability of discontinuing these examinations.

Mr. FOSTER. We have dropped one examination.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is holding out false hopes to young men in the outlying provinces when 1,000 or 3,000 candidates have already passed, and when there are so many more on the lists than there will be vacancies for some years to come. If that is the case, it seems to me to be a perfectly useless expenditure, if not worse, for it raises hopes which cannot he realized.

Mr. FOSTER. At first we had two examinations per year, and after the candidates amounted to a good round number we dispensed with one. It might be a question as to whether an examination every other year might not now be sufficient. I do not think the Government, as a Government, have considered the question, but it might be well worth consideration. All those who have passed are not actual candidates for civil service positions. A number have taken positions elsewhere, and have found occupations which they would not relinquish even though civil service positions were offered them here, and it is not quite fair to assume that all those who have passed the examination are waiting for office. Then again it seems a little harsh to prevent anyone who comes up during this year say, from having a chance to get a diploma which he may wish to have and which may at any time entitle him to fill a post as a vacancy occurs.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know several young men in my riding who have passed the civil service examination, and in several cases they have been waiting two, three and four years, expecting that possibly the time may arrive for them to get an appointment. I think it is wrong to encourage young men to pass an examination in the hope that they may get an appointment when there are so many on the list. The Minister of Finance says that there are about one thousand waiting, and I suppose there are about that number altogether in the inside service, and these thousand men are pressing on the representatives from their constituencies, who are in favour of the Government, getting an appointment. There are a great many of them who are hoping and waiting and urging on their representatives to try and secure them an appointment. It would be very much better, as the Minister of Finance said, that the examinations should be held every two years if necessary or every five years, and thus give these young men to understand that they should not look forward to the hope of getting an appointment in the civil service. I think it is too bad to keep so many of them waiting in expectancy of such a position.

Governor General's Office—Contingencies..$12,500

Mr. McMULLEN. In looking over the items of the contingencies of the Governor General's office, I find that there are a great many items that are continuously growing. It was supposed at one time that the $5,000 given to the Governor General would suffice for all the travelling expenses. This year I find that there are $750 about, paid in addition for the travel of his staff. If we keep on from year to year adding to this, the travelling expenses will amount to an enormous sum. I think we should have some distinct understanding as to what that $5,000 given to the Governor General is intended to cover. I find that on page B-66 of the Auditor General's Report, there are several amounts charged for the travelling expenses of the Governor General's staff.

Mr. FOSTER. The $5,000 is for the travelling expenses of the Governor General, and if my hon. friend will look at B-86 of the Auditor General's report he will see an amount for $714 for expenses incurred for the carrying of despatches which have to be carefully looked after. Then there is a clerk or orderly who is at Quebec for a certain time during the year to look after the Governor General's department there, and his expenses have to be paid. The item for travelling expenses to Wash-

ington and New York is for the carrying of confidential despatches which are not given to the mails but are sent by a private confidential messenger.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice on B-88 of the Auditor General's Report that General Sir Fred. Middleton drew travelling allowance to the amount of $500 and I would like to know what was that for?

Mr. FOSTER. That was for his travelling expenses home.

Mr. McMULLEN. He has not then employed in this country?

Mr. FOSTER. No; but we had to pay his expenses going home. We paid his expenses out here, and we always pay the expenses of the generals back again.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, if he is sent back for the last time I suppose it is all right.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board—Contingencies $9,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that last year the very large amount of $5,400 was spent in travelling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes: the expenses last year were heavy, as shown on page B-90. I will mention the chief items. There are the travelling expenses of the Deputy Minister who went home to England in connection with the raising of the temporary loan. There are also the travelling expenses of the Assistant Inspector and Inspector of savings banks, who have to travel through all parts of the Dominion. The expenses of the Superintendent of Insurance are also included, though they are not an ultimate charge on the Consolidated Fund, being paid by the companies themselves. Then, there are the travelling expenses of the Minister himself, which this year are very large.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not anticipate another trip to the West Indies?

Mr. FOSTER. No. I do not think the expenses are extravagant when you consider the number of miles travelled and the length of time occupied. Then, there were the travelling expenses to Washington.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At page B-91 I see that $1,400 of unforeseen expenses are charged to commercial agencies. What was the expenditure for the trip to Jamaica?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the West India Islands trip, and also the Washington trip. The expenses of the trip to Washington this year are also charged to commercial agencies.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not the intention of that vote, is it?

Mr. FOSTER. The intention of the vote was never thoroughly carried out, though it is at present. But as we had not a surplus in the strictly proper appropriation, I thought it just as well to take the money out of that vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that while the expenses of the Finance Minister to Washington are charged to commercial agencies, those of Sir Charles Tupper are charged to miscellaneous charges. How is that?

Mr. FOSTER. It really makes very little difference, I suppose, to what they are charged, as they all come out of the same pocket.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course it is public money, and in that respect it does not make any difference. But the vote for commercial agencies was intended to facilitate our foreign trade.

Mr. FOSTER. These items are perfectly correct, then?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That was not the object of the vote. The object was to establish new lines of trade, and the Finance Minister should not lose sight of that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very true.

Department of Agriculture—Contingencies $20,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the amount spent in this department for travelling expenses of the Ottawa officials, amounting to $1,600. There are charges of the Minister's private secretary amounting to $600 or $700, for being in attendance on the Minister at London during December, February and March, last year. It is singular that we should have to pay such an amount for the expenses of his private secretary at that particular time.

Railways and Canals Department—Contingencies $8,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Finance Minister will recollect the discussion that took place last year on the item involving the amount of subscriptions to newspapers for all different departments, and I think he will agree with me that there was an understanding that something was to be done to reduce that expenditure. Now, and for years past, there has been a separate reading room in every department, and a large sum of money has been required for this. Last year we spent $9,183.88 in furnishing newspapers for the different departments. I would ask the Minister if he has done anything yet in attempting to reduce this expenditure. Last year it was suggested that it would be proper that the reading room here should be used by the employés of the different departments.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman is right in part. I stated that an attempt had been made for two or three years back to reduce that expenditure, and, if the hon. gentleman would take the average expenditure of three years ago and compare it with this expenditure, he will find that it has been materially reduced. They used to spend $700 or $800 or $1,000 for newspapers in various departments, but last year an Order in Council was passed on my recommendation providing that the amount to be expended on newspapers and books, and technical magazines required in the departments, should be limited to $500. That is being rigidly carried out, so that next year no one of the departments will spend more than $500.

Care and cleaning of Departmental Buildings..... ..... $27,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How is this money expended? Is the work done by day's work or under contract?

Mr. FOSTER. Under this item is included nearly all the help in the different departmental

buildings at Ottawa. It is under the superintendence of an officer in my department who is charged with the whole matter. This includes the charwomen and carriers and so on, who are in a way permanent, receiving so much per day. I believe this is very carefully managed. Formerly it was left to the different departments, and afterwards it drifted partly into the Public Works Department, while part of it remained with the other departments, but now it is under the Treasury Board and is managed by an officer in my department.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 21st March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LENNOX ELECTORAL LIST.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk had laid on the Table, in obedience to the Order of the House of the 14th inst., copies of all the original lists, papers, including all declarations, notices of appeal, objections to preliminary lists, and relating to all other proceedings now in the possession of the revising barrister, or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in any way affecting the voters' lists for the electoral division of the County of Lennox, as settled by the revision of 1891, together with a certified copy of the revised voters' list of 1891 furnished by the revising barrister to the returning officer.

THE LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was in attendance at the Table with the returns of the last election in the electoral district of the city of London, in the Province of Ontario, together with all poll books and other papers, letters, documents and memoranda which had been transmitted to him by the returning officer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved that the papers brought down with reference to the election in the city of London do lie on the Table of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. In accordance with the wish expressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I have looked further into the question that was discussed on Friday last, respecting the right of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) to anticipate a motion on the Notice Paper as a question of privilege. If the House will permit me, I will read a memorandum which I have made in regard to the matter. *Primâ facie*, a question affecting the seat of a member of the House is a question of privilege; but the practice of Parliament goes to show that it must be urgent in character, and demand the immediate interposition of the House. In the Canadian Commons such questions have been made without notice: for instance, in the Muskoka and West Peterborough case in 1873, the King's County, P.E.I., case in 1883, and the Queen's County, N.B., case in 1887. In all these cases urgency was the essence of the question, and the House was asked to interpose immediately without notice. Also, in the cases that occurred in 1877, of members alleged to be public contractors, the House acted immediately on the statements made by members of the House, showing that the cases were matters of urgency In the cases above cited a reference to the Journals will show that the House had the information in its possession, and was able to come to a conclusion on a question of privilege. In the case now under consideration the hon. member for the West Riding of Lambton has not shown any question of urgency. The hon. member gave notice on Tuesday for the consideration of his motion, not on Thursday as the rules permitted him to do, and on which day it would in all probability have been reached in due course on the Order Paper, but for Friday, which, being a Government day, precluded the possibility of its being reached in the ordinary course. I may, perhaps, with the permission of the House, cite one or two decisions in the English House of Commons which seem to me to have some bearing on the question of privilege. On the 16th of February, 1882, Mr. Cowan called the attention of the House to a breach of its privileges in the matter of the election in the north riding some weeks ago, wherein he alleged that two peers had substantially supported a candidate. Mr. Speaker Brand ruled that as the hon. member had allowed a considerable time to elapse, instead of bringing the question forward at the earliest possible moment as a question of urgency, he had thereby lost his claim to deal with the matter as privilege. Then, with reference to motions for new writs, on the 24th of March, 1882, Mr. Labouchere asked Mr. Speaker whether he could move, as privilege, for a new writ for Northampton in place of Mr. Bradlaugh, disabled from sitting and voting in the House by the resolution of 6th of March, 1882; secondly, whether in regard to a petition presented this day from electors of Northampton, having regard to the proceedings of the House in the matter of the Middlesex election of 29th of April, 1879, he was entitled, as a matter of privilege, to move that the electors of the Borough of Northampton be heard at the Bar. Mr. Speaker said:

"Motions for new writs are ordinarily made without notice, and have precedence as concerning privilege. Such motions are founded upon certain events which have recently caused vacancy—as, for example, the death of a member, his acceptance of office, or the report of election judges. In such cases there are obvious reasons for giving precedence to a motion for a new writ. The grounds are clear and of recent occurrence, and the seat ought not to be left vacant, in the interest of the electors. But none of these reasons are apparent on the present occasion. The motion, indeed, can scarcely be proposed with the serious purpose of inducing the House to issue a new writ for Northampton; but, like a similar motion of the hon. member on the 21st February, seems rather designed to raise a discussion, indirectly or irregularly, upon the claim of the junior member for that borough to take the oath. For these reasons the motion of the hon. member is clearly not entitled to privilege. With regard to the second question of the hon. member, I have to say that there are standing orders with regard to petitions which were not in existence when the Middlesex petition referred to by the hon. member was heard. On that

account there is no ground for dealing with a petition of that kind stated as a matter of privilege."

Now, having in view these decisions, and having in view the fact that the hon. member for West Lambton has not stated in his place in the House that he proposes to attack the seat of the hon. member for London, I am of opinion that sufficient urgency has not been shown to justify me in giving precedence to the motion as a question of privilege.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 31) respecting the *Globe* Printing Company.—(Mr. Innes.)

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Woman's Baptist Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

POSTAL SERVICE IN DRUMMOND COUNTY.

Mr. LEDUC asked, Has the Government taken into consideration the petitions addressed to it with the object of securing the carriage of the mails by means of the County of Drummond Railway, in order to serve all the parishes lying between St. Hyacinthe and Nicolet, and in the neighbourhood of the said railway? If so, what decision has been arrived at by the Government?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the absence of the Postmaster General, I may say that after enquiry it was ascertained that the expense would not justify such a change.

BRITISH COLUMBIA INDIANS.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) asked, Why was section 93 of the Indian Act, Chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, not included in the proclamation dated 12th January, 1892, which extends sections Nos. 83 to 92 of that Act to the bands of Indians in the Province of British Columbia?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The provisions of section 93 of the Indian Act suppose such a condition of advancement to exist among the members of an Indian band as would admit of any member thereof becoming enfranchised, should the band agree to that step being taken by a member. The department is not aware of such a condition of matters existing in any band in British Columbia; and it was, therefore, considered prudent to not extend the provisions of section 93 to the British Columbia Indians. Were this to be done and any band to grant under that section permission to any members thereof who might elect to do so, to become enfranchised, friction would occur between the Department of Indian Affairs and the Indians composing the band in question, if an applicant for enfranchisement should, after serving the usual term of probation, prove to be incompetent and the department be consequently obliged to reject him.

POST OFFICE AT CAP ST. IGNACE.

Mr. BERNIER (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) (Translation) asked, How comes it that the difference of opinion existing among the citizens of the parish of Cap St. Ignace, respecting the opening of a new post office at the station of the Intercolonial Railway in the said parish, prior to the 9th October last, did not prevent the hon. Minister then in charge of the Post Office Department from writing the following letters granting the opening of the said office:—

"OTTAWA, 25th July, 1891.

"MY DEAR MR. CHOQUETTE,—With reference to the establishment of a new post office at Cap St. Ignace, County Montmagny, which I lately promised you, I beg to say that I have not yet succeeded in procuring a postmaster for the office, but if I do not receive a nomination in the course of the next week or ten days I will ask the Inspector to find a suitable person for the postmastership

"Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) "JOHN HAGGART.

"P. A. CHOQUETTE, Esq., M.P.,
"House of Commons, Ottawa."

"OTTAWA, 9th October, 1891.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 6th instant, on the subject of the proposed new post office at Cap St.-Ignace Station.

"I have on different occasions written to Sir Adolphe Caron asking him to favour me with a recommendation for the postmastership of the proposed office, and at the present moment Sir Adolphe, as I understand, has the matter under consideration. He only asks a delay of a few days in order that he may receive information as to which of the three or four persons suggested for the postmastership would be most acceptable to the residents of the locality.

"Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) "JOHN HAGGART.

"P. A. CHOQUETTE, Esq., M.P.,
"Montmagny, Que."

What are the additional reasons furnished since the 9th October last, by the citizens of Cap St. Ignace, to prevent the carrying out of the promises of the ex-Postmaster-General by the hon. Minister now in charge?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I have the honour to say that the member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) having written to the Postmaster-General on the 5th October, 1891, a letter stating that a certain resolution passed by the municipal council of Cap St. Ignace, opposing the opening of the new post office, was an irregular and worthless resolution obtained by indirect means, the Postmaster-General accepted as true the assurance so given by the member for Montmagny, and wrote the letter of 9th October. The information mentioned in this letter having been asked for, a new resolution was passed on the 5th of October by the municipal council of Cap St. Ignace, and reached the department on 12th October. This resolution concludes as follows:—

"This council thinks proper to reaffirm its protest against the opening of a new post office within the limits of the municipality. This council hopes that the Postmaster-General will be pleased to take this protest by the

council under serious consideration rather than the requests of Mr. Choquette, who is neither a resident nor a proprietor in the locality."

In view of such a protest, the Postmaster-General thought better not to resist the public sentiment in the matter, even at the risk of not meeting thereby with the approval of the member for Montmagny.

AMERICAN BEEF AND PORK.

Mr. FORBES asked, Whether the Government propose to allow lumbermen importing American beef and pork for use in the prosecution of that industry, to take the said beef and pork out of bond without paying dues?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the intention of the Government to give any such promise as would be contrary to the provisions of the law.

CANADIAN GRAIN SHIPMENTS.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked, Whether it is to the knowledge of the Government that a large portion of the surplus grain of Manitoba and the North-West is now being shipped to Europe by way of New York, and is it the intention of the Government to take any steps, as a compensation to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for their share of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to ensure the shipment of this grain at Maritime Province ports in the winter season?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government have knowledge that a large part of that grain is being shipped out by the principal seaports of this continent, including those of the Maritime Provinces, and they have done everything a Government can do to ensure the shipment of that grain through the Maritime Province ports.

QUEBEC RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked, Whether the Government is aware that by the construction of a railway from Moncton to Edmonton, a railway bridge at Quebec and a direct line from Quebec to a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway near Lake Superior, a saving of nearly 300 miles could be effected in the distance by rail from Halifax to Winnipeg?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I might say that the Government is not aware of it.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps during the present session to carry out the promises made by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, on the floor of this House on the 17th April, 1884, as to the construction of a railway bridge at or near Quebec to connect the Intercolonial with the Canadian Pacific Railway, surveys for which were made?

Mr. HAGGART. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I might state that on reading carefully over the remarks of Sir John Macdonald in the House on the 17th April, 1884, I find no promise made by him as to the construction of a railway bridge at or near Quebec, and the policy of the Government is the same as stated by Sir John Macdonald on that occasion.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the quantities of beef salted in barrels; dried or salted meats and meats preserved in any other way than salted or pickled; other meats fresh or salted, N. E. S.; butter, cheese and horses imported into Canada from the United States in each of the three years 1888-89, 1889-90 and 1890-91; with the values thereof and rates of duty thereon.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Copies of all documents, correspondence, &c., (exclusive of documents brought down last session) exchanged between the Intercolonial officials at Moncton and the Department of Railways, in relation to the accident which occurred at St. Joseph de Lévis on the 18th December, 1890.—(Mr. Carroll.)

Return showing the quantities of each of the following classes of pork and hog products imported into Canada from the United States, in each of the years 1888-89, 1889-90 and 1890-91; with the values thereof and amounts of duty and rates levied thereon: bacon and hams, shoulders and sides; lard, tried or rendered; lard, untried; pork; pork barrelled in brine, made from the sides of heavy hogs after the hams and shoulders are cut off, and containing not more than sixteen pieces to the barrel of 200 lbs. weight; pork imported in the carcase for exportation.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Copies of all letters, correspondence, petitions, &c., relating to the claims or settlement, or proposed settlement of claims of settlers on the Waldron Ranch Company's territory; copies of all complaints made regarding the treatment settlers have been subject to by the company. —(Mr. McMullen.)

THE LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. LISTER moved for:

1. Copies of the voters' list for the Electoral District of the City of London upon which the recent election for such district was held.

2. Copies of the judgment given by the Revising Officer on objections taken to the names of Lewis Allin, S. F. Glass and James P. Moore and 226 others on said voters' list, and which 229 names were subsequently struck off the said voters' list by the Revising Officer, on the hearing of the objections, but which were nevertheless printed on the said voters' list is the subject of an appeal, together with copies of the notices of objection to such names and copies of the evidence taken before and decision given by the Revising Officer on each such name.

3. Copies of all proceedings in appeal taken to the County Court judge from the judgment of the Revising Officer on any or all of such cases, together with any judgment or decision given by such County Court judge thereon.

4. Copies of the judgment of the Queen's Bench Division, High Court of Justice, Ontario, in the matter of application to said court for a mandamus to said Revising Officer in respect of the said votes or any of them, together with copies of the judgment of the Court of Appeal (Ontario) in respect of the same matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The copies of the voters' list referred to in the first paragraph are already laid on the Table, and therefore that should be struck out. Is it the pleasure of the House to strike out the first paragraph of the resolution?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the resolution as amended?

Mr. LAURIER. Drop.

Motion dropped.

On the resolution being proposed:

That the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery do attend this House forthwith with the writ for the election of a member to represent the City of London in the House of Commons, together with the return thereto, and all other papers and documents in his custody or control relating to the said election.—(Mr. Lister.)

Mr. LAURIER. Drop.

Motion dropped.

EXPORTS OF FARM PRODUCE.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the quantity of the shipments in the following lines from Canada, from 30th June, 1891, to 29th February, 1892, and the country to which shipped:—The number of horses of all kinds; the number of lambs; the

quantity of eggs; the number of bushels of barley; the quantity of malt; the number of tons of hay; the number of bushels of potatoes; giving the quantity shipped to each country, and the total shipments in the several lines.

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest to the mover of this resolution the propriety of changing the word "lambs" to "sheep." There is no distinct entry in the Trade and Navigation Returns as to the quantity of lambs exported from the country. I would also suggest that if the hon. member desires to have the information at as early a date as possible, he should either make the motion read from the 31st December last, or from the 31st of March. If he makes it read from the 31st of March, of course it would be delayed until the quarterly returns are received. If he is content to accept a return to the 31st December, we shall be able to bring it down at an early period. I make this suggestion in order that the House may be furnished with the particulars, and to point out that as these returnss are made quarterly they will not be made again until the 31st of March.

Mr. McMULLEN. We will take it from the 31st December, and we can move afterwards for the three months return until the 31st of March; with the change also of "lambs" to "sheep."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

WHITE PINE TIMBER.

Mr. IVES moved:

That an Order of the House do issue to the Director of the Geological Survey of Canada, for a map of Canada showing the areas of spruce, and white pine timber, respectively, now standing. The said map to be laid on the Table of the House for the information of members.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I would say that I have a communication from the Director of the Geological Survey in which he states that there is not sufficient data to indicate the area of white pine or spruce timber. But I hold in my hand the only map on record in the Geological Museum which shows the limits of the areas of timber as they are described in the report (pages 464 to 469) published by Professor Macoun on Canadian plants. But all the additional information that it is possible to bring down, of course I will be very glad to furnish.

Motion agreed to.

EMPLOYÉS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Reports to Council and Orders in Council since the last session of Parliament, relating to the employés on the Intercolonial Railway, or to the salaries of any such employés or their dismissal.

He said: I would like to be permitted to amend that resolution—because the word "dismissal" may not properly describe what I mean to get at—by adding the words "or the reduction in number of such employés.

Mr. HAGGART. There are no reports to Council or Orders in Council on the subject, since the last statement.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then it is not worth while passing the Address.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must have heard a report of contemplated reduction. But I have made no report to Council as yet, and no Order in Council has been passed on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As the Minister tells me that there has been no report to Council, and no Order in Council, of course I do not want to go through the form of passing the Address.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Return of all correspondence, telegrams, papers, reports, orders and other documents relating to the intended dismissal of a number of Intercolonial employés at Moncton, Halifax or other places on the Intercolonial Railway, since the last session of Parliament.

He said: I would ask the committee to allow me to add the words "or reduction in number of such employés" after the word "dismissal."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

AMERICAN BEEF AND PORK.

Mr. FORBES moved for:

Return showing the quantity of American beef and pork taken out of bond by Canadian fishermen since the imposition of the duty by the Canadian Government on beef and pork imported from the United States.

Mr. BOWELL. It will be impossible to bring down the information asked for by this return, from the fact that the record of American beef and pork taken out of bond by Canadian fishermen is not kept on record in the department at Ottawa; and even if an attempt were made, we would have to apply to all the ports in the Maritime Provinces in order to ascertain the information asked for, and have an examination made by the officers of all papers and invoices filed during the last 25 years, which is the period during which this duty has been in force. The hon. gentleman, therefore, will see the utter impossibility of obtaining that information, especially when it is remembered that during that period many of the Custom houses of the different ports have been burnt, and the papers destroyed. I am very sorry to say that one of our most expensive buildings, together with all the papers, except some invoices and other papers that were in the vault, was consumed in the city of St. John on Saturday, involving a loss of nearly half a million dollars. From the statement I have made, the hon. gentleman will see the utter uselessness of passing a motion of this kind.

Mr. FORBES. Do I understand that it would be utterly impossible to ascertain the quantity of beef and pork imported and taken out of bond by Canadian fishermen?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will see that the motion covers a period of 25 years, for it asks for a return during which a duty was imposed on those articles.

Mr. FORBES. I would limit it to the last three years.

Mr. BOWELL. Even then the information could not be obtained unless we applied to the different ports; and in that case we could not obtain it where the papers had been destroyed, as was the case on Saturday night at St. John.

Mr. FORBES. If I cannot get it I suppose I cannot have it. Do I understand from the acting Minister that it is impossible to obtain the quantity of beef and pork consumed by our fishermen and taken out of bond?

Mr. BOWELL. If any person asked for an export entry for beef or pork he could obtain it. The export might be made for fishermen or for other purposes, but we would not have any record as to whether such meat was consumed by the fishermen or not. Every person has a right to ask for an export entry, but there is no special record kept as to its consumption or what becomes of it other than the fact that it leaves the country.

Mr. LAURIER. As it appears to be impossible for the Government to bring down the information asked, my hon. friend had better withdraw his motion, and amend it as suggested by the Minister.

Motion withdrawn.

CONTRACT ALIEN LABOUR IN CANADA.

Mr. TAYLOR moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada. He said: In rising to move the second reading of this Bill, I wish merely to say that it is the same Bill I introduced two years ago, which was referred to a special committee of the House, empowering the committee to send for persons and take their evidence as to the extent of the injustice perpetrated by a similar Bill which is in force in the United States. This Bill is an exact copy of that placed on the Statute-book of the United States. That committee heard evidence, and made the following report:—

"Your committee find on examination, that the Bill is similar in all respects to a Bill passed by the Congress of the United States in 1885, and amended by that body in 1886.

"Your committee have had before them witnesses from different points along the frontier, and find from their evidence, a copy of which is annexed hereto, that the American Alien Labour Law has been enforced in such a way as to compel many of our people to relinquish their employment in the United States or to remove with their families and reside there permanently while citizens of the United States are permitted to work in Canada every day, and to return to their homes on the American side every night, without interference of the Canadian authorities.

"Your committee recommend that the attention of the authorities at Washington be directed to the oppressive application to Canadians of the American Alien Labour Law, and to allow of such representation being made, and to afford time for its due consideration, recommend that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed until next session; and if some suitable measure for granting relief to Canadians from the grievance complained of be not passed in the interval by the American authorities, that your committee recommend that a Bill dealing with this question be introduced next session and taken into consideration."

That was the report of the committee. The Bill was introduced next session, but at the request of the Government it was allowed to stand over, pending negotiations that were then going on between the two Governments. I have not seen the correspondence that has passed between the two Governments in regard to the Bill, if any has passed; but I know that, judging from newspaper reports from points all along the line, the Americans are still enforcing their Act to the great injury of very many Canadians. It is now high time that we had a similar Bill on our Statute-book. I am a protectionist. I believe in reciprocity, if we can get it; reciprocity in tariff and the same reciprocity in labour. If we cannot get that reciprocity, let us have it in law. Let us place an Act on our Statute-book, as the Americans have done. I have several clippings here bearing on the question. One is from a St. Catharines paper of 2nd February, which says:

"BUFFALO, Feb. 1.—Inspector DeBarry was notified this noon by the Customs-house officials at International Bridge of the arrival of William Dunn, a ship carpenter, from St. Catharines, Ont. Upon investigation the inspector learned that Dunn came here last Thursday and got employment with the dry dock company on Ganson street. He was to begin work to-day. Mr. DeBarry communicated with the company and informed them that Dunn could not legally work here until he immigrated with his family to this country as prescribed by law. The company refused to perfect the agreement with Dunn until he complied with the requirements of the law. The inspector then deported the man to Her Majesty's domain."

I have another clipping from the Port Huron *Herald* of 26th April, which describes how three young ladies, who had been employed at Port Huron for a number of years, had been obliged to leave their employment or remove with their families to the United States. I have also a paragraph in regard to a clergyman with whom many members of the House are well acquainted, Rev. W. W. Carson. It is as follows:—

"DETROIT, Jan. 29.—At the annual meeting of the congregation of the Jefferson Avenue Presbyterian Church, held last night, after the various reports had been presented, the trustees reported that the call to the pastorate extended to Rev. W. W. Carson, of Kingston, Ont., was cancelled on account of the Alien Labour Law. Immediately after the adjournment the chairman informed the members that the fact should be understood that Rev. Mr. Carson was not the pastor of the church. When the call was extended to him, and it was found that his case was covered by the Alien Labour Law, it was immediately withdrawn. Should the reverend gentleman take up his residence in the United States and become a citizen of this country another call to the pastorate might be extended to him, but otherwise the laws of the country would be strictly adhered to by the church."

That is how they deal with clergymen as well as with labourers. I have another extract here:

"Two Roman Catholic clergymen landed from a steamship at Philadelphia on Tuesday. They were Rev. Dr. Minkenburg and Rev. Dr. Loentgarutt, and had come to this continent to deliver lectures on natural philosophy and theology in a number of leading cities. The authorities detained them under the contract labour law, as aliens entering the country under contract to compete with native labour. Finally it was decided that their case did not come under the provisions of this law, and they were released. They will carry back to Europe with them strange ideas of United States justice and hospitality. The idea that they should even have been arrested coming for the purpose they did, suggests reflections by no means complimentary to the age and the country."

Another extract says:

"Last Monday two respectable-looking young mechanics from London, stonecutters by trade, went over to Port Huron, having heard that there was a good demand there for stonecutters. They carried valises containing some personal effects, one having his tools. On arriving at the wharf the Customs officer would not allow them to land and ordered them back to Canada. They returned, but thinking that the objection to their landing in the United States was owing to their having valises, they left them in Sarnia and went over again. They were similarly treated, and had to return to Sarnia. In company with some acquaintances from this town they tried on Tuesday for the third time, and, we are informed, effected a landing, but before they had gone any distance up the street were followed by the Customs officer who threatened to arrest them and put them in the lock-up unless they returned to Canada at once. Of course they had to return once more. We are informed, on good authority, that they had made no contract to work for anyone in the States, and did not know where they could get work: all that they had heard was that stonecutters were scarce in Port Huron."

Now, by the evidence that was produced before the committee, a copy of which I have in my hand, it was proved to the satisfaction of the committee

that down in New Brunswick several hundreds of persons are crossing from the United States daily, working in our cotton factories during the day and returning to their homes in the United States at night. I presume that this same state of affairs is in existence now, as it was then, and there is no interference with it by the authorities or by the people of Canada. So far we have been willing to meet the people of the United States fairly and to have reciprocity in labour, but so far as I can learn, there has been no move made on the part of the United States authorities to amend their law so as to make it not apply to Canadians living on the Canadian side who may cross over to the United States to do work and return to their homes at night. Canadians are driven back from the States, while our laws permit the people of the States to come here in the morning, to work all day and return home at night to their families. We have not so far insisted on them bringing their families to this country, and causing them to become residents in order that they may obtain work. I do think that it is only justice to the people of Canada that we should not suffer these indignities any longer. Therefore, I have introduced my Bill for the third time, and I purpose pressing it to a division.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter my protest against this Bill, in the first place on general principles, and secondly, because of special cases that I know of myself. If there were any arguments necessary why we should not pass this Bill, I think the mover himself has given them to us. If this were a Bill to interfere only with our neighbours to the south of us, I could understand that it was introduced on the principle of being a retaliatory measure; but when the hon. gentleman comprises in his Bill all foreigners and aliens, then he simply strikes at one of the very best methods by which we can get people to this country who would teach our people that which they do not know themselves, as we can teach those who come here that which they do not know when they arrive. I think that this Bill might perhaps be the natural sequence of the census recently taken, and if it should pass the House, I have no doubt that the results will be even more striking in the next 10 years than during the last 10 years. On general principles I oppose anything like a measure that keeps out from our country trained and experienced men. I will give one or two examples of how the Bill would injure our people in Nova Scotia. When the glass works were opened in the town of New Glasgow, we had not a man who knew anything about glass working, but we had enough enterprise to put money into the business, and so the secretary of the company was sent to visit Belgium, and Austria, and Bohemia, to obtain skilled labour. He made arrangements with some of the very best glass-blowers that could be got, and he brought them to this country. What was the effect of these men coming here? In the first place the works were established and put on a sound foundation and the boys and young men in New Glasgow were taught by these skilled tradesmen, so that in a year or two we could do without their services if they wished to go elsewhere. If such a law as is proposed by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had been in existence at that time our glass works would never have been established. Then again, we are starting very extensive iron works in New Glasgow, and where have we to go for a manager; a man who can build the smelting works and carry on the business. We have to go to Philadelphia, and no man is going to leave a good situation there unless he is certain of something better; he is not coming to this country to take chances of whatever he may get. An arrangement has to be made with this man before he leaves Philadelphia. The result in this case also is that our own young people when taught by a skilled man of this kind, a man of reputation in his business, will be able to carry on the industry, if this skilled manager should seek employment elsewhere when his term with the company in New Glasgow expires. We started steel works in New Glasgow and we got some experienced men from England and elsewhere, and the manager of the company brought in young men to the works belonging to the town, and they obtained the experience, so that now they can do the whole work themselves. If this Bill should become law, what are you going to do in Canada when you want to start a business in which no Canadian has ever been engaged? Must you not of necessity go to a foreign country to get the men who understand the business? If this Bill had been the law of the land, some of our best industries would never have been started. Anyway, I am sure that the mover of the Bill does not wish that some men who come to this country under a contract to do work for a concern like the ones I have mentioned, should go back and be able to report the same impressions of Canada as the hon. gentleman read that these two clergymen had when they were not allowed to enter into the United States. Skilled labour is a commodity which every country ought to be proud to gain, instead of trying to debar it from coming here. There are men in every walk of life whom you cannot bring to a strange country without a special agreement, because such an agreement is a guarantee to them that they can remain in the country for a certain number of years. Are the steel works in New Glasgow to be lost, and will the iron works in New Glargow be lost to this country, simply because we are going to keep out of the country a few experienced workmen in order to spite our neighbours to the south of us? If the people of the United States adopt a policy that is not in accordance with the best principles of national life, are we to follow them? I am sure that the hon. gentleman from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), if he took a moment's consideration, would see that there are some men whom Canada ought to be proud to get into the country to teach our people. The matter will right itself afterwards. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that skilled labour when it is in the country, will so teach the young men of Canada that they will afterwards be able to do the work themselves. These men whom this Bill seeks to keep out of Canada will be teachers for us. The Bill of my hon. friend will simply have the effect of keeping out all skilled labour. I am opposed to this Bill on account of the special cases that I have named, and even if they were not enough, I am opposed to it on general principles. Perhaps I may not carry with me the opinions of this House, but I believe in opening our doors to the whole world. We have a large country to be filled up, and I would put no restriction on any man from any country coming here, except those who

are sent away from the country in which they have lived because they have broken the laws and are not allowed to stay there. With our vast mineral wealth and our vast country to be inhabited, this Bill might be the first step in directing a blow at proper immigration. I hope that this House—and I speak especially for the place from which I come will not commit itself to the general principle of keeping these men out from our country. If the hon. gentleman wishes to make our neighbours to the south of us feel badly, and if he wishes to prevent any of them coming in here, there might be some point in the Bill, although, even then, it would strike at our industries in New Glasgow and I would be still opposed to the measure. I do not believe that this Parliament should follow the wrong methods of any country: I do not believe that we, with our broad views, should pass any Bill because another country is shortsighted enough to enact it, in the interest of factions within the country itself, upon which the party in power depends for its political existence. Therefore, I am opposed with all my heart to the passage of this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member has wasted a good deal of his time in discussing a Bill which he has not read. If I read the Bill correctly, the 5th clause provides for just such cases as he has referred to, where new industries are to be established, and skilled labour cannot be obtained in Canada to carry them on. That clause reads as follows:

"Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent any citizen or subject of any foreign country, temporarily residing in Canada, either in private or official capacity, from engaging under contract or otherwise, persons not residents or citizens of Canada, to act as private secretaries, servants or domestics for such foreigner temporarily residing in Canada as aforesaid; nor shall this Act be so construed as to prevent any person or persons, partnership or corporation from engaging, under contract or agreement, skilled workmen in foreign countries to perform labour in Canada in or upon any new industry not at present established in Canada, provided that skilled labour for that purpose cannot be otherwise obtained."

Now, the whole force of the argument of the hon. gentleman rests on the assumption that this skilled labour could not be obtained in the country, and that this Bill would shut it out, though it is quite clear that provision is made in the Bill for such a case. But we know that Canadian citizens are every day shut out of the labour market of the United States, on the most trivial pretexts: and I do not see any injustice in our returning the compliment by passing such a Bill as the present one. We know, too, that large numbers of Americans are engaged in Canada. That occurs in my part of the country, where many men are brought in from the United States for the purpose of taking out logs and timber in the Georgian Bay district—work that could be performed quite as well by Canadians. These people are brought in under contract, while if one of our people is taken to Michigan to perform the same kind of labour, he is shut out by the Alien Labour Law. It is unfair and unjust to our own people; and while our people are shut out of the United States in that way, I do not think there will be any injustice in our passing a law to mete out to them the same treatment as they do to us.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will ask the very careful attention of the House to this Bill, because I am aware that it is supported somewhat enthusiastically by the representatives of a considerable number of persons in this country—or, I might more properly say, by the representatives of a large class in the country. I am perfectly aware—as the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill has reminded the House this afternoon—that the committee appointed to investigate this subject two years ago gathered a good deal of evidence tending to show that the people of this country, especially our people near the borders of the United States, have from time to time been subjected to great inconvenience and hardship by the operation of the law of the United States relating to alien labour contracts. It was, I think, at first supposed by the committee, perhaps, too, by a good many members of the House, that the operation of that law was intentional as regards Canada, and I think that before the discussion was concluded the House was convinced that while the Bill was probably not specially aimed at Canada, it fully comprehended the kind of immigration from Canada, and which was employed in the United States along the border line under labour engagements. But, Sir, I have to ask the grave consideration of the House to this question: whether we are going to improve the position of own people who have suffered that inconvenience by an abortive attempt to inflict the like inconvenience upon our neighbours? I maintain that we are not. I am unable to see how any working people in districts neighbouring to the United States will be in the least degree benefited by the passage of an Act of this kind in this Parliament. The operation of the Alien Labour Law of the United States will be as rigorous, notwithstanding this futile attempt on our part to inflict an injury upon their people. I am sure that the policy of Congress on this subject would not be in the least degree affected by the operation of this Bill. We have to expect no mitigation in the operation of their law, and no amendment of their law in the direction of the amelioration of their relations to our labouring people from the passage of an Act of this kind. They have in their own country a very abundantly supplied labour market: they have a very large population: and their policy in some respects as regards immigration is directly opposite to that which is desirable for us. In every session of Congress we see that the attempt is made to restrict rather than to encourage immigration, whereas in every session of our Parliament members are occupied with the grave consideration of how to enhance the flow of immigration instead of endeavouring to restrict it. I, therefore, think it is most undesirable, in the interests of any class in this country—especially undesirable in the interests of those who have complained of irritation and oppression caused by the Alien Labour Law of the United States, and most undesirable in the interests of the country with reference to its settlement—that any class of working people should be excluded from the country. I am aware that the attention of Parliament has frequently been called to representations of labour organizations against the introduction, by Government aid, of workingmen, or of other classes of people, who would be likely to settle in cities and compete with our own working people. But even that, while it may be arguable, is totally distinct from an attempt to exclude that kind of people from the country when they propose to come here without the aid of the Government at all. I agree with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that

this country is not so full of population that we can afford to close our doors against any class who are willing to come here to earn their living, and I think we ought to be very careful how we legislate against the introduction of such a class. Notwithstanding the observations of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), there is a good deal in what has been said by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) as regards the establishment of new industries. If we refer to clause 5 of the Bill, we shall find that while it attempts to meet the point he raised, it does not meet it in a very effective manner. The clause provides that this Act "shall not prevent any citizen or subject of any foreign country, temporarily residing in Canada, from engaging any persons not residents or citizens of Canada, to act as private secretaries, servants or domestics for such foreigner temporarily residing in Canada as aforesaid;" but it seems to prevent a resident of this country from importing a domestic servant, although there has never been any representation made to this Parliament that the introduction of that class of persons into the country is undesirable, but on the contrary Parliament has frequently voted aid to induce such persons to come to the country. The next provision is that the Act shall not be construed "so as to prevent any person or persons, partnership or corporation from engaging, under contract or agreement, skilled workmen in foreign countries to perform labour in Canada in or upon any new industry not at present established in Canada." That has reference only to the establishment of a new industry, not one at present established; and there is a proviso further that skilled labour for that purpose cannot be otherwise obtained, so that if an industry is not entirely new, the skilled labour cannot be imported from abroad. If, in the instance put, of the glass works, or any other industry of that kind, an extension is to be made of those works or works of a like kind established, say in a different section of the country, it will be impossible to go abroad and import the skilled workmen, because it is an industry already established in the country, or a branch of one already established. A further proviso is that the provisions of this Bill shall not apply to professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, or to persons employed as personal or domestic servants; and it is provided that nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any individual from assisting any member of a family, or any relative or personal friend, to migrate from any foreign country to Canada for the purpose of settlement here. In the list of professional persons allowed to come into the country under engagements, we have simply actors, artists, lecturers and singers.

Mr. DEVLIN. Priests and ministers are left out.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All the features of the American law which have been exploited in their courts for the purpose of making their enactment the laughing-stock of the civilized world are left in this Act. A minister of the Gospel or a clergyman of any denomination whatever comes under the provisions of the Alien Labour Law, so that we cannot allow such persons to come into this country even to preach the Gospel. It will prevent a lawyer coming from the United States to attend to professional interests, or the interests of a client who lives out of the country but has business in our courts, even to instruct the Canadian counsel in charge of the case. So that, notwithstanding that the provisions of section 5 were undoubtedly intended to ameliorate, to some extent, the Alien Labour Law, as it is generally known in the United States, it is quite ineffectual, and bears all the blemishes which have been found in the law of the United States, except perhaps that in which domestic servants are referred to, where I see the exemption is larger than I supposed it to be at first. In the United States the industries of that country are greatly developed and there is hardly any occupation in the world for working people which is not to be found there. In that country, skilled workmen are to be found in every branch of employment, but in this country as has already been pointed out, we are seeking to establish new industries, we are seeking to increase those we have, and yet the people who are most competent to operate them and to make them successful are not to be imported, but if we establish such industries at all, after 13 or 14 years' effort to increase them, we are to trust them to utterly incompetent men, or else we are to subject the persons who may import competent men to all the dangers of a trial for misdemeanour, and we are to put upon him the burden of proving that, besides the industry being a new one, skilled labour of that kind is not to be found in the country. The provisions of section one make it a misdemeanour, an offence punishable by a very heavy penalty, as we shall see presently, for any person, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners into Canada, under contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or migration of such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, to perform labour or service of any kind in Canada. So that the farmer desiring farm labourers to go to the North-West Territories where we have such abundance of land, or to go to Manitoba, who sends to our own agents, or our own Commissioner in Great Britain, the intimation that he has employment ready for such people and is willing to engage them, is unable to engage the services of these agents to procure immigrants of that kind, because he will subject our agents to a very heavy penalty for having encouraged such persons to come into the country. The contract is to be made void by section 2. According to that section, it shall be utterly void and of no effect. Under section 3:

"For every violation of any of the provisions of section one of this Act, the person, partnership, company or corporation violating the same by knowingly assisting, encouraging or soliciting the migration or importation of any alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners into Canada, to perform labour or service of any kind under contract or agreement, express or implied, parole or special, with such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners previous to becoming residents or citizens of Canada, shall forfeit and pay for every such offence the sum of one thousand dollars, which may be sued for and recovered by the Dominion of Canada, or any person who shall first bring his action therefor, including any such alien or foreigner who may be a party to any such contract or agreement, as debts of like amount are now recovered in any competent court of the Dominion of Canada."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). May a foreigner sue?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. I suppose, therefore, if two persons have violated the Act, one of

them can collect the penalty ; or possibly any one person so imported can himself collect it. He will recover against the person who assisted him. He will sue Mr. Dyke in Liverpool, or Sir Charles Tupper, for having assisted or encouraged him to come to the country. The fourth section provides :

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

Under section 5, I would like again distinctly to call the attention of the House to the fact that the burden of proof would be apparently upon the person sued to show, not only that the industry was a new one, but that the labour could not be had in this country ; and I should like to know how that could possibly be investigated in a country so large as this. An employer of labour, desiring to establish a new industry, being sued for the penalty, would have to run the risk of its being proved that somewhere in this country persons whom he never heard of, or who never exercised their skill in the country, possessed skill, according to their own account, it might be, and were able to discharge the duties for which he employed foreigners. Altogether, I think the Bill is one which, while it may be framed closely on the lines of the legislation of the United States, we would not hesitate to condemn wherever we found it. The American Act itself is one which has provoked a remonstrance. I think the unanimous remonstrance, of the committee which investigated the subject, and I should suppose it would not be in accordance with the desire of that committee that an Act which they resented as harsh, extreme in its provisions, almost barbarous in its operations against labourers along the British line, should be copied by this House. At any rate the Bill is one from which we can expect no redress, as far as the operation of the law in the United States is concerned, and I fail to see what good it can do in this country. I intimated, when I commenced my remarks, that the Bill was supported by the representatives of a very numerous class in the country. I am aware that a number of persons in the country desire a passage of a similar law, in the interest of working people and labour organizations. I am sure that this Parliament has always been willing to give that class of persons any proper legislation for the legitimate encouragement of their organizations or for their effectual working, and will give them any fair and proper protection for their labour, but they cannot expect this Parliament to give them legislation which will close the doors against foreigners who are willing, at their own expense, to come to this country and earn their living like the rest of us. I will, therefore, conclude by moving that the further consideration of this Bill be deferred until this day six months. I would call the attention of the House, although perhaps I ought not to make too much of that, to the circumstances connected with our present relations with the United States. I am convinced that, whatever the result may be of the negotiations which are in progress as regards matters which are still unsettled between the two countries, there will be a desire on the part of the United States to make a friendly adjustment of those differences with us, provided that no interest of the other country is sacrificed to any considerable extent. Representations have been made with regard to the harsh operation of the Alien Labour Law which exists in that country, and, though it would be absurd for me to say that we have any hope or expectation as to what the result of our remonstrances may be, because the Alien Labour Law is not the policy of any particular Administration in the United States, but is a law passed by Congress and it is Congress alone that can undertake to shape the policy on that subject, still I do think that, even from that point of view in regard to our relations with that country, if this Bill were felt to be even the slightest sting by them, it would be unwise to adopt it in the present stage of negotiations between us and in the unsettled state of some affairs between the two countries. However, what I base my motion on, irrespective of any sentiment which we may feel as to the harsh treatment of our citizens under this law, is that this Bill if passed will not ameliorate the condition of affairs in any degree, that it will not have the same effect that remonstrances on the part of this Government would have, and that it will not in any way improve the position of our people in that regard.

Mr. LAURIER. While I agree with the hon. gentleman that the Bill is of an illiberal character which should not be encouraged under any circumstances, I do not think the hon. gentleman has really addressed himself to the task of dealing with the question which is before the House. I did not understand the mover of this Bill to recommend it in any way to the House on its merits, but simply as a measure—I will not say a retaliatory measure—but as a measure called for by the character of of the legislation which has taken place in the United States. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to defend the proposition of his own Bill upon its own merits, but simply because he thought it was necessitated from the illiberal character of the legislation of the United States upon the same subject. As I understood, he would not propose such legislation if it did not exist on the other side of the line, and the only excuse he made for introducing it was that we were to meet the Americans on the same ground as we were met by them. That is a measure of reciprocity, but it is not a reciprocity of friendliness, but a reciprocity of retaliation, according to the way in which he puts it. It was pointed out to us two years ago, when a similar measure was before us, that the legislation of the United States was not designed especially against Canada, but was against the world at large. It was pointed out that the policy of the United States is, as has been stated by the Minister of Justice, and as Sir John Macdonald stated at the time, not to encourage immigration but to curtail immigration, and that this measure was not designed against Canada in particular. The proposal then was that a friendly conference on the subject should be had with the United States Government. The matter was referred to a committee and considered by them, and the committee reported :

"Your committee recommend that the attention of the authorities at Washington be directed to the oppressive application to Canadians of the American Alien Labour

Law, and to allow of such representation being made, and to afford time for its due consideration, recommend that further consideration of this Bill be postponed until next session."

The Minister of Justice has just told us that representations have been made at Washington against the oppressive character of this law, but it seems to me that the most important occasion to make such representations to the Government at Washington has been lost. I presume such representations were made by correspondence, but some days ago, we had a delegation of the Canadian Government going to Washington, and certainly that was the most convenient time to make representations against a law which, while it was not intended against Canada particularly, still in practice has been carried out against Canada. The correspondence has been brought down as to what took place at Washington on this occasion, and among the matters which were brought to the attention of the American Government by the Canadian commissioners I fail to see anything in regard to this matter. This vital subject appears to have been omitted from their representations. I am sure the hon. member who moved this Bill will agree with me that the occasion when representations could have been made to the authorities at Washington would have been when our commissioners had been there discussing various matters at issue between the two countries, and it seems to me that, if they had made those representations then, they would have had a better opportunity of being heard, and of securing a remedy. Of course there is an evil in connection with this. Though the legislation of the United States in this regard was not designed against Canada, still, as the hon. gentleman has conclusively shown, its effect has been against Canada, but I think the best method is not what he proposes but by negotiation with our neighbours.

Mr. RYCKMAN. The principle of protecting the interests of our labouring people—the whole working community in fact—is one which should receive careful attention, and it is one which, in view of the way in which this matter is dealt with in the United States, deserves strong support here in Canada. According to the Alien Labour Law now in force in the States, contractors are debarred from importing foreign labour to carry on their works, and everybody knows how this law has been made operative to prevent individuals in Canada from crossing the boundary line to work in the United States, while being residents of this country. The ultimatum has been that such men must transfer themselves bag and baggage and become *bonâ fide* citizens of the Republic, or else they cannot be allowed to work there. However much we might feel disposed to condemn such a principle and such a law in the abstract, when brought face to face with the fact that they are being carried out against labour in our own country, it naturally suggests retaliation. The question arises under these circumstances: Should not something be done to protect our workingmen and mechanics in a manner similar to that which prevails across the line? If the United States law works against Canadian labour and assists labour in that country, there seems to be no reason why a similar law should not work in the interest of labour here. As far as I am able to judge, I am inclined to think the measure introduced by my hon. friend is a fair one in the interest of an important element of our population.

Mr. McKAY. I consider that the policy of protection, which is now the policy of this country, should be applied to the workingmen just as much as to the employers. We have innumerable cases where citizens of this country have gone over to the United States and secured employment, and then they have been told that the laws of that country prevented their remaining there unless they were citizens. In the city I have the honour, with my colleague, to represent, we have many cases where men have gone to Buffalo and other places, and have been told they could not be employed unless they moved their families and became citizens of that country. During the sittings of the committee two sessions ago, we had innumerable cases brought before us, showing that, while this was the case with our citizens along the border, citizens of the United States were allowed to work freely in this country. At the same time our citizens on the border were forbidden from working in that country. That has happened at Fort Erie, at Port Huron, Niagara Falls and at Windsor, and many other places on the frontier. Railway employés, of which there are a great many in those places who were working in cities on the opposite side, were told that to obtain employment in that country they must give up their residence in Canada and become residents of the United States. There was one case in the town of Welland, of a lady who had a position on the other side, and had to abandon it on account of this law. This law has been in existence now for some years, and as time has rolled on we find that it is being more rigidly enforced, and is now applied with more rigour than it has been at any time heretofore. I do not consider the Bill, which has been brought in by the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor), to be in any sense a Bill of retaliation; I consider it rather in the direction of the protection of our workingmen. I do not think that the Bill will tend to prevent immigration to this country. There is nothing in it to prevent or forbid any person coming to this country of his own free will in order to secure employment or to retain it, so long as he does not come under contract. I think the intention of the Bill is rather to prevent workingmen coming over here in large numbers, under contract, to displace our own workingmen. For these reasons I intend to support the Bill now before the House.

Mr. EDGAR. I am very glad indeed that the hon. member has brought in this Bill. I agree with a great deal that he has stated about the barbarous character of the Act of Congress to which he refers, and the hardships to which it subjects our citizens. But the reason why I am glad he has brought in this Bill is in order that the Parliament and people of Canada may show that they are not actuated by the same feelings as actuated the Congress of the United States when they passed that Act. I hope both sides of the House will show that they are able to rise above those sentiments of retaliation which they might naturally feel at first thought, but which our cooler judgment should forbid us to indulge in. I think this Bill is a very extraordinary one. For instance, in the sixth paragraph, to which no reference has yet been made, I find that it is proposed to make the collector of customs at every port in Canada a

judge, and a juror, and a policeman. The Bill says :

"The collector of customs at any port in Canada, in case he shall be satisfied that an immigrant has been allowed to land in Canada contrary to the provisions of this Act, shall cause such immigrant, within a period of one year after landing or entry, to be taken into custody and returned to the country from whence he came, at the expense of the owner of the vessel."

The idea of coolly proposing in this Parliament legislation of that character, I cannot understand. To place it in the power of any collector of customs at any port in Canada, upon being satisfied of certain conditions, to arrest an individual and place him in custody and expel him from Canada—why, Sir, I think the hon gentleman cannot have been serious in asking the House to pass a clause of that kind.

Mr. IVES. I think the time will eventually come when a motion for the six months' hoist of a Bill of this kind will not prevail in this House. It is true that the law of Congress referred to is barbarous, and I may say, indecent. But we must not forget that the United States is the dominant power on this continent, and that smaller powers, such as our own, cannot afford to be more moral than the United States, especially in questions affecting our own people and our own trade interests. If we cannot have reciprocity in one way, we have got to have it in another. If the dominant nation is not above petty attacks of this character upon our people, contrary to principle, contrary to decency, and contrary to judgment, it may become necessary eventually for us to respond in the same manner. Although I am prepared to-day to vote for the amendment, I will not promise what I may do in future if our Government do not succeed in prevailing upon the American Government to mitigate very considerably the grievances that our people complain of, and which are expressed in the Bill now before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman reminds me of a church member who, being subjected to a great provocation, said : "I belong to a society that believes in falling from grace, and if you do not stop your improper conduct and observations towards me, I shall fall and then I shall give you a thrashing." And so the hon. gentleman says, although at the present time he is not prepared to support so barbarous a measure as that which is now before the House, yet the time may come when he will support a measure just of this sort. If we cannot afford to be any better than our neighbours, and if our neighbours choose to adopt a barbarous policy, we must be just as barbarous as they are. Well, Sir, I do not subscribe to that doctrine. I do not think that the Bill of the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor) is a necessary Bill under the existing circumstances, and I cannot conceive a state of circumstances in which it would ever be to the advantage of Canada to adopt such a measure as the hon. gentleman has submitted. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman's statement of the facts. I do not agree that the American Bill, whatever may be its character or its provisions, has been applied to anybody in this country in the rigorous way that the hon. gentleman supposes, and that the extracts which he read would lead us to believe. The extracts which the hon. member has read to the House are representations of the exceptions and not of the rule. If the hon. gentleman were to go to-day to the town of Windsor opposite Detroit, and go down to the ferry at seven o'clock in the morning, he would find every morning two or three hundred people crossing from Windsor to Detroit to engage in their daily occupation : and at six o'clock in the evening he would find them again at the ferry on their way back. So it is not a fact that persons are prevented from residing in Canada, and entering into contracts with persons residing in the United States. I have no doubt that if a company were to undertake to come into Canada and engage persons here to go across the border and to labour in the United States, impediments would be put in their way under the Act. But so far as I know there never has been any obstacle put in the way of a party residing on the Canadian side of the border, going over the other side and entering into a contract with a party there to engage his services. The Bill of the hon. gentleman would go very much further than the American Bill, as it has been interpreted. The Bill of the hon. gentleman would prevent every clergyman who resides in the United States from crossing the border and engaging as pastor of a church or congregation on the Canadian side of the line. A clergyman assumes that he is acting under a divine commission, and that so far as his vocation is concerned, he is not amenable to the law of any particular country. He goes where he pleaes. Every day you will find church associations undertaking to send missionaries to China, Japan and farther India ; and if the Governments of those countries were to act in the way in which the hon. gentleman proposes to act in this Bill, they would be justified in undertaking to expel every one who crosses their borders. The hon. gentleman would regard that as a most barbarous species of persecution, one against which christendom should enter its protest : and yet the hon. gentleman proposes to place restrictions in the way of the various religious bodies or denominations sending a minister from another country into Canada, or preventing him voluntarily coming here, if there is any arrangement or agreement that he shall act as pastor of any church or engage as missionary in any particular district. When I look at this Bill I find it would contravene what I suppose to be an important matter of public policy, not simply on this side of this House but on that side of the House as well. Let me suppose, as I think the hon. gentleman himself stated, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company must be regarded as a great immigration agency ; that this railway has millions of acres of land, and it would be for the interests of the country that it should engage in the settlement of those lands, to construct branch lines, to extend railway facilities to a population that are not yet in the country ; that in the course of a few years those lands will be subject to municipal taxation and serious burdens, and if the railway company has not disposed of them they will have very strong pressure brought to bear on them, so much so that it will become their interest to secure settlers and dispose of all their land. If this Bill were adopted, the Canadian Pacific Railway company could not hold out any inducement to parties to come and settle with a view to obtaining employment from the company, with a view to railway construction, with a view to receiving compensation in the form of land. We know that if any

general scheme of immigration were undertaken in the North-West and attempts were made for the settlement of the country by this great corporation—and I admit it could do a great deal if it were so disposed—the Bill of the hon. gentleman would place a serious impediment in the way of any such enterprise. I agree with the observation made by the Minister of Justice, that the Bill of the hon. gentleman would not be an effective measure. There are hundreds of people residing on the Canadian side of the boundary who are employed on the American side and they continue to reside here. There is no such corresponding number of Americans wanting to obtain employment on the Canadian side of the border. This makes it, therefore, even if it were made effective, operate against an insignificant number of people, a mere fraction of the number that the American Bill, if it were put into effective operation, would seriously or injuriously affect, who are residents on the Canadian side. It seems to me that a very much stronger position to take is, to urge the American Government to repeal their measure. I admit it is a barbarous measure; I think it is a measure interfering with those rights which belong to a man as a man, and it is not in our interests to follow on the line which they have adopted, but it is our interests to adhere to what is a generous, just and fair course, and to press upon our neighbours the propriety of repealing a measure that on no principle of justice, humanity, or fair dealing can be upheld.

Mr. INGRAM. I would not rise to take part in the discussion of this Bill were I not of the opinion that the motion made by the Minister of Justice will do injustice to a large portion of the people of Canada inasmuch as sufficient discussion should be given it. The Bill was introduced into the House in 1888, and was refered to a special committee in 1890. Evidence was produced before that committee, which, in my mind at all events, requires legislation of some kind. So far as this Bill is concerned, personally I am not prepared to say that I would support any such measure, nor am I prepared to say that there are not provisions in it which I would not heartily support. When the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) introduced this Bill the other day, he allowed it to be postponed until to-day, at the request of Ministers, and from the remarks made by that hon. gentleman in moving the Bill, and with the little discussion that has taken place, the motion moved by the Minister of Justice seems to me to be unfair to a large portion of the people. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated that if you go to Windsor you will not find the same objections raised there as were entertained in 1888 and 1889 when this Bill was before the House. I wish to say that I have visited Windsor on many occasions, and have found a very strong feeling in that town against the American authorities for the harsh manner in which they treat the Canadian people. Along the line at Fort Erie and Buffalo the same feeling is met with; at Niagara Falls and Clifton the same feeling is entertained among our own people. I think it would be proper for this Government to introduce some legislation that would make provision for the protection of our workingmen along the boundary line at such places as I have described. I have read in the evidence adduced before the committee that at St. Stephen 700 men are employed, half of whom reside in the State of Maine. They are permitted to go to this town, work there, and return to the United States at night. This is only one of the several cases I read in the evidence of that committee; and yet the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that such is an exception and not the rule. If all the cases of hardship that our people suffer through this Alien Act of the United States were known, hon. gentlemen would be surprised there were so many. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who must know as a matter of fact that this Bill has been before the people for three years, rose to-day and condemned every provision of the Bill, when it is quite evident he never read it. I therefore, say that if other hon. members have given the Bill no more consideration than that, then it is only a matter of justice to a large number of our people that this Bill, instead of receiving the three or six months' hoist, should be postponed to a later date in order that hon. members may carefully read and study its provisions. I would ask, Sir, on behalf of the representatives of the Labour Congress of the Dominion, that this debate be adjourned until some time next week at least, in order to give these gentlemen an opportunity of discussing this question with the Government on Saturday next. After that I am prepared to vote on this question. I will, therefore, move that this debate be adjourned, but before the motion is put I would like to refer to a statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman says that the Alien Labour Law was not designed against Canada. Well, the hon. the leader of the Opposition and the hon. the Minister of Justice differ somewhat in their opinions as to that, because I find from the Hansard of 1890 that the Minister of Justice quoted some of the remarks made by the committee on this very same Bill in Washington, the tendency of which remarks was to show conclusively that the American Congress did design this Bill against Canada as against every other nation of the world. I am not in sympathy with the Alien Labour Law of the United States. I am opposed to any such legislation as that being placed upon the Statute-book of any country, but when the American people take such a course I have sufficient Canadian blood in my veins to stand up for the Canadian people. I have great hope in the future of this country, and I have faith that the workingmen of Canada are prepared and willing to stand up and defend themselves; willing to stand up for what they believe to be right, and willing to say that they are able to compete with all other workingmen on equal terms, no matter where they come from. All our working people want is to be placed upon the same terms with the working people of the United States. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Administration of Justice—Travelling expenses of Judges in the North-West Territories..... $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. How are the travelling expenses of the members of the North-West Council arranged?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The members of the North-West Council are paid out of a vote taken by the Minister of the Interior for the legislative expenses of the North-West Territories. The sessional allowance is fixed by statute and the mileage I think is fixed by an ordinance of the territories.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it that a vote of $4,000 is asked this year, when only about two-thirds of a similar amount was expended last year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has been customary to take this vote because it is impossible to ascertain exactly the amount that will be required. Last year it took about $2,300, but that may be increased considerably in a year, through its being necessary to hold a court for the trial of criminal offences, special terms, or anything of that kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood the custom was that a vote was not taken for any more money than it was found necessary to expend from year to year, and my reason for asking the question was because the vote was so much in excess of the sum expended last year.

Circuit allowances in British Columbia. $7,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there any distinction made between the judges of British Columbia and other judges?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Travelling is very expensive in British Columbia.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the circuit allowance for each judge? Does this include the expenses of the County Court judges?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It does include the travelling expenses of the County Court judges. These expenses are often very high. It is not uncommon for a judge to require $1,200 to pay his expenses on a large circuit.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In what way are they paid?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The actual expenses which they incur, and they send their vouchers. In some cases pack-trains have to be sent with the judge, and it is very difficult to get accommodation in the country at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the mode of providing for the travelling expenses of the judges in the North-West, as well as other officials there, is a wrong one. I think it would be better to grant a reasonable mileage allowance, instead of leaving the judges to make out and certify their own accounts. In Ontario each county judge is allowed $200 a year for travelling expenses. Why not apply the same principle to all judges in every part of the Dominion? Owing to the facilities now provided by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other modes of travel in the North-West, it would not be a difficult matter, I think, to fix what would be a sufficient amount to cover the expenses of the judges there.

Travelling allowance, Court of Queen's Bench and County Court Judges, Manitoba $2,500

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there a fixed allowance for each judge in Manitoba?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are allowed $6 a day for living expenses, besides their actual moving expenses.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know why the judges of Manitoba could not be put under the same rule as the judges of Ontario. In Manitoba the municipality arrangements are now complete, and I think the Government might do away with the *per diem* allowance, which appears to be pretty large.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The allowance in Manitoba is not so favourable to the judges as the allowance in Ontario and the Eastern Provinces, where they are allowed $100 for every court they hold. For instance, a judge holding a court for five days in one of the other provinces, would receive $100, whereas in Manitoba he would only receive $30 and his actual travelling expenses, which would probably not amount to more than $30 more.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if there is any intention of increasing the salaries of the judges. We had some discussion last session on this subject, and I understood that the Minister of Justice was opposed to any increase.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not quite say that; but I shall be able to inform the hon. gentleman later. I am not quite able to do so now.

Supreme Court of Canada—The Reporter.. $2,400

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I notice by the press reports of an interview which the hon. Minister of Justice had with certain gentlemen from the Ontario bar, that he intimated to them that he would be disposed to order the Supreme Court reports to be furnished free to law libraries. I do not know whether that report correctly describes what he did say, but I would like to ask him if he will do that, and if so I assume that the same favour will be extended to the Maritime Provinces.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The interview was not quite correctly reported. What I said was that there was a proposition before the Council, not disposed of, for granting to the law libraries, which are organized under statutory authority in the different provinces, the Supreme and Exchequer Reports, as they are furnished to the judges, and also one or two copies of the annual statutes, and the *Gazette*, and the annual compilation of the criminal law.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that will be done?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot say, as it is not disposed of yet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, I understand, is rather personally in favour of that. Of course, I understand, if it is done, it will apply to other provinces where law societies are incorporated.

Supreme Court—Librarian..... $1,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to make a change. No librarian has been appointed so far, and the books are in charge of a caretaker, who ranks very little above a messenger. The number of volumes is becoming very large and the library very valuable, and I think it ought to be under the care of a thoroughly competent librarian. I do not think it is wise to continue the system we have had heretofore. I made a proposition in Parliament the session before last, but deferred taking action in view of the opinion then expressed as to the advisability of going on as we had gone before. Now

that we have a new library room ready for occupation, I think we should have a competent librarian.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not propose to retain the person who has acted as librarian for some years back?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the hon. gentleman going to do with that officer?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to superannuate him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman state who will be appointed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Exchequer Court of Canada—Additional to Registrar as Editor and publisher of Reports..... $300

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The reports will be a new series, and the sum of $600 is given to the Registrar of the Supreme Court for supervising and editing the reports of that court. I propose to give half that amount to the Registrar of the Exchequer Court for acting as editor. I think the issue will not be so large as the issue separately of reports, although the Registrar thinks they will; but for the present I think half the salary ought to suffice.

Salary of Registrar in Admiralty, Quebec..... $666 66

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why pay him any more then the registrar anywhere else?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only for the reason that the salary has been paid for many years. The fees were abolished last session. I will ask to have that item stand for the present.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was going to ask the hon. gentleman, with reference to the new Admiralty Court, whether the judges for whom he has provided a salary will continue hereafter to receive the fees which they have been heretofore entitled to under the rules?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, the judge receives his salary in lieu of all fees. That is expressly provided by the Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think they are exacting them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must see to that at once and have the rules altered if necessary.

Dominion Police.....$22,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a slight increase here because some extra hands are required during the session of Parliament, as we have been asked by the Commission of Internal Economy to provide men to attend the lobbies of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under what department does this police force come?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the first place it is under a commissioner of police, who is appointed under the statute passed on that subject. He is attached to my department for the purpose of making recommendations to Council and reporting, but the commissioner has the sole right to appoint the officials.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many men are there in the Dominion police force? Are they all in Ottawa?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, they are all living in Ottawa and are all discharging duties connected with the public buildings. The number and the salaries are shown in the return which I laid on the Table at the beginning of the session as required by the statute. I think there are about 25.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are they all required?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to ask that the committee rise and report the resolutions. Owing to various causes, the lateness of the last session, the printing of the revised lists and other matters, some departments are behind with their reports, and I am afraid some of them will not be able to get out their reports until a late date. I hope my hon. friends opposite will take that into consideration and will not make any objection on that account. But, in view of that, I propose that we shall take up first those items in the estimates which are not dependent upon bringing down the departmental reports for their illustration. In fact, I think that nearly all the illumination required will be found in the Auditor General's Report, and with that before the hon. members all the items of expenditure might be taken up. However, if hon. gentlemen agree to that, we will next take up legislation, in regard to which there is no report, and then generally such votes as do not require the departmental reports.

Mr. LAURIER. I must tell my hon. friend that I think much more of the reports of the various departments than he seems to do. I do not think Parliament would be discharging its duty to the public if members did not read these reports.

Mr. FOSTER. How many do you read yourself?

Mr. LAURIER. I do not read them all, but, though I have not time to do that, my colleagues do read them, and, while we will facilitate business as far as we can, I do not see that the hon. gentleman can go on with Supply to any extent without these reports being before us. I admit that the session last year was very long, but the hon. gentleman must remember that it was called much later than it should have been.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 22nd March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 36) to amend the Act incorporating the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Carpenter.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. LAURIER. I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Marine if the papers brought down the other day in regard to the Newfoundland question include the whole of the correspondence?

Mr. TUPPER. No. The papers I brought down the other day are the papers on which I based an answer to a question asked across the House, and which I stated would be prepared in advance of the other papers. The other papers are more voluminous than I understood a few days ago they were, but they have been prepared for presentation, and are awaiting the ordinary approval of the authorities before being laid on the Table.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply. He said: In making my financial statement last year, I estimated that the revenue for 1890-91 would amount to $38,858,701. The revenue which actually accrued fell short of that by $279,391, and was distributed as follows:—

Customs	$23,399,300
Excise	6,914,850
Miscellaneous	8,265,160
Total	$38,579,310

Comparing these items and total revenue with the result of 1889-90, we find a Customs decrease of $589,653, an Excise decrease of $703,268, and a decrease in Miscellaneous of $27,694. The decrease in Customs is spread over a number of items, which I will read:

Animals	$ 9,710
Books, periodicals, &c	15,420
Breadstuffs	151,743
Cement	5,079
Clocks and springs	10,512
Crapes	3,505
Earthenware and china	21,009
Fancy goods	90,941
Fish and products of	5,154
Furs	19,515
Glass	19,569
Gold and silver and manufactures of	4,299
Gunpowder and explosives	4,058
Gutta percha and India rubber and manufactures of	26,448
Iron and steel and manufactures of	194,564
Jewellery	18,600
Lead and manufactures of	8,331
Leather and manufactures of	42,856
Musical instruments	3,106
Packages	16,516
Paper and manufactures of	19,029
Pickles	24,519
Provisions	104,459
Seeds and roots	30,398
Silk and manufactures of	51,342
Soap	4,608
Spirits and wines	148,053
Molasses	76,212
Sugar candy	$ 2,876
Tin and manufactures of	9,213
Varnish	7,877
Vegetables	14,498
Watches and parts of	21,558
Wood and manufactures of	59,995
Wool and manufactures of	199,251

The following are some of the principal items from which increased Customs duties were received last year, the principal being sugar:—

Ale, beer and porter	$ 5,786
Brass and manufactures of	13,070
Bricks and tiles	4,813
Carriages	4,224
Coal and coke	115,627
Copper and manufactures of	28,450
Cordage	6,114
Drugs, dyes and chemicals	24,532
Flax, hemp and jute and manufactures of	4,315
Fruits and nuts, dried	11,740
do green	21,332
Gloves and mitts	13,648
Hats, caps and bonnets	66,657
Metal, composition and other	4,446
Oils, coal and kerosene and products of	5,553
Oils, all other	43,986
Ships, vessels, and repairs on	3,762
Sugar	290,744
Tea	3,886
Tobacco and manufactures of	31,136
All other articles not specified	225,982

There was a decrease in the sugar duties over the normal year preceding, 1888-89; and if it had not been for the displacement and disturbance which arose consequent upon the change of sugar duties in the United States and the idea that a corresponding change would be made in our own tariff, there is no doubt the Customs duties derived therefrom would have been far larger than they were, instead of falling, as they did, far short of those of 1888-89. Excise shows a large decrease of $703,268, but that is more nominal than real. The law which makes it necessary that spirits should be kept two years in tank for aging purposes came into effect the 1st of July, 1890, and a large amount of spirits was withdrawn in anticipation, the duties upon which would have amounted to probably $500,000. This would have gone naturally, but for that circumstance, into the Excise duties of the year we are considering. In the Miscellaneous a small decrease, as compared with the preceding year, is shown, namely, $27,694. The total decrease amounts to $1,320,615. With reference to Excise, the following table shows the course of business for two years:—

TABLE showing the Quantities taken out and the Duties accrued.

—	1889-90, Quantity	1890-91, Quantity	1889-90, Duty Accrued.	1890-91. Duty Accrued.	Increase or Decrease.
	Gals.	Gals.	$	$	$
Spirits	3,574,799	2,708,841	4,617,643	3,544,191	1,073,452
	Lbs.	Lbs.			
Malt	54,974,013	57,909,201	557,021	588,593	+31,572
	No.	No.			
Cigars	98,810,725	101,117,080	593,710	605,017	+11,307
Cigarettes	28,990,440	36,066,600	43,508	54,737	+11,229
	Lbs.	Lbs.			
Tobacco and Snuff	9,802,951	9,688,643	1,850,621	1,869,895	+19,274

This shows that the quantity of spirits taken from bond in 1889–90 amounted to 3,574,799 gallons. In

1890-91 the quantity taken out was 2,708,841 gallons, and the decrease in the accrued duty of 1890-91, as compared with 1889-90, was over $1,000,000. All the other articles of Excise, malt, cigars, cigarettes, tobacco, and snuff, show an increase over the preceding year. Malt shows an increase of $31,572 in accrued duties; cigars show an increase of $11,307 in accrued duties; cigarettes show an increase of $11,229; and tobacco and snuff an increase of $19,274 in accrued duties. It might be as well to keep up the table which has been presented for several years in our financial statements as to the *per capita* consumption of liquors and tobacco, as shown by the Excise reports. The following are the figures:—

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF LIQUORS AND TOBACCO.

—	Spirits.	Beer.	Wine.	Tobacco.
	Gals.	Gals.	Gals.	Lbs.
Average from 1867....	1·151	2·708	·140	2·128
do 1889-90..	·883	3·360	·104	2·143
do 1890-91..	·866	3·282	·102	2·033

When we come to the expenditures of 1890-91, which were estimated at $36,000,000, we find that the actual expenditure exceeded that amount by $343,567, giving a total actual expenditure of $36,343,567. Although the expenditure last year shows an increase of this amount over the estimate, the expenditure itself is $574,267 less than the expenditure in 1888-89. The chief items in which there was an increase of expenditure, as compared with the preceding year, are as follows:—

Premium, Discount and Exchange	$ 33,285
Sinking Fund	50,841
Civil Government	25,306
Administration of Justice	16,808
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	4,655
Census	252,134
Fisheries	45,309
Geological Survey	8,523
Immigration	70,954
Quarantine	4,998
Lighthouse and Coast Service	26,481
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions	34,802
Miscellaneous	7,729
N. W. Territories Government	68,545
Ocean and River Service	35,231
Penitentiaries	3,319
Collection of Revenue—Customs	27,061
do Excise	15,240
do Post Office	87,206
do Public Works	10,235
do Railways & Canals	143,316
do Weights, Measures and Gas	3,655

A large increase took place owing to the census, for which there was an item of $252,154. The next largest item is in the collection of revenue, Railways and Canals, which shows an increase of $143,316. The increase in expenditure, therefore, as compared with the preceding year, is almost entirely due to the abnormal and large expenditure incurred in taking the census. The decreases were as follows:—

Interest on Public Debt	$ 72,705
Charges of Management	1,625
Indians	120,389
Legislation	335,701
Marine Hospitals	$ 6,562
Militia and Defence	7,500
Mounted Police	12,114
Pensions	3,541
Public Works	34,956
Railways and Canals	15,106
Culling Timber	2,182
Dominion Lands	15,091

Decreases took place in the expenditure on the interest on the Public Debt of $72,705, due to the retirement of stock bearing 6 per cent, 5 per cent and 4 per cent and replaced by money borrowed at about 3½ per cent. In Charges of Management there is a slight decrease of $1,625. In the care of Indians, there is a large decrease, amounting to $120,389. In the Mounted Police there is a decrease of $12,114. As far as these decreases are concerned, they are permanent as regards Mounted Police and Indians and, in the matter of the Public Debt, so far as the principal involved is concerned, while the increases are largely abnormal in their character and are not likely to occur again, the census being likely to be finished during the current year. Summing up, then, we have as a revenue for the past year $38,579,310, and an expenditure of $36,343,567, which leaves us with a surplus on Consolidated Fund account of $2,235,742. If it were not for the item of Capital Expenditures, this surplus would remain in hand for a decrease of the debt, but during the past year there was expended on capital account the following amounts:—

Railways and Canals	$2,502,409
Public Works	515,702
Dominion Lands	94,847
N. W. Rebellion Losses	2,901
	$3,115,859
Railway Subsidies	1,265,705
	$4,381,564

Comparing this with the previous year, 1889-90, we find that the expenditure then on capital account was $5,731,354, as against $4,381,564 in 1890-91, making a saving in favour of the latter year of $1,349,790. The net result, therefore, of the operation of the year, is that we have provided for the ordinary expenses and services of the country out of the Consolidated Fund, we have laid up in the Sinking Fund, which is of course practically a reduction of the debt, $1,938,078, we have provided for capital expenditures, including railway subsidies, $4,381,564, and we have been able to do that with an addition to the debt of only $275,818. Hon. gentlemen may remember that in 1889, on the occasion of my first Budget speech, I made a forecast as follows: That I thought the time had come for equalizing revenue and expenditure, and that, by the time we entered 1892, we should have reduced the revenue and expenditure to a balance, and from that time on we should have sufficient as a surplus from Consolidated Revenue Fund to pay the ordinary capital expenditure which was necessary for the country from year to year. That forecast has so far been fulfilled, and if it had not been that we took off the duties on raw sugar last year, involving a loss of over $3,000,000 in that item of revenue alone, we should have been able to come up to the end of 1892 without one dollar of increase of debt since 1889, and with more than half a million of decrease in our permanent debt. It may not be uninteresting to the House to take a review of the four years just past in order to show by a bird's-eye view the financial operations

of the country during that time. This will readily appear from the following table :—

	1887-88.	1888-89.	1889-90.	1890-91.
	$	$	$	$
Expenditure on Consolidated Fund	36,718,494	36,017,834	35,994,031	38,343,507
Expenditure on Capital (not including railway subsidies)	4,437,460	4,420,313	4,033,159	3,115,860
Revenue, Consolidated Fund	35,908,463	38,782,870	39,879,925	38,579,310
Surplus or Deficit	−810,031	+1,865,035	+3,885,893	+2,235,742
Net debt	234,531,358	237,530,041	237,533,211	237,809,030
Increase of net debt	1,216,582	2,998,683	3,170	275,818
Net interest paid	8,891,288	8,843,539	8,574,570	8,506,908
Rate of interest on gross debt	3·45	3·52	3·37	3·35
do net do	3·12	3·07	2·99	2·93
Net interest *per capita* (revised)	1·90	1·86	1·79	1·76

It will be seen that, during those four years, the expenditure on Consolidated Fund account has kept remarkably even, being on an average about $36,000,000 each year. On capital account, not including railway subsidies, we expended in 1887-88, $4,437,460; in 1888-89, $4,420,313; in 1889-90, $4,033,159; and in 1890-91, $3,115,860; the amount for 1890-91 being $1,321,600 less than was expended in 1887-88, which again is in the proper direction. The revenue, also, has been buoyant, rising from $36,908,463 in 1887-88 to $38,579,310 in 1890-91. There was one deficit incurred contrary to the convictions and the traditions of the party, which occurred in 1887-88, but which was due to abnormal conditions and amounted to $810,031; but the subsequent years showed a surplus of $1,865,035 in 1888-89, $3,885,893 in 1889-90, and $2,235,742 in 1890-91. The net debt has remained at about the same figure, and is now $237,809,030. The net debt increase in the last two years has been only $275,818. The net interest paid has decreased from 1887-88, having been $8,891,288 in that year, $8,843,539 in 1888-89, $8,574,570 in 1889-90 and $8,506,908 in 1890-91. That is to say, in the four years the net interest paid has decreased by about $400,000. The rate of interest on the gross debt has also decreased continuously as well as on the net debt, and while it stood at 3·45 on the gross debt in 1887-88, it is now only 3·35, while the interest on the net debt has decreased from 3·12 in the first year to 2·93 in the last year. The net interest *per capita* required to carry the debt according to the revision consequent upon the census statement, was $1.90 in 1887-88 and $1.76 in 1890-91. This, in brief, shows the operation

of the finances of the country during the last four years, and I have no hesitation in presenting it to the House and to the country as a conservative statement full of hope and promise as to the ability and the capacity of this country, in the first place to keep its expenses fairly within reasonable limits, and at the same time to carry on without undue stint the public and necessary services of the country. Coming now to 1891-92, the current year, the receipts up to the 20th March were $25,459,000. From the 20th March, 1890, to the end of the last fiscal year the receipts were $11,396,000. But of course there have been changes which will necessitate my making a different estimate for the time between the 20th March, 1892, and the end of this fiscal year. The expected increase in Excise for the remaining four months, or about that time, as compared with the like period of last year, is estimated at $350,000, and the expected decrease in sugar duties for that time is estimated at $550,000. So, provided that the trade of the country goes on upon about the same basis as last year, and making an allowance for these two items, we may expect for the remainder of the term from the 20th March to the 1st July, $11,196,000 of revenue. That, added to what has accrued up to the 20th March, will give for the current year an estimated revenue of $36,655,000, divided probably as follows :— Customs, $20,500,000; Excise, $7,900,000; Miscellaneous, $8,265,000. On that basis of calculation the revenue from Customs paid by the people of the country this year will be, in round numbers, $3,000,000 less than that paid last year, which was about the amount of actual taxation taken off in the repeal of the duties of raw sugar. The Excise will net, probably, about $1,000,000 more than the past year. The Miscellaneous I have estimated at about the same. Coming to the expenditure for 1891-92, up to the 20th March we have expended $23,206,000, and I estimate for expenditure up to the end of June, $13,450,000, which will make a total estimated expenditure for the current year of $36,650,000, which is just about the same as my estimate of revenue, leaving a small balance to the good, if we come out upon that basis. That is, the House is to understand that under present conditions of tariff and revenue, as long as they remain, we must not expect much surplus. We may expect an average income of about $36,500,000. We must cut our garments according to our cloth, and keep our expenditure within that amount. The estimate for 1892-93 is as follows :— Customs, $20,500,000; Excise, $8,000,000; Miscellaneous, $8,000,000, making in all $36,500,000. So much with reference to that. Last year, as the House already knows, temporary loans had to be incurred to the amount of $7,786,666. These were, of course, made for the purpose of meeting redemption of debt, as last year the total addition to the net debt was only some $3,000. We have running now, as the House was informed a few days ago, $9,753,333 in temporary loans. I may take a moment to explain as to the items of redemption which made these loans necessary. First, there has been the drain upon the savings banks of the country, owing to the change of interest from 4 per cent to 3½ per cent, and perhaps to other causes more general in their nature. In 1889-90, there was withdrawn from the savings banks of the country $1,943,892 more than the deposits, plus the accrued interest for the year. In 1890-91, the sum

thus withdrawn was $1,612,438, a reduction of about $300,000; and I estimate that for the current year there will be nothing withdrawn in excess of the deposits, plus the accrued interest, but that rather, from the indications of the last eight months, we will have a sum to the good, striking a balance between these two items. These, however, make a sum of $3,500,000 which was practically a redemption of debt, and had to be met and was met out of these temporary loans. For redemption of debt proper, we redeemed in 1889-90, $3,577,348; in 1890-91, $1,905,964; in 1891-92, $1,937,795; in 1892-93, $2,178,960 will be redeemed, making a total amount of $9,600,067 for redemption of debt to be met out of temporary loans. Then the capital expenditure, the increase of debt for the two preceding years, the net increase of debt for the current year and the next year, have to be met as well; so that in addition to the $9,753,333, which is at present running as a temporary loan, probably some $5,000,000 will have to be provided either by temporary or by permanent loan. As I mentioned to my hon. friend who questioned me on this point the other day, whether these temporary loans shall be continued as they are, or as they can best be continued, or whether it will be thought advisable to go upon the market for a permanent loan to meet and wipe out all these temporary loans, will be dependent upon the indications of the money market, and the present is not a time at which I can definitely say what these indications will advise. To show that whatever may have been the reduction in the Government savings banks in 1889-90 and 1890-91, it was not due to a diminution in the savings and deposits of the people, I have here a table which I think will give satisfaction to the House. This shows the total:

DEPOSITS IN BANKS.

—	May 31, '90	May 31, '91	Feb. 29, '92
	$	$	$
In P.O. Savings Banks	21,357,554	21,130,429	21,686,074
In Dom. Savings Banks	18,488,290	17,114,889	16,929,825
In Charter'd Banks payable on demand	51,440,101	56,522,473	60,029,923
In Charter'd Banks payable after notice or on a fixed day	74,629,147	84,679,400	93,394,227
City and District Savings Bank, and Caisse d'Economie	10,778,164	10,994,546	11,928,669
Totals	176,703,258	190,441,739	203,968,719

This tells us that whereas the year ending May 31, 1891, witnessed a decrease of over $1,600,000 in deposits in the Government banks the 8 months of the current year show an increase of nearly $400,000 in these deposits, while the total increase in all banks is, for the 8 months, $13,526,980, and for the 20 months $27,265,461. Whatever course may be adopted as to these temporary loans it is satisfactory to know that there are indications from the records of the past two years of some trial and difficulty, that in the money markets at home the credit of Canada stands well. First, our stocks and securities, while participating in the general fall which took place a year or so ago, owing to well-known causes, have speedily recovered and maintained themselves since in advance of the securities and stocks of every other colonial market. I think it is not amiss for me, at this point, to take notice of what I consider a somewhat remarkable, as it is, I am happy to say, an unprecedented, circumstance, with reference to our position and standing in the old country. Hon. gentlemen know well on this side of the House that during the last three or four years we have had to meet in the United States of America malign influences emanating from certain persons in Canada, pointing out to those who are not very friendly to us on that side of the line, the way in which Canada could be the most effectually stricken and in what interests she might be most especially hurt. And those intimations, sent often direct, sent often through agents, and influential agents, sent quite as often in the published speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, have had their effect, and it has happened that in the legislation which has supervened Canada has been hit at exactly those points pointed out in the way I have mentioned. But, Sir, it had not been known previously that the scene of operations was to be transferred from this country and carried to the mother country, where the credit and reputation of Canada are of much importance to us, and contribute greatly to our prestige and our prosperity. But, Sir, it has so been determined and the first attack has been delivered. The time of the attack was a peculiarly opportune one for an enemy to have winged his arrow to a vital point in Canadian reputation and Canadian credit. It was a time when the money market in Great Britain was peculiarly sensitive. It had for two years been sustaining the strain of losses and liquidations in South America and of liquidations at home, and was agitated by the possibilities and premonitions of financial hardship, and perhaps financial disaster in different parts of Europe. It was a time when criticism of colonial finance was much the fashion in Great Britain, and was somewhat unfavourable, owing to the late attempts which have been made, not always successfully, by the Australian colonies to float loans on the money market, and which had in most cases resulted unfavourably to themselves. It was a time when, as I have stated, Canada herself had temporary loans running, amounting to $10,000,000, which had to be continued or renewed in one form or another. It was a time when many meritorious enterprises were upon the London market, which, if they could be realized, would tend to the development of the resources of Canada in a material degree. It was a time, too, when owing to the fine and abundant harvest of last year emigrants from the various centres of Great Britain were being led to look to Canada, and to our North-West particularly, as a future home for themselves and their families. It was a time, when a friend of Canada, if he had nothing good to say, would have held his peace, or if he could have presented one truth to have buoyed up and sustained the position of Canada, would have thought it his duty to do so. It was a time when an enemy would have dipped his arrow in poison and winged it as straight as he could to the vital part of Canadian credit and reputation in the old country. He was wickedly wise too in his choice of the instrument through which to make his attack. He chose a financial paper, one of the first in Great Britain which circulates among monied men, and through its utterances and representations has great influence and great weight in determining the mind of monied men towards any

country or enterprise, and which is studied as well by influential factors and motors in the emigration from that country to this. Sir, I hold in my hand the document which, at this particular time and by this particular vehicle, has been not only sent broadcast in the *Economist* through Great Britain to do its work, but has actually been printed, probably by the writer himself -if not by him by one who was a no greater friend to Canada- and as a campaign document has been spread through Great Britain from one end to the other. What are the assertions contained in this document? They are assertions not new to us here, assertions stated over and over again from almost every platform in the country and on the floor of this House year after year, and exposed as often as they were uttered; but which going to the British public and the British people had far different weight attached to them from the name and position of the writer and from the fact that the phases of Canadian party politics and the facts relating thereto are not studied and are not well understood, as indeed they could scarcely be, by the people in Great Britain I suppose it is known to whom I refer, the gentleman sits opposite to me to-day, he was Finance Minister during the Liberal regime, he is to-day the actual financial leader of his party, if not the potent leader of his party, he is the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). His statements, which may be read by any hon. member who chooses to do so, are familiar and well known, but I have arranged just half-a-dozen in a line of crescendo or climax, keeping the worst to the last. He declares in that document that during thirteen years Canada has trebled her taxation. This is not true. He declares there exists a tremendous exodus and very great depreciation in farm lands. That is an exaggeration, and what there is true in it is made all the more mischievous because he puts no facts of comparison along with the statement he makes. He declares there has been an immense increase in the aggregate debt of this country. The immense increase consists in this—he is speaking of federal matters, I suppose, and he means federal indebtedness -that in 1878 the amount per head paid for the federal indebtedness was $1.58, whilst in 1891 it was $1.76, an immense increase of just 18 cents per head during the period from 1878 to 1891. That document states that the great mass of the people, notably the farmers of Canada, are distinctly poorer than twelve years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a fine statement to be made by the hon. gentleman and spread broadcast throughout Great Britain, from which we get the greater part, I may say the better part, of the immigration which comes to this country. He declares the census shows that Canada lost in the last ten years 1,500,000 of people. The census shows no such thing; but such a slight misrepresentation as that causes no scruples with the hon. gentleman, he makes his statement all the same. He declares that the agriculturists of this country have been simply bled white and that $60,000,000 are taken annually out of the pockets of the people for federal taxation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And more.

Mr. FOSTER. That, in connection with the hon. gentleman's statement that in thirteen years Canada has trebled her taxation, is probably the greatest of all the many great exaggerations of which the hon. gentleman, during the last five years, has been guilty. In 1878 the taxation of the country for revenue purposes was $17,841,938, or $4.37 per head. In 1891 it was $30,214,150, or $6 per head. The increase in taxation as to amount has therefore been but 70 per cent, and as to relative incidence but 37 per cent, instead of 200 per cent. In no country in the world do farmers pay less taxes than in Canada. He declares that bribery is a pure matter of business routine in Canada. The hon. gentleman may find something in his own experience to justify this statement; I would not contradict that, but if he means that assertion to apply to the Canadian Government, as at present constituted, or as it has been constituted since 1878, I give it my emphatic denial. He affirmed, Sir, that public life in Canada is disgraced by an intolerable and organized corruption, unknown to the people of England since the days of Walpole, or Charles the Second, and he winds up by declaring that it is utterly impossible for Canada to prosper under present conditions; that, "if there is no change, Confederation must perish, rotten before it had time to become half ripe, as a result of the vice and the folly with which its affairs have been administered." That, Sir, is the hon. gentleman's contribution. A more unfounded, a more unjustifiable and a more mischievous attempt to ruin the reputation and credit of his country in another land is, happily, not to be found in the annals of modern political history. Now, I say that the hon. gentleman can have but one motive in penning that letter and publishing it as he has published it. His presumed motive for taking his case at all before the British public, was, that he might explain to the British public what he meant by this policy which for the last five years he has been endeavouring to thrust upon the people of Canada, and which was as intolerable to the thinking British public as it was to the thinking Canadian public. That, Sir, might have been a good and valid excuse for the hon. gentleman to have explained his policy and defended it before the British public, but it was no excuse for him taking up more than half of his letter in this vilification and unwarranted abuse of the people, the politics, the reputation and the credit of Canada. He could have but one motive, and that motive was to transfer the partisan operations carried on during the last five years in fruitless fields comparatively upon this side, to the other side of the water, from which we draw our sympathy, where we look for large capital to develop this country, and where the credit and reputation of Canada count as a great factor in our future progress and development. These same misrepresentations the hon. gentleman has brought forth before the electorate of Canada time and again for the last five or six years. He has given them utterance on almost every hustings in the country, and wherever he has uttered them, almost without fail in these latter days, the people have repudiated him. Now, the hon. gentleman, foiled, disappointed and baulked in his programme of veiled annexation in Canada—I quote the words, and if not the words the exact meaning of the gentleman whom he owned as leader for six or seven years in this House—foiled and baulked and disappointed in that, he has nothing better to do than to transfer his base of operations to the mother country and give there one final stab as strong as he can at the credit, the reputation and the vitality of his native country. I thought it my duty to call the attention of the House and

the country to this matter. I brand the action of the hon. gentleman as unprecedented, as unjustifiable, as uncalled for, and as most unpatriotic; but which, from a party point of view, I present to hon. gentlemen opposite with this single remark: That so long as they retain their affiliation in politics with a gentleman who adopts that method of warfare, just so long they will not have to seek far and wide for reasons why they are repudiated by the Canadian people and refused the reins of political power. They will find the explanations close at home in such actions as those I have noted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Probably they will get a recount.

Mr. FOSTER. It would take a great many recounts to have the hon. gentleman who interrupts me straightened up. I pass from that little episode to a more pleasing subject for the House in general, and one which will prove, I am sure, a complete refutation of the misrepresentations I have just noticed, and I will enquire for a few moments as to the conditions of trade as developed by the operation of the past and of the current year so far as it has gone. I do this, largely because the assertion is very frequently made inside this House and out of it, that the trade of Canada is actually diminishing, and that since the operations of the McKinley Bill and the making of treaties consequent upon that legislation, Canadian trade is being hampered and Canada as a country is becoming isolated and restricted in her area of business transactions. Well, Sir, if we take the aggregate trade of last year we will find that it remained at about the same figure as that of the preceding year, which, however, we must not forget was in advance of about $14,000,000 upon the year preceding that. The imports, however, are nearly $2,000,000 less than in 1890, caused mainly by larger productions for our own home market as a result of tariff legislation, and as a result of the development of our manufacturing industries. Take, for instance, as a matter of tariff legislation. We find that there is a decrease, in round numbers, of $800,000 in the importations of pork and pork products from the United States in 1891, as compared with 1890. That does not mean that our people have consumed or produced less pork products, but it means that the pork products which before, under lower tariff, came in from the United States of America and displaced or supplied the demand for our own products, have been kept out to that extent; and that this demand is now supplied by home production to the benefit of the consumer and producer as well. The following table will make this clear:—

IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES INTO CANADA.

—	1890.	1891.	Decrease.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
Bacon, hams and shoulders	4,353,653	2,570,412	1,783,241
Beef	6,445,105	2,715,101	3,730,004
Mutton	246,363	6,388	239,975
Pork	17,185,794	11,116,948	6,068,846
Lard	4,881,786	991,655	3,890,131
	33,112,701	17,400,504	15,712,197
Value	$1,734,225	$973,312	$760,913

The total exports, however, of this past year amounting to $98,417,296 show an increase of $1,668,147 over 1890; so that, while the imports have decreased for the causes I have mentioned, our exports show a gratifying extension, especially when you find that compared with the exports of the preceding year of 1889 they exceed these by the large sum of $9,228,129. An increase of nearly $10,000,000 in exports in two years during the very period of this threatened and much-talked of legislation which was to have hindered and restricted us, is very gratifying to anyone who looks upon the matter from a fair and reasonable standpoint. The export of the last year is the largest of any year since Confederation, with the exception of 1882. It is nearly $14,000,000 more than the average yearly export since Confederation, and $17,700,000 more than the average annual export during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. As further confirmation of the favourable trend discernible in this, I may mention this fact to the House: That although the exports last year reached that high water mark and were $10,000,000 above the exports of 1889, yet in the eight months of the current year the exports are higher than the exports of the eight months corresponding of last year by about $10,000,000. This means that if the proportionate increase holds till the end of the year, the exports for 1891-92 will be about $13,000,000 or $14,000,000 greater than the exports of last year, which were $10,000,000 more than the exports of 1889. It is a circumstance which I have noted, and which may be interesting in itself, that there is scarcely a dollar's difference between the exports of the eight months of the current year which I have mentioned and those of the twelve months of the last year that my hon. friend was Finance Minister in the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. This statement is immensely strengthened, and will be by that much the more reassuring to the country, by the reflection that since 1873 the value of articles of export and import has decreased by about one-third, and that to find the comparative volume of trade now as compared with that date you must add fully one-third to the figures of the present trade. This, Sir, would make the trade of 1891 about $290,000,000 on the basis of the values of 1873 as compared with the trade of the latter year. Our total trade has increased with the United States, Germany, Spain, Italy, Newfoundland, the West Indies, China and Japan. It has decreased slightly with Great Britain, France, Portugal, Holland, Belgium, South America and Switzerland. Our export trade, however, has increased largely, that with Great Britain being $11,000,000 in excess of 1889, and that with the West Indies having increased in the same time by about $500,000. Our exports to the United States, as compared with those of 1889, show a decrease of $2,400,000. I have a table here which I will read, simply to show the trend of trade within the last few years, and to give us hope and confidence that neither the McKinley Bill nor any other of a like nature necessarily bars the current of Canada's export trade or the current of its general business. Comparing 1888 with 1891, our exports of animals and their products to the United States fell from $7,595,000 to $4,316,000, a decrease of 43 per cent, whereas the exports of the same products to Great Britain rose from $16,500,000 in 1888 to $21,000,000 in 1891, an increase of 27 per cent. The exports of agricultural products to the United States fell from $10,000,000 in 1888 to $7,000,000 in 1891, a de-

crease of 30 per cent, while those sent to England rose from $4,292,000 in 1888 to $5,254,000 in 1891, an increase of 22 per cent. If you take the total exports in 1888 and compare them with those of 1891, there was a decrease of 3¼ per cent in those sent to the United States and an increase of 22 per cent in those sent to England.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are these the products of Canada alone, or the total exports?

Mr. FOSTER. These are the home productions of Canada alone. There is another indication contradictory of this theory or assertion that trade is stagnant in Canada. It is found in the record of the railways and shipping of Canada, as shown in the following table:—

RAILWAYS IN CANADA.

Year.	Miles Operated.	Train Mileage.	Number Passengers.	Tons Freight.	Earnings.
					$
1875..	4,826	17,680,168	5,190,416	5,670,836	19,470,539
1880..	6,891	22,427,449	6,462,948	9,938,858	23,561,447
1889..	12,628	38,819,380	12,151,051	17,928,626	42,149,615
1890...	13,256	41,849,329	12,821,262	20,787,469	46,843,826
1891..	14,007	43,334,891	13,164,420	21,727,025	48,139,980
Increase, 1891 over 1875....	145 p. c.	153 p. c.	283 p. c.	147 p. c.	

SHIPPING IN CANADA.

Year.	Tonnage of Vessels in and out, exclusive of Coasting.	Tonnage of Vessels in and out, Coasting.
1879.....	11,646,812	12,066,683
1889.....	16,054,221	19,834,977
1890.....	18,446,100	22,797,115
1891.....	18,803,648	24,986,130
Increase, 1891 over 1879...	61 p. c.	107 p. c.

In 1875 we had 4,826 miles in operation; in 1891 we had 14,007 miles in operation. The train mileage in the same time rose from 17,680,168 miles to 43,334,891 miles, an increase of 145 per cent. The passengers increased from 5,190,416 to 13,164,420, an increase of 153 per cent. The freight increased from 5,670,836 tons to 21,727,025 tons, an increase of 283 per cent. The earnings increased from $19,470,539 to $48,139,980, an increase of 147 per cent. These figures effectually demonstrate the absurdity of the contention that the trade of Canada is not on a constant and progressive increase.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The railways are not controlled by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very wise and sapient remark, and I earnestly commend it to all my hon. friends on this side of the House. I hope they will not be overcome by its sapiency.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg pardon. The Intercolonial Railway is controlled by the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Taking also the shipping, which is another branch of our carrying trade, we find that in 1879 the tonnage of vessels in and out, seagoing and inland, exclusive of coasting vessels, rose from 11,646,812 tons in 1879 to 18,803,648 in 1891, an increase of 61 per cent. The tonnage of coasting vessels in and out rose from 12,066,683 tons in 1879 to 24,986,130 tons in 1891, an increase of 107 per cent. These, too, are conclusive indications of the business and trade activity and development of this country. So that, looking at these indications of the increase of both our foreign and interprovincial trade, the conclusion is forced upon us that there has been a great and progressive increase in the general trade and commerce of Canada. In passing, I wish to speak for a moment of the different large steamship services of Canada—not by way of going exhaustively at all into the operations of the past year, but merely to say that in the Pacific coast and the West Indies steamship lines, there has been a constant and gratifying increase, both in the passengers carried and in the freight delivered. The steamship service to the West Indies, especially during this last year, appears to have given excellent satisfaction, and to have been a principal factor in developing a largely increased trade between our country and those different islands. With reference to the Atlantic fast steamship service, during the past year tenders were again called for. In answer to our calls but two tenders were received, both of which were, in the opinion of the Government, beyond what could reasonably be expended by this country for a fast Atlantic service; so that, though the policy of the Government has not changed, the circumstances have made it impossible for us as yet to establish that service. I may state, also, that in accordance with my intimation given in the House last year on an item in the Estimates, I have this year made a beginning in the way of establishing corresponding commercial agencies in different ports and countries, somewhat on the consular plan, without, of course, diplomatic standing or diplomatic responsibility. At the present time we have as commercial agents in Paris, in Great Britain, in the principal centres of the West Indian Islands, gentlemen whose services are enlisted for the purpose of giving all possible information by correspondence and by reports, to be sent to the department and to be published in bulletin form, as to the opportunities that exist for trade and commerce between those different countries and Canada: and I have no doubt that this service will develop gradually into one of great practical benefit to the mercantile classes of our own country and the different countries with which we establish trade relations. The feature of the year outside of Canada has been the wide arrangement of commercial tariffs, and the changed principle upon which commercial intercourse between different countries is regulated. Within the last few months we have had France moving to do away with every treaty in which a most-favoured-nation clause was found, giving notice as to all such which were about to expire, and denouncing them at the period of expiry; and by the 1st of July, 1892, every treaty, with one exception, which runs for another year in addition, that France had with other countries, embodying the most-favoured-nation clause and carrying the obligations of that clause, will have been done away with. The French Government has legislated in the line of a double tariff;—a minimum tariff, sufficient, in its opinion, to protect French industries, for it is constructed upon the protective basis

and which shall be granted to those countries who give like or compensating concessions to France, and a general tariff which is applicable to all other countries. Trade arrangements, based upon the minimum tariff, are subject to denouncement or change, at once or upon a year's notice, so that none of the disturbing and sometimes embarrassing complications which attach to the most-favoured-nation clause will, after the 1st of July next, be in the way of the commerce of France with other countries. Consequent upon this has followed a rearrangement among other European countries, Prussia, Austro-Hungary, Switzerland and Italy making a treaty among themselves, by which certain products are mutually charged a lower rate of duties, thus stimulating, so far as they could in that direction, trade among those four great countries. Then we have seen the United States of America, by virtue of the third clause of the McKinley Act, entering into a series of treaties with other countries. Up to the present time the following have been promulgated ;—with Brazil, with Spain for Cuba and Porto Rico, with the British West Indies, with the Dominican Republic, with Salvador, Germany, France and Nicaragua, giving these countries in exchange for certain reductions and the placing of certain articles upon the free list, the benefit of allowing hides, coffee, sugar and molasses to come into the United States free of duty. In all these changes, what has been the result, so far as Canadian interests and trade are concerned? In the first place, I may say that with reference to France, we stand in about the same position as we did before. We had before to pay a surtax, over and above the rate charged Great Britain, on our colonial produce exported to that country. To-day we are under the operations of the general tariff. With reference to the treaty which has been arranged between Prussia, Austro-Hungary, Italy and Switzerland, whatever benefits accrue from it by the way of lessening duties, accrue to Canada as well by virtue of the most-favoured-nation clause in treaties with Germany and Austro-Hungary, so that the benefits of lessened duties upon certain articles under their lately arranged treaty inure as well to the products of Canada coming under the same schedule. With reference to the treaties which have been made by the United States, as far as Cuba and Porto Rico are concerned, we have the advantage of the most-favoured-nation treatment until the 1st of July of this year. Negotiations are now in progress with a view of having continued to us the same favourable terms : and there is nothing, so far as the tariff of our country is concerned, in its treatment of products of Cuba and Porto Rico which should induce them to give any better terms to the United States of America than to Canada, as we allow their products in, on the whole, on a more favoured basis than even the United States. With regard to the British West Indies, no discrimination was—I will not say allowed—but hinted at in the arrangement of the treaty between them and the United States of America ; and I think we owe to the British West India Islands this acknowledgment of their fair and manly and brotherly spirit, that in making a treaty which they considered to be of very great benefit to themselves, and in which considerable pressure was brought to induce them to give better treatment to the goods of the United States than to Canadian and British goods, they adhered to the Colonial and Imperial system of treating sister colonies and the mother country on the same basis as they treat others. With reference to the Dominican Republic, as I have stated, although our trade with the Republic is not very large, we happen to have the benefit of the most-favoured-nation clause. So that Brazil is the only country outside of those I have mentioned in which our products, for the time being, in certain lines, are placed at a disadvantage as compared with those of the United States, and I may say that negotiations are now in progress, which I hope will eventuate in our products being placed on the same footing as those of the United States in the markets of Brazil. Naturally, this review of treaty arrangements and their results upon Canada, leads up to the conference which took place not long since in Washington between delegates of the Canadian Government and representatives of the Cabinet of the United States, with reference to trade relations. The House is seized of the correspondence and the facts with reference to the steps which brought about the ultimate and completed conference ; and on the 10th of February of this year, by appointment of the Secretary of State, a delegation from the Canadian Government went to Washington and met the Secretary of State in conference. I may say this, and I think it is nothing more than right to say it, that Mr. Blaine met us with the greatest kindness and courtesy. Although not in the enjoyment of robust health, and although he was in the midst of the arduous duties of a session of Congress, in the midst of diplomatic correspondence of a weighty and grave character, he gave up his time to the delegation from Canada and for five successive days met them in full and frank and prolonged conference upon the various points treated of between the two. I will say nothing as regards the other points discussed, which have already been more or less fully laid before Parliament, but with reference to the discussion of the trade question I think it my duty to make Parliament acquainted with what took place and the results therefrom. In conference with Mr. Blaine, the Canadian delegation proposed, as a basis for negotiation, the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, with such modifications and extensions as the changed condition of both countries might render necessary and desirable, and pressed the conclusion of a treaty upon that basis. They were met with the reply from Mr. Blaine that a proposal looking to a treaty based upon natural products alone had not in it the essential elements of reciprocity, so far as the United States are concerned, and consequently they were unable to entertain it. He raised the question, as did also General Foster, who was his coadjutor in the conference, as to whether we were prepared to make a proposal which would go wider than natural products, and take in and include a general reciprocity in manufactured articles as well. When that point came up, the Canadian delegation immediately raised the question and discussed it fully and freely with Mr. Blaine as to what would be the necessary conditions of such a reciprocity. Did it mean that we were to give United States products and manufactures preferential treatment in our country and discriminate against like articles from Great Britain and from other parts of the world ? and the reply came, after a full discussion of the matter, that a reciprocity treaty would have no compensating advantages to the United States of America unless they were

given preferential treatment in our markets, especially against Great Britain, which was their chief competitor in nearly every line of manufactured goods, that under any scheme of reciprocity which could be looked upon favourably by them, the United States would expect to compete with Canadian manufactures in Canadian markets on even terms, but with no others. Well, when that point was reached, discussion took place as to the difficulties to be met by Canada in subscribing to a treaty of that kind, and they were fully and frankly laid before Mr. Blaine. They were, in brief, these: that in going into a treaty of that kind we should stand to lose what we were less able to lose than the United States of America, a considerable proportion of our revenue: first, the eight millions or so which we collected upon the products of the United States that came into Canada; and, secondly, the diminution, whatever it might be, which would result in the imports from the outside world owing to the competition and entrance of United States goods free of duty into our country. Mr. Blaine raised the question whether we had not other methods of taxation. We explained that we had methods of taxation by internal revenue as they themselves had, upon which he remarked that it would be necessary in a treaty of this kind that these inland revenue duties on liquors and tobaccos should be equalized; and that immediately brought up the point that, if they were equalized and if the United States were not willing to level up to our rates, Canada would stand to lose a large amount of revenue in excise duties, inasmuch as our rates are much higher than those of the United States. We also pointed out the grave difficulty which met us in discriminating against the goods of Great Britain with whom, as a colony, we had close and intimate relations, and the repugnance felt against drawing a cordon about ourselves against the world with the exception of the United States. At this point another question came up. Suppose that Canada were willing to discriminate against the goods of the outside world and of Great Britain on this proposed basis of a treaty, who should fix the discrimination and what should be the measure of that discrimination? And as an illustration the article of wool and of woollens was instanced, in which the duties on the raw material vary in both countries as well as do the duties on the manufactured goods. Mr. Blaine admitted at once that this was a vital point, that the United States had its policy of protection, of large protection for both wools and woollen goods, and that unless this vital point were guarded there would be no security to the United States on the one hand against smuggling along a line 3,000 miles in extent, and no security, on the other hand, for the permanence and preservation of the policy of protection which they, up to this time, had maintained, and which they proposed to maintain, and that he saw no way out of the difficulty unless the tariff of Canada were made uniform with that of the United States. Well, Sir, this question passed on in discussion until we had pretty well exhausted the subject, when the Canadian delegates, after having presented these difficulties and canvassed them fairly and thoroughly, said to Mr. Blaine: These are our difficulties; you acknowledge them. Now, you have had large experience in framing reciprocity treaties and have had much to do in the study and arrangements of reciprocal matters: we lay these points before you and we ask whether or not, out of your experience, you cannot see your way to propose a modification of this basis in order that we may diminish, at least to some extent, the difficulties we are under as to loss of revenue, as to discrimination, and as to a uniform tariff; and, after discussion of some time, we received an answer from Mr. Blaine, that while he acknowledged our difficulties, he was clear in his own mind that no other arrangement would be satisfactory to the United States of America, that their manufactures must have preferential treatment, including, of course, discrimination against foreign countries and especially against Great Britain, that there must be a uniform tariff, and that that tariff must be practically the tariff of the United States of America. With this remark, we passed on to other points in discussion and we did not thereafter recur to the trade question. This is, in brief, a fair and candid account of what took place at the conference. I think it is only necessary for me to put in brief the results, and they are simply these: that so long as the present party and the present policy is maintained in the United States, in one branch or the other of the Legislature or in the Executive, we cannot hope for any treaty with the United States, except upon these lines, viz., a treaty which will take in both natural products and manufactured goods: a treaty unlimited in its scope, of which the basis is a preferential treatment in our market with discrimination especially against Great Britain and against other countries; a treaty that must be accompanied by a uniform tariff, and this tariff equalized with that of the United States of America. These are in brief the results which have been arrived at. During years of discussion from the time the old reciprocity treaty was denounced in 1865 to the present time, there have been various ideas put forward, there have been various plans submitted, there have been assertions and counter assertions of what could be done, there have been several proposals made, but up to this date we have been unable to get any one of our proposals adopted by the United States, or to get one counter proposal from them. Now the matter is settled. It is settled in point of clearness and definiteness. I, for my own part, regret that it is settled as it is, and still I am glad that it is settled at all. I regret that no *modus* can be found by which profitable trade relations could be established between these two countries, without our being called upon to sacrifice too much of Canadian interests and too much of Canadian nationality. I am glad, however, that from this time forward there need be no lack of definiteness, for all parties and all interests in Canada may now know exactly the basis upon which a treaty can be obtained or cannot be obtained.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister whether the deputation at Washington made any report to His Excellency or to their colleagues, on their return, that can be laid before Parliament? I think, Sir, it is a very unusual thing to enter into such a discussion on this occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is the unusual feature on this occasion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman should not rise and interrupt me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Bothwell is rising to a point of order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the rule is, that when a matter of this sort is being discussed, there shall be some official report laid upon the Table of the House as a basis for discussion. The hon. gentleman has referred to negotiations that have taken place, and no report whatever of those negotiations has been laid before Parliament. In the case of a British Minister residing abroad, the practice is for him to make a report of the interview, that report is sent to the Foreign Secretary and is brought down to Parliament. Now, Sir, if the Government adopt the usual course, instead of sending an agent to select certain members of the Government to go themselves, it is the business of those members of the Government to report to the executive head of the Government, and it is the right of Parliament to have that report laid before them. Now, there is no such report whatever before us. We have no means of judging of the statements made by the hon. gentleman except what he says in the speech he is addressing to the House. I say that it is a highly irregular proceeding, and before the hon. gentleman undertook to make such a statement to the House he ought to have made a report to His Excellency or to his colleagues, and that report should be officially before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has declared that he is speaking on a question of order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I submit whether the hon. gentleman has not completely refuted his own statement by the fact that when he rose the first thing he did was to ask a question of the Minister of Finance——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So I did.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON—upon which to base a point of order, and he got no reply to that question. Now, Sir, I submit to you whether there is any rule, any practice, any authority of any description whatever, which restricts a Minister of the Crown from stating that which has transpired on a mission on which he has been sent by competent authority. There is nothing of the kind, I submit, in the usages of Parliament; there is absolutely nothing of the kind in diplomatic usage, or the practice which prevails between Ministers and the Executive. If a Minister of the Crown makes a statement that is not authorized by His Excellency to be made, or which has not been communicated to him—if it should have been communicated to him—that is a matter of responsibility between the Minister and the head of the Executive. But it is the right and privilege of every member, whether he be a Minister of the Crown or a private member of the House, to give to the House that information on public questions which he possesses, whether anybody else has had it communicated to him or not.

Mr. LAURIER. The question put by my hon. friend to the Minister of Finance has not been answered, unless he means to say that he is now making, in his speech, a report of the negotiations which took place at Washington. I submit that if the Minister wanted to refer in his speech on this occasion to the facts which he is now disclosing, he should have first laid them before the House in the form of a Message.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand the matter, I think the statement made by the Minister of Finance was perfectly in order. I know of no more opportune time than the delivery of the Budget, to deal with these questions with which the Minister of Finance is dealing. He is making statements as to the result of trade negotiations between this Government and the Government of the United States, and I know of no rule of Parliament that would prevent him from making those statements.

Mr. FOSTER. I thank the hon. member for Bothwell for two things: one, for giving me even so short a period of rest; and the other, for his very full indication of his own disturbed feelings at this time. Generally the hon. member for Bothwell is thirsting for information, but to-day he seems to be so full that he does not require further information. We are never too old to learn, as the saying goes, but I am forced to conclude now that my hon. friend is either too old to learn, or does not wish to learn any more. I was proceeding to remind the House, when I was interrupted, that we have now acquired a definite statement as to the real basis upon which a treaty with the United States of America was possible. I was going on to say that I was glad that it was settled, although I regretted that it was settled in that way. For several years the commerce of this country, the business of the country, and the prosperity of the country, have been affected by an agitation which contemplated a very grave change in the commercial and other conditions of Canada. An agitation was set on foot which promised certain things, and held out in roseate language a certain prospect as the result of what could be accomplished, and this continual agitation, and placing before the people the idea of great changes from which they were to get great advantages — which were impossible of fulfilment — cannot but have had a detrimental effect upon the business and progress of the country. I am glad for this reason that this is now settled, and that Canadians can now turn their faces to the future with a definite idea of what they have to do for themselves and what they may expect from those who live close beside us. For my own part I am not at all afraid to face the future, and to encounter what it has in store for us as to the development and progress of Canada. If the Canadian farmer is to be debarred in great part from a market in the United States for his products, which market at the best is partial, sectional and variable, he will at least have this satisfaction, that under due and adequate protection he will not be exposed to the great and dangerous competition, in the products of this country, from the great western country of the United States. He can prepare himself to find a market for his wares in other countries where they get more favourable entrance, and he can especially prepare himself to enter fully upon that almost inexhaustible market which awaits him for all his products in Great Britain, our mother land. In that country, already, by force of good quality and by prudence in selection, his apples, his cheese, his wheat, his cattle, his bacon and ham, find large and constantly increas-

ing markets, and have to-day secured a permanent place in the market, and practically overtop all competition. And what has been done for these in the British market, by the same careful selection, and the same force of quality, can be done for the beans, the barley, the oats, the lambs, the butter, the poultry, the eggs and all the other great products that the farmer in this country raises, and of which Great Britain takes large and increasing quantities. If the Canadian manufacturer cannot have a fair entrance into the markets of the United States, where he would, of course, meet with strong competition from the accumulations of skill and capital that are there, he can, at least, under the shelter of a proper protection, supply the great and growing home market for manufactures, and with a stability ensured at home, he can push his wares into those countries where they find entrance on more favourable terms. I was speaking, Sir, a moment ago as to the English market in connection with the farm products of this country. I have here a table, in which I give the figures in round numbers, not going into particulars, and I find Great Britain in 1891 imported for consumption in that country, in quantity, as follows:—Bacon, 380,000,000 lbs.; salt beef, 27,000,000 lbs.; fresh beef, 224,000,000 lbs.; hams, 135,000,000 lbs.; mutton, 136,000,000 lbs.; pork, 40,000,000 lbs.; butter, 240,000,000 lbs.; cheese, 230,000,000 lbs.; eggs, 106,000,000 doz.; apples, 3,000,000 bbls.; potatoes, 640,000,000 lbs.; and in value, poultry, $2,000,000; wheat, $145,000,000; wheat flour, $50,000,000; barley, $29,000,000; oats, $26,000,000; peas, $4,500,000; beans, $6,000,000. There, Mr. Speaker, is a market which is easily reached, and possesses the feature of stable permanence in that it is subject to the minimum of home competition, of variation and fluctuation in the way of tariff imposts put upon it from one year to the other, a market made up largely from the non-producing classes, in these respects, who are constantly at work in the hives of busy industry and are continually calling on this country and other countries like situated for food supplies, to make that muscle, brawn and sinew with which they do the manufacturing for so large a portion of the world. We have in that country, besides, a discriminating market, where the best wares are quickly taken at the best prices, and where the material in goods or money is always at hand to pay for that which they purchase. So, Sir, I say we may face towards the old country, and for our varied products, exploit those markets which are sure to prove profitable from their constant, and, indeed, growing demands. And it may also be that, in the near future, considering this war of tariffs, which is taking place the wide world over, considering the discriminating benefits which are given by some countries and denied by others, it may be worth the careful and thoughtful attention of the Government as to whether or not the time is not approaching, if it is not near at hand, when it will become the duty of this Government to hold out the hand of help to those that help us, to repay favour with favour and interest with interest, and to give the best treatment in our markets to those countries which afford to us the best treatment in their markets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the Minister of Finance has any sentiment of gratitude in him, he ought to be extremely grateful to me personally for the opportunity that I afforded him of delivering himself of those very patriotic and glowing sentiments in which he indulged a little while ago. I regret for his sake, not for mine, he did not see fit to read to the House the whole of the letter under my name and signature which appeared in the London *Economist*, of 13th February, because then, like the fabled creature of Shakespeare, his speech would have resembled the toad, which, though ugly and venomous, had a precious jewel in its head. But, as he would not do so, and as my modesty forbids my doing it, I can only call the attention of the House to that letter, every syllable of which I stand by, as I intended to stand by it when I caused it to be published in the *Economist* in reply to the foul slanders on the Liberal party which the subsidized press of the hon. gentleman and his paid agents, or our precious High Commissioner and his gang had been daily circulating to the detriment of all those in this country who desire the real prosperity and advantage of the people of Canada. With respect to the first part of the hon. gentleman's speech, that is to say, his financial statement, I have no particular objection to make to it. That part of it was moulded very much on the lines of the Queen's Speech delivered by His Excellency at the opening of this Parliament: it did not tell us anything that was new, and it omitted all reference to a great number of matters which, at this moment, are, I think, deserving of the most serious attention of the people. The hon. gentleman gave us half a dozen columns of Estimates, half a dozen columns of the Public Accounts, half a dozen columns of the Trade and Navigation Report. So far as his statement went, he was, like some of his predecessors of old, extremely careful with respect to dealing with mint, anise and cummin, but omitted all reference to those weighty and more important matters which, on the present occasion, might well have engaged the attention of the Minister of Finance of this country. I think we had a right to expect something better on the present occasion from the hon. Minister. This is not an ordinary occasion. This is the first opportunity we have had since our last great decennial stock-taking of testing, in the only and the best way in which it can be tested, the real effects of the policy of which that hon. gentleman has been for years the exponent in Parliament. Sir, facts have been laid before this House, facts are contained in these documents under my hand, which might well have startled the most callous, which might well have alarmed the most stupid man in Canada. And, Sir, in face of these facts, what do we find on the part of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues? We find a long array of figures having no bearing at all on the more important points at issue: we find fatuous and silly assertions of prosperity, which—if there be one particle of truth in the statements made from year to year by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and which are contained in the documents laid on the Table of this House by their order—show the result to be that the condition of things in Canada is such as has not been paralleled for at least fifty, if not one hundred years, in any English community having the like opportunities which we possessed. To whom does he make these statements of prosperity? He makes

them to the people of Canada, whom his own detailed records show, as I have proved again and again, to have lost at least one million and a half of their population within the course of the last ten years. He makes them to the people of this Dominion, whose representatives now around me know, that in all but a few favoured localities the value of their property has been diminishing for the last dozen years by leaps and bounds. Perhaps of all men, this hon. gentleman is the very fittest man in the House to stand up and make these assertions here, because he represents a province which has suffered more—as these very records show—through the results of his foolish and wicked policy, than any other province in the Dominion; and because, by a curious combination of facts, the identical constituency of Queen's which that hon. gentleman represents——

Some hon. MEMBERS. King's.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—King's is it—the identical constituency which he represents has the worst record of any of the fifteen subdivisions of New Brunswick to present to the people. Those very facts that I have alluded to ought themselves to have taught the hon. gentleman to have spoken in a more modest tone on the present occasion. I turn, Mr. Speaker, to the records in my hand, and I find that in the Province of New Brunswick, with a total population of 321,231 souls, the results of his policy is shown in the fact that in the course of the last decade New Brunswick has exactly increased 61 souls. New Brunswick, with a population of sixty thousand families, more or less, with a total area not far short of 20,000,000 acres, has gained 61 souls in ten years, and his own particular constituency, to which I alluded, having begun ten years ago with a population of 14,017, being entitled to natural increase of about 3,500, which ought to have given it a population of 17,521, comes out to-day—the hon. Minister of Finance's own constituency—with a population of 12,152, showing a total loss, putting together the positive loss and the natural increase, of 5,369 souls on a population of 12,152.

Mr. FOSTER. What constituency is that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is your own constituency of King's, or whichever it is.

Mr. FOSTER. Look at it again; you had better revise your figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have given my figures. Which of my figures is it that you deny?

Mr. FOSTER. Those that you have read, *in toto*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will give you the time and opportunity now, and here, of refuting them if you can.

Mr. SPEAKER. An experienced parliamentarian like my hon. friend knows that he must address the Chair.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I stand corrected, Sir, but I think you might also remark to my hon. friend opposite, that no member of Parliament in his position is well advised or in order in interrupting another member when he is speaking.

Mr. FOSTER. I admit that, but I hated to see you go wrong.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Be consoled, I have not gone wrong. The hon. gentleman's commissioners of census may possibly have gone wrong, and I am not responsible for the accuracy of their figures, but these figures which I have just given to the House are the exact and literal figures taken from the census returns laid on the Table of Parliament by hon. gentlemen opposite. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government records be true—and be it remembered he has no reason to doubt them—these records show that during the last ten years during which the hon. gentleman and his friends have administered the Government of Canada, the total loss of population almost equals one man in three of our present population, taking as correct the statement that the Government brought 900,000 immigrants to settle in Canada. I call the attention of the House to the conditions under which this monstrous loss has taken place. Had such a loss occurred in an old country, a thickly-populated country, even in such a country no wise statesman would have passed it with indifference, but, Mr. Speaker, it has occurred in Canada, a country which contains an almost unlimited area of absolutely virgin soil, the greater part of which at this day is utterly unoccupied, which is capable of sustaining not the million and a half that we have lost, but is abundantly capable of sustaining, under a wise and honest Government, ten times, twelve times, fifteen times, aye, twenty times our present population. There is hardly a single province in this Dominion, as I said, in which with a wise and honest Government, it would not be possible to find prosperous and profitable employment for all this million and a half of people whom the Government have driven away. More than that. Not merely have we an almost unlimited area to develop, but we have, besides, exposed the older provinces in this community to almost unexampled sacrifices, and we have incurred a most enormous expenditure, which can only properly be measured by hundreds of millions of dollars, for the purpose of developing the settlement of the country. Great as the loss in quantity has been, there is not a man in this House who has paid the slightest attention to the character of the exodus which has been going on for so many years, who does not know that the loss in quantity is far indeed from being the true measure of the loss the people of Canada has sustained. Sir, it is not the dregs or the refuse of our people that are going from us; it is the very choice and flower of our population. An enormous percentage of this emigration which I deplore is composed of men between twenty and forty years of age; men in the very prime and vigour of life, and I believe that it is to-day calculated by American statisticians that there are more New Brunswickers and more Nova Scotians, between the ages I have mentioned, to be found in Massachusetts and the sister New England states than remain in the provinces which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues represent. Under these circumstances, we have a right to expect one of two things from the hon. gentleman. We have a right to expect an explanation of how these things have come about, or we have a right to expect a confession that his policy and the policy of his colleagues has been, as we have all along contended from first to last, a failure and a fraud. Sir, I pause to examine the wretched subterfuges which the subsidized press of the Government, and members of the Government themselves

on various occasions have had recourse to for the purpose of diminishing the weight of the facts which they were compelled to place before the country. First of all, I note that on almost all the occasions on which they allude to this state of things, their chief plea is this, that in some insignificant corners of the United States, where the soil is less fertile, and from which for many reasons the people for a long time back have been in the habit of migrating to some other parts of the United States, a somewhat similar state of things prevails to that which exists in Canada. Sir, if that were true, there is this essential difference between the two conditions of things: The citizen of the United States who migrates from one state to another still remains a citizen of the United States; he does not forswear his allegiance or seek shelter under a foreign flag, but continues to swell the resources and to increase the population of the United States. But how is it with us? We all know very well that only the smallest fragment of the population we lose finds its way from one part of Canada to another part of Canada. We know that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has resulted in this, that during the last ten years they have driven into exile far more than a million of the best citizens of Her Majesty. But, Mr. Speaker, the statement which these hon. gentlemen have made, that things are the same in the United States, is not by any means a truthful statement of the facts. It may be true as regards Vermont, Maine or New Hampshire; but as regards that great group of states which adjoin Canada, and which are substantially in the same position as Canada, there is not a particle or vestige of truth in the statement. Sir, I will take the case of Massachusetts; I will take the case of New York; I will take the case of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and North Dakota; and I invite hon. gentlemen in this House, as well as all Canadians who care to ascertain the real facts of the case, to compare the facts recorded in the last census of the United States with the allegations so freely made by these hon. gentlemen. In 1880 Massachusetts had a total population of 1,785,000; in 1890 this had risen to 2,238,000. In the corresponding ten years the population of the five older provinces of Canada had risen exactly 325,000, on a population of over 4,000,000. So that it is plain that Massachusetts, with a little less than half of our population, gained 50 per cent more than all the five older provinces of Canada, and very nearly three times as much as our own magnificent Province of Ontario, which possesses far greater natural resources and far greater opportunities of absorbing a larger population than Massachusetts can possibly show. I turn to the State of New York, and I find that in 1880 it had a population of 5,082,000, which in ten years had swollen to 5,997,000, being an increase of 915,000, very nearly treble the increase of our older provinces on very much the same population. I take the case of Pennsylvania, which in the ten years increased in population from 4,282,000 to 5,258,000. Now, the population of Pennsylvania is almost identically the same as that of Canada; and yet in 1891 it had increased by 976,000, or treble the increase in the population of all our older provinces, and double the total increase of all Canada put together. Ohio increased from 3,198,000 in 1881, to 3,672,000 in 1891, a gain of 474,000. Michigan, beginning with 1,636,000, increased to 2,093,000, being a gain of 457,000. North Dakota, beginning with 36,000, reached 182,000, being a gain of 146,000. I have called attention to these facts, in order to show how baseless is the allegation made by these hon. gentlemen and their friends that we need not concern ourselves with the facts stated, because, when all is said and done, we are growing in population in the same ratio as the more important states of the United States. Take those states adjoining Canada, not one whit better than our chief provinces, and compare the results: and then judge for yourself whether or not I am justified in saying that it is impossible to show on this continent a fair parallel for the failure to increase the population of the country which marks our case in Ontario and in Canada at large. Then, Sir, they have a second plea, which is well worth attention. That plea has reference to a certain well known peculiarity of modern life. They urge that they are not to blame because for many years back there has been an unfortunate tendency on the part of a large number of our people, in common with many in the United States and in England, to desert the country for the cities. Well, Sir, out of their own mouths these men are condemned. If that tendency does exist as one of the marked features of the present epoch, then beyond all doubt it would have been the duty of wise and prudent statesmen to have endeavoured as far as they could to check that which has become a very mischievous tendency, or, at the very least, not to have wilfully and deliberately legislated in such a way as to increase it. Sir, the policy of this Government has been in every shape and way, from first to last, deliberately to injure the agricultural classes, and deliberately to increase the very tendency of which they complain as springing from a cause which they are unable to control. I am, however, bound to say that the case is not, after all, quite as bad as the Government's records make out. I have never believed, as I have stated over and over again in this House, that the statements so loudly paraded of the success of this Government in bringing immigrants to Canada had the smallest foundation in fact. I never believed that there were 47,000 immigrants in 1881, 112,000 in 1882, 133,000 in 1883, 103,000 in 1884, or 886,000 in the whole space of ten years; and I make the Government a present of this explanation—which is good so far as it goes, inasmuch as, if my view is correct, it diminishes to a considerable extent the apparent lamentable exodus of our people from Canada—that for the last ten years the entire of the reports of the Agriculture Department have been not merely erroneous, but little better than a deliberate fraud—that none of these immigrants, or only the merest fraction of them, ever came to this country. My own belief is that when we obtain proper reports showing the birthplaces of the various inhabitants of Canada, we shall find that so far from nearly 900,000 immigrants having settled in this country, probably not 25 per cent, very possibly not 10 per cent of all those who were brought here, and who have been paid for at the cost of the people of this country, have remained in Canada, and therefore that the position is really less evil, less mischievous, than the Government records would indicate. If they choose to assume that explanation, that their officers and colleagues have been guilty of errors, which, under the circumstances, approach to deliberate frauds, they are welcome to take it and make the best of

it. Looking over the expenditure of nearly $2,857,000 for immigration purposes since 1881, I am bound to say that my opinion is now, and always has been, that a great proportion of that sum was never expended for proper immigration purposes at all, but went to form a part of the vast corruption fund by virtue of which, and which alone, hon. gentlemen opposite hold their seats. Nevertheless, making all possible deductions, there is no doubt that the condition is most grave. If you choose to analyze the returns which have been laid before us, showing the condition of the rural districts of Canada, you will find a state of things which deserved at least passing mention at the hands of the Minister of Finance. I take these provinces in rotation, and find that in Prince Edward Island, out of three subdivisions for census purposes, two large subdivisions show not only a loss of the whole natural increase but a considerable, absolute and positive loss, and the remaining one shows a positive increase very far below the natural increase of births and deaths. When I come to New Brunswick I find that out of fifteen subdivisions, eight show a positive loss and seven show far below the natural increase. In Nova Scotia, no less than eight subdivisions show a positive loss, nine are below the natural increase, and one only, out of the whole eighteen or nineteen, shows an increase. In Ontario we find thirty-nine subdivisions show a positive loss, forty-two are almost stationary or are below the natural increase, and out of the whole ninety-four or ninety-five, thirteen alone—almost all of them cities—show some increase. In Quebec there are twenty-seven subdivisions showing a positive loss of population, there are thirty-two which are stationary or below the natural increase, and five only can be found which show an increase equal to the natural increase. Now, you will remember that in all these cases, I am supposing that not one single immigrant has been added to the population. I am supposing that of all these 900,000 to whom I have alluded, not one has settled in any of the other parts of this country. I am just simply stating the case as exhibited in the census and looking to the natural increase alone. If any considerable immigration came into these provinces, then no doubt the loss of our natural population would be even larger than I chose to put it down. But, as it is, the case is bad enough. Supposing the natural increase in Prince Edward Island had been equal to that of former years, we have a dead loss in that province of about 27,000 souls; in New Brunswick, we would have a loss of 80,000; in Nova Scotia, a loss of 100,000, calculated on the ordinary percentage of natural increase. In our Province of Ontario, we find ourselves confronted with a loss of 300,000; in Quebec we are confronted with a loss of 230,000, while, if you come to particular constituencies, we find, in the case of the great County of Huron, a loss of 26,000 souls on a population of 58,000; we find in Grey a loss of 15,000, on a population of 76,000; we find in Bruce a loss of 16,000, on a population of 64,000; we find in the County of Oxford a loss of 13,000, on a population of 48,000; in Wellington, a loss of 25,000, on a population of 72,000; in Norfolk, a loss of 12,000, on a population of 37,000; in Perth, a loss of 14,000, on a population of 46,000; in four ridings of Middlesex, a loss of 27,000 on 103,000; and I am very sorry indeed to say that there are many ridings in which the case is considerably worse, but with the details of which I do not feel it necessary to trouble the House at this moment. Now, there can be no doubt whatever to any man who will take the trouble to study the records of our census, that in the case of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island our Provinces of Ontario and Quebec see their own fate reflected. Allow this policy of isolation, of excessive taxation, to go on to its legitimate end, and before we are ten years older those of us who survive will see Ontario and Quebec in the same retrogade condition in which I am sorry to see the Maritime Provinces now placed. But it all appears to have no sort of weight whatever on the hon. gentleman opposite. Now, I say that this is the direct result, the plain, inevitable, direct result of the policy which has directed the affairs of the Government for the past fourteen years. I say, Sir, that there is no test of the real progress and advancement of a country like ours which can compare for one moment with the test applied by the growth of population, and when we see such results as those I have just depicted taking place in a country like this, with such unlimited resources and capacities for employing a large population, those facts alone condemn, as nothing else possibly could, the policy which has brought about these results. I have never doubted that we committed a most egregious blunder when we were induced, chiefly by the example of the United States, to apply to Canada the policy which prevailed there, chiefly brought about, as everyone knows, by the financial exigencies arising from their civil war. I have never for one moment pretended that I thought the people of the United States committed other than a very great blunder indeed when they committed themselves to a policy of protection. I believe, if they had the wisdom to adhere to their earlier line of policy, they would be to-day far more formidable competitors for the manufactures of the world than they are; but, at the same time, I have always admitted that there were circumstances connected with the United States which rendered it possible and probable that the experiment of protection might be tried there with less injury to the people than in almost any other country we can imagine. These conditions are the exact opposite of those which prevail in Canada to-day. Everything here tends to magnify and increase the mischief of a protective policy just as everything in the United States tends to minimise and diminish it. What is our position? Every human being knows that the products of our various provinces are substantially similar the one to the other. Everyone knows the various provinces have substantially the same climate, are inhabited, to all intents and purposes, by people having the same wants. Everyone knows that the interprovincial trade we have striven so hard to encourage among them is, through no fault of the people but from the geographical necessities of their position, unprofitable, costly and difficult, compared with the trade they could carry on in other quarters. Everyone knows that our market in itself is small, and that that market is really smaller than it seems to be, by reason of those very geographical difficulties which make intercourse among the several provinces unprofitable. Now, if you turn to the United States, what do you find? You find that practically they are a world among themselves, possessing almost every imaginable variety of climate and almost every imaginable variety of

production, and you find what perhaps is more important, that among the forty nations who may be said to compose that Republic, there is to-day the most perfect free trade which ever subsisted between any equal number of people in the world, and it would be far truer, if a fair account were given, to claim the United States as a proof of the enormous benefits which accrue to a country like that from perfect free trade among a great number of communities extending from ocean to ocean, and very nearly from the tropics to the Arctic Sea, than to claim it as an example of the benefits of protection. It is a literal truth, though perhaps it may seem a paradox to state it, that such are the natural advantages of the United States that they might adopt an absolutely prohibitory tariff and it would do them infinitely less damage than a moderate protective tariff would do in a country like this. Of course, these statements belong to the A B C of political economy, but to judge by the utterances that we hear on the other side, to judge by the articles which appear in the subsidized press of hon. gentlemen opposite, and to judge by the speeches of Ministers themselves, these facts have never occurred to their minds, though they actually go to the very bottom of the question as to whether it is wise or prudent for Canada to condemn itself to a policy of protection and practical isolation. I was not sorry to hear the hon. gentleman throw some considerable discredit upon his past protectionist policy. The hon. gentleman, I suppose in a fit of candour, intimated that perhaps the time had come to break down some of those protective barriers and to admit British goods on comparatively equal terms to compete with Canadian manufactures. We desire to cherish any germ of grace, however small or slight, and, if the hon. gentleman will bring down a policy to reduce the taxes on British goods and to extend to British manufacturers the same privileges and rights which the British Government and people afford to our productions going into their markets, I am sure I speak the sentiments of all my hon. friends when I say that we will support him in passing that over the opposition of the Canadian manufacturers. We have no objection to free trade with all the world, if the thing be feasible or practicable. For my own part, I do not see that at this moment the thing is quite as feasible as I would desire it to be, and I am certain that perfect free trade with the United States, perfect free trade and free interchange with the United States, is of more value to the people of Canada than free trade with all the rest of the world, with the United States left out. But, whether you have free trade with all the world or whether you have continental free trade with the people of this continent with whom we are geographically connected, we have no objection, but what we contend, and always have contended, is that your present policy, which is neither continental free trade nor free trade in any shape or form, your present policy of isolation and excessive taxation is, and has been proved to be, the very worst policy for the settlement and development of Canada that any Government ever committed itself to, and I say again that the census returns from which I have quoted afford the most ample and unanswerable argument in support of my position. Now, these three facts stand out very clearly at this present moment, although the hon. gentleman does not choose to admit them.

First of all, it is clear and plain that Canada has sustained an absolutely unparalleled loss of population in spite of the most prodigious sacrifices and the most prodigious efforts which have been made to retain her people here. In the second place it is clear—let the hon. gentleman cavil at my figures as he may—that Canada is to-day subject to an enormous burden of taxation, if you take the actual taxation and not simply the nominal taxation, if you take not simply the taxation which is paid into the public treasury, but if you take the taxation as it really is—one moiety for the so-called needs of Government and the other moiety which is imposed by the Government to pay their paymasters, the protected manufacturing interests: and I may add that, grave as these burthens are, they have been, despite all the hon. gentleman may say, enormously increased within the past year or so by reason of the operation of this so-called McKinley tariff and the taxation recently imposed by the United States, with this further grave difficulty in our way, that this tax falls with excessive weight on a class of the population already overburdened, because I am sure I need not waste any time in attempting to show that the taxation inflicted by the McKinley tariff falls almost wholly upon the shoulders of the agricultural population from one end of the Dominion to the other. Well, under these circumstances, it is not much to be wondered at that the hon. gentleman is obliged to stand up to-day and to make public confession of the utter failure on the part of the Government and himself to redeem any one of those promises with which they have been deluding the House and the country for so many years. The hon. gentleman has told us unmistakably and clearly that he and his colleagues have utterly failed in their negotiations for reciprocity. He cannot deny—he will hardly attempt to deny—that he has utterly failed in the pledges and promises he made that he would retain our population in this country, and it is at least equally clear that the hon. gentleman has likewise failed utterly in all his attempts to provide a home market for the products of the people. All of these three things their policy depended upon, all of them were essential if their policy was to succeed at all.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before I proceed to discuss the question of the operation of the McKinley Tariff, I will take the opportunity of putting myself right as regards the Minister of Finance on one point. I find that I was in error in one respect as regards the position of things in New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman represents a county which has sustained the greatest positive loss of any county in New Brunswick, but not a county which has sustained the greatest relative loss. I find that he represents the County of King's, not Queen's, as I erroneously supposed; and I find that whereas the County of King's has a population of 25,617 souls, and whereas the natural increase on that ought to have amounted to 6,404, so that had it retained its natural increase without one single immigrant, it ought to have had, in 1891, a population of 32,021 souls; I find that it has a population of 23,094, and that I was thus far in error. I represented the hon. gentle-

man as representing a county which, on a population of 12,000 old, had sustained a loss of a little over 5,000, whereas he represents a county which, on a population of 23,094, has sustained a loss, as nearly as possible, of 9,000 souls. So, Sir, I make the *amende* to the hon. gentleman; he does not represent the county in New Brunswick which has relatively suffered most from his policy and the policy of his colleagues, but he represents the county which has absolutely suffered most.

Mr. FOSTER. The compensation of having a good representative.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman holds himself worth 8,927 good Canadians who have gone to the United States, all I can say is that in the opinion of most people of this country he estimates himself at a good deal more than 900,000 per cent above his proper value. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak of a matter which the hon. gentleman did, indeed, touch upon, but which he touched upon marvellously lightly, which he appeared to consider a mere question of temporary inconvenience which might possibly disturb the business relations of a small portion of the people of this country, but which it was hardly worth the attention of a potentate like him to consider seriously, that is to say, the effect of what is known as the McKinley Tariff on the trade and commerce of this country with the United States. I desire to call the attention of the House to one most unfounded assertion made by the hon. gentleman as regards the McKinley Tariff. If I took down his words correctly—and I am open to correction, if I did not—that hon. gentleman took upon himself to assert that the McKinley Tariff was the result of suggestions made more or less directly from this side of the House. Sir, there never was—although it is a very strong term—a statement made in this House more utterly devoid of foundation in facts. If there be one man in Canada more than another to whom the worst features of the McKinley Tariff are directly due, it is to the hon. gentleman, who, many months before that tariff became the law of the United States, in spite of warnings over and over again repeated from this side of the House, deliberately, by enactments made here, as I say, long before the McKinley tariff became law, challenged retaliation on the part of the agricultural interests of the United States, and deliberately deprived our friends in the United States of all argument, of all chance of modifying the most objectionable features of that Bill. The hon. gentleman's tariff came into effect some time in April or May of the year 1890; the McKinley tariff did not receive presidential sanction, if I remember right, until the 5th or 6th of October of the same year; and more to that act of folly than to anything else is it due that there were not large and important modifications in the McKinley tariff. Sir, when the hon. gentleman tells us that the hostile feelings of the United States were stirred up from this side of the House, has he forgotten, or have his colleagues forgotten, the testimony of a late Finance Minister, now the High Commissioner of Canada, given from his place on the floor of this House, that the course, the impolicy, and the folly of the Government of which he was then a member, had brought the two countries, as Sir Charles Tupper declared in his place, to the very verge of actual war, and over and over again within a hair's breadth of an absolute prohibition of all intercourse between Canada and the United States? Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that I cannot treat the McKinley tariff at all as lightly as that hon. gentleman does. Last year we had a most marvellous escape from the evil consequences which were likely to follow from that measure. You are aware, and probably every hon. gentleman whom I address is perfectly well aware, that last year we were favoured with a remarkably good harvest, and by an extraordinary coincidence—I cannot call it a providential interposition, seeing that our gain was the loss of a large number of our fellow men—while Canada rejoiced in an extraordinarily good harvest and obtained extraordinarily good prices therefor, a large portion of the European world was plunged in downright famine. It is not likely, it is not reasonable, it is not natural, that such a coincidence should occur again; and before the hon. gentleman tells us, or tells the people of Canada that this McKinley tariff is to be treated as a trifling inconvenience, I recommend him strongly to wait until one or two more ordinary years have passed over our heads, and when that is done he will be able to form something like an accurate judgment of what the McKinley tariff may really mean to the people of this country. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has indulged in what I am afraid I must characterize as a very absurd misrepresentation—absurd, at any rate, as coming from a man in his position—of the real value and importance of the English markets to Canada. I am very far from alleging that the English market is not one of very great importance and very great value; but I have got this to tell the hon. gentleman, that he makes, I think, a tremendous mistake if he believes that the English market is likely to be available to us for all or more than a portion of our products. For a part of our products I grant that the English market is probably very desirable; but there is a very large and important portion of the products of Canada, very large and important agricultural products, for which I tell the hon. gentleman, that—whether he knows it or not, the farmers of Canada know it—there cannot be found any market in the world for one moment to compare with the market offered by the United States. The hon. gentleman told us, and the House will bear in mind, that the circumstances of this year, to borrow a word from him, are extremely abnormal, that it is not at all likely we shall have a recurrence of such extraordinary circumstances as occurred on this side of the water this last year. The hon. gentleman stated, and he may have stated correctly, we have not the facts which he quoted from his own documents, that in the year just passed our trade, under the circumstances to which I have alluded, did not diminish perceptibly. But the hon. gentleman did not state to the House the fact which is apparent on the most cursory examination, that under the McKinley tariff the trade of Canada, of all the provinces, and especially of Ontario and Quebec, has sustained a very severe loss. How severe that loss is may best be judged by a comparison of the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1890 and 1891 as regards four or five important articles. What I have to tell the hon. gentleman is this, that under the operation of the McKinley tariff our trade in barley has enormously diminished, that our trade in horses has enormously diminished, our trade in

hay has enormously diminished, our trade in eggs and poultry has enormously diminished, and the loss on these five articles to the agriculturists in Canada must be estimated by several millions. I do not want to inflict on the House very minute details of all the articles on which we have sustained loss under the McKinley tariff, but I take the five articles to which I have alluded, and I think any hon. gentleman, when he hears what we have sold to the United States in 1890 and what we have sold in 1891, must admit that I am perfectly justified in stating that in these important articles of farm produce, to enumerate no others, a very serious reduction has occurred, let the hon. gentleman say what he pleases, in consequence of the operation of the McKinley tariff; and what is perhaps more to the purpose, that there is no reasonable chance of our obtaining an equally good market in any other part of the world. I find in 1890 we sold to the United States 9,935,000 bushels of barley, of the value of $4,582,000. In 1891 and it will be remembered that the McKinley tariff was only in force for a portion of that year, and that large quantities of our products were sent forward in anticipation instead of selling them nearly 10,000,000 bushels, we sold them 4,751,000 bushels, of the value of $2,868,000. In 1890 we sold the Americans 101,000 tons of hay, of the value of $922,000; in 1891 we sold them 50,000 tons of the value of $375,000. In 1890 we sold about 13,000,000 dozen of eggs, of the value of $1,795,000; in 1891 we sold 7,364,000 dozen, of the value of $1,074,000. In poultry we sold them the value of $105,000 in 1890, and $53,000 worth in 1891. In the case of horses, we sold them in 1890 16,118, of the value of $1,887,000; in 1891 we sold 9,937, of the value of $1,215,000. In these five products alone we sold the Americans in 1890 the value of $9,291,000, and in 1891, $5,585,000 worth. If that is true on these five articles, I ask the House to consider what would probably be the total loss likely to be sustained by our farmers if I were to include all the vast varieties of other articles, all the vast varieties of agricultural and animal products, for all of which every farmer in Canada finds a far better market in the United States than can be possibly obtained for them elsewhere. It is interesting to notice what our trade with the United States would have amounted to had the trade for 1891 been left undisturbed by the operation of the McKinley tariff. Had there been an equal trade for 1890, and 1890 was by no manner of means our largest year, this result would have followed: our experts to the United States would have been rather in excess, I fancy, of our exports to any other country in the world, Great Britain not excepted. As it was, I notice that whereas in 1890 we sold to the United States our own products to the value of $36,112,000, in 1891 the value was $37,242,000; and I observe that our total trade with the United States is larger than our total trade with any other country in the world. I notice, also, that the total increase which took place in 1891 appears to have occurred in our trade with the United States. Our exports to the United States of our own products increased by $1,530,000; our imports from the United States increased by $1,395,000, bullion not included. Sir, I think this brief statement of the facts ought to show every man in this House that whether or not on a particular occasion we have sustained serious damage from the loss of the American market, yet, under usual circumstances in any ordinary year, it was scarcely possible for any man to exaggerate the mischief and injury which would be done to the agriculturists of Canada if the American market should unhappily continue to be barred to their products. Practically speaking, the only thing in which, so far as I can see, we are likely to deal on even terms in the English market, are wheat, fat cattle, pork products and cheese. In all other respects I say here, without fear of contradiction from any man who understands the agricultural interests of Canada, that the loss of the American market, if we do lose it, would be little short of an irreparable calamity to the already overburdened farmers of the Dominion. In measuring the amount of taxes on our farmers, it would be well for hon. members to remember this, that they have a double tax to pay by the McKinley tariff. First, they are taxed to the full extent in almost all cases for the benefit of the American treasury. I grant you the American consumer suffers; but it is an equally notorious fact, that while the American consumer loses, the Canadian consumer loses likewise. It is an equally notorious fact, that if the American is compelled to pay more for what he purchases, the Canadian farmer is obliged to accept less. Over and above this, it is perfectly plain to demonstration that on all the articles I have named the Canadian farmer suffers a double loss, not only on what he pays into the American treasury, but the reduced price at which he has to dispose of his surplus products in the home market. In the first place, the farmer is obliged to pay a tax to the United States, and he is also obliged, in his own market, to take a much smaller price than he otherwise would have received. I say, that if ever there was a case which deserves special consideration at the hands of the Government, it is the case of the Canadian farmer from one end of Canada to the other to-day. The best that can be said is this: Many of our farmers must prepare for a total change of system, and I need not tell the House that you cannot change the system of agriculture in any country without a considerable expenditure of capital, nor need I tell my friends here that in the case of a vast number of our farmers, it is utterly hopeless and impossible for them, as matters now stand, to raise that requisite capital. What is the condition of the farmers of Canada? At this present moment the policy of the Government is to pay huge bounties out of the pockets of the people, out of the pockets of these very farmers, for the purpose of encouraging certain petted and special manufacturers. When the Minister of Finance stated that I compute the tax paid by the people of Canada at $60,000,000, he stated what is perfectly correct. We pay $30,000,000 into our national treasury for our national expenditure, and we are taxed in all human probability, to a much larger amount for the purpose of promoting the interest of a couple of hundred favoured manufacturers. I will give but a few illustrations of this. Why, Sir, at this very moment the community of Canada are taxed to the tune of nearly $2,000,000 on the article of sugar alone, of which tax only a most insignificant fraction goes into the public treasury. The farmers of Canada are compelled probably to pay at least half of that, and they get absolutely

no return. Take the tax on binding twine to which some of my hon. friends have been inviting attention by their motions on the Order paper. I am not going into a discussion to-night as to whether the figures given by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) are exactly and minutely correct or not; but this I say to the House of Commons, and this I say to the people of Canada, that here is another case where the farmers of Canada are deliberately taxed between $300,000 and $400,000, and the treasury of Canada benefits by scarcely $6,000. Take the article of coal oil, and you find that all over Canada our people are compelled to pay 200 or 300 per cent more than they need pay if they had free trade in that with the United States, and a very small amount in comparison of that tax finds its way into the public treasury. Take the tax on iron and the bounty on iron. Why, Sir, iron is an article of prime necessity and prime consumption on the part of the farmer. Iron in its various shapes is most enormously taxed. Iron is subjected in some shapes in which the farmer uses it to a tax of 60, 70, and even as high as 80 per cent; and, not content with that enormous tax, the Government must place a bounty on it, to be paid out of the pockets of the farmer on every pound of iron produced. I say nothing of the tax on coal, because that only falls upon the farmer in a comparatively small degree: but it may be well to remind the House that that tax is virtually doubled by the fact that over and above the tax on coal, we are compelled every year to pay large sums to make good the deficit in the running expenses of the Intercolonial Railway, because it conveyes coal for the benefit of one or two favoured collieries at far below prime cost. I ask, as I have a right to ask, what do the Government propose to do, under these circumstances, for the farmers of Canada? We listened in vain in the hon. gentleman's speech for one single suggestion, one single remark or observation, which could be construed in any shape or way into signifying either that the hon. gentleman recognized the position and the extreme severity of the burden laid on our agriculturists, or that he was prepared to take one step to remove it. Does he propose to reduce a single one of the taxes which weigh heavily on the farmers? Not he. Does he propose to give our farmers any bounties? They are subjected by the action of a foreign state to a very oppressive taxation indeed. I would like to know, Sir, what merit there is in any man manufacturing cotton or woollen which gives him a greater claim on the treasury than the farmer should have who manufactures beef, or who manufactures barley or any other description of agricultural products. If the hon. gentlemen opposite are consistent, if the hon. gentlemen do desire to relieve the farmer, the way is open to them. Let them bring down a measure—it will not consort, I grant, with the principles of political economy; but what are the principles of political economy to them—let them bring down a measure to relieve the farmer from the excessive burden which foreign legislation has placed upon him; let them bring down a measure to pay him 30 cents per bushel on barley, and 5 cents per dozen on his eggs; let them compensate him for the loss on his horses, and then I will say—not that their course is wise or politic—but at least that it is consistent and honest; and most assuredly the farmers of Canada, under the circumstances, have as good, and a better claim to be indemnified than have the manufacturers. Or do the hon. gentlemen propose to find the farmers new markets? Well, Sir, if I am to judge from the statements recently made to us, the opportunity and the hopes of the Government ever finding new markets for our farmers or anybody else, are few and far between. The Minister of Finance to-night was good enough to give a description of his recent trip to Washington and of the success which attended his earnest and well-meant efforts to promote a treaty of reciprocity between Canada and the States: and here I have a word to say to the hon. gentleman with respect to the papers which were laid on the Table of this House. In these papers, from first to last, I, for one, fail to find the smallest or slightest reference to the trade negotiations on account of reciprocity; not one syllable contained in the documents, not one word, not one allusion to it is laid on the Table of this House. Sir, this is a matter of grave importance. The statements made by the hon. gentleman to-night are very grave and will have, I fear, graver consequences than he appears to believe at this present moment. If the statements have been duly protocoled, if they have been submitted to Mr. Blaine, agreed to by Mr. Blaine, or by United States representatives and accepted as a truthful statement of what happened there, then, Mr. Speaker, all I have to say is that, in my opinion, the Government were guilty of a grave act of disrespect to this House and were derelict in their duty in not having included such a protocol or a statement of what happened in the papers laid on the Table. But, if they have not been submitted to Mr. Blaine, if they have not been agreed to by him, if it should turn out as it has turned out before, that there are serious misunderstandings between our delegation and the representatives of the United States as to the construction to be put on this verbally reported conversation which we had to-night; then, Sir, I have to tell the Minister of Finance that he has committed about as impolitic and unwise an act as it is possible to conceive. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that this matter was settled. I doubt if the hon. gentleman ever made a greater mistake in his life. The matter is not settled, nor will any such statement as he has made, even if it were endorsed by Mr. Blaine, avail to settle it. I will tell the hon. gentleman what is settled: I will tell him on what point no man in this country need any longer have any doubt. That point is the utter disinclination of hon. gentlemen opposite to take any effective steps whatever to bring about a treaty of reciprocity between Canada and the United States. Sir, their whole conduct has been of a piece in this matter. First of all, a year and over ago we had these gentlemen obtaining a dissolution under what I must characterize as false pretenses, in view of the statements subsequently made by Mr. Blaine and confirmed by Sir Charles Tupper. After that we had them going down to their mock conference at Washington in April last. And now, Sir, we have had them go down again—and for what purpose? Sir, I take the statement made by the hon. gentleman himself, in his place a few hours ago, and if I am to judge by that statement, the object of his going down to Washington appears to have been to raise all the difficulties that he knew how to raise in the way of any settlement or agreement with the United States.

He did not go down for the purpose of making any proposition which he entertained the remotest idea the United States would accept. He went down, if he had any definite object in view, for the purpose, so far as I can see, of bolting and barring the door, to the best of his power, against any other negotiators who might proceed to Washington with an honest desire to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. Why, Sir, on the hon. gentleman's own statement, he seems to have applied himself diligently to obtain a refusal from Mr. Blaine. Was it ever heard before that a Canadian Minister applied to the Minister of a foreign state to be told how he was to raise a revenue? Was it ever heard before that he entered--for the purpose, no doubt, of facilitating a treaty of reciprocity with the United States--into a long, elaborate and minute description of all the difficulties that would attend it? That is not the way, Sir, in which reciprocity treaties or any other treaties can be negotiated. That is not the way in which Lord Elgin and his Ministers succeeded in obtaining the reciprocity treaty, to which the hon. gentleman referred, made in 1854. Now, Sir, I am afraid that it is quite needless to invite any favourable response. These hon. gentlemen's course had been pretty well known in the United States. Their utterances in this House and out of it, particularly out of it, could not possibly have escaped the attention of the United States. They were published in all their journals; they were published in all possible places and on all possible occasions. Why, Sir, I myself, but one week before the hon. gentleman went down to Washington so earnestly desirous of negotiating a treaty, had the pleasure of hearing him for an hour and a half in the town of Brampton descanting to an audience of several thousand people on the uselessness of applying to the United States for a reciprocity treaty. Never was there a prophet who took more pains to fulfil his own prophecy than the hon. gentleman. But what are we to expect of negotiators who go down to conduct a difficult and delicate negotiation with a people like the United States, and who one week before have publicly declared in the freest and frankest manner that they do not believe in reciprocity, that they do not think it would be worth anything to the Canadian people if they got it, and that they had not the slightest idea that it would be obtained. Now, Sir, I would like to know who ever expected--following the hon. gentleman's own statement--that the United States were going to enter into a treaty of reciprocity with us unless we were prepared to admit their manufactured as well as their natural products. Why, Sir, it was known perfectly well that it was the idlest folly in the world for any Canadian Minister to go down and talk about a reciprocity in natural products. Allow me to tell the hon. gentleman that reciprocity, in the very nature of the case, must involve—not discrimination, as he puts it artfully, for the purpose of exciting prejudice against it; but every genuine reciprocity treaty involves this: If a country is going to give you special privileges, you must give that country special privileges in return. It is of the very essence of reciprocity. It would be monstrous for the hon. gentleman or his colleagues to expect that the United States or any other country would enter into a reciprocity treaty on any other terms.

Mr. FOSTER. How about the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver)?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that the member for Huntingdon ever denied that proposition. The member for Huntingdon, being a man of intelligence and sense, understands perfectly well that the very essence of reciprocity is to give in order that we may get. There can be no reciprocity otherwise. And, moreover, the hon. gentleman and his friends knew perfectly well that the United States would insist, and they have a perfect right to insist, that if they extend the hand of good-fellowship to us, if they give us this great privilege, as great privilege it would be, we on our part should have sufficient decency and self-respect not to turn Canada into a smuggling base to the detriment of the United States. Now, Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman that for my part I think he has misunderstood and seriously misinterpreted what has passed. Possibly we may be in a position to judge of that before we are very much older. I have no doubt that the United States Government or their representatives would insist on the two things which I have enumerated: first of all, that the reciprocity should be genuine, one under which they would obtain advantages as well as give them, and secondly, that we should take care that Canada should not be a smuggling base. Beyond that, for my part, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. gentleman, I have very grave fear that he most seriously misunderstood and has most seriously misrepresented the whole nature of the conference. And I have no doubt at all about this, Sir, that any Canadian delegation who go down there with a clearer and more honourable record than these gentlemen are able to bring--any Canadian delegation who are able to say to the United States: "while we desire to retain our own autonomy, we are honestly and sincerely desirous of living on friendly terms with you and giving you something in exchange for what you give us," will not find any insuperable difficulty in obtaining a reciprocity treaty with the United States.

Mr. WALLACE. Farrer, for instance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt that he would make an infinitely better negotiator than any or all of the gentlemen who went there. Now, Sir, I am glad for one that the hon. gentlemen have shown their hand at last. All through this controversy we have been hampered and entangled by the assertions made by their followers, if not by themselves, that they were most earnestly desirous of negotiating a reciprocity treaty. Sir, no man now can pretend that they either desire or hope to obtain a treaty of reciprocity with the United States. It is perfectly plain and clear, that so far as these men are concerned, all hope has departed. They cannot, they will not—I do not believe, Sir, that they ever had the desire or the power—to negotiate a reciprocity treaty on any terms that would be acceptable; because, Sir, I know who stands behind the throne, I know who control this Government. I know who are the men without whom they have no chance whatever of retaining their present place: and, knowing that, I, for my part, never have entertained the slighest belief, nor do I entertain the slightest belief now, that those hon. gentlemen have the slightest desire at any time to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, at any rate for the admission of

American manufactures on equal terms with Canadian. Sir, I think the hon. gentleman has shown conclusively, to-day, to every man who paid the least attention to his speech or his tone or the tone of his supporters when he delivered it, that he, for one, was most sincerely delighted when he obtained a refusal from Mr. Blaine to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. Now, Sir, there is another point to which the attention of the House may fairly be called, as to which the hon. gentleman thought it expedient to say little or nothing. It has been, for a long time, a very unfortunate feature, indeed, in our domestic economy, that, while we have spent larger sums of money than, I think, any country of our size and population, almost, has ever spent on great public works, up to the present time the results have been simply disastrous. I am not able, to-day, to put my finger on one single, solitary public work anywhere in Canada which pays interest on its outlay. I am hardly able to put my finger on any one public work which does not show an annual deficit in the effort to make good the gap between the actual working expenses and receipts. So it would appear we are going, and going very rapidly, from bad to worse. Now, I have given a memo. of the total cost of our railways and canals and other public works during the past year. The hon. gentleman, although he gave us a great many figures, did not dwell particularly on these, and yet these are ones, I think, which might command particularly the attention of this House. I take first the Intercolonial Railway, on which last year we received the sum of $2,977,395, and on which wholly and entirely apart from the heavy charges on capital account, our expenditure amounted to $3,362,314, being a deficit of very little less than $700,000 on the working of last year. I turn to our canals, on which we received $329,189 all told, and on which our expenses amounted to $543,934, being a clear deficit of $223,000. I turn to the whole volume of public works, including the cost of the department, and I find that while our receipts amounted to $3,685,630, our total expenditure was $4,971,179, showing a deficit, over and above interest on the enormous cost of construction, of $1,295,549. It would be well if that were the worst, but the House will remember that a little while ago, in reply to a question put by me across the House, the hon. gentleman opposite was good enough to inform us that, in, I think, a period of seven months out of the twelve, the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway had run up to the amount of $700,000, being at the rate of $100,000 a month, or $1,200,000 in the course of a year, if the same ratio between receipts and expenses continued. Sir, it is worth while to go back for a year or two in this matter of the Intercolonial Railway. In 1889, I find that its total receipts amounted to $2,895,364 and its total expenditure to $3,153,928, showing a deficit, therefore three years ago, of $258,000. In 1890 its receipts were $2,928,477, and its expenses, not including the items charged to capital, $3,481,472, being a deficit of $552,000. In 1891, as I have told you, their receipts were $2,977,375, and expenses $3,662,314, showing a deficit of $684,900. Now, that is a tolerably rapid progression. $258,000 deficit in 1889, $551,000 in 1890, $684,000 in 1891, and in the seven months of 1891-92, $700,000 more. Looking at our Trade and Navigation Returns, I see that there is indeed a small increase. Apparently our returns of imports and exports together have risen from $209,000,000 to a little over $211,000,000, a rather small increase, I must say, seeing that it only amounts to one per cent on the volume of transactions in the year. But it is noteworthy, particularly in this connection, to observe where those increases took place. Our increased trade and commerce with the United States, in spite of the McKinley tariff, represents the whole $2,000,000; and if you choose to compare our trade with the United States in all the great items, whether it be mines or fisheries or lumber or agricultural productions or manufactures, you will find that in all, save the single article of animal products, the United States are our largest customers, and even take seventy-five or eighty per cent of all our products, proving completely, I say again, the enormous importance to the people of this country of maintaining friendly commercial relations with the people of the United States. Now, I am not making a comparison at all for the purpose of annoying hon. gentlemen, but I am making it for the purpose of showing what an enormous capacity of increase there is in the trade of the United States, and I would just call attention to the fact that between the years 1890 and 1891, the total trade of the United States appears to have increased nearly $90,000,000. Their exports in 1890 were $845,000,000; in 1891 these exports rose to $872,000,000. Their imports in 1890 amounted to $789,000,000, and in 1891 to $845,000,000. I call attention to that, as I say, not for the purpose of comparing the relative increase there and the relative increase in our case, but for the purpose of showing, what I have often pointed out to the House, the almost unlimited possibilities for the expansion of trade between us and the United States, if only we could obtain free access to their markets. I spoke awhile ago of the huge burden of actual taxation now inflicted on the people of Canada, and, as I say, it is perfectly clear they are at present obliged to pay no less than three separate taxes, one stated by the hon. gentleman to-night, to the federal treasury; another of at least an equal amount, of which I gave a few samples a little while ago, to the protected manufacturers; and again a third, and a very onerous tax, to the United States treasury, and coupled with it must be taken the loss on their home sales sustained by the farmers in consequence of being deprived of that market. Now, although it may sound a large sum, I entertain no doubt whatever myself that these three distinct items of actual taxation—for they are all actual taxation—have come to equal a sum not much short of $70,000,000 a year inflicted upon the people of this country; and, further, and what is worse, a large proportion of that taxation is very unequally distributed, and a large proportion of it rests on the shoulders of the farmers alone, who are at present least able to bear it. There is another consideration which it will be well for hon. gentlemen to bear in mind. The hon. the Finance Minister talks about the negotiations between us and the United States as being settled and concluded. Sir, I am unable to agree with him on that point. My experience, and I think the experience of most men who have paid any attention to the passage of events in that country is this: Either the gap between us must be closed or the gap will widen. I think the hon. gentleman is deceiving

himself and deceiving the House, if he imagines that things will be allowed to remain as they are. I believe he will find either that he will have to come to terms with the people of the United States, or he will find looming in the not distant future what Sir Charles Tupper pointed to not long ago, and that is something nearly approaching to total non-intercourse between Canada and the United States. And now, having reviewed more or less briefly the statements made by the hon. gentleman, and some of the facts which I have myself extracted from our Public Accounts, I desire to spend a few short moments in reviewing first of all, what the Government of Canada have done for Canada during the past ten or twelve years, and next, what they have not done. Well, what they have not done is easy enough to understand. They have had most extraordinary opportunities given them, they have had most extraordinary means placed at their disposal for the purpose of colonizing and settling that vast territory to which we became heirs in the North-West. What have they done there I would like to know? If you were to enter into an account of their transactions there, putting in all the additions to our capital debt and the amounts charged to consolidated fund, I believe it would be found that the result of all this huge expenditure has scarcely settled one family in the North-West for every $10,000 which has been taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada, and I add, from my own knowledge of that country, that I believe, if the Government of Canada had had nothing at all to do with the North-West, if the lands there had simply been left open for settlement, if they had been left in the same condition as those in North Dakota, there would have been far more settlers in the North-West and Manitoba than are to be found there at this moment. Sir, the hon. gentlemen have, as I have shown, utterly failed in keeping the people of this country in their native land. They have by their own showing utterly failed in conducting to a favourable issue negotiations for reciprocity with the United States. They have not, as far as I could gather from the speech of the hon. gentleman, been more successful in finding any other markets for us, and in fact I fear for my own part that some of the few markets we do possess and which are very useful for us will be seriously impaired or taken away altogether. They have failed utterly in making our public works pay even running expenses, not to speak of making any return for the money which has been expended upon them, and I need not tell the House how completely they have failed to fulfil the promises made by their colleagues and predecessors as to the vast revenue which was to be derived from the North-West. In fine, they have failed to keep any of the promises or pledges which they made to the people of Canada. That is what they have failed to do. But I am bound to say on the other hand that these hon. gentlemen have done a great deal they did not promise to do. I am bound to admit that they have displayed the most extraordinary diligence in bringing together and obtaining by hook or by crook vast campaign funds for their own purposes. I am bound to say that they have displayed extraordinary energy and skill in training up a corps of professional gentlemen who, though perhaps not of so much service in the hurly-burly of a general election, yet when allowed a fair field for their energies, for example in bye-elections, when these are not rushed altogether, but are allowed to take place by twos and threes, so that the brigade may be advantageously moved from point to point as political exigencies may require, have proved eminently successful—as, I admit, we know to our cost—in promoting what my esteemed friend the Premier terms the intelligent discussion of financial questions with the individual electors. And, when campaign funds fail, and when these trained professional gentlemen are unable to indoctrinate the public with their views on general questions, the Government has taken effective precautions for maintaining due stability against the haphazard decision of majorities. It is perfectly well known that at the last general election in my own province of Ontario the Reform party carried, according to these gentlemen's own returns which are in my hands, a large majority of the popular vote, but, thanks to the precautions to which I have referred, thanks to Franchise Bills and Gerrymander Acts, the Reform party, though they had a large majority of the popular vote, were in a decided minority on the floor of this House. Then Government have also been successful in overcoming the ignorant impatience of taxation. Taking into account the real taxation of the people and not simply the nominal taxation, taking into consideration all that has been extracted from the pockets of the people for the benefit of the manufacturers in the last 14 years, as well as what has gone into the Dominion treasury, I venture to say that these hon. gentlemen and their friends have succeeded in extracting no less a sum than $800,000,000 from the pockets of the people of Canada. No doubt they have, indirectly, done good to the million and a half of people whom they have driven out of the country, because all the accounts we receive show that most of those persons who have been expelled from this country by evil government have prospered, have done well and have thriven in the land to which they were obliged to have recourse. And there is no doubt that hon. gentlemen have done another thing. They have succeeded to an extraordinary degree in concentrating values in certain localities and in a small number of hands. If they have done this at the expense of all the rest of the community, why, Sir, you and the House in general know perfectly well that after all they have only acted in accordance with the scriptural precept: "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." Now, under these circumstances, it is not to be wondered at that the Minister of Finance considers that we are a most prosperous community, that he has nothing to propose, he has nothing to suggest, he sees nothing amiss, nor has he the smallest prospect of improvement to offer. Sir, it may suit the Government of Canada to continue to play the part of the ostrich in this matter, as they have done long before, but for my part I cannot but regret the statements which have been made to-night by the hon. gentleman, and more particularly those important statements which he has made showing that he for his part, and on behalf of his colleagues, utterly dispair of coming to any understanding whatever with the United States. I cannot but regard these statements as most unfortunate, and as likely to exercise a most unfortunate influence on the destiny of this country. I entertain no doubt whatever, knowing what I do of the feeling of the

people of Canada, that the announcement made to-day by the hon. gentleman will, in all human probability, cause a very great increase of the exodus now taking place. At this present moment throughout Canada there is a very large number of men who are clinging desperately to the soil in hope of an improvement in their condition, and they know perfectly well that there is no reasonable hope of any material improvement in their present condition except through the policy of the Liberal party being adopted, and except through a reasonable agreement being come to with the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman has practically taken away all hope from these people, and I fear, if he does not, that one result of this announcement will, beyond all question, be enormously to increase the exodus of the people from this country of which we have already had such lamentable proof. Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman another thing. It has been no part of our policy on this side, it has been no part of our desire on this side, whatever the hon. gentleman or his friends may be pleased to say, to stir up the question of political union. Our policy as was the case with the early Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, would have provided a cure, would have prevented that feeling from spreading; but I fear very much that the announcement the hon. gentleman has made will have a directly opposite influence on the minds of his followers at least. He has made it plain to them that so far as he and his Government are concerned, there is no hope or chance of coming to any understanding with the United States. He and his friends have persistently misrepresented the position of the Liberal party on that point, and they have persistently dinned into the minds of their own supporters the idea that practically speaking there is no chance of obtaining reasonable terms with the United States except by political union. I do not admit that; we do not admit that at all. But I know that the language and the action of hon. gentlemen are producing in the minds of their own supporters a strong conviction that way, and, what is worse, I fear a great many of them are prepared to take the step with its consequences. Sir, I think if ever any policy stood self-condemned, it is this same policy of isolation and high taxation. Here we are in a country which ought to be able to support a population of 80,000,000 or 100,000,000, a country which has hardly been settled, in the greatest portion of it, for the life time of one ordinary human being, and yet, Sir, in that short space of time we have contrived to raise our real taxation to a point equal to, if not greater than, that of the highest taxation levied in the oldest and most thickly settled European countries; we have contrived to lose an enormous number of our population—I will not stop to argue whether it is a million or a million and a half. It is clear, at any rate, that we cannot keep any respectable percentage of our own youthful population in this country, much less the strangers who come here. Now, Sir, if such have been the consequences of the administration of those hon. gentlemen in the past, what are they likely to be if we have a few more years of this plundering and blundering? It is perfectly clear that unless a government can show that it promotes the material and moral well-being of the people over whom it rules, that government fails to establish any just claim upon their respect or their allegiance. Sir, what have these hon. gentlemen done for the material and moral well-being of the people of Canada? The census returns speak trumpet-tongued as to what they have done for their material well-being, and the scandalous revelations of last session, which have made, to our shame be it said, the very name of Canada a synonym for venality and corruption throughout the whole civilized world, which make men who love their country ashamed to call themselves Canadians when they go abroad, speak equally loud as to how they have promoted the moral well-being of the people of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that there is no alternative for us now but to admit that these same census returns, from which I have quoted to-day, are a fitting crown to the edifice I have depicted just now. They show, as no other public document ever laid on the Table of Parliament in any country ever showed, I regret extremely to say it, how utterly and completely ignorance, and corruption, and mismanagement can avail, in the first place, to nullify and destroy the greatest natural resources, and in the second place, how easy it is and how likely it is, if these things are allowed to go on unchecked and unpunished, as they have, I am sorry to say, gone on here for so many years, to degrade a nation of free men into something very little better than a horde of venal serfs.

Mr. TUPPER. Those gentlemen who have listened to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to-day will, I am sure, forgive me for saying that the impression produced upon my mind by the arguments, by the utterances, and by the desperate plunges over the whole field of this discussion, made by that hon. gentleman, make an old story come to my mind, not at all inappropriate. A celebrated politician was holding forth in one of those counties by the sea to which the hon. gentleman has given a great deal of his attention of late, and after he got through there was naturally a curiosity on the part of some as to the impression he had made, and one candidate remarked that it was the old hash without the gravy. I can make many excuses for the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I understand thoroughly well why the old fire seems to have left him, and why he appears as much stranded in this debate as his policy to which he has for so long a time clung so desperately. The hon. gentleman may well complain, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did, that suddenly and without one word of warning, the Minister of Finance should expose, in the few crisp sentences he did to-day, the utter futility, if not the absurdity, of the policy to which hon. gentlemen opposite have for so long pledged themselves and pledged the salvation of their party. I consider that after the satisfactory statement made by the Minister of Finance, a statement which I venture to say will be intensely satisfactory to the business men of this community, who can read it without party feeling, a statement so strong and so eminently indicative of the commercial prosperity of Canada, I am in the judgment of this House when I say the financial statement was a subject to which the hon. member for South Oxford gave the least attention to-night. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman, who once was Finance Minister, recollects the last Budget

speech he delivered, and the last I venture to say, that he as Minister of Finance, will ever deliver in this House, and that he was compelled after four years' administration of this country as Minister of Finance to face this Parliament and the country with a statement which I will quote. I ask the attention of the House to it particularly, for the contrast between that statement and the statement of the Minister of Finance of the present day is, I believe, one of the prime causes of the hon. gentleman's sorrow and disturbance. The member for South Oxford stated in his speech in 1878 as follows :—

"It is not often in the commercial history of any country, that we are called upon to chronicle so great a reduction, not merely in the total volume of our trade, but also in the revenue derived therefrom, as we have seen within the last two or three years. Making allowance for the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Union, the total volume of the trade and commerce of Canada has in that short interval been reduced by very nearly $50,000,000. While the revenue derived from customs alone shows a decrease in that period of something like $3,000,000, the actual figures in round numbers being that our trade and commerce collectively has been reduced from $218,000,000 to $168,000,000, while the duties derived from customs alone have fallen off from $15,351,000 to $12,546,000."

Further than that, the hon. gentleman was obliged to admit and confess that one of the results of his administration—if administrations are responsible for the financial condition of the country, as he now seems to think—was that :

"Whereas a few years ago, with a total population of 3,600,000 souls, we imported something like $127,000,000 worth of goods, we found ourselves with a population of 4,000,000 importing a little over $94,000,000 worth. In other words, the total imports have fallen from an average of $35.25 per head, to something like $23.50 per head. Had the imports continued stationary, as it was at that time supposed they would, the revenue, under our present tariff, would, in all probability, have considerably exceeded $27,000,000, and had the reduction which actually took place not exceeded the amount estimated by myself, it would still have remained at about $24,000,000: while, as the House knows, the actual fact is that our revenue has sunk to a sum very little exceeding $22,000,000."

We remember how unsatisfactory the converse of that statement was to the hon. gentleman to-night. We remember, for instance, the horror with which he heard the statement from the Minister of Finance that the exports of the country were increasing, that the trade of the country was steadily increasing, and when my hon. friend alluded to the various and different signs of our prosperity, the hon. gentleman opposite offered up his prophecies of ruin and of despair. What do hon. gentlemen suppose that when he was Minister of Finance, he, the hon. gentleman felt warranted in saying with the country in that condition, with trade in the state depicted in the language I have read? He concluded that financial statement by telling the House :

"I venture to say that the record submitted in the Public Accounts is not a record of which any Government may be ashamed."

If our population has not increased to that extent we would so much desire, if everything is not as we would have it, surely if that was a satisfactory financial statement, the hon. gentleman knows the reason for that triumphant cheer which greeted the financial statement of to-day, and can account in some degree for that half-hearted faint cheer which greeted the hon. member for South Oxford from the benches around him. I do not desire to be personal at all, but, judging from the exaggerated style so peculiar to the hon. gentleman in dealing with the characters of opponents, or with financial matters or commercial questions, looking around the Province of Ontario, not to speak of the "shreds and patches," it is known that among his friends or those associated with him, the hon. gentleman is regarded as rather a dangerous auxiliary in political matters. His party were to-day entitled to a more powerful utterance from him, to a little more fighting form, to some attempt, at all events, to cheer their flagging and drooping spirits. But it is a difficult matter, as some one has said, to howl very loudly into the mouth of a cornucopia, and he has endeavoured to shelter himself behind the crops of the country, and expressed delight at the thought that good crops will not always be with us as they are to-day, and he will wait till we have the weevil, as our old leader used to tell us, and the potato bug. The hon. gentleman was not ashamed to admit the authorship of a letter, which I am not at liberty to truly designate owing to parliamentary rules and parliamentry customs. I could not attempt to equal the criticism made of that letter by the Minister of Finance; but a document coming from the hon. gentleman must receive even more attention than has been bestowed upon it, and I wish to remind hon. gentlemen that when you read the extravagant language, coarse statements, if I may be allowed to so refer to them, contained in the letter, no surprise need be felt by any hon. gentleman who is familiar with the method of the hon. gentleman opposite in political conflicts and contests. I have taken the trouble to select some of the choice words that have fallen from the lips of the hon. member from South Oxford. Out of curiosity I made a short study of the adjectives the hon. gentleman uses with such freedom and volubility. For instance, he did not merely denounce the present policy but also the great majority of the people of this country, whether in the "shreds and patches" as he describes some of the provinces, or in Ontario, his own native province. I intend to read parts of the hon. gentleman's letter if you, Mr. Speaker, and members, will permit me—if indeed you will permit the repetition of such language on the floor of the House—in order to give some idea of the hon. gentleman's literary style, some idea of the eloquent manner in which he handles his opponents, either with or without gloves. I will call attention to some of the sweet terms he has on various occasions made use of. Alluding to his opponents, the hon. gentleman designated them corrupt, debauched, bribers, robbers, rogues, infamous, hypocrites, and then he struck the church and used the term, pious frauds; turning to his opponents again he called them embezzlers, loathsome, impudent robbers, pack of wolves, old poachers, loud-mouthed blatant blockheads, titled blockheads, boodlers. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will allow me, and I will give a story for the benefit of the hon. gentlemen opposite to show that these people who use strong expressions are unfortunately quite a numerous class in every country. On one occasion a clergyman endeavoured to deal with a man of something of the same temperament as our friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He told him there was no occasion to resort to these expletives, that coarse or strong

language never increased the force of any statement one wished to make, that in fact the statement was all the stronger if it were couched in the language most used by gentlemen. Well, said the old parishioner: "I am a plain man, and I am a plain spoken man," and like the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), he said he always called a spade a spade, and the parson replied: "Well, that is no reason for your calling it a blankety blank old shovel." I hope the hon. member for South Oxford will take that to heart. He is accustomed to the use of vitriol, so to speak, in political life, but he has never killed anyone that I have heard of, nor has he disfigured them very much. I do not know that it would be right for me to say, Mr. Speaker, that before I reached the signature of that letter in the *Economist*, I came to the conclusion that Jack the Ripper was discovered, and that Jack the Ripper would have his name in full print at the bottom of that document; but it was not so. Before I allude to the language that is contained in that article, I call the House to witness that the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to say that he stood by every word of it. He is not afraid of the letter nor of the utterances, and he is only anxious for some one to read that letter and to read more from it than the hon. the Minister of Finance did to-day. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is something like the boy in the story I once heard; and perhaps it was told of him in his earlier days when he happened to be the son of his father or the nephew of his uncle or something of that sort. It was related on that occasion that his father or uncle met him in the field and saw him in a certain condition when he should have been hard at work. Later on some one asked the relative whether his son was a good man to work or whether he was not afraid to work and the relative replied: "Why Dick is not in the slightest afraid of work, for I have known him to lie down beside it and sleep for a whole day." The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) if no one else did, would lie down and sleep by that letter for a whole day. Now, Mr. Speaker, the language of this document deserves a great deal of consideration. The language is not choice, but I wish to call the attention of the House to some of the statements that are found in it. For instance, the hon. gentleman was not ashamed to say referring to the policy of the Canadian Government:

"That even in a comparatively short space of time this most ill-advised policy had resulted in a tremendous exodus of the very choicest portion of the population of Canada."

Now that statement the hon. gentleman will stand by. He can give no proof that a tremendous exodus of the very choicest portion of the population of Canada had taken place in that limited period. He makes the assertion but he has not given a particle of evidence nor will any hon. gentleman who sits besides him, I venture to say, attempt to support that statement by reference to public documents or to proofs that will stand investigation in this Parliament. The hon. gentleman has further stated:

"That this exodus had been accompanied as is usual in such cases by an immense increase in the aggregate indebtedness of the Dominion in the shape of large additions to its federal or provincial and municipal debts, and also to the mortgaged debts incurred by private individuals, and liabilities incurred for the construction of railroads. By far the greater part of all our obligations are held abroad."

I am not complaining of the exact language they used, but I point out to this House, as showing the animus that induced the hon. gentleman to pen that statement, that there is no corresponding statement as to the benefits conferred on the country by this expenditure. Had the hon. gentleman only quoted his own language: language which was used for instance by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) last year, he would have been able in his own words uttered in this House to have given a full justification for every dollar of the federal part of that expenditure. When the hon. gentleman alluded to this debt he should have said that it was represented by these great national works such as the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway: these responsibilities that were upon our shoulders, the responsibilities with which we had to grapple, and which the language of the hon. gentleman showed w re of immense advantage to this country. All reference to that is eliminated in the letter because that would not serve the purpose that apparently induced the hon. gentleman to write it. He continues:

"That in the thirteen years to which he was referring there was absolutely no increase at all in the collective wealth of the community."

That is a statement which I say is incapable of proof. But the hon. gentleman was more specific and he went on to say:

"That two or three cities, and perhaps a score of towns have increased considerably later on, but the great mass of the population, and particularly the agricultural class, are distinctly poorer and less prosperous than they were twelve years ago."

As to that I wish to give some proof to show the inaccuracy of the statement, and I call the attention of the House to the census bulletin published by the Department of Agriculture in which a list of towns where an increase of population has taken place is given, and instead of the hon. gentleman's statement being accurately correct, this is the statement contained in the official census bulletins:

"In comparison with the growth of city population in other countries Canada's urban development shows favourably. The 28 large cities of England increased their population during the decennium by 942,497 souls: equal to 11·2 per cent. London increased 10·4 per cent; Birmingham, 7·1 per cent; Newcastle, 28·2 per cent; Cardiff, 55·7. The increase in the 1,006 urban districts of England amounted to 15·3 per cent in the ten years.

"The larger growths in India were: Calcutta, 13·29 per cent: Madras, 10·87 per cent; with the highest recorded increase, that of Mirzapur, 46·6 per cent.

"In the United States the limit of urban population is placed at 8,000 souls. The highest percentage of increase (excluding two or three cities) which had no existence in 1880) are: Chicago, 118·6: Minneapolis, 251·4: St. Paul, 220·1: Kansas City, 137·9 per cent.

"It will be seen in the tables given below that Winnipeg shows an increase of 221·1 per cent; New Westminter, 342·9, and Toronto, 88·4 per cent.

"If the annexations of territory were disregarded in the case of Toronto, as has been done in the case of Chicago, Toronto's increase would be for purposes of comparison with that of Chicago, 108·6 per cent.

"If all the population in what popularly constitutes Montreal were municipally united, that city would show an increase of 46 per cent. However, Montreal with her increase of 39·5 per cent (as given below) compares with Boston and its 23·60 per cent, and with Philadelphia and its 23·58 per cent of an increase.

"The city of Vancouver has grown from nothing in 1881 to 13,685. There is but one instance of a similar growth in the United States—the City of Roanoke, Virginia."

Now, that entirely meets the point that the hon.

gentleman wished to make when he penned that statement, and, in speaking of two or three cities and a score of towns he understated the facts, because the towns are numerous where there has been an increase of population, as the hon. gentleman himself well knows. Again, the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to state in this letter to the British public that there were:

"Outrageous demands for fresh bribes in the shape of unprofitable and utterly uncalled for public works and additional provincial subsidies, which are of continual recurrence as matters now stand."

And he held up to the reproof of right-thinking people in England, and as a mark of discredit and reproach, that there were demands for additional provincial subsidies, and that these were granted. What a reflection upon his present leader, who made a bargain, not only with the premier of Quebec, but with the premiers of the various provinces, for additional provincial subsidies? While his leader was making such a bargain, this dangerous auxiliary, the hon. member for South Oxford, was denouncing it as one of those "outrageous demands for fresh bribes." Then, the hon. gentleman said further:

"One thing, I think, ought to be clear to all intelligent Englishmen, and that is, that it is utterly impossible that Canada can prosper under her present conditions,—isolated, and in danger of being still more completely isolated, from trade and commerce with the entire continent to which she belongs geographically, losing her population at the rate of one million and a half in ten years."

I stop not to allude to what the hon. Minister of Finance dealt with as to the inaccuracy of the statement in regard to population; but I wish to allude to what the hon. gentleman has dwelt upon to-night, as to the enormous magnitude of our continental trade. The hon. leader of the Opposition at Boston, in December last, stated that in round numbers that trade amounted to one hundred million dollars a year: and to-day the member for South Oxford took up our attention by showing that notwithstanding this McKinley Bill and other American legislation since 1867, our trade with that country was not only valuable, but enormous in extent. Yet he tells the British public that we are so cribbed and confined in our relations with the United States that we are isolated from the trade and commerce with the entire continent. He has to-night proved, if he has proved anything, that that statement to the British public was inaccurate and without foundation. Then, the hon. gentleman, in this letter, after alluding in the most offensive way to his opponents, both the living and the dead, stated that "the agricultural class has been simply bled white." The hon. Minister of Finance alluded to it; but I would ask the hon. member for South Oxford to consult the Premier of Ontario and the colleagues of that gentleman who address large masses of the people of this province on our natal day and at other times, as to whether they would corroborate his statement, or whether they would not point to their utterances freshly recorded, giving it the flattest and strongest possible contradiction. The hon. gentleman stated in this letter:

"The duty on sugar is now so arranged, for the advantage of half-a-dozen sugar refiners, that the Canadian consumer is obliged to pay a tax of nearly two millions a year, of which only the most insignificant fraction finds its way into the public treasury."

And yet, we are fresh from the electors, from the consumers of sugar, who gave their votes to men supporting this Administration for the very action taken on that question at the last session of Parliament. What was the hon. gentleman's own course at the time he was charged with the administration of the finances of this country? So completely did he mismanage that question, so little did he understand the sugar trade, that no less a man than a gentleman who subsequently became his colleague, the member for the City of Halifax at that time, the Hon. Alfred Jones, denounced his policy on the floor of this House, and charged the hon. member with having driven away a sugar trade worth three or four million dollars a year from Canadians into the hands of the refiners and middlemen of the cities of New York and Boston. And yet this hon. gentleman had the hardihood to put his pen to a statement of that kind, and to ask the British public to withdraw their confidence from Canada and the Administration, because they had done what has proved to have been popular in the minds of the vast majority of the people of this country. Then, the hon. gentleman made this statement:

"The sum taken out of the pockets of the people for the benefit of the protected manufacturers, in addition to that paid into the treasury, is certainly not less, and is probably a good deal more, than $60,000,000."

Now, Mr. Speaker, to make that statement the hon. gentleman has to adopt the point which has never been accepted by the people of this country, that is, that our people pay all the duties. The hon. gentleman has dilated to us upon the duties our people have to pay under American legislation, and he claims that we also pay the duties incidental to Canadian legislation. But let me ask him whether in regard, for instance, to anthracite coal, his theory is sustained? When the duty existed on that article, the hon. gentleman claimed that there would be a reduction in its price the moment the duty was taken off. The duty was taken off, and the exchequer of this country lost about half a million dollars a year of revenue: yet to-day the price of anthracite coal is higher than it was when the duty was on. Many other criticisms occur to us to show that the hon. gentleman was not warranted in making so bold a statement. We know how little his argument prevailed with the editor of the *Economist*, whom we find pointing out that under the plan of the hon. gentleman himself, the only difference would be that instead of the Canadian manufacturers receiving the money taken from the people the Yankee manufacturers and the United States treasury would receive every dollar of it; and the hon. gentleman did not deal with that very apt and appropriate criticism of the paper in which he places so much confidence. The hon. gentleman also stated:

"The Government gives the protected manufacturers the power to tax the people for their own purposes, and the protected manufacturers in turn, whenever called upon, assess themselves in whatever amounts the Government require in order to enable it to carry the elections."

That statement is absolutely baseless: that statement the hon. gentleman could not prove; that statement would be contradicted on oath by manufacturer after manufacturer in this country; and the hon. gentleman knows it. There is no possible way in which the hon. gentleman could have got information to enable him to make that statement. It is absolutely incorrect from beginning to end. I challenge the hon. gentleman or any of his friends

in this House or out of it, to give a scintilla of evidence on which any man valuing his character or reputation would repeat his statement. The hon. gentleman was not content with making that bold and reckless statement, but he went on to say:

"The thing is done openly and shamelessly by both parties to the transaction. Prior to the general elections of 1882, of 1887, and of 1891, Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues deliberately called the protected manufacturers together, and demanded and obtained from them such sums as they deemed necessary for the purpose of debauching the electorate, pledging themselves in return not to alter the tariff to the detriment of the said contributors, which compact was faithfully carried out and impudently avowed."

The hon. gentleman will not say that he would dare to put his name to an affidavit containing that statement—an affidavit for the statements in which he could be held responsible in a court of criminal jurisdiction. The hon. gentleman ought to understand that there is a difference between making statements in argument, and sitting down in cold blood and penning sentences which he cannot support.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Every word of it is true, and you know it.

Mr. TUPPER. I say the hon. gentleman cannot prove it. He cannot by the evidence upon which he made it, and there is no evidence in existence so far as the people in Canada know: there is no man in Canada who has ever seen, so far as the public are aware, a statement from a responsible man that the sentences, as I read them here, are true and correct. The hon. gentleman cannot give the evidence now or later on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I can. I have heard the statement from the manufacturers themselves again and again.

Mr. TUPPER. And it was hearsay evidence from the manufacturers?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was from the men who subscribed it.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman brands all the manufacturers and the Government of his country and every opponent on a statement of manufacturers who would tell him the story of their own shame. The hon. gentleman in this gives evidence of his recklessness; he gives evidence that the reckless spirit which was in him when he wrote that letter has not departed from him yet. The hon. gentleman stated to the English public, not as an argument but as a fact:

"When the Government of any country deliberately abdicates its highest functions in favour of a few selfish rings, and permits its Minister of Finance to become in the most literal sense, the mere mouthpiece of a manufacturer's association, in return for the right to hold the proceeds of the robbery for political purposes. It is idle to expect anything from a government or a legislature elected by such means and under such auspices, except precisely the results with which every newspaper in England and in the United States were ringing during a great part of the past year."

And it obviously occurred to the London press to ask how was it, if this member for South Oxford was as righteous as he pretended to be, and so sensitive in connection with these things, he had not one word to say about his old colleague and coadjutor, one of the leaders of the Reform party, Mr. Mercier and his toll-taker Mr. Pacaud? It occurred to the press all the way across the sea, where the hon. gentleman thought they knew so little of us, at once on reading this statement, that it was a most extraordinary thing this righteous man had not one word to say against the character of this man who had been proved to have committed the crime he suspected his opponents of being guilty of, and which he so recklessly charged against them. Now, then, I say that the only thing on record we can compare to this document, the only thing so outrageous that I have seen in my short political life, is the utterances of that hon. gentleman on a previous occasion, and the document printed and published by one of his confrères and able allies, now the editor of the Toronto *Globe*. That letter went to London for a bad purpose. It has almost accomplished a bad purpose, as I will show. An actual conclusion has been drawn by one of the financial papers, which accepted this miserable document as having a vestige of foundation. This statement itself is on all fours with and is just as bad as the statements of that infamous man living in Canada notorious as Farrer, the editor of the *Globe*. That infamous man wrote language of this kind:

"The imposition by the United States of a tonnage tax on all Nova Scotia vessels, laden whole or in part, with fish, would speedily put an end to seizures, and indeed the whole controversy. Whatever course the United States may see fit to adopt, it is plain that Sir John's disappearance from the stage is to be the signal for a movement towards annexation."

The House will see that these hon. gentlemen think a good deal alike.—

"The enormous debt of the Dominion ($50) per head) the virtual bankruptcy of all the provinces except Ontario"—

I give the head notes of the hon. gentleman's speech to-night in reading this.—

—"the pressure of the American tariff upon trade and industry, the incurable issue of race, and the action of the natural forces making for the consolidation of the lesser country with the greater have already prepared the minds of most intelligent Canadians for the destiny that awaits them, and a leader will be forthcoming when the hour arrives."

Now, then, I allude to the previous utterances of the hon. gentleman himself. He was once aware that it was a dangerous thing to state even all the worst facts in connection with the financial affairs of this country on the London market. In that year, as Finance Minister, he went to that market and put a rosy hue on all the acts of his predecessors in office. He complimented them and the country on the successful manner in which they had administered the affairs of the country and built the public works of Canada. But later on, he assumed his old role, the role he has attempted weakly to-night, and this was the style of the hon. gentleman on the self same subject after having pictured in London the prosperous condition of affairs. He stated to the electors in this country:

"How, I say, did they prepare to meet these obligations. The thing is incredible but it is true. These old, these wise, these sagacious, experienced and provident statesmen actually prepared to meet this tremendous charge on our resources in this fashion."

Then, he goes on to say how they did it:

"Sir, I have asked myself more than once and I now publicly repeat the question: Was this done in sheer brutal ignorance and recklessness, or was it done of malice prepense? Did they design to scuttle the ship after they had plundered her, or was it only the last mad folly of the drunken crew before they ran upon the breakers?"

The hon. gentleman, on another occasion, is reported to have said that he did not tell the whole case in London, and he did not use that statement there, because he was not going to cry stinking fish when

selling fish on the market. But now the hon. gentleman, shorn of responsibility for all time to come, as I believe, in the country, having no fear of responsibility as to the future, rises and is willing not only to cry stinking fish in Canada, but in London, so long as it will accomplish some fell political purpose. Now, let us see whether this language, absurd as it seems, baseless as we know it to be in Canada, hit the mark in London. The *Economist*, a paper of first-class financial standing, saw through the hon. gentleman's argument at once. They had studied his statements frequently and no doubt were as familiar with them as we are. So they passed by his vile attacks on his opponents, knowing that he was suffering the bitterness of defeat, and merely pointed out to him the absurdity of the proposal he had made for the relief of Canada. But another paper, not knowing the hon. gentleman as well as the *Economist* does, the *Financial Standard* and *Imperial Post* of 20th February, 1892, read this letter, accepted the statements as true, and concluded it was its duty to advise all who held Canadian securities to get rid of them as soon as they possibly could. That is the logical result, if result there could be, of the letter to which I have alluded, and from which I have quoted. The House will allow me, I hope, to show, because the subject is a serious one, how unfortunate it is that any journal of standing should, for a mament, be induced to believe the statements in that letter. That paper says:

"In short, between Toryism and the neighbouring developments in rings, trusts, and corners, Canada has either to sink or swim."

"Sir Richard J. Cartwright calls his opponents plunderers, and therefore"——

Little knowing the hon. gentleman or his vocabulary, or the ease with which he could bring such statements out.—

—"and therefore probably they deserve the name."

And further on:

"Poor Canada! Once so hopeful and enterprising; once so proud of its trade returns and the percentages of increase in its population; but it is the way of the world."

And so on, and then the paper moralises, but, after quoting the enormous interests and securities of Canada in England, after showing how healthy those stocks seemed to be and the splendid position they had on 'Change in London, this paper says:

"Now the game is ended, and Canada has found it easier to borrow and spend than to pinch and pay. In the expressive words of Sir Richard Cartwright, the backbone of Canada, namely, the agricultural class, 'have been bled white.'"

Later on again, we find:

"The condition of men stirs passion more than sentiment, and if the facts are as set forth by Sir Richard Cartwright, the sooner the better for all classes of Canadian securities to be realised. Thus Canada may be said to be played out. By the hands of the common enemy, debt, it goes under, a warning among ourselves to school boards, county councils, chancellors of the Exchequer, and nationalisers of trams and rails, gas and water works, land and the instruments of production generally."

I hope the hon. gentleman is gratified that I have been able to find a paper that accepted those statements and that, if they have any influence or effect at all in London, it will not be to appreciate or assist our securities of any kind in that market. The hon. gentleman in his choice language and with the pleasant epithets he can so easily throw across the House, alluded to the High Commissioner and his gang, and in that choice production he alluded to his dead opponent as Sir John and his fellows. That is the style of the hon. member for South Oxford and the kind of language in which he indulges. If I were inclined to be cruel, I might ask him for the biography of, not the gang, but of the coadjutors of the hon. gentleman. It is hardly a year ago when we were told that the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs boasted of this "gang" amongst its leaders—I only use the expression to show how far the *tu quoque* might be carried:—Laurier and Cartwright and Mills and Charlton and Davies and Paterson and Mulock and Mowat and Ross and Fraser and Mercier and Langelier and Joly and Scriver and Blair and Fielding and Greenway. These were the leaders and controllers of the Reform party and were so christened by the Toronto *Globe*, which is supposed to be the organ of that party and I understand is partly the property of the member for South Oxford. What would he say if I entered into the history of some of these names. I will not do it, because we are all familiar, the electors are all familiar, with the facts, they are fresh in their minds, and it would be wrong for me to dwell unnecessarily on them at this stage. We are satisfied on this side of the House with the verdict the people have given on the charges made by one side and the other. As I have said, the hon. gentleman does not spare his enemies living or dead, but neither will he spare his friends. Surely the leader of the Opposition was entitled to some courtesy at his hand. It is true that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made an uncomplimentary reference to the leader of the Opposition, for which I believe he has apologised, as he should have done, and that he also made some uncomplimentary allusions to some of the other leaders on the Opposition benches, but to-night the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his anger, in his jealousy and rage over the satisfactory statement of the Minister of Finance, alluded to that hon. gentleman's statement as to the prosperity of the country as fatuous and silly assertions on the part of the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance stated and proved that Canada was growing, developing and progressing, and I ask hon. gentlemen whether the member for South Oxford did not devote a great deal of his time in a vain effort to prove that Canada was not growing, was not developing and was not progressing. He tried to show that the worst fate that could overtake a country was hanging over us. Yet, in Boston, in December last, the leader of the Opposition told the gentlemen who were assembled around the banquet board, and told them truly, that Canada is "growing, developing and progressing." That is the report of the hon. gentleman's speech in the Toronto *Globe*. The statement was correct and creditable to Canada, and I wish I could endorse the other statements made on that occasion, but I regret that I cannot. The hon. gentleman having alluded to the deplorable condition of this country renders it necessary for me not to weary the minds of hon. gentlemen with statistics, for the statistics or figures from the blue-books given by the Minister of Finance have not been gainsaid, but to give the House some other authorities of some other Liberal leaders on the subject to endorse the position of the Minister of Finance and the leader of the Opposition, that Canada is

growing, progressing and developing. I will call attention to the statement of an attorney-general, who is, in his political views, in accord with hon. gentlemen opposite, as it appears in an English review. Referring to Canada, he said:

"It has a population of at least 5,000,000 and is rapidly growing. It has large cities and rising towns. The trade is expanding and its wealth accumulating. It has two of the greatest railway lines in the world. Canada cannot be charged at home or abroad with lack of national enterprise. Wealth is being rapidly accumulated * * * by the steady progress of trade and industries * * * Things are moving up wonderfully well at present and to sum up Canada is prosperous, contented and happy."

The leader of the Liberal Government in Nova Scotia was attempting to obtain money for his province in London last year. Fortunately, he was there before the letter of the member for South Oxford saw the light of day, but, speaking in public, he is reported to have said—and he did not deny the truth of it when it was brought to his knowledge—that the condition of things in Nova Scotia was satisfactory, that the condition of trade was satisfactory. But we have the authority of far more responsible men, of far more notable leaders of the Liberal party to the same effect. We know that the leader of the Liberal Government in Ontario was stung to the heart by the statements of the hon. member for South Oxford in the last fight, and in his letter to the public press, he proved to the people that our position as an agricultural people, as a mechanical people, as a labouring people, was as satisfactory as the condition of the people of that country to which the member for South Oxford devoted so much time to-night, and has devoted so much attention for some years past. I could quote statements of some of the present members from Ontario where they rightly boasted of the splendid progress of Canada in commerce and in every branch of industry. If hon. gentlemen talk in this way in Boston, and in our own country, what are we to think of this fearful array of figures, this eight hundred millions of dollars taken out of the pockets of the people, to which the member for South Oxford has referred on the floor of this House? How is it that he alone of all that party has such an enormous fund of knowledge locked up in his own mighty and gigantic brain? How is it that these facts have not reached the minds of these men with whom he is working? How is it that the leader of the Liberal party has not taken the slightest interest in them, and evidently does not agree with him on that subject, or he could not, even on a festive occasion, have made the statement that Canada was growing, developing and prospering? But to show the progress of this country further, I will ask the attention of the House to a comparative statement in relation to those matters to which the hon. member for South Oxford was once in the habit of alluding. He has directed our attention to the United States for no other purpose but to keep up a spirit of unrest among Canadians, to induce Canadians still to believe that matters are not prosperous with our brethren across the line. I have a statement as to the deposits in the savings banks and chartered banks in Canada and the United States for a certain number of years. First, in the United States according to Mulhall:

Deposits in the savings banks of the United States in 1870	$ 657,072,000
Other banks	2,041,200,000
	$2,698,272,000
In 1889—savings banks	$1,379,754,000
Banks	3,693,600,000
	$5,073,354,000

Increase in 20 years, $2,375,082,000 or 88 per cent.

From the Canada Statistical Record:	
Savings banks, 1870	$ 4,387,538
Banks	50,767,099
	$55,154,637
In 1890, including savings banks and chartered banks	$188,211,447

Showing an increase in 20 years of 241 per cent in Canada or three times as much as the similar deposits in the banks of the United States. An hon. gentleman has kindly furnished me with a comparative statement of the position of our credit in the English market, and he has given me the reason in that for the letter to which I have called attention: certainly the letter will not improve the position much. For instance, I find that in London on March 2, 1878, the closing price of our debentures was £94; in 1892, on March 5, the price had risen to £105. Hon. gentlemen, in reference to this subject, have answered that that was due to the condition of the money market more than to the condition of this country, and there is something in that argument, of course. But to test it the following is interesting:—When we take the position of the Australian colonies we find that though the credit of those colonies stood higher than that of Canada in days gone by, under the Reform administration, the relative position has changed under the present economical conditions of Canada, and under the administration of its affairs by this Government. For instance we find that in reference to the securities of New South Wales, of their 4 per cent loans, to run 25 years, in 1875, the closing price was £99¼; Victoria, £99; Queensland, £94; South Australia, £95¼; while Canada was £93. That was the relative condition of Canada with those colonies under the Reform rule. In 1892, however, the order as to credit on 5th March was as follows:—Canada, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia, Canada being at the top, according to the opinion of the best financiers of the world. Now, I come to that favourite topic of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, the topic that he has almost worn bare, the subject of the exodus. On a previous occasion I ventured to say to the House that I had studied somewhat the career of the hon. gentleman as shown by the parliamentary debates, and I find that his first utterances in Parliament indicated that his mind was given up to this question of the exodus ever since 1865; ever since then he has been endeavouring to terrify the people of the country by dwelling on the subject and predicting that the exodus would assume, and that it had assumed, greater proportions than ever. Still we live, still we prosper, still we grow and develop. The hon. gentleman to-night started out, as he started out in the last campaign, on an argument based on the accuracy of the census of 1881. The hon. gentleman could not twit the Minister of Finance or any others in reference to the comparative condition of their counties, unless he started upon the hypothesis that there was an accurate count of the inhabitants of Canada in 1882. But to show to the House the manner of man we have to deal with in the member for South Oxford, it is only necessary to refer to the *Hansard* of 1882. He was face to face with the condition of affairs at

that time, and stated to the people of this country at large that it was not on the whole an increase of which we need be ashamed. He approached the condition of affairs at that time in this fashion :

"I doubt that this is even too favourable a view to take of the case, as there is too much reason to think that when we take the census as our guide we are resting on a very uncertain basis."

But now his whole policy on this trade question, as he says, and as we have reason to believe from the length of time which he dwells on the subject of the exodus, depends on the census returns of 1882 as compared with our present return. He goes on :

"Canada, I think, of all civilized countries, possesses alone a census as to which only one certain part is known, and that is "——

Mark, Mr. Speaker, what follows.

—"that it is utterly unreliable, and that it is not an enumeration of the people, that it does not give the number of Canadians in Canada but the number that are in Canada and a certain number of Canadians outside of Canada."

The hon. member has put them all back in the census of 1881 in order to show the small increase in comparison with the census of 1891. Yet he went on to say :

"I fear the mode in which that census was taken was with a deliberate fraudulent intent. I fear it was taken for the purpose of eluding the terms of the Confederation Act, and to deprive the Province of Ontario and the Province of Nova Scotia of a large part of the representation to which they are justly entitled. It is a very extraordinary fact that the Province of Quebec, a province which was alleged to have been depopulated under my hon. friend, has increased under this census twice as much as it had between 1861 and 1871, and the distribution of population involves other circumstances which give the census a suspicious character.

"If that suggestion be unfounded, the hon. gentleman has at all events deliberately invited it by their barbarous manner of taking the census, a system which I do not believe would be tolerated by any other country calling itself civilized."

Yet the hon. gentleman has gone to the London market on the basis that this barbarous census, this wholly incorrect census, this fraudulent census, was right and correct, because from that deduction he could make the picture all the blacker for Canada and all the worse for his opponents. The hon. gentleman found to-night that some of the statements would not bear investigation, and he was compelled in the face of the Minister of Finance to correct statements which he had evidently been making for some time as regards the condition and population of New Brunswick. He has taken these statements back, and I only wish he would act in a similar manner in regard to many statements in that document to which I have referred. But he has referred to a group of states, and he selected them in order to make the comparison all the worse for his country. I ask, Mr. Speaker, is it not significant in following the argument of the hon. gentleman on this subject to find that on all occasions he has given the country and people of this country and this House the very worst possible feature he can carve out of either the American or Canadian census so far as illustrating the position of Canada. The hon. gentleman selects special states for the purpose of his comparison. Let me give one or two arguments which occur to me on this point. One has been furnished to me by the hon. member for Cumberland ; but there is another one to which I desire to refer before taking up that one. Let me take a group of states. Let me begin with this group : Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont—these are not, as it were, considerable states, but add the state of Ohio, to which the hon. gentleman alluded, and which is one of the most important and populous states in the Union. Taking these together we find their population was in the aggregate almost the same as the population of Canada in 1881, or the beginning of the respective decades ; and the increase in Canada was greater, even according to the census of 1891, than it was in those different states to which I have alluded. I take this, therefore, as a perfectly fair comparison, these states having the same population ; and this creditable fact which I have pointed out I have never heard stated from the lips of one of my opponents. Why should we not take that comfort from a comparison with the other side? But if the hon. gentleman wishes a further comparison, let me give him the one made by the member for Cumberland, one made, I believe, with considerable effect in the late bye-election. Taking the St. Lawrence and the counties on each side of the river, one set in the United States and another set in Ontario, you have the basis of a perfectly fair comparison. If it is not fair, it is unfair to Canada for this reason, that the counties in the neighbouring states are nearer to the large centres of population on this continent, such, for instance, as New York. Let us make that comparison, as having a direct bearing on the larger part of the argument which the hon. gentleman has brought to-night, as of old, in regard to the condition of affairs in Canada as contrasted with the condition of affairs in the United States. Taking the New York counties bordering on the St. Lawrence and the lakes, coming upwards, we find the following population —

	1880.	1890.	Decrease.
St. Lawrence	85,997	85,048	949
Oswego	79,911	71,883	8,028
			Increase.
Cayuga	65,081	65,310	221
			Decrease.
Wagner	51,700	49,729	1,971
			Increase.
Munro	144,903	187,586	44,683
		44,530 in city of Rochester	
Orleans	30,128	30,083	675

There were increases in the city population of Niagara and Erie. The net decrease is 9,249. There is in the State of New York 60 counties, and there is a decrease in 23 of them. Let us now look at the Lake Ontario group in Canada. That group shows an increase of 88,031 ; but deduct, as I have deducted for Rochester, 85,000 for Toronto, and this gives a net increase of 3,031 under the present tariff laws, constitutions and institutions, as compared with the neighbouring counties across the border, of 9,249. That is a satisfactory statement. It is not only satisfactory, it is full of significance. It verifies the utterances recorded by Mr. Mowat in Ontario, who, speaking of the people of the United States, said : "We are not worse off than our neighbours." Let me take another group of states. We take Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. These nine states had a population, in 1880, of 14,507,407, in 1890 of 17,401,545, or an increase of 2,894,138. I deduct the urban population, 6,254,096, from 8,976,426, leaving an increase of 2,722,330, or an increase in the rural population of 171,808. I will not go on,

as I could do, to enlarge upon this point, but I call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman, in order to make his contrast more favourable, has picked out certain of the most prosperous states of the Union, states that started in the race with Canada in the possession of every advantage, with their railway and canal systems developed when ours were only about to be undertaken, in order to present Canada at a disadvantage and render the picture as unfavourable as possible to this Dominion. I will detain the House for a few moments with a reference to Lord Durham's report in 1839. It shows that since that time we have reversed the order of things as regards many of the neighbouring states. The late member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) showed the real position of the Eastern Townships as compared with Vermont. In those days, while all was prosperity and hope on the other side of the line, everything here was terrible, and even as bad as the hon. gentleman now pretends the affairs of Canada are. The report says:

"On the American side all was activity and bustle. The forest had been widely cleared; every year numerous settlements were formed, and thousands of farms were created out of the waste, the country was intersected by roads; canals and roads were finished, or in the course of formation; the ways of communication and transport were crowded with people and enlivened by numerous carriages and large steamboats. Bridges, artificial landing-places, and commodious wharves were formed on the lake frontages as soon as required. Townships were growing apace, and the stability and magnificence of their buildings might have done credit to populated centres of the old world. On the British side (that is the Canadian side) with the exception of a few favoured spots where some approach to American prosperity was apparent, all was waste and desolate. There was but one railroad in all British America, and that one was only fifteen miles in length. The ancient city of Montreal could not bear comparison with some of the most recent American cities. The difference was, however, most manifest in the country districts. On the Canadian side was a widely scattered population, poor and apparently unenterprising, though hardy and industrious, separated from each other by tracts of intervening forest, without towns or markets, almost without roads, living in mean houses, drawing little more than a rude subsistence from ill-cultivated land, and seemingly incapable of improving their condition. In the eastern townships of Lower Canada, upon the border line, it was a common practice for settlers when they wished to meet, to enter the State of Vermont, and make use of the roads there for the purpose of reaching their destination in the British province.

"Throughout the frontier, the market value of land was much greater on the American than on the Canadian side. The average difference was 'notoriously several hundred per cent,' and in some cases amounted to over one thousand per cent. The price of wild land in Vermont and New Hampshire, close to the frontier, was five dollars per acre, and in the British townships only one dollar. In Canada a great deal of land was totally unsaleable, even at such low prices, while in the States property was continually changing hands. Not only was land almost unsaleable, but it was impossible to obtain money on mortgage of land, because when a sale was forced there was no certainty as to the value, since at the time there might be a perfect glut of land in the market, and no purchasers."

Mr. LAURIER. That was the cry of the country.

Mr. TUPPER. If that was the cry of the country we have stopped that cry. We have reversed the whole state of affairs and it is to the Canadian side you must now look for the prosperity that was once boasted in the States of New Hampshire and Vermont: states which the hon. gentleman considers have not to be weighed in the balance when comparing the relative advantages of Canada with that of the United States. On this subject much has been said, and very little new was said to-night with all due deference to the hon. gentleman who gave so much attention to it. I consider that he handled that subject most unfairly and that he has handled it in a manner in which it has not been dealt with even in the United States. Take General Potter's reports on the census of that country. Even where they had so large a population, he directs attention to the fact that population is not the main thing, but that the chief thing is the condition of the population of the country and he refers to the subjects which have been dealt with by the Minister of Finance, the trade returns, the traffic receipts, the public works, and so on, of the country, in order to ascertain whether we are prosperous or whether we are retrograding. But under free trade, a policy which the hon. gentleman thinks so admirable, but which he fears to advocate or adopt in this country, the same condition of affairs has taken place as in Canada, viz., the migration from the country to the towns and the rural population becoming urban. We find, for instance, in the mother country, that the late census shows, as the *Times* puts it:

"The decrease of population in rural districts which marks the census of 1891 has been more or less continuous during the whole of the present century. It is a necessity of the changes which have taken place in the composition of the working classes of the country, and is not without its compensations to the rural labourers themselves; a far more potent cause of the changes we are considering has been the transition from agricultural to manufacturing and industrial supremacy. This has created new interests and new classes of workers, and the process has absorbed capital as well as labour from one class of the community and transferred them to others. Foreign competition and the rise in the value of gold combined to bring about low prices. To these causes add that of bad seasons, and we have the real explanation of the recent agricultural depression. But with new adjustments completed, the last vestiges of the depression will vanish, and the transition to manufacturing and industrial supremacy will be of the greatest gain to agriculture."

I call the attention of the House to that statement for the reason that we hear every day that the cause of this unsettled condition of the rural population is the National Policy fostering manufacturing industries in this country and taking these people from the farms where they would do so much better. Yet under a free trade policy, every child in this country knows, that free trade was primarily for the sake of the manufacturers and indirectly, as Cobden advocated, for the agricultural classes. The result has been an attraction of the rural population to the manufacturing centres. That is not peculiar to this country, it is not peculiar to the United States, it is common to every country which is able to boast of manufacturers. The *Times* continues:

"The attraction of higher wages in towns has, no doubt, led many to migrate thither from the country, who were not compelled to do so in search of work; but the majority of those who have gone to the towns are of the latter class. In weighing the causes which are conspiring to reduce the rural population, however, we must not overlook the spread of education among the working classes of the country, which has led many of them to seek to better their fortunes either by migration to the towns or by emigration."

Now every person knows that in this country our great difficulty has been that we cannot keep that body of men, who are moving in every part of the world, within our own territories as easily as could the United States; simply because down to 1886 I believe we had not the means of transporting them to our western territories; whereas, at that

time all the western territories of the United States were gridironed with a splendid railway system and had companies at work competing for these emigrants and bringing them from all quarters of the globe. We are now starting more fairly in the race; we are equipped and we are ready, and it is in our great west we will see to-day perhaps the greatest confidence in that respect in regard to the future of this country and in regard to the prospects of future emigration. I am pleased to see that even the Liberal papers of Manitoba have taken but very little stock in the dismal tales and the doleful accounts of the condition of the country given by Reformers on the stump during the last election, but they recognize their relatively strong position and the relatively weaker position of the United States now. The prospects of our western territories are so great and are so much greater than those of the neighbouring territories to-day, that there is no doubt in the minds of those best able to judge, as to what the future is that lies before us. I can tell the hon. gentleman also when he talks about our tariff being the cause of the condition of the agricultural class, that that is not in my opinion or in the opinion of any candid man outside Canadian political life, a fair statement. If he will go to free trade England, he will find this very same problem grappled with. It is only the other day that Mr. Chaplin, a member of the British Government, stated at the Agricultural Congress held at Ely, the difficulties that have to be met by the agricultural classes. Unfortunately these difficulties exist in the United States and in Canada, but I believe myself with the majority of my fellow citizens in this country, that relatively the Canadian farmers' position is the best of the three. Mr. Chaplin in the month of January last, made this admission as to the problems facing the English Government in dealing with the condition of the agricultural classes of England:

"He recognized with pleasure that there were among them a large proportion of genuine and unmistakable representatives of the class earning their livelihood by actual labour on the land. (Hear, hear.) They lived in times when the agricultural interest of this country had been passing through periods of severe depression, by which all its members, from landlords and owners of the land and tenant farmers and occupiers to the classes which gained their livelihood by actual labour, had been sorely affected in a greater or less degree. There was no one connected with the land who had not felt the strain of that depression, the consequences and the gravity of which could not be overestimated."

And yet we are told day after day that the fall in the price of agricultural lands in this country is due to misgovernment, in spite of the fact that in a country enjoying a free trade fiscal system we find that condition intensified, and far more unfavourable to the farmer than it is to the Canadian farmer. Mr. Chaplin goes on:

"Among all the consequences which were due, or partly due, to the agricultural depression, there was not one among them, in his opinion, of graver or more serious import to the agricultural interests of this country than the constant migration of the rural population from the country to the towns, which they witnessed so frequently at the present time. Although this was partly due to the depression, there were many other causes which had been or were conducing to these results. There was the great development of the manufacturing industries which in recent years had taken place in this country. The increased demand for labour that they created, and the higher wages that labour necessarily commanded, and the increased attraction presented by living in towns conduced to this migration. But the migration was not limited to this country alone. It might also be observed in certain countries on the Continent, and notably it went on in the United States of America."

That is the statement of Mr. Chaplin, and with the fact to which he alludes we are all of course very familiar. I refer to it, however, to show that the hon. gentleman's argument on that head was not candid, and was not fair to the condition of the farmers or the people of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said that population was the best test of prosperity in a country like Canada. On that point the hon. gentleman could be answered again from his own speeches. Members of this House who follow his speeches in the country, need only refer to the time when he was Finance Minister, to get a flat contradiction of that principle. In the speeches delivered by that hon. gentleman as Finance Minister in 1876 and 1877, he again trotted out his hobby, the exodus, alluding to the migration of the people of Canada to the neighbouring states. But he asked the people to be of good cheer, because the trade statistics showed that man for man our trade was improving; and he endeavoured to use the argument which the hon. Minister of Finance has been able to use with so much force under the circumstances this very day. So that on this question of the exodus, I think I have shown that the hon. member for South Oxford is not a safe guide, that is, if his standing as Finance Minister should impart responsibility to his utterances. Now, the hon. gentleman's argument, to-night, on the question of trade generally was, I submit, an argument against the very basis of Confederation, minimizing as it did the importance of interprovincial trade. His argument revealed only too well the trade for which he would give up almost everything. But I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1865, when a young man, and in 1870, when an older and more experienced man, that his voice was lifted up in the old Legislature of Canada, and in this very House, to warn Canadians against absorption into the United States, and to advocate as vehemently and earnestly as he could the cause of interprovincial trade and the cause of Canadian Confederation, in order to prevent that absorption taking place, which to-night he apparently wishes to see brought about; and the Confederation which he now practically denounces he then regarded as the only means by which we could escape from that absorption or annexation. The hon. gentleman was admittedly embarrassed by the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance as to the result of the negotiations at Washington. He could not understand, after Mr. Farrer's visits to Washington, after Mr. Wiman's and Mr. Goldwin Smith's visits, all annexationists open and avowed, why he could not have been in possession of this information as soon as the Minister of Finance; and, I take it, that is the reason he doubts the accuracy of the version given from the Treasury benches to-night. But it is not strange to see the hon. gentleman embarrassed. We have seen him so often in that condition that it is a familiar sight. But, Sir, is it not significant that although the hon. gentleman talked so much of our relations with the United States and of continental free trade, repeating all the old arguments, he omitted to tell this House or this country whether he was willing to accept Mr. Blaine's terms? They were not accepted by the Government of the day; and they would not be acceptable to any wing of the Conservative party

in Canada—that is well known. The hon. gentleman spoke about almost everything connected with the subject, but did not give his own opinion of the conditions laid down by Mr. Blaine for the market upon which, according to the hon. gentleman, the whole prosperity of this country absolutely depends. I would suggest to his colleagues—that seeing that they have kept secret too long what is their own manner of working out this trade question, seeing that they have denied to the Canadian people any information as to the means whereby they could put into effect a free trade policy—that this is the hour and the day when they should tell us whether they will take the responsibility of saying yes to the offer that has been refused by the Canadian Government. Now, the hon. gentleman's argument that the whole McKinley tariff is on the shoulders of the Canadian farmers, that they pay all the duties imposed by it, is, I say advisedly, the argument on which Mr. McKinley relied for the passage of the agricultural features of his Bill in the House of Representatives. I heard Mr. McKinley base the agricultural features of his tariff on the statements made by Mr. Goldwin Smith and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), quoting the statements of those gentlemen. Then, you have only to turn up the press reports of Mr. McKinley's campaign against Mr. Campbell for the governorship of Ohio, to find that his ammunition for that campaign and his defence of his tariff measure were based on the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, who told Mr. McKinley that the Canadians pay the duties, and contradicted Mr. Campbell when he asserted that the tariff was a burden on the people of the United States. Whether we are responsible for it or not is a very small question when these facts meet us in the face. Whatever was in the minds of the framers of the Bill, the arguments they used to bring it into life and to keep it on the Statute-book came from the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite and were such as the hon. member for South Oxford made use of to-night. Then, the hon. gentleman, while objecting to several features of the tariff, said nothing of coal, because he is apparently making love to the farmer only. He said that that duty affected the farmer only in a comparatively small degree, affecting other classes much more. I would like, if the hour were not so late, to say much on the coal question. I say that the examination of that feature of the tariff will afford the best possible vindication of the National Policy. Experience has told us, in regard to the price of both anthracite and bituminous coal, that the argument made by the hon. member for South Oxford is fallacious, that instead of these duties always falling upon the consumer, the duty on anthracite coal was paid by the coal exporters from the United States and not by the Canadian people, and the best proof of that is the proof to which I refer to-night. Taking the *Globe* statement of market prices, the Canadian people have paid more for their coal since the duty was taken off.

Mr. LAURIER. Put it on again.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is aware, from the statement of the Minister of Finance, that we are not so hard up as to require that amount of revenue, but it is there ready any moment. Whenever we may require half a million dollars, there is the article from which we can obtain it with the least burden to the Canadian people. The reason of the increase is that when the duty was on, all points in Ontario were made competitive because there was a prospect of the bituminous coal of the Maritime Provinces going further west, but when that duty was taken off, the Ontario district, then a separate district, went into what was called the Buffalo district, and those districts are parcelled out by the owners of anthracite coal, who fix just such prices as they please. Before that, Ontario was neutral ground on account of the coal tariff. But I will now touch the other subject of bituminous coal. Sir Henry Tyler has made a statement that the Grand Trunk Railway paid $500,000 a year in coal duty, owing to the duty of sixty cents a ton, on the coal they consumed. I was amazed at that statement, which utterly contradicted all my own belief on the subject, and I communicated with the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. Sargeant, but although months have elapsed, certainly weeks, I have not been able to obtain from Mr. Sargeant any evidence upon which such a statement could be made. In 1890 all the duty collected on all the coal actually consumed by the Grand Trunk Railway, Canadian Pacific Railway, and every one else brought into this country, was only $800,000, which shows that the statement of Sir Henry Tyler is not capable of being proved. If it is, I am utterly unable to understand upon what such a statement can be based. I will not go fully into that question, although I am prepared to do so, but I wish to allude to the change of tone regarding that duty. I can hardly make it out. To-night it is not so bad a tax, apparently because it does not affect the farmer so much as other taxes, but the hon. member for South Oxford, a few years ago, in 1886, for instance, was of the opinion that:

"The two most barbarous taxes even in our present barbarous tariff—I doubt if it is possible to find two more utterly odious and detestable taxes than that those on coal and flour. This tax on coal may be considered as the tax which of all others sets most at defiance every sound principle of political economy and of common sense. You can conceive of no tax which is more indefensible, which is more absurd, and which is worse in its practical operation than the same duty on coal."

The hon. gentleman has changed his opinion about many things, and on the coal question I sincerely trust he has changed his opinion also. Whether he has or not, let me tell him that the country where the price of coal is increasing and where the combinations, so much denounced under the National Policy by hon. gentlemen opposite—when considering the question of binding twine for instance—are flourishing and where coal rings now run the price up or down just as they please, is England to-day as well as the United States. Under the so-called free trade system, I am able to prove that the price of coal is fixed, not according to the laws of supply and demand, but by the coal association. The price fixed in England by this combination, a gigantic affair, was six shillings in 1889, it was raised to eleven shillings in 1890, and ten shillings in 1891, and I ask Sir Henry Tyler, in considering this subject, to be fair to Canada and to admit, as the facts will force him to admit, that while he is paying less for the coal consumed by the Grand Trunk to-day under the National Policy than he paid under a Reform Administration, with no duty on coal, in England the railway companies are paying more. The price of coal, under the operations of the

combine in the mother land, is to-day dearer to the railway companies than the price paid to-day in Montreal by Sir Henry Tyler for the Grand Trunk Railway. And that is a condition of things under which the statement comes with good grace from the ex-Minister of Finance, when he states that he has not so much to grumble over in the coal tax as it only affects the farmer in a comparatively light degree. To make sure that the English prices were correct, I communicated with the Great Western Railway Company in England, and found that the statement I have given the House was correct as to the increased price in England, and the London *Times* is my authority for stating that those prices are fixed by the combines of the great colliery proprietors of the mother country. But there is another feature in connection with the coal trade. It is a barometer as to the general commerce in Canada, and the best barometer we have. For instance, I found that in 1874 the production in Canada, when the Reformers came into power, was 81,058,146 tons. After two years under that Administration, it dropped to 933,803 tons, whereas in 1879, after ten years of the National Policy, it had risen to 2,616,441 tons. I will pass over the other points in connection with the subject. I regret that I have occupied far more of the time of the House than I intended, or indeed, from my point of view was at all necessary. The hon. gentleman, however, to whose remarks I have been addressing myself for the most part, spoke of the grief he felt over the statements of the Minister of Finance. Hon. gentlemen opposite are and will be, I believe, grieved. They are grieved at being now absolutely stranded, so to speak. They are absolutely at a loss for a policy. Certainly the ex-Minister of Finance has not vouchsafed us a hint as to the position they are now to assume. The hon. gentleman says we courted a refusal at Washington. The hon. gentleman can hardly have meant that. The hon. gentleman could not have gathered that from any statement made by the Minister of Finance. The hon. the Minister of Finance gave to the hon. gentleman a succinct account of a business conversation between two business men, and I do not think there has been a hint on the authority of Mr. Blaine or of anyone who could speak with authority in the States, that the delegates from this Government attempted to play with the question or to trifle with it. From the outset both parties acted with the greatest candour, and with too much candour for the digestion of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman says we would prefer Mr. Farrer as a delegate. I would like to know whether with a mask or without one. I was not surprised to learn that the hon. gentleman would prefer Mr. Farrer as a delegate. If public rumour is correct, that gentleman has already acted as a delegate to Washington on more than one occasion, not as a delegate for the Canadian Government, but as a delegate against the Canadian Government and against the interests of the Canadian people. At last, the hon. gentleman got his political fangs, so to speak, on the Intercolonial Railway. He left the canals and the great expenditure which has been made upon them in the past and the expenditure which it is intended to make upon them in the future, and, again thinking of the "shreds and patches," and finding that their good example has been followed in Ontario, he went down to the lower provinces and attacked the most important work in that part of the Dominion. I have a speech under my hand delivered by the hon. gentleman when these deficits did not appear to appal him as they do to-night, when that road was of comparatively small extent, when it ran only to Rivière du Loup, and the hon. gentleman, as Finance Minister, stated that the anticipated deficit was not less than half a million of dollars. But at that time, when more statesmanlike views prevailed in that party, the hon. gentleman's old leader, Mr. Mackenzie, whose present illness I am sure we all greatly deplore, stated as Prime Minister that he viewed this great public work, this work so essential to interprovincial trade, this work which was a part of the conditions of confederation, in a very patriotic sense. In 1878, he stated in this House that:

> "He was not hopeful that he should succeed for years to come in making the traffic entirely a paying one, but the road would yield a return in many other ways than dollars and cents, by opening up a vast portion of the country which had been almost inaccessible. It would pay in another way. It would afford a highway of our own to the ocean, to our two great cities on the sea coast, thus promoting that intercourse which was essential to the growth of national feeling amongst us which was much more valuable than money—that independent national feeling without which no people could be prosperous or great."

How have the hon. gentlemen departed from those principles, when to-night the hon. member is bringing up as a bone of contention among the different provinces, the supposed burthen in the way of a deficit on the working of the Intercolonial Railway. I might also quote Mr. Brown who, as one of the Fathers of Confederation, was willing, speaking for Ontario, to spend the cost of five of these roads in the interests of that great scheme; but the hon. gentleman gloats over the loss of revenue and tries to terrify the taxpayer of the west on account of the deficit on that great public work. I have already alluded to our public works in general. The hon. gentleman at one time could give a very different account of the wisdom of our expenditure in that particular. We accepted the silver side of his shield, and the people of Canada have accepted it at many elections since 1878. Finally, we are told that the Reformers in the bye-elections, as on all occasions, got the popular vote, and there are the representatives of the popular vote, a score or so, as the hon. gentleman said when speaking of the towns of Canada. I do not know how the hon. gentleman got the popular vote, because in county after county, according to the latest returns, we have the popular member, and I think the hon. gentleman's statement in that regard is about as correct as his statement as to the population of this country as a whole. However, the hon. gentleman reached a climax at the end. He reached one of the greatest flights to which he ever has soared in any financial statement, when he alleged that the manufacturers had cost Canada eight hundred millions of dollars in the last fourteen years. That is the hon. gentleman in his position as a financial adviser. I hope some kind friend will take the trouble to send that statement to some English financial journal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He did not state that.

Mr. TUPPER. I so understood him; but I have no desire to misrepresent the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not so understand it.

Mr. TUPPER. I hope my ears deceived me, but I was even ready to believe that from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Too ready.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is surely unkind to say that anyone is too ready to believe what the hon. member for South Oxford states. In conclusion, I may say that in every country there are croakers and, no matter what prosperous condition may have been reached, there are these wiseacres talking of debt, and distress, and misery, and burthens, and so on. No country ever grew to a nation without having scores upon scores of such men, but no country ever came to ruin that prevented those mournful advisers from taking their seats on the Treasury benches.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At this late hour of the night, I shall not attempt to detain the House for any length of time, and I am sure the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat will not accuse me for want of courtesy if I do not waste valuable time in replying to much of what he has stated. Some years ago, and down to recent years, we were accustomed in many constituencies in the west to see an old scrap-book brought out on platforms, containing scraps of speeches reported to have been made by individuals during the last quarter of a century. It was known as "Charlie's Scrap-book." In listening to the hon. gentleman, I thought perhaps Charlie's scrap-book had got lost and someone had found it and given it to the hon. gentleman. The present state and condition of the country is certainly worthy of some consideration over and beyond the adoption of a tone of abuse and of vilification as far as possible towards an hon. member on this side of the House. It seems to me, when a financial statement is presented, it is a time, as the Finance Minister would recognize, and one would think anyone would recognize in a deliberative assembly, to consider carefully the condition of the country and to consider any suggestions which may be offered for the bettering of the condition of the country. That is the duty I suppose that devolves upon us here, and what effect it can have to quote extracts which, taken out of their connection, may not mean what the hon. gentleman intends them to mean, bring them into a discussion where they can bear no possible weight, I cannot see, and it can only weaken the position the hon. gentleman takes. The first criticism was that the hon. member for South Oxford had paid no attention to the financial part of the Finance Minister's speech. I think that is not correct. I think my hon. friend did deal with it, he dealt with it in a short way, and he could not help dealing with it in a short way because it was a brief statement of facts the greater part of which all the gentlemen who have studied the Public Accounts were perfectly conversant with. The Finance Minister stated what items had come short in the receipts and what had exceeded on expenditure in the Public Accounts that we have. True the Finance Minister tabulated them in a nice, readable way, but they called for no comment. Over and beyond that he gives us his estimates for the year 1891-92. He estimates that we will receive $36,550,000, and if the expenditure is maintained for the next few months until the end of July, he thinks we will have a surplus of some $5,000. He expects in the year 1892-93 that we will have a stationary revenue—not hinting at any tariff changes at all—of about $36,500,000; and he threw out a note of warning that it would be well to adopt the policy of confining our expenditure to about that amount. Now, without endeavouring to disparage the statement at all I think he dealt exhaustively with all the Finance Minister said in reference to the finances of this country. He noticed this fact, that the Minister expects that without any changes in the tariff, leaving the same machinery in operation, there will be a stagnation in this country so great that he will have no augmented revenue at all: he expects that with the same rate of taxation he will have an income for the year to come of $36,500,000, but no increase at all. I take it that if there was to be an increase, even with the present rate of taxation, it would be due to the increased prosperity of the country. The Minister, however, evidently does not look for that, and thus we will have to confine our ideas so far as expenditure is concerned, to $36,500,000. My hon. friend next had recourse to his scrap-book, and from that he professed to read some statements that had been made by the member for South Oxford some 16 years ago, in which he pointed out that the revenue had somewhat disappointed him. It was quite proper for him to point out, it seems to me, in general keeping with his position of Finance Minister at that time, and as explanatory of it, that the duties were then levied wholly, or almost wholly, upon an *ad valorem* basis, and that the shrinkage in values in this country—not caused by this fact, not caused by any action of the Government—but the tariff being levied upon an *ad valorem* basis, these values had shrunken and the revenue had shrunken somewhat, and the hon. gentleman seems to think that is a matter of reproach to my hon. friend. Well, I cannot see that, nor can I see where injury was done to the country. He boasts that by the machinery and the skill that have been made use of by the Finance Minister in extracting money from the pockets of the people by putting on a specific combined with *ad valorem* duties, they have, during a period of stagnation and dulness of trade, nevertheless been able to wring their extra millions out of the pockets of the people. But what credit is that to a Government? If, under the operation of the tariff of the member for South Oxford two millions less went into the revenue than he anticipated, not knowing that the decline in value would take place, where was that two millions left? It was left in the pockets of the people. The boast of the hon. gentleman comes down to this, that they have succeeded in devising a scheme whereby, let times be hard, let values fall in consequence, they will wring out of the pockets of the people the millions they want to expend, whether the people are able to pay it or not. Sir, suppose a municipal council seeking re-election at the end of the year, come before the people and say: You ought to return us, the old council, because if you look at the matter, and we can prove it to you, we absolutely doubled your taxation during our year of administration. Why, Sir, in what position would the reeve and the council of any municipality be if they went to the people and urged as their claim for support that they had taken double the amount of money out of

their pockets by way of taxation than had been taken by the previous council? That is the argument and the position taken by the hon. gentleman opposite. He says: "We have devised a tariff, we have set in operation machinery by means of which, whether the country is poor or rich, whether values are high or low, whether you are able to pay it or not, you have got to give us the millions that we require to carry on the Government at the extravagant rate of expenditure we have inaugurated and that we intend to maintain." He next found fault with the hon. member for South Oxford because he had not made a plucky speech. It seems to me he was hard to please, for he went on in the next breath to quote some utterances, or alleged utterances, made by my hon. friend, I suppose, on occasions when he considered that my hon. friend spoke pluckily, and containing a number of endearing epithets that he made use of towards his friends opposite. I suppose he was disappointed, because, having prepared all these extracts and expecting that my hon. friend would use these expressions, when he found they were not used, it rather took away his thunder. Then he took the bold position that no one would state that a large number of people had left the country, if I understood him right, for I took the statement down, and this in the presence of the census returns which have been quoted, in presence of the facts known to himself, in presence of the fact that when they bring down the Redistribution Bill, they will be forced to reduce the number of representatives in his own province, because of the loss of population in that province. Why, Sir, when you have examined statements such as that, you are not prepared to attach as much importance as the Parliament of Canada would like to be able to attach to the utterance of one that is entrusted with a portfolio in its administration. He gave us several stories, we had heard them before. If I might say to him—I do not know how his stories took upon the platform, I do not know whether they conduced to his fame as an orator—but if he would permit me, somewhat his senior in public life, to say it, I would tell him that I do not think they will conduce to his standing or reputation as a member of the House of Commons. He was bold enough to say that my hon. friend did not understand the sugar question, that when he was in the office of Finance Minister he arranged the sugar question in such a way that it was not in the interest of the country. Sir, he arranged the sugar duties in such a way, at any rate, that the greater portion of the tax went into the treasury of the country. I think if the hon. gentleman himself and the hon. Minister of Finance wholly understood the sugar question they would see that there is a source of revenue lying open to them right on that very question, without destroying their National Policy, if they will maintain it, and what is that? Well, I will tell them, and I charge them nothing for the information. The hon. gentleman evidently had tried to get some tariff hints from Mr. Blaine when in Washington. I will tell him that, assuming to-day that the importation of sugar, in round numbers, is about two hundred million pounds, if he puts $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent per pound duty on raw sugar under No. 14 Dutch standard he will get a revenue of $600,000 that will go into the public treasury from that source. I will tell him further than when he has done that, he has left the refiners of sugar in this country precisely the same amount of protection that the refiner has in that country that he says is protected to death. I think the hon. member for South Oxford would understand that much about the sugar question, and evidently the hon. gentlemen opposite do not understand even that simple proposition, or a worse supposition must be mine, that knowing it, they deliberately neglect the interest of Canada in that respect. Then we have an allusion to the coal duty, and he seemed somewhat nonplussed because the hon. member for South Oxford had not said something about coal, but not having mentioned he was fain to take hold of it boldly himself, because he had probably a lot of figures, he had probably got a lot of statistics in order to prove that when the duty was upon anthracite coal it was not the Canadian that paid the duty, but it was the American producer of the coal; and that if it was reimposed it would not come out of the pockets of our people at all, and that was one of the fallacies entertained, according to him, by the member for South Oxford. When the leader of the Opposition asked why the leader of the Government did not reimpose it, the hon. gentleman said we did not need the money just now. That would be very kind and considerate if those to be benefited under it were to be our people, but when the people of the United States were to receive the benefit according to him, they paying the duty on it, we rather think he would consider the Government failed in their duty by not reimposing it. I do not propose to read extracts, but I have in my mind a speech delivered by an hon. gentleman who occupied a seat in this House, who was at one time Minister of Finance, and who is now our High Commissioner in London, in which, when introducing his iron duties, placing excessive burdens upon that article which is in such common use among the people, burdens that were grievous to be borne, said, by way of comfort, that he at one fell swoop swept away half a million of taxation that was upon us by taking off the duty on coal. But he may not have been, as was alleged against the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) a financier, he may not have understood these matters and have been entirely mistaken. It was, at all events, the opinion he held at that time, if I am not mistaken, and if I am in error I shall be glad to acknowledge it, as can be easily found by looking up the Budget speech delivered when the iron duties were imposed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not an hereditary opinion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, it has not descended. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries addressed some other remarks to the House that I did not take note of, because I did not think they came into the consideration of this question, for they have been spoken of so long and so often: I refer particularly to the grouping of certain portions of the neighbouring Republic in order to show that their population had not increased as it should have done. I do not attach importance to this line of argument in questions of this kind. It may be very well when there is time to discuss such issues and one may be able to score a point in that way. But the whole question must be looked at, a broad view of the whole question

must be taken when you are devising means whereby the trade of a country may not only be maintained but enhanced. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite when they take that narrow view, how is it possible for them to conceive that the policy of isolation and high taxation which they have inaugurated and have endeavoured to maintain can be a policy in the best interests of the people. If it is true that interprovincial trade has benefited the Dominion, of course we arrive at the result that if we can secure free trade with 65,000,000 instead of half a million, vast benefits must be secured to our people. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare that Canada is prospering; they read extracts from Mr. Mowat and other gentlemen. Who says that Canada has not increased? The fact stares us in the face that the census shows we have only half a million more population than we had ten years ago. That is better than if we had half a million less. Here is proof that we have not absolutely gone backwards. What we, on this side of the House, hold is that a country like Canada, with its resources and people and nationality, should have increased in population, not half a million, but a million and a half. The question should be, not that the people of Canada should be able to get bread and butter for a few years, that the mortgages should not eat them entirely out of house and home, and that we should be able to keep as many people here during the next ten years as there are now. What a low estimate this is to take of this country with its population and resources. In considering this question, we must consider it in the light of what progress ought to have been made as compared with the progress which has been made. What is there that debars the progress of Canada? Has it not stores of wealth in the fisheries? They are an inexhaustible mine of wealth. Are there not mineral resources locked up in the earth? It is known that Canada is rich in mineral deposits. Is it because we have not agricultural lands? Look at the provinces, not only those by the sea and Quebec and Ontario, but glance at the millions of acres of fertile land in Manitoba and the North-West awaiting settlement. Look at the wealth of the country locked up in the Rocky Mountains and Selkirks. Look at the wealth in the fisheries of the Pacific, away in the far west. What is the matter with the country? Nothing is the matter with Canada. There is no better country under the sun than Canada. If we have a rugged climate in portions of it, it tends to produce the best and hardiest class of men in muscle and brain. The fault is not in the country. Yet the fact stares us in the face that, taking the figures of hon. gentlemen opposite, we are short of a population which ought to be in this country of over 1,000,000 people at the lowest calculation. Why are they not here? I will not weary the House by going into figures at length, but I point out that we had a population of 4,324,811 ten years ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite will certainly not dispute that proposition.

Mr. McNEILL. I thought you denied it on your side of the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not deny it. I hope the hon. member as a loyal supporter of the Government which took these figures will not deny it. I think the hon. gentleman will not deny that the lowest natural increase in those ten years should be one-fifth added to the population. With the natural increase alone it is apparent that 386,000 people were lost to this country. But that is not all. If we are to take the figures of hon. gentlemen as given by themselves, we find there have been immigrant settlers, said to have come into this country, and to have settled in this country during the ten years from 1881 to 1890, to the number of 886,177. Putting the two together you have a right to expect, if the figures of gentlemen opposite are true, that when these people came to Canada and expressed their desire to settle in Canada with its vast resources, and climate right; if there had not been something wrong in its Government, and in its law, you have a right to assume that they would remain in this country which is equal to any other on the face of the globe. You have a right to assume that if everything was right at home the flower of our population, our youth, instead of going to other countries would settle down in their own, where there are great possibilities for them, and a field for all the energy that they possess. Sir, if our own people had remained, and if the emigrants they professed to have brought here had remained, there would have been an increase of 1,751,139 souls; but the figures show that there is a bare increase of 500,000, or 1,200,000 souls less than came to this country, and than were in this country, if we take the figures of hon. gentlemen opposite, and who have left this country which is rich so far as its natural advantages and its material well-being are concerned. It is for hon. gentlemen opposite to say why they have left this country. An excuse was offered by the hon. gentleman who last spoke; he did not venture to say it himself but he professed to read, that the figures of 1881 were doubted as being absolutely accurate by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not venture to say himself that the figures were not correct himself. Why did he read what another man said? Why was he not manly enough to say that the figures of 1881 were wrong?

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say a word?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman misunderstood my argument in that connection; I did not state my own opinion, nor was it necessary to do so. I was simply then endeavouring to show the House the animus that influenced the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in dilating upon the present terrible condition of the country, as he said; and to show that he was not dealing fair, as I thought, with the subject. I mentioned a fact that he had carefully concealed, and certainly did not bring to the attention of the House. That was, that while he now assumed in his calculation that the census of 1881 was absolutely correct, he almost called it a deliberate fraud in 1891, as having exaggerated the number of people there were in Canada. It was not necessary for me, for my purpose, to say that the census of 1881 was correct or incorrect.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But it would be very pleasing to me now in my argument if the hon. gentleman would give us his own opinion?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows what his leader says.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But I would like to know what the would-be leader of some other hon. gentlemen had to say.

Mr. TUPPER. It is quite clear you are not satisfied with the authority of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Not at all, but I think there is the weakness in the hon. gentleman's argument, that he puts it on to the hon. member for South Oxford. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might say that the figures as taken by the Government now, represent more people than there are at present in the country. They are taken on precisely the same basis as the last census, taken on the *de jure* and not the *de facto* system. But let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this fact. Go back to the figures of the census of 1871, twenty years ago, and you will find that there were 3,686,583 souls in Canada then. Surely there would be a simple two per cent per annum of natural increase added in a population like Canada, and that would have given you an increase of 1,474,637 souls, whereas your entire increase is but 1,136,751 or 337,886 souls short of what you ought to have with a natural increase, to say nothing of the 886,000 that you claim to have brought into the country by immigration during these ten years. I think I heard the Minister of Justice say that this exodus was during the Mackenzie Administration. Let him not lay that flattering unction to his soul, let him look up the figures of the exodus at that date and compare them with the exodus proved by the figures of the Government to have taken place during their reign, and I think he will never, in the future, say anything about the exodus under any previous Administration. I ask in all seriousness, if instead of these charges which we have heard, these old utterances of sixteen and twenty years ago that have been given on the election platform, time after time, I ask if it would not have been suitable at this time that the hon. gentleman had recognized the fact that during the past ten years it is a sad disappointment to the people of this country, that they are not able to find 1,200,000 souls, which, if the Government count is to be taken as correct, are not to be found within our own borders. We had a right to expect that the Minister of Finance in dealing with the problem of the welfare of this country, its financial position and its material prosperity, should have made some allusion to that, that he should have endeavoured to ascertain what was the cause, to have pointed it out to the House and to have devised some remedy and made some proposition by which this drainage of our population might have ceased. Sir, we listened in vain for it from the Finance Minister. He was followed by his lieutenant, but we listened in vain for it from him also. What did we hear from the Minister of Finance? We heard him relating that he had been on a mission to Washington to endeavour to effect a reciprocity treaty with the United States, either for the good of Canada, or for the ill of Canada. We will suppose as honest men that when he went there and made the proposition that he believed it would be in the interests of Canada to have freer trade relations with that nation to the south of us. As honest men we are bound to suppose that that was the case. Then, I ask, how is it that when he came back and stood in his place in this House, and told us as he did—his face exultant as he told us—that there was no possible hope of that which would be a benefit to this country being accomplished, his followers behind him cheered to the echo. I say that such a spectacle never was witnessed in the Canadian Parliament as a Minister going to Washington, declaring that he was going there to effect a reciprocity treaty and to bring about freer trade relations with the people to the south, which would be to our benefit, and on his return, exultant as he declared, that he not only could not get it, but that nobody else could get it, and the wild cheers of more than one-half of the members of Parliament sitting behind him responding to that. Sir, it seems to me it was not creditable to these gentlemen that they should have taken that position. If, on the other hand, I was to suppose that it was possible for sworn advisers of Her Majesty to enact a farce, to play a deceit, to go to Washington to pretend to go there with a desire to procure something, while their aim and object was to prevent it, I can understand why they should smile and why they should be applauded by their supporters. Sir, the hon. gentleman has on more than one occasion—he did it to-day, though not in as plain words as usual—taken the ground that reciprocity would be of very little value to us. He has taken the ground that that country is not a natural market for the products of Canada. He has repeated that statement from the platform. He has belittled the benefits that could be derived from free intercourse with the people to the south, and he and his party have joined together in denouncing a reciprocity treaty even in agricultural products as a bad thing for the farmers of Canada. That position was taken by him in Toronto, where he asserted that the United States was not our natural market, but that our natural market was in England, and repeated by their organ, which, on the day just preceding one of the bye-elections, came out with the reasons why the Reform candidate should not be supported, one of them being: "Vote against So-and-so and the flooding of the Canadian market with cheap American products." Now, Sir, that being the view of these hon. gentlemen, I ask what position were they in to go to Washington on behalf of Canada, honestly, sincerely and earnestly endeavouring to bring about a treaty that would be ruinous and disastrous to the agricultural interests of Canada? Sir, one or other of these positions is occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite. Neither position is very honourable; I hesitate to make the choice for them, and will allow them to do that for themselves. Sir, I believe that freer trade relations with the people to the south of us would be beneficial to the people of this country. I desire to see these relations brought about, if possible. I do not believe in paying the price that hon. gentlemen opposite have declared we would have to pay in order to get reciprocity; but, notwithstanding the statement of the Finance Minister, I am scarcely prepared to believe yet that some one else might not perhaps be able to give more hope that such a thing would be accomplished, than the Government were able to give this afternoon. We have to take the word of the hon. Minister of Finance for it. I can only imperfectly remember what he said. I would know it better if I had it before me—if we had it before us, as I

think we should, some "memo." of what did transpire. The seal of secrecy was not on the hon. gentleman, or else he violated it in his verbal statement. The seal of secrecy was not there, and there should have been on the Table of the House some written communication which would enable the House to know just what did transpire in reference to this matter. But following as well as I could follow words spoken fluently and pleasantly, but hurriedly necessarily, as words will drop from a speaker's lips, I was unable to see, from what he did say, that there was anything like an earnest, honest attempt to sit down and discuss the possibilities of securing reciprocity. Why, Sir, from the statement of the hon. gentleman himself, it seemed to me that he was suggesting to Mr. Blaine all the difficulties he possibly could suggest. He seemed to say to him: "Why, my dear Mr. Blaine, you know I have got to raise a revenue; how do you think I shall raise my revenue?" And I can imagine Mr. Blaine looking at him quietly, thinking no doubt in his own mind: "Well, my dear friend, I should have thought you ought to have known what you were going to do about your revenue before you came to talk to me." But Mr. Blaine seems to have been taken by surprise, and to have said to the Finance Minister: "Have you no other way to raise a revenue besides putting duties on goods that come from the United States?" And that subject seems to have been dropped. Then, they talked about excise duty, and the hon. Minister seems to have said to Mr. Blaine: "There is trouble there; if you have excise duties, our excise duties will have to be the same as yours;" and that subject seems to have terminated there. Then he said to Mr. Blaine, : "If we take down the barriers and make a reciprocity treaty with you, will you let us take down the barriers against all other countries in the world?" And Mr. Blaine said he seemed to think that lacked one of the principal elements of reciprocity. It seems to me that when the Finance Minister made that suggestion, this difficulty would occur to him, that he would be still shorter of revenue when he took down the barriers against all countries. Sir, I cannot understand that manner of negotiating. I cannot understand men having a love for their country, and professing their belief, that freer trade relations would be advantageous, going to Washington, apparently not seeking to obviate difficulties in the way, but presenting difficulties, and then hurrying back to deliver the message which the hon. gentleman delivered to-day, with exultant voice and amid the cheering of his supporters behind him. And these hon. gentlemen tell us that we are dumbfounded by his statement. What is there to cause consternation in the Liberal ranks by such an announcement made by the hon. Minister of Finance, under the circumstances, detailed by himself? I have failed to be struck with the force of it in such a way as to be unable to gather my thoughts together and express my views in reference to this subject. But if hon. gentlemen opposite had made up their minds—and certainly they have made up their minds that as far as they are concerned no further attempt will be made to secure free trade relations with the people to the south of us—we were entitled, I think, in the presence of the fact that we are losing our population at the rate we are, in view of the fact that this is not the fault of the country, but is due to some other reasons, to expect that a gentleman occupying the position of Minister of Finance would have been prepared to point out some other direction in which in his opinion it would serve the interests of Canada to move. But, Sir, we have listened in vain. He proposes nothing, except that his excessive taxation is to remain upon the people of this country; the exodus is to go on; the burden of the national debt increased by a hundred million by these gentlemen during these very ten years, is to continue. He proposes no relief, no extended trade in any direction. He coolly tells the farmers of Quebec and of Maritime Provinces: "Cease to grow your hay, which is your profitable crop; raise thorough-bred horses for the English market, and breed fine cattle." That is the way in which he talks to men whose capital is all invested at the present time in their farms, the relief is to come not through any effort of the Government. They are to remain in office worse than flies upon a wheel, and the farmers of Canada are to get relief by working out their own salvation, by growing as much as they can upon their farms and sending it to whatever market will choose to take and pay for it. Sir, they tell us that we have the English market, and they rejoice in the fact that we are not tied to the American market, and they exclaim the American market is not our natural market, but the English market is. But we had the English market long ago, and we have it still on the same terms as the American and other nations have, save in the scheduling of cattle. And if we had freer trade relations with the people to the south of us, secured on fair and honourable terms, we would have the English market then just as free and open as at present. The hon. gentleman rejoiced at being able to point to the fact that our exports to Great Britain had increased and those to the United States decreased. I am sorry to think that a gentleman occupying the position of Finance Minister should state calmly a proposition of that kind, should compare the free, open English market with the American market barred by a duty of 25 to 75 per cent; and should claim that because, forsooth, more of our products are going to the English free market on account of the barriers being raised higher and higher against us in the American market, the former is our natural market and the latter is not. Sir, I by no means undervalue the English market. On the contrary I say cultivate it in all legitimate ways we can, but if you want to make a fair comparison, you should consider what the Canadian farmers would be able to do in the American market were it as free as the English market is now, and then determine. Take, for an illustration, the egg. I suppose if the United States were to impose a prohibitory duty upon eggs, more of our eggs would go to England than ever and less to the United States, and the hon. gentleman could then point to England, with equal logic, as our natural market for eggs. But would that demonstrate that if the duty were wiped out and the American market made free, our trade would not go there? Our trade returns tell us it would. But the extension of our trade has been crippled by the imposition of higher and higher duties, which prevent commerce between the two countries. What we say is that if our neighbours will remove these barriers and make their market free, we will still have the

English market as we have it now, and the law of supply and demand would determine to what extent we could use it. The competition would bring higher prices. Would that hurt the country? I do not propose to detain the House at greater length. I have spoken longer than I intended, but I endeavoured to pay the hon. gentleman who preceded me the courtesy of noticing all he said, and I think I have alluded to all his principal statements. I have endeavoured to point out that in my judgment the Ministers have failed to show any way by which Canadian trade may be improved. They have not suggested any remedy, but have simply given a statement of how our finances stand. They have spent a great portion of their time in endeavouring to confute statements made by the hon. member for South Oxford in his letter, but have not endeavoured to answer his arguments, simply contenting themselves with a general denunciation of those opposed to them. Then they wound up with the consoling thought that the Opposition was vanquished, that the Opposition had lost their courage and were no longer able to maintain their position. Those are things that seem to give joy and delight to hon. gentlemen opposite. I have not noticed those things: I have not felt them myself. In any position I have taken with reference to this matter, I have endeavoured honestly to carry out my convictions. I believe to-day that if you could secure freer trade relations with the people of the south on fair and honourable terms, which the leader of the Opposition has told you are the only terms on which they will ever be accepted by him, it would be a boon to this country. I believe there is a vast majority of the people of Ontario, and all other parts of this Dominion who would rather have heard the Finance Minister say that he thought there was an opportunity in the future of securing freer trade relations with the Americans, than to hear him with exultant voice declare that we need look for no relief in that direction but should be tied up in the future as we have been in the past. There are people who expected that the Minister would give some hope of being prepared to lift the burdens from the people, and I venture to say that on reading his speech they will rise with the feeling of utter disappointment. They will feel convinced that the best interests of the country are not being served by maintaining in power the present Administration, who seem to have given palpable evidence that they do not believe that which the majority of the people believe to be in their interest; and when the time comes—I make no prophecy—and the people will again be able to pronounce as to whether they approve of the methods of the Government or do not, I have every confidence in the result. In the meantime, what we believe to be right on this side, we will endeavour to advocate by argument and not by abuse, and when the time comes for a final contest again before the people, then, in spite of all the unfair methods which have been made use of by this Government, in spite of their saying practically who shall be the electorate in each division, then printing the lists in their own Printing Bureau, where by accident or otherwise, so many mistakes occur, in spite of their appointing their own returning officers, and controlling all the machinery of elections, as it is not controlled by any other political party in any country, we will be able to go to the people and ask for their verdict on the administration of affairs during the past thirteen years by this Government which has shown no capacity save in the increase of taxation, confident that the time must come when no artifices or deceit can prevent the people from giving full expression to their convictions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. BAKER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 23rd March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT—ANNUNCIATION DAY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That when the House adjourns on Thursday, the 24th, it do stand adjourned until Monday, at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Motion agreed to.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION—WELLAND.

Mr. TISDALE. I have a motion of privilege of an urgent character which I wish to bring before the House, relating to a seat in this House and affecting the electors of an electoral division—I refer to the Electoral District of the County of Welland. With the permission of the House, before entering into the question, I will call attention to such parts of our Dominion Controverted Election Act as, in my judgment, relate to the matters I propose to bring before the House by this motion. According to the 43rd section of the Act, dealing with the judge's report:

"At the conclusion of the trial the judge shall determine whether the member whose election or return is complained of, or any and what other person was duly returned or elected, or whether the election was void, and other matters arising out of the petition and requiring his determination—and shall, except only in the case of appeal hereinafter mentioned, within four days after the expiration of eight days from the day on which he shall so have given his decision, certify such determination in writing to the Speaker, appending thereto a copy of the notes of the evidence; and the determination thus certified shall be final to all intents and purposes."

Section 44 provides that in addition to that certificate, the judge shall certify whether any corrupt practice has prevailed, giving the names of the persons who have been proved guilty of corrupt practices, whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed, and whether he is of the opinion that the enquiry into the circumstance of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition. Section 45 provides that:

"The judge may at the same time make a special report to the Speaker as to any matters arising in the course of the trial an account of which ought, in his judgment, to be submitted to the House of Commons."

Section 46 enacts that:

"The Speaker shall, at the earliest practicable moment after he receives the certificate and report or reports, if any, of the court or judge, give the necessary directions

and adopt all the proceedings necessary for confirming or altering the return, or, except as hereinafter mentioned, for the issuing of a writ for a new election, for which purpose the Speaker may address his warrant, under his hand and seal, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery or for otherwise carrying the determination into execution, as circumstances require."

Section 47 provides that the judge may make a special report to the Speaker. Section 48 enacts that:

"When the judge, in his report on the trial of an election petition under this Act, states that corrupt practices have, or that there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the election to which the petition relates, or that he is of opinion that the enquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition, and that further enquiry as to whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed is desirable, no new writ shall issue for a new election in such case except by order of the House of Commons."

Then, as to appeals, section 50 provides:

"An appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court of Canada under this Act by any party to an election petition, who is dissatisfied with the decision of the court or a judge:

"From the judgment or decision on any question of law or of fact by the judge who has tried such petition."

Section 51, sub-section 3, provides:

"The party so appealing shall, within three days after the said appeal has been so set down as aforesaid, or within such further time as the court or judge by whom such decision appealed from was given or by whom the petition was tried allows, give to the other parties to the said petition affected by such appeal, or the respective attorneys, solicitors or agents by whom such parties were presented on the hearing of such preliminary objections or at the trial of the petition, as the case may be, notice in writing of such appeal having been so set down for hearing as aforesaid, and may in such notice, if he so desires, limit the subject of the said appeal to any special and defined question or questions."

Those provisions, so far as I have been able to understand the Act, contained the law which would be applicable to the case to which I propose to call the attention of the House. Now, the facts as shown by the records placed upon the Table of the House yesterday are that an election petition was filed against the return of the member for the County of Welland. The petition was the ordinary petition and contained two divisions. One asked that the election be avoided by corrupt practices by agents, and the other charged personal corruption against the member. The trial came on before Mr. Justice Rose and Mr. Justice MacMahon on the 10th December, 1891. The court as usual took up first the part of the case relating to corrupt practices by agents. On the second day, three charges were brought to a conclusion; the judges retired, and upon their return said that upon one of these charges they avoided the election for corrupt practices by an agent. Immediately Mr. Cassels, who represented the respondent, arose in court and said:

"Mr. Cassels.—I may say that I discussed the matter with Mr. German while your Lordship had retired, and we are perfectly satisfied with the correctness of your judgment, and there is no intention to appeal.

"Mr. Blackstock.—There is no reason to deal with any further agency charges, and I will confine myself now to personal charges."

Mr. Justice Rose remarked:

"With reference to the two charges that are before us, judgment is not asked in respect of those?

"Mr. Blackstock.—No. In view of the announcement of my learned friend, I do not ask for judgment on that."

And thereafter, no further evidence was offered on that branch of the case, but the investigation went on in regard to the personal charges, which culminated in a judgment declaring the respondent guilty of personal corruption. On the 29th December, the court delivered judgment, and the record discloses that they sent the report to the Speaker of the House, and also to the Registrar of the Supreme Court, which report I will read:

"*To the Honourable*
"*The Speaker of the House of Commons*
"*of the Dominion of Canada:*

"We, the Honourable John Edward Rose and the Honourable Hugh MacMahon, two of the Justices of the Common Pleas Division of the High Court of Justice, do hereby certify that we held a court at the town of Welland, on the tenth, eleventh and twelfth days of December, 1891, for the trial of the petition between the above parties respecting the above election, at which the said William Manly German had been returned as duly elected, upon hearing the evidence adduced and what was alleged and admitted by counsel for the parties respectively, we found and determined:

"1. That the said William Manly German was not duly elected or returned, and that the said election was void by reason of corrupt practices, that is to say bribery, which has been committed by an agent of the said William Manly German, and also the said William Manly German.

"2. That a corrupt practice has been proved to have been committed by John F. Gross, financial agent of the respondent, to wit, paying for horses and carriage to convey voters to and from the polls, but it was not proved that such corrupt practice was committed by or with the knowledge or consent of the respondent, and a further corrupt practice, to wit, bribery, was proved to have been committed by the respondent, but no corrupt practice was proved to have been committed by John Ferguson the candidate other than the said respondent at the said election.

"3. That the following persons were proved at the trial of the said petition to have been guilty of corrupt practices, that is to say, the said John F. Gross and the said respondent.

"4. That owing to the fact that judgment was asked for on only two of the charges other than the personal charges, we have no evidence before us to enable us to say whether or not corrupt practices extensively prevailed at the election to which the said petition relates.

"5. For the reason set out in the preceding paragraph we have no evidence before us to say whether or not an enquiry as to whether corrupt practices extensively prevailed at the said election is desirable, but having regard to the practice governing the enquiry into corrupt practices in election trials we cannot say that the enquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the actions of any of the parties to the petition.

"6. We herewith append and forward a copy of the notes of evidence taken at the said trial.

"Dated this twenty-ninth day of December, A.D. 1891.

(Sgd.) "JOHN E. ROSE, *J.*
"H. MACMAHON, *J.*"

Appended to the report to the Speaker was a letter explaining that the report was sent to him as well as to the registrar of the Supreme Court on account of some uncertainty which arose in regard to section 14 of the Act amending the Controverted Elections Act, and of that letter I propose to read the last clause:

"I beg to advise you that an appeal has been lodged in both of these cases. In the Welland case the judges wish me to inform you that, at the close of the judgment unseating the respondent for a corrupt act of his agent, the respondent through his counsel expressed to the court his entire satisfaction with the judgment and his intention of not appealing therefrom. We mention this as we have not been apprised of the fact whether the appeal is generally on the whole case, or merely on the ground of disqualification of the respondent."

That is signed by the registrar. The next proceeding in the case is the notice of appeal, which I will also read:

"Take notice that the above-named William Manly German has appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada from the judgment and decision of the Honourable Mr. Justice Rose and the Honourable Mr. Justice MacMahon, the judges by whom the matter of the election petition above described was tried, and which judgment and decision was pronounced by the said learned judges on Saturday, the 19th day of December last.

"And further take notice that the record of the case upon such appeal has been transmitted to the Registrar of the said Supreme Court and set down for hearing by the said court, pursuant to the statute, at the sitting of the said court to be holden at Ottawa on Tuesday, the 16th day of February, 1892.

"And further take notice that the above named William Manly German, the party so appealing, hereby, pursuant to the statute in that behalf, limits the subject of the said appeal to so much of the judgment aforesaid as grants that portion of the prayer of the petition which relates to the personal charges against the present appellant, and finds and declares the present appellant (the respondent in the court below) guilty of personal corrupt practice at the said election, and the present appellant will, upon the hearing of the said appeal, contend that the said judgment, so far as it declares the present appellant guilty of any corrupt practice personally, should be reversed and set aside."

The factums and the case presented to the Supreme Court also relate entirely to the personal charges and to nothing more. It would seem then from the records that, applying to the law to which I briefly referred, there is no question that the Speaker had no authority, under the circumstances, to issue a writ or take any action in connection with the vacancy that the records show was created. It would also appear beyond peradventure that by the proceedings in the court the seat is avoided, not only by the deliberate action and judgment of the court but by the assent of the respondent; and not only did he assent to avoidance of the seat, but he undertook through his counsel in court that he would not appeal against the decision, and in consideration of that statement the counsel for the petitioner brought no further evidence forward upon that branch of the enquiry, nor did the judges give judgment on the other two cases which were held to have been proven. Following up that, the appeal, which, according to one of the clauses of the statute that I read, can be limited, was expressly limited to the corrupt practice. From these facts which are now before the House, although technically they were not before it until these papers were brought down, it is perfectly clear that that seat is vacant and is unrepresented, and has been since December last. We find further that notwithstanding that judgment, voiding the election and declaring that Mr. German was never elected, notwithstanding that he concurred in it, notwithstanding the fact that the appeal on his behalf was limited entirely to the corrupt practice, we find that a few days ago that gentleman took his seat in this House. I, therefore, move:

That at an election for a member of the House of Commons for the Electoral District of the County of Welland, held on the 26th day of February and the 5th day of March, 1891, William Manly German, of the town of Welland, in the County of Welland, Barrister-at-law, was returned as duly elected:

That one Jesse Calhoun Rothery, an elector of the said electoral district, under the provisions of the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, duly filed a petition praying in effect, that the election of the said William Manly German should be declared void, and that he himself should be disqualified by reason of corrupt practices committed in connection with the said election, both by the said William Manly German, personally, and by agents on his behalf:

That the said election petition was tried on the 10th, 11th and 12th days of December, 1891, before the Honourable John Edward Rose and the Honourable Hugh MacMahon, two of the Justices of the Common Pleas Division of the High Court of Justice for the Province of Ontario, at the conclusion of which trial the said learned justices found and adjudged that the said William Manly German had not been duly elected or returned, and that the said election was void by reason of a corrupt practice committed both by the agent of the said William Manly German and by the said William Manly German himself, and the learned judges certified the same accordingly:

That, during the trial of the said petition, and upon the decision of the said learned justices, finding that the said election was void by reason of a corrupt practice committed by an agent of the said William Manly German, Counsel on behalf of the said William Manly German undertook and agreed that there should be no appeal from such decision, in consequence of which agreement, other charges of corrupt practices, alleged to have been committed by agents of the said William Manly German, were abandoned:

That, in proceedings by way of appeal from the said judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, asserted by the said William Manly German, the said William Manly German limited the subject of appeal to so much of the judgment of the said learned justices as granted that portion of the prayer of the petition which related to personal charges against him, and found and declared him guilty of a personal corrupt practice:

That there has been and is now no appeal pending from that portion of the said judgment which declared that the election was void, and the said Electoral District of the County of Welland is, therefore, now unrepresented in Parliament (all of which facts appear from the papers and proceedings laid upon the Table of the House, pursuant to a resolution of this House passed on the 17th day of March, instant):

That, in view of the foregoing facts, the House declares that the said seat is vacant; and it is hereby ordered, that the Speaker do address his warrant under his hand and seal to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, authorizing the issue of a writ for a new election for the said Electoral District of the County of Welland.

Mr. LAURIER. I should like to ask the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) if the hon. member for Welland has had notice of this motion?

Mr. TISDALE. He has had no further notice, to my knowledge, than the proceedings in the House. I moved for the papers on the 12th, and they were laid on the Table of the House yesterday. Beyond that I have given no other notice of any kind to anybody.

Mr. LAURIER. This motion assumes that the seat for Welland is vacant. I am sure that, so far as I am concerned, it is a question on which I am not prepared at present to offer any opinion. The hon. member for South Norfolk has had the advantage of looking over the record, and he has come to a certain conclusion, while we, who have not had the same privilege, cannot be expected to offer any opinion. The only observation I intend to make at the present moment is, that at all events the hon. gentleman who claims to represent the County of Welland should have notice and have an opportunity to be heard before further proceedings are taken. This is the course usually followed in such cases.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have always asked, when such motions were made as a matter of privilege, that they should stand over at least 24 hours in order that members of the House, as well as the member particularly concerned, should understand the bearing of the motion. I presume my hon. friend will have no objection to that course being taken.

Mr. TISDALE. None whatever.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. My hon. friend will notify the House now that he will go on with it to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. Apart from that, I assume that, as a matter of justice, the member whose seat is impugned should have notice of this proceeding, and have an opportunity to be heard. There may be two sides to this question. The hon. gentleman has come to the certain conclusion

from the facts, but another conclusion may be reached. It is the invariable rule on such occasions to give this notice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The better course would be to let the motion stand until to-morrow. The leader of the Opposition can intimate to-morrow what is his view as to further extension—as to how long he desires. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Report of the Minister of Justice as to Penitentiaries in Canada--(Sir John Thompson.)

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. STEVENSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Government if they will cause the report of the Commission on the Trent Valley Canal to be laid on the Table and printed.

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand there is a deputation coming here to-morrow or the following day on this subject, I will see that the report is laid on the Table immediately.

DOMINION ILLUSTRATED.

Mr. SOMERVILLE asked whether the Government purchased, during the current fiscal year, copies of the *Dominion Illustrated* recently published in Montreal? If so, what number of copies were purchased, for what purpose were they purchased, from whom were they purchased, and what sum was, or is to be paid, for them?

Mr. CARLING. Two thousand bound volumes of the *Canada Illustrated*, each volume containing 424 illustrated pages, with a specially printed introduction, descriptive of Canada, were purchased from the Sabiston Lithographing and Publishing Company, of Montreal, at the price of $1 per volume, for immigration purposes, and distributing in news rooms, institutes and other public places in the United Kingdom.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM REPORTS.

Mr. DEVLIN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to have the French reports of the Experimental Farm for the present year ready for distribution at as early a date as the English reports? What was the number of French reports ordered and issued; also the number of English reports? When were the English reports of the past year ready for issue; also, when were the French reports for the same year published and issued?

Mr. CARLING. The practice has been to translate the English edition into French so soon as it has been put into type and corrected. Fifteen thousand English and 3,000 French were ordered. The proportion being based on the actual number demanded in the two languages to supply the copies to those who had applied for it. The larger edition of 250,000 copies ordered by the House has been printed in the two languages in the proportions ordered by the House. The date of first issue of English reports was 14th April, and of the French reports, 26th November. This difference in date of issue was owing to the protracted session of the House and the pressure of other work on the translators.

BREAKWATER AT SANDFORD, N.S.

Mr. FLINT asked, Whether the Government has taken steps to secure an investigation as to the condition of the breakwater at Sandford, in the County of Yarmouth, N.S.? If so, has any report as to the state of said breakwater been received by the Government?

Mr. OUIMET. An examination was made, and a report from the engineer received in 1890. Another examination was subsequently made, and we are expecting to receive the report very shortly.

RAILWAY BRIDGE AT BEAR RIVER.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to fulfil the promise made by the hon. acting Minister of Railways and Canals on 2nd July, 1891, that if piers were necessary to facilitate the passage of vessels through the draw of the railway bridge at Bear River, that the same would be built? Have the Government asked for a report from their engineer on the subject?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a question we must decline to answer. It assumes certain facts. It assumes that a promise was made by a Minister to build a public work, and we dispute that such was the case.

RAQUETTE PIER, DIGBY.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Whether the Government intend to extend the time for the completion of the Raquette Pier, Digby, or will the bonds of the contractor be forfeited for non-fulfilment of contract? Is the overseer, Mr. John Welch, still receiving two dollars and fifty cents per day from the Government? If so, what duties does he perform?

Mr. OUIMET. The time for the completion of the pier at Raquette, Digby, does not expire until 18th May next. Mr. Welch was paid up to 4th November, 1891, as inspector. Since that date he was employed ten days in January, 1892, in examining timber, for which he has been paid. Nothing has been paid Mr. Welch since.

HATCHERIES IN ST. MARY'S BAY.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place hatcheries in St. Mary's Bay, Digby County, at an early period, so that the waters of that bay and of the Bay of Fundy may be restocked?

Mr. TUPPER. It is not the intention of the Government.

CHURCH POINT WHARF.

Mr. BOWERS asked, The amount of money expended in repairing the wharf at Church Point, Digby County, in 1891 and 1892. Has the engineer made any report as to the necessity of any additional work required at said place? Has the Government received any complaints on account of

gravel washing around said wharf and closing the channel? If so, will a small sum be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to remedy the same?

Mr. OUIMET. The sum expended in 1890-91 was $100.81; 1891-92, up to 29th February last, $453.29. The engineer has not reported that any additional work is required. The attention of the department has been called to the fact that gravel was working around the wharf, and the foreman has been instructed by the resident engineer to remove it. The question is under consideration as to whether any amount will be placed in the Supplementary Estimates.

WESTPORT HARBOUR—CAN BUOYS.

Mr. BOWERS asked, The number of can buoys in or near the harbour of Westport, Digby? The amount paid for painting, keeping in position and replacing, per year? The time such contract expires? Is it the intention of the Government, at expiration of contract, to again call for tenders for a similar object?

Mr. TUPPER. There are three can buoys, and $135 a year is paid for painting, keeping them in position and replacing them. The contract expires on the 1st of April, 1894. The time for a decision as to the renewing of the contract or calling for tenders has not yet arrived.

I. C. R.—PASSENGER CARS.

Mr. BORDEN (for Mr. FRASER) asked, 1. What amount is paid per day to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for each passenger car running between St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S. and how many cars have been paid for during the past year? 2. Are such passenger cars hired because the Intercolonial Railway have not sufficient cars to run between said points? 2. Have the Government given their consent to a large number of the station masters on the Intercolonial to act as agents for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? If so, are such agents paid for their services by the said company?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. For each passenger sleeping car, $4.95 each way; for each passenger first-class car, $4.95 each way; for each passenger second class car, $3.30 each way. Number of passenger cars paid for year ended the 29th February, 1892: Sleepers 325, first-class 320, second-class 363 each way. 2. No; they are allowed to run through between Montreal and Halifax so as to save passengers trouble of changing cars at St. John. 3. The station masters along the line of the Intercolonial Railway east of St. John are required to be neutral between the Intercolonial Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway, selling tickets or billing freight in whichever direction the passenger or consignee desire. They are paid by the Intercolonial Railway.

AMERICAN CATTLE IN BOND.

Mr. SPROULE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, as intimated in a despatch from Ottawa to the Winnipeg *Free Press* of 17th inst., to allow the establishment of an abattoir in Montreal, for the purpose of importing in bond and slaughtering American cattle, to be exported as dead meat?

Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. BOWELL, I have not seen the despatch referred to, and consequently cannot give an opinion as to its merits; but I can inform the hon. questioner that no such permission as that indicated in the question has been given by the Government.

ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER--MONEY DEPOSITS.

Mr. BRODEUR (Translation) moved for:

Copies of correspondence exchanged between the Government and the Postmaster of St. Césaire, County of Rouville, or any other person, with reference to deposits of money to be made by the said postmaster.

He said: In presenting this motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a few remarks to draw the attention of the Government to the false position which is occupied by the parish mentioned in the motion. Last year we had in the parish of St. Césaire a bank in which the postmaster would make his deposits, either for the payment of money orders or the management of the office. There has been since a change in the administration of the bank, or rather that bank has taken its offices to Montreal, and another bank has established a branch in the parish. Now, it seems that the postmaster could not get from the Government permission to deposit in this new bank the money needed for its office. The consequence is that when money orders are sent from Montreal to be paid at St. Césaire, the persons to whom these orders are payable, instead of being able to draw their money immediately at the bank doing business now in the parish, are obliged to go to Montreal to get their money. Evidently this is a false position, and I believe that if the attention of the Government is called to the inconveniences resulting from this state of things, the Post Office Department will soon remedy it, and give an order to the St. Césaire postmaster to make his deposits in the local branch of the bank of St. Hyacinthe, instead of making them in Montreal. It would be much more simple, it seems. Besides, the amount of business is not very large at this post office, and I believe that if it is shown that the inconveniences that I have referred to are detrimental to the people, it behooves the Government to take the means to remove them. I have mentioned one, and I am confident that the attention of the Government having been drawn to the matter, the Post Office Department will instruct the St. Césaire postmaster to make his deposits in the Banque de St. Hyacinthe doing business in that parish, so that the people who may have money orders to cash will not be obliged to go to Montreal to have them paid.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) I see no objection to the bringing down of the correspondence asked for by the hon. member. The hon. member has shown the facts such as they are. But I am not ready to promise the hon. mover of the resolution that the change he asks for shall be made. Long before I took control of the Post Office Department, a branch of the Banque Ville-Marie was doing business at St. Césaire. This branch was later replaced by a branch of the Banque de St. Hyacinthe. When the branch of the Ville-Marie existed at St. Césaire, the deposits of the Post Office Department were made in that bank, but as the Government had no account with the Banque de St. Hyacinthe, after the removal of the Ville-Marie branch, the department thought proper to make its deposits with its usual

bankers, the Bank of Montreal. I have not examined the question so as to know whether it would suit the department to make the desired change. However, I will say to the hon. member that I have no objection to bring down all correspondence, and to further enquire into the question.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The hon. Minister will allow me to point out to him, that the answer which he has just given is not satisfactory. My hon. friend for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), in making this motion, only wishes to draw the attention of the department to the serious grievances now existing in the parish of St. Césaire, since, as he said, the money orders for that parish cannot be cashed there, but have to be sent to Montreal, as the Government has no bank at St. Césaire where it makes deposits. Now, there is at St. Césaire a branch of the St. Hyacinthe bank; can there be any reason why the deposits cannot be made in that bank? The Government is not obliged to do all its business with the Banque de St. Hyacinthe I know; but for the St. Césaire post office business can there be any objection to the deposits being made in that bank? My hon. friend should take a pride in inaugurating a new régime in the Post Office Department, by giving satisfaction on this point.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF MICHAEL QUINN.

Mr. GUAY moved for:

Copies of all evidence taken at an enquiry held at Lévis, in the month of February, 1892, respecting the discharge of Michael Quinn, a permanent employé in the shops of the Intercolonial Railway at Hadlow, Lévis; and of all correspondence between Alfred Drake, Chief Mechanical Engineer for the said railway at Hadlow, and the railway officials at Moncton, in relation to the dismissal of the said Michael Quinn.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection bringing down all the papers on this subject which we have in the department. The information which we have is that Michael Quinn was dismissed for drunkenness and for using improper language to the foreman of the shops. The evidence on which his dismissal was based is not in the department, but I suppose we can send and get it.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) If I understand well the hon. Minister of Railways, he states that according to the papers in his department, relating to this affair, Michael Quinn was dismissed for drunkenness. I had no intention of speaking on this motion, but after what the hon. Minister said, I feel it to be my duty to make a statement of the facts. I very much regret not to make this statement in English, so that the hon. Minister may understand me, but I hope that some one within his reach may translate him my remarks. Here are the facts. Michael Quinn is an old man—fifty-five or fifty-six years of age—who has been for a long while in the service of the Government. On Christmas day last, he was on duty at the Intercolonial shops at Hadlow, and was doing his work there. Mr. Alfred Drake, the chief engineer of the Hadlow shops, came and examined Quinn's work. A quarrel took place, but who commenced it—Drake or Quinn—I do not know. However, as a result of the quarrel Drake told Quinn to go home. Quinn, who was not altogether without liquor, went home. The next day Drake wrote to the railroad authorities at Moncton, a letter in which he said that he had dismissed Quinn, for drunkenness. However, two days after, Drake wrote to the same authorities of the Intercolonial at Moncton, saying that he was mistaken, and that Quinn was not drunk on the 25th of December—the day on which his first letter reported him to have been drunk—and he himself requested that Quinn be reinstated in his duties. Matters remained thus until the approach of the last provincial elections, when the friends of Quinn—who are not my political friends—exercised a considerable pressure on the Intercolonial authorities at Moncton to have an enquiry made into Quinn's conduct. An enquiry was instituted and several witnessess, five or six witnesses, declared that Michael Quinn was not drunk on the 25th of December last. That he was a man of perfectly sober habits, and that if any one was at fault, it was Drake himself, the chief engineer of the Hadlow shops. Now, Mr. Speaker, the object of my motion is to establish, if this evidence is brought before the House, that Quinn was slandered on this occasion. I must add that my intention is not to throw any discredit upon the conduct of Mr. Drake, but solely to furnish Quinn with an occasion to clear himself before his fellow-citizens, from an accusation of drunkenness, a grave charge which he certainly did not merit.

Mr. HAGGART. I would state, in answer to the hon. gentleman that some time ago representations were made to the department that Mr. Quinn was not drunk as alleged, and a further investigation has been caused to be made on the subject, but the report or the evidence has not yet come to Ottawa. Whenever the report or the evidence comes there will be some action taken upon it, and I shall be pleased to lay it on the Table of the House.

Motion agreed to.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) moved for:

Return showing the number of cows kept at the Central Experimental Farm between the 1st day of January, 1891, and the 1st day of January, 1892; the number of cows of each of the different breeds; the quantity of milk given by each cow; the quantity of milk to make a pound of butter; the quantity of milk sold; the quantity of butter sold; where sold, and the prices obtained each month; the kinds of food given and the value of the same.

He said: I ask for this return because we are not likely to get the report of the Dairy Commissioner before the House rises, and it is of the utmost importance that the information called for should be laid before the country. There is a considerable disposition at the present time among our farmers to engage in dairying, and it is very important that they should know the results of the experiments at the Central Experimental Farm in regard to the quantity of milk produced, the quantity of food consumed, the best market for butter, the prices that can be obtained, and the best breeds of cows for dairy purposes. I suppose some of the butter has been sent to Britain in order to test the market there.

Mr. CARLING. There is no objection to bringing down the information which the hon. gentleman asks for, but I think it will be all found in the report, which is now in the hands of the printer, and which I expect to be able to lay on the Table of the House within a couple of weeks. However, if the hon. gentleman desires to have the information sooner, there is no objection to obtaining it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to ask if the report will give a statement down to the 1st of January last?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, I understand so.

Mr. McMILLAN. If the report will be in our hands before the Estimates pass, that is all I would ask.

Mr. CARLING. I think it will.

Motion agreed to.

SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Correspondence, reports, &c., which may have taken place between the Government of Canada and Sir Douglas Fox, or any other engineer, since the 1st day of September, 1891, having reference to building a tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the Mainland across the Straits of Northumberland.

He said: This question has been brought so often before this honourable House and the Government, and the people of Prince Edward Island, that we expected by this time the Government would have settled it definitely and either pronounced themselves in favour of building the tunnel or rejected the proposition altogether. I was amazed to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Finance say, in reply to my question, that the matter was still under the consideration of the Government. Why, only a year and a half ago, in February, 1891, we were told by eminent men, by the High Commissioner for Canada, that this was a question rapidly approaching settlement. The people were told, not only in Prince County, but all over Prince Edward Island, that the Government were going to build the tunnel. A promise had been made in 1887 that a subway would be built, and the Government had even granted a charter to a company to build that subway, and the election was run on that ground. But Senator Howlan failed on that. It was found that a subway under the Straits of Northumberland was dangerous and it was allowed to drop, but, in the fall of 1890, all of a sudden, Senator Howlan put himself into correspondence with Sir Douglas Fox, one of the most eminent engineers, I understand, in Great Britain, and perhaps in the world, and Senator Howlan published a correspondence between himself with Sir Douglas Fox and between himself and the late Sir John Macdonald, giving the people of Prince Edward Island every encouragement that the tunnel was going to be built. I suppose, if I could have heard the secret counsels of Ministers at that time, and the advice and command which they gave to Senator Howlan, I might be able to make a statement. I suppose he was told: Have you not some influence in Prince Edward Island, cannot you drive out that old Perry and that Yeo, and get yourself returned there? We understand your reputation is good; we understand that you have been selling reapers there; you have been carrying on some fisheries and have bought fish and have dealt honourably with the people, and no doubt that gives you a great deal of influence; we will give you power to state on behalf of the Government that we are going to build that tunnel if the people of Prince County will vote against the Liberal candidates. I do not state these things for facts, but I think perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Finance might have been the only delegate appointed to wait on the senator in regard to that. No doubt the senator had these instructions. No doubt he was told: If you bring us support here, even if you are defeated we will put you back in the Senate; but the senator, at a meeting held there, said, no, he would do nothing of the kind. Yet it was not many weeks after his defeat in Prince Edward Island when he was a senator again. That was his reward for trying to trick the people of Prince Edward Island at the dictation of the Government of Canada. I say the Government have attempted to delude these people, and have attempted to buy the liberties of the people of Prince Edward Island on false pretenses by making promises which they will not carry out, which they do not intend to carry out, and which I believe they never will carry out. Past experience shows that I am correct. They have dangled this matter before the eye of the people for years and years, and especially before an election, and I believe they intend to use it again whenever an election is about to take place. But they will find that they have made a mistake. They will find that the people of Prince Edward Island, and especially the people of Prince County, are not to be bought by promises or by the construction of a tunnel even if it cost twenty million dollars. The people of Prince County are too honest and too independent to be bought. No doubt they would be glad if the promises which have been made were carried out, but they know that these promises have never been carried out, and the people of Prince County will not be gulled by any such promises. I hold in my hand a small document, which is a letter from Senator Howlan addressed more particularly to the electors of Prince County, but really to the whole of the electors of Prince Edward Island, and dated on board the Steamer *Stanley*, the 10th February, 1891. This gives the whole account of the negotiations for the building of the tunnel. The senator says that he asked Sir Douglas Fox these three questions:

"1. For what sum of money he would give his professional opinion as to the feasibility and practicability of a tunnel.

"2. For what annual subsidy, payable half-yearly in London and satisfactorily guaranteed, contractors could be furnished to complete the work.

"3. If in his judgment the total cost would fall within five million dollars.

"In answer to this he wrote me under date of October 10: 'If I heard from you by cable upon receipt of this letter, I could probably arrange for Mr. Alfred Palmer to examine the position of the tunnel, and the connecting railways, on his way home from Labrador, where he is at present engaged. For the opinion which you mention, I would suggest the following: That you pay Mr. Alfred Palmer's time at the rate of $225 per month, together with his extra travelling expenses occasioned by this detour, with a fee to myself of £262 10s. Upon receipt of Mr. Palmer's report to me, I shall be better able to deal with the second and third questions in your letter.'

"I laid this correspondence before the Premier, Hon. Neil MacLeod, and the Hon. Donald Ferguson, and they said they would guarantee the cost of Mr. Palmer's visit, but I must hold myself responsible for the rest, but they would assist me in obtaining the amount from the Dominion Government."

I do not know whether the Government paid that amount or not. Most likely they did. He goes on:

"And here, let me say, I cannot speak in too high terms of the manner in which both the honourable gentlemen gave me their warm, earnest and hearty assistance in this whole matter, and thus relieved me of a very considerable expense."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want the House to bear in

mind that early in January, 1891, as we are told by Senator Howlan, Sir Douglas Fox had sufficient data to enable him to pass an opinion as to the feasibility and the cost of building the tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the mainland.

"I wired Sir Douglas Fox: 'Send Palmer.' He arrived, and as the public is already aware, a recognizance was made at both capes, the result of which Mr. Bain has so admirably given in his lecture, and which is so fully approved of by Sir J. W. Dawson.

"I also forwarded to Sir Douglas Fox samples and analyses of brick clays and brick as collected and made by Mr. Bain, with a lot of plans, papers, &c., bearing on the question. He acknowledged the receipt of all these, and said he now had sufficient data on which to form an opinion.

"I cabled him on the 13th of July to know when his report would be ready, to which he replied on the 15th: 'Report ready in ten days.' On the 29th he cabled thus: 'Much prefer delaying report until Pearson, Hudson River contractor, returns next month. Reply.' To which I answered on the 29th: 'Yes: but want approximate cost immediately. Government guarantee might be obtained for six millions. Answer.' On the 30th, he answered as follows:—

"'Sum named should probably cover tunnel.'"

Now, here we have it from the mouth of Senator Howlan himself that Sir Douglas Fox, in his telegram to him of the 21st of January, stated that $6,000,000 were sufficient to complete that tunnel. Of course, it was a great inducement to the people of Prince Edward Island to support the Government, after they had been for 15 or 18 years trying to persuade the Government of Canada either to build the tunnel or do something else to keep up continuous communication, in winter as well as summer, between the Island and the mainland. Both branches of the Prince Edward Island Legislature have urged the Government of Canada to pay the sum of $5,000,000 to the Government of Prince Edward Island as compensation for failing to carry out the terms of Confederation, but they were refused. In fact, Earl Granville says himself that he is sorry that the Dominion Government, up to that time, had taken no steps in order to carry out the terms of Confederation. And, Sir, when they heard the promises of such an eminent personage as Senator Howlan, who could blame them if they were under the impression that this Government was in earnest and sincere in their representations to Senator Howlan—because I contend that he was speaking the sentiments and views of the Government. Senator Howlan goes on to state:

"It will be noticed in my letter of the 17th September, that I asked for contractors, &c., to do the work. Since the above cable despatches were received I got the following letter, dated 21st January, which, I have no doubt, will be read with pleasure by your readers, as it establishes the practicability of the tunnel, and taken in connection with the cablegram of the 30th ult., settles the question of feasibility and cost."

Now, Senator Howlan says that the letter I am going to read from Sir Douglas Fox, settles the question of the cost of the tunnel:

"VICTORIA MANSIONS, 28 VICTORIA STREET,
"WESTMINSTER, S.W., 21st January, 1891.

"*The Honourable George W. Howlan, Ottawa:*

"TUNNEL UNDER NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have now received through the Assistant Provincial Secretary, the sum of £56.1.0 for Mr. Palmer.

"I have been going carefully into the whole matter with him, and have formed a very favourable opinion as to the practicability of the proposed tunnel, and will send you a preliminary report in a few days.

"I am sorry, however, to find that Mr. W. Pearson, the contractor for the Hudson River tunnel, who would be, in my opinion, the best contractor to employ, is at present in Mexico, so that I have not been able to consult him, as I should much wish to do, before sending in my definite report. I have ascertained that Mr. Pearson will be in New York, in care of Messrs. Pearson & Sons, Hudson Tunnel Works, New York, about the middle of February, and I think it would be a most important step if you could arrange with him on his way home to visit Northumberland Straits so that he may be prepared, on his arrival here, to consult with me, with a view to his giving a tender for the work."

Now, Sir Douglas Fox here recommends that Mr. Pearson be allowed to give the first tender for this work, saying that he was a most competent person and able engineer, and that by visiting the Island and making a personal examination, he would then be in a position to give an honest tender to build that tunnel—

"Mr. Pearson is a contractor of the highest respectability, and of good experience. I am writing to him direct, suggesting that he should communicate with you on the subject.

"Will you kindly cable me what you arrange with him.

"Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) "DOUGLAS FOX.

"I cabled him on the 6th instant: 'Will write Pearson as suggested,' and I wrote Mr. Pearson to New York with a copy of Sir Douglas Fox's letter, advising him to come and look at the Straits, etc., and make some boring through the ice on each side, and I expect him to do so before returning to England.

"I put all these facts before the Dominion Government, and I have much pleasure now in submitting to your readers the following letter.

Now, it shows that the Senator was acquainted with all these facts, it shows there were negotiations going on between the Government of Canada and Senator Howlan; it goes a long way to prove what I stated awhile ago that there were solemn orders and solemn commands given by this Government to Senator Howlan when he left Ottawa, to come and stump Prince County in order to drive out the two gentlemen who were opposed to the present Government. I am going now to read a letter of Sir John A. Macdonald, the late leader of the Government, and I suppose the leader of the present Government and his colleagues will defer to the opinion of that statesman. Sir John Macdonald wrote as follows:—

"EARNSCLIFFE, OTTAWA, 6th February, 1891.

"MY DEAR HOWLAN,—In response to your pressing requests with respect to the tunnel across the Straits, I desire to repeat that, under present circumstances, the Cabinet are not in a position to deal with the question. If, as I believe, the country will continue to give us its confidence, the Ministry will under my guidance take the matter up without delay. I understand Sir Douglas Fox is of opinion the scheme is a feasible one. The chief thing still unknown is the cost of construction."

Senator Howlan told us some time ago that he had received a letter from Sir Douglas Fox, stating that he could construct a tunnel from the mainland to the Island at a cost of $6,000,000. If Senator Howlan had performed his duty this information would have been sent to the Government, and the announcement might have been made that Sir Douglas Fox estimated that the tunnel could be built for six millions. But, unfortunately, Sir John Macdonald was told that the cost of building the tunnel was utterly unknown. Sir John Macdonald continued:

"I fully appreciate the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by the Dominion to maintain continuous communication between the Island and mainland."

Sir John Macdonald at that time saw the responsibility which the Government undertook in violating the terms of Confederation with Prince Edward Island. He wrote further:

"We have tried to carry this out by the *Stanley*, but of course she cannot fight against the elements. So if the cost comes within a reasonable amount, such as Parliament feels itself justified in incurring, I shall be prepared to submit the question for their favourable consideration.

"I am, yours sincerely,

(Sgd) "JOHN A. MACDONALD."

We know from Sir Douglas Fox that the sum of $6,000,000 is sufficient to build the tunnel. Sir John A. Macdonald distinctly stated that if the amount came within reason, he would at once recommend his Cabinet to take hold of the work. But we find they have not done so. Indeed it appears that the Ministers of the present day are not so apt to carry out their promises as was Sir John A. Macdonald. Senator Howlan continued :

"In conclusion, permit me to say we are now within 'measurable distance' of a solution of the question of daily and continuous communication with the railway system of the Dominion.

"This has taken six years of unremitting attention and perseverance, with no little cost.

"Had Prince Edward Island, four years ago, sent two supporters of the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, I have not the most remote hesitation in saying the subway, or tunnel, would now have been completely and entirely finished."

There is the bribe. He tells the people that if they do not vote for the Government candidate, they will not get the tunnel or a breakwater, or even get a breakwater repaired. There is the threat held over the heads of the people, that unless they vote for Government candidates they cannot get anything. I would be ashamed to speak such words before any intelligent constituency. Senator Howlan continues :

"During all these years what have we received from the Grit party on this island and throughout this Dominion? Nothing but sneers and contempt."

No Grit members from the Island had sneers for the tunnel. No doubt many of us had doubts as to the efficacy of a subway. I had doubts as to whether it would be sufficient to carry on continuous transport between the Island and the mainland, but I defy Senator Howlan to show that I even spoke in depreciation of the tunnel. I am sure my colleague did not do so, and the member for King's has also thrown his weight in favour of the tunnel. Senator Howlan further says :

"I say, therefore, if the people of Prince Edward Island want a tunnel let them support the Government, who are already persuaded, nay more, convinced, of its practicability, and are not afraid of its cost, but are ready to recommend to the favourable consideration of Parliament a sum sufficient to build it."

He says the Government were then convinced and satisfied of the practicability of building a tunnel. The Senator concludes as follows :—

"I have done my part, and I trust our people will act wisely and prudently by doing theirs, in supporting Sir John A. Macdonald and his party, who are quite sure to have control of the purse-strings for the next five years.

"I am, yours truly,

"GEORGE W. HOWLAN.

"On board str. *Stanley*, Feb. 10, 1891."

That is the mandate which Senator Howlan published to the electors of Prince County, and it will be observed that he obtained his information from the Government, that the Government told him how to act, that he was sent there for this special purpose, in order to try and gull the people and induce them, under false pretenses, to vote for candidates running in support of the present Government. He did not succeed ; but the Government was returned all the same. If it has come to this, that all the electors of Canada must be Conservatives and supporters of the Government in order that people may obtain their rights, I do not want to stand by the constitution. It would be much better for the people of Prince Edward Island that they should be separated from the Dominion and out of Confederation, and as they were in 1873, a happy people who did not know what a provincial debt was. For, let me tell you, that at the time we were coaxed into Confederation, we entered it in order to secure a continuous steam communication between the island and the mainland. What is the condition of our people now ? Every man, woman and child in the island represents a debt of $48, which is their portion of the net debt of the Dominion. What have we received in return from the Government? Nothing but false promises. Let us go a little further, and see how they have been dealt with by the Government. Here is a telegram sent from Amherst, on 28th February, 1891. It is addressed to a gentleman, D. Ferguson, Charlottetown, who was running as a Government candidate. It is from Sir Charles Tupper, and reads as follows :—

"D. FERGUSON, Charlottetown.

"I regret deeply that it is impossible for me to go to the Island, as the *Stanley* cannot cross and I dare not attempt the Capes. I have satisfied myself that the tunnel can be made for $6,000,000, and you may rely upon all the aid I can give to that important and necessary work.

"CHARLES TUPPER.

"Amherst, Feb. 28, 1891."

There is proof that there was at that time no communication between the mainland and the island, and the very wording of the telegram shows that Sir Charles Tupper could not cross. Sir Charles Tupper could not cross at the Cape ! Is his life more precious than that of any one else ? We have to do that, and I am an older man than Sir Charles Tupper, and I have to do that. It shows that there were no means at that time, and perhaps for several days before and after, of crossing from the mainland to the Island. Sir Charles Tupper says :

"I regret that it is impossible for me to go to the Island, as the *Stanley* cannot cross and I dare not attempt the Capes. I have satisfied myself that the tunnel can be made for $6,000,000, and you may rely upon all the aid I can give to that important and necessary work.

"CHARLES TUPPER.

"Amherst, Feb. 28, 1891."

Sir Charles Tupper says he has satisfied himself and he was recently from England and probably had been in correspondence with Sir Douglas Fox. If he had not been in correspondence with Sir Douglas, Fox No. 1, he might have been in correspondence with Senator Howlan, Fox No. 2. Now I ask the Government, what does that telegram of Sir Charles Tupper mean ? Does it mean that the Government are not going to make a distinct and honest effort to carry out their promises ? This telegram from Sir Charles Tupper was sent on the 28th of February, and the election took place on the 5th of March. Was the telegram sent with the intention of trying to induce the people to vote for the Government candidates ? Mr. Ferguson was one of the Government candidates ; and I remember well that on the next day after the telegram was sent, which was Sunday, it was read in all the public places in the province. It was copied and sent by special express here, there and everywhere to induce the people to vote against the Liberal candidates and for the Conservative candidates. It did not have that effect because the people of Prince County are an extraordinary people. As I have said

before, they are not to be bribed or blinded by false promises. I give them credit, and I say that I stand here one of the proudest representatives in this Parliament, because I represent, I believe, the most honest constituency that Canada can produce. I ask again, does this telegram of Sir Charles Tupper mean anything? Will the Minister of Finance stand up in this House and repudiate it and say that it is false? Will he tell me what Sir Charles Tupper meant at that time, and will he himself tell me what he meant when he answered me the other day and said that the question was still under the consideration of the Government? What is the meaning of that? Was Sir Charles Tupper brought here for the purpose of going to Amherst and sending this telegram to the people of the Island? Is it for this that he got paid ten dollars a day and his travelling expenses to and from England? Is this part of the fraud? Was he only representing the Tories? Are there none but Tories in this country? Is not the Liberal party a strong and respectable party, and do they not pay their taxes as well as the Tories? I say that such conduct on the part of the Government is a shame and a disgrace and whenever a country is misgoverned in that way it can never expect to prosper. Canada is not prosperous, although the Minister of Finance told us no later than yesterday that it was. But we know that his own blue-books tell a very different story. We know how the census shows that the people have been driven out of the country. Now, Sir, after all these transactions the matter did not remain there, and Senator Howlan went on a trip to England. He had not been in England for some years, and he put it into the head of some of his friends to hold a meeting in Charlottetown and to vote him $400 to send him to England, and he was to do all the rest. He was to satisfy Sir Douglas Fox that the scheme was good; and we have here an extract from a sound Tory paper that collected several hundred dollars last year as pap, and no doubt was bound to fight for the Government. This is what the paper says:

"IMPORTANT.

"Hon. Senator Howlan, at the instance of the Charlottetown Board of Trade, and others interested in the tunnel, left on Wednesday evening last for London, England, *viâ* New York, to confer with Sir Douglas Fox, in order to supply him with necessary information to enable him to draw up, without delay, an accurate estimate of the cost of the tunnel. By Mr. Howlan's personal presence, full information can be given Sir Douglas, with data already before him, so that there will be no misunderstanding in the matter, and that an accurate estimate may be prepared with a view to calling for tenders. The Local Government are in hearty accord with the move, and have assumed the cost, about $400, of Mr. Howlan's trip to London. This is an important move, and we trust that it may result in the early inauguration of the work."

Now, the Island has paid $400 for Senator Howlan's trip to England, and the Island expects some return for that. The people of Prince Edward Island are not in the habit of paying money without knowing what they pay it for, and the people have a right to know the result of Senator Howlan's mission to England on that occasion. Have the Government any papers to bring down containing the result of his trip? Is there anything to show what Senator Howlan did to enable Sir Douglas Fox to make an estimate? It appears the Government has nothing to show in that respect, and the Minister of Finance told us the other day that the matter was still under consideration. We know that Senator Howlan went to England about the middle of April last, during the earlier part of the session of Parliament here, and we know that any negotiations he could have made were early in May. What has been the result of these negotiations, I ask? We were told here some time ago that the Government were going to vote some $2,000 for new borings and new examinations so as to get further information; but we are told in this communication of Senator Howlan that they had all the information necessary, and Sir Charles Tupper himself, when just lately come from England, told us that he was satisfied of the feasibility of the tunnel. The Government are not satisfied yet. We know that the Government do not intend to build it, but they are not honest enough to come forward and say so. What I want the Government to do is this: Let the Government assume an honourable position, an independent position, a position of fair-play to the people of the Island, and state whether they are going to build the tunnel, or if they have given it up. If they have given it up, I will say that they do not intend to carry out the terms of Confederation by building a tunnel, which I believe is the only way in which the terms of Confederation can be carried out. If they do not carry out the terms of Confederation in this direction, the people of the Island have a heavy claim for damages as compensation against the Government of Canada. In 1883 the Government of the Island, led by the Hon. Mr. Sullivan, made a claim of $5,000,000 upon Canada for the non-fulfilment of the terms of Confederation. They went to England with that claim, and they appeared before Her Majesty's Government there. Of course, they were met there by the influence of Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles Tupper did not think at that time that a tunnel could be built; he did not think that the people of the Island had any grievance at all. In fact, he endorsed the whole report—a very partial report, I must say, made by a sub-committee of the Privy Council composed of Sir Alexander Campbell and the Hon. Mr. McLelan. When the delegation went to England they were met face to face by Sir Charles Tupper, fortified with this report in his hands. But I am proud to know that we had a friend at court in Earl Granville, who took a proper view of the application of the people of Prince Edward Island. He said that he was aware that the people of Prince Edward Island had a grievance, and that the Government of Canada were bound by the terms of the treaty to carry out their part of the agreement to keep up continuous communication between the Island and the mainland in winter as well as in summer; and he was aware that they had not done it. He said that it was beyond the power of the Imperial Parliament just then to interfere and take the matter out of the hands of the Dominion Government, but he would use his influence, and I have no doubt he has used it, to induce the Dominion Government to carry out the terms of Confederation. But it is hard to persuade the Dominion Government to do what they ought to do. I believe they will have the political impudence to hold this matter before the people again on the eve of the next election. I believe that there will be another fox in the field. They may try to mislead the people on the eve of another election, but the people will not be gulled. They expect an honest decision from the

Government; they expect the Government to say whether they will build that tunnel or not. The question has been long enough in agitation. If the Government are satisfied that the tunnel cannot be built for less than $15,000,000, I would not ask them to build it. I believe it would be unreasonable to ask Canada to build a tunnel from the Island to the mainland costing $15,000,000. If the report of Sir Douglas Fox that it can be built for $6,000,000 is based on good information, the Government will be treating the people of Prince Edward Island unjustly if they do not carry out the work. I expect that they will build the tunnel and do justice to the people, and the sooner they decide the question the better. I expect that when the papers are brought down we shall have another whack at it, and I trust that by that time the Government will be prepared to tell us what they are going to do. Last session we were told by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) that the Dominion gained nothing in the way of revenue from Prince Edward Island, but that the Island had been given this, that and the other —that, in fact, we were a drain on the treasury of Canada. Sir, that is not correct. We have been charged improperly with many expenditures, such as the building of the pier at Cape Tormentine and the subsidies to the steamers, although these steamers carry mails from the Island as well as to the Island and take more people from the mainland to Prince Edward Island than from the Island to the mainland. If the Government of the Dominion are so penurious and so mean that they will not acknowledge the rights of Prince Edward Island, let them cut us off altogether—we have no objection—and place us in the same position that we occupied in 1873. There is not a man in Prince Edward Island who would not jump at the offer and be glad to get free of the shackles imposed on us by the Dominion Government. I suppose that the Government will tell us that if we do not return supporters of them we are disloyal. I defy my opponents to state on any public platform that the people of Prince Edward Island are not loyal. I do not mean to say that the Tories are not loyal, but I say that the Liberals are just as loyal to the Crown of England as they are, but we object to being tyrannized over by the Government of Canada.

Mr. YEO. I hope the Government will see that these papers are brought down, and that they will show that the Government have not lost sight of this very important matter, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, in the construction of a submarine tunnel between the island and the mainland. It is a question which I suppose is not very interesting to the members of this House generally. My hon. colleague has gone so fully into the matter, and it was so well discussed at the last session of this House, that I think any hon. member who has given the matter any consideration must admit that Prince Edward Island has a strong claim. Last session facts and figures were adduced here to show that Prince Edward Island is not a burden on the Dominion of Canada, but that we pay considerably more to the revenue of the Dominion than we receive in return. But I contend that even if such were not the case, that fact would not lessen our claim. I would ask any hon. member to read the terms of union between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada, and he will find that one of the stipulations clearly expressed is that the Dominion Government binds itself to keep up continuous communication between the Island and the mainland in winter and summer. We know that some efforts have been made to carry out this agreement; but it has not been fulfilled. During this winter, which has been one of the most favourable experienced for many years, continuous communication has not been kept up, and for several days there have been no mails either received or taken from the Island. I trust, Sir, that when the papers are placed on the Table of the House we shall see that the Government have been fully alive to the promises which have been made, and that this question will be taken up and dealt with speedily. I was a little surprised to hear from the hon. Minister of Finance, a few days ago, that this matter was still only under consideration. I had hoped for a more definite answer. I had hoped that he would have been able to say that some progress had been made. But it is well to know that it is still under consideration, and I hope it is receiving favourable consideration. My hon. colleague has gone very fully into the details of how the subway was originated in 1887. This proposition was not so favourably received in Prince Edward Island, and doubts were expressed as to the subway giving the benefits we had reason to expect, but when the question of a tunnel was brought forward, when we were led to believe it was practicable and could be constructed for an amount we might reasonably expect the Dominion Government would not hesitate to expend, we looked forward to the work being taken up as soon as the elections were over. We had the promise of the late leader of the present Government that this matter would be taken up and dealt with as speedily as possible, and in addition we had the promise of the High Commissioner to the same effect. Sir Douglas Fox, the engineer who has been consulted in this matter, has expressed the wish that further surveys and borings should be made before he could give a decided opinion as to the cost, and it is well known that if these surveys and borings are to be made, they should be undertaken early in the summer, as it is more difficult to do the work at any other season. I trust if the Minister of Finance does not do anything more, he will at least see that a sufficient sum is placed in the Estimates to cover the cost of further surveys and borings. I hope and trust the matter will not be allowed to stand over until we are on the eve of another election in Prince Edward Island, but that the Government will deal with the question as it ought to be dealt with; and if it is found, after the surveys and borings have been made, that the cost of the work is too great for the Dominion Government to feel justified in the expenditure, it will then become a question between the Government and Prince Edward Island as to what compensation should be offered and accepted in lieu of the subway, unless some other means are found of carrying out the conditions of Confederation. According to the letter read from the late leader of the Government, he admitted the responsibility of the Dominion to carry out those terms. He admitted the terms of Union had not been carried out, and since then no improvement has been made. I cannot for one moment believe that these promises

were made merely to delude and deceive the people. I cannot think that hon. gentlemen occupying high positions would for a moment think of doing that. It is pretty well understood that promises made on the eve of an election must be received with a good deal of caution, but in an important matter such as this, where a treaty has been made and the leader of the Government admits the responsibility of the Dominion and its obligation to take the matter up at once, the case assumes a much more serious aspect. I cannot believe that the Government intend to deceive the electors of the Island. I have the interests of my country too much at heart to suppose that they will be treated in such a way by the Dominion of Canada. It is unnecessary for me to tell hon. members the disadvantages we labour under in Prince Edward Island, cut off as we are from the mainland for nearly five months in the year, and thus prevented from participating in the benefits which accrue to our fellow citizens in other parts of the Dominion from our railways and canals and other great public works. On those grounds we are entitled to a great deal of consideration; and although $6,000,000 may seem a very large sum, yet when this amount is to be expended to carry out a solemn contract entered into between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, the amount ought not to be for a moment considered. What I, as one of the representatives of Prince Edward Island, am anxious to see is to have the matter fully decided. I do not want the minds of the people to be disquieted by the expectation that a tunnel will be built if it is not to be undertaken. If the Government say it cannot be undertaken, the sooner we know it the better. Then we could perhaps devise some means of improving our present means of communication. After all that has been said, it is quite unnecessary for me to say more. I can only express the hope that the Government will have those papers brought down and that it will not be shown to this House that they are not alive to the interests of the Maritime Provinces. The fact of Prince Edward Island being represented by four opponents of the Government will, I hope, have no weight in the matter, as it is only justice we seek, and Prince Edward Island has a right to expect from the Government justice, whether represented by Liberals or Conservatives.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not wish to detain the House and will be very brief in my remarks. I regret that the Minister of Finance should have called out "carried" without giving expression to the intentions of the Government regarding this important work. It is in the interests of the Dominion at large and the province I represent that this question should be grappled with and settled one way or the other. It is not in the interest of the people or creditable to the Government that election after election should come round and the construction of this tunnel be continually before the people. The people should be left free to determine the great political issues of the Dominion without having this question drawn as a red herring across the track. I am interested, I acknowledge, in having an affirmative decision given by the Government. I do not want to press unduly arguments in favour of the construction of the tunnel, and I do not want to press the Government to expend the money if they are satisfied the cost is going to be too large, but I cannot forget the fact that, some time ago, the Government, at the instigation of some of its supporters, and in pursuance of the promise of their late leader, endorsed by Sir Charles Tupper, forwarded all the papers in connection with the construction of the work to an eminent engineer in England for his opinion. The Local Government sent a gentleman home at the same time to give further advice and facts to that engineer relative to the construction of this road. An engineer in the confidence of Sir Douglas Fox came to the Island and examined the work on the spot. He made local surveys, he was assisted by the information gathered on an official survey made under the direction of the Government. The straits were surveyed, borings were made, and so far as a layman could form an opinion, it seemed that the information and data necessary to enable the engineer to give his opinion and the Government to come to a conclusion were fairly before them. The engineer estimated for three different sizes of canals certain sums. A small one amounting, with contingencies and land damages—that is, the necessary approaches—to £1,075,000 sterling; a 16-foot tunnel, with contingencies and land damages, amounting in round figures to nearly £3,000,000, and an 18-foot tunnel, with land damages and contingencies, amounting to £2,250,000. Well, we went into a discussion upon that question last year, and I am not going to repeat those arguments again or to weary the House with the recitation of the solid and real grievances under which that province has laboured. I might mention in passing, that, while this House has spent money like water in every part of the Dominion for the construction of canals and the construction of railways, for the subsidizing of railways and of branches of railways, there is one part of the Dominion to which they never voted any money, and that is the province from which I come. When we voted several millions a few years ago for the construction of railways in Cape Breton, no one said anything against it. In the same way, when large sums of money were voted for the New Glasgow branch, the Pictou branch, the missing link between Digby and Annapolis, all the money required for those purposes was voted without any serious opposition, and wherever the money was required to enable the people of the country to carry their products to market, no question has been raised; and, except in regard to the Trent Valley Canal, no work has been so much dangled before the eyes of the people as this to which we are now referring. The people of Canada are under the impression that the Dominion has expended the money for the construction of the Prince Edward Island Railway as they have expended the money of the country for the construction of roads in other parts of the Dominion, but that is not so. Prince Edward Island has paid every cent of the cost of that main line of railway, for the whole amount of three and a quarter millions was charged to the Island in the settlement which was made of the accounts between the Island and the Dominion, and the only amount which the Dominion Government has expended has been on that short line to Cape Traverse, amounting to $275,000 or $280,000. These facts cannot be put out of sight. Prince Edward Island has not had fair-play—I will not say fair-play, but

it has not had common justice meted out to it in this matter of expenditure. I do not wish to press this matter unduly, but last year the hon. gentleman told us he was considering this question, and his remarks were made at the close of the debate last year and after Sir Douglas Fox's report had been in the hands of the Government for some time, after the promises made by the late Sir John Macdonald and the present High Commissioner had been in the hands of the Government, after the people knew what was thought upon this question, what the engineer estimated the cost of the construction at, and all the data were then in the possession of the Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman then said:

"It may be possible, and I believe it is true that there are not yet sufficient data for getting at what may be termed the fairly certain cost of the tunnel; and I think it will be the duty of the Government and I am sure it will also be its pleasure, if there is something else needed in order to carry on investigations which will give the data as nearly as possible for a pretty definite and certain estimate of the cost and feasibility of constructing a tunnel, to do this if it can be done without too great cost, as I am quite certain it can"

The hon. gentleman did not seem to have any doubt about it. He seemed to be quite certain that it could be done without too much cost. I make no complaint if the Government say that the information they have is not sufficient to express a judgment upon, but I do claim that, in face of such a promise made by the Minister last year, we are not being treated with common fairness. If the hon. gentleman had not the data then, why has he not got it now? This was in the spring of last year. I do not care whether you have Conservatives or Liberals representing the Island in the House, but I do want the Island to get common justice, and, when the Finance Minister made such a statement last year, I think I may say we are being treated with negligence and contempt, and that the Government have not acted according to their promise. Why did not the hon. gentleman obtain the data he required, and propose a vote to enable him to obtain the information if he wanted to get it? After comparing the probable outlay on the one hand and the probable receipts on the other, the probable cost of the work and the saving which would be effected by the Government by doing away with the present modes of carrying out the communication, he went on to say:

"That is about the way this matter strikes me; and so far as the Government is concerned it has done what I have stated, and I think it is prepared to say that if further estimates are necessary to get at the cost of the structure, they will be got; and after that the Government will seriously and earnestly consider the question as presented in the light of those facts, and ask Parliament to consider it as well."

Now, we ask that this shall be done. So far as I am personally concerned, I have never yet seen the full report of Sir Douglas Fox, but the Finance Minister last year gave us the estimates of the cost of these three tunnels, and then I think he was of the opinion that the smaller tunnel would not be effective. I share in that opinion. I do not think the small tunnel would be worth considering, in view of the requirements of the Island in regard to taking their goods to market. I think the tunnel should be one of such a size as to enable the people to carry their produce to market. Otherwise it is of no use at all. If the cost of such a tunnel is too much, in Heaven's name let us know it. I do not want to be urging year after year a scheme which is not practical. Let the Government say that it is not, and let us drop the matter forever. But I object to their keeping this dangling before the people, to their making promises which are not kept and which are made only to be broken, but which are made before every election. I repeat that this matter ought to be grappled with, and in a statesmanlike way. If the hon. gentleman wants further data, I think he is bound by his promise and by those of his predecessor and late leader, to get the data. If Sir Douglas Fox's report is incomplete, let him take steps to complete it. If, after he has all the data in his possession, he comes to the honest conclusion that the cost of this work is beyond the resources of the country, let us know it and have done with it. But I almost despair, in view of the almost negligent way in which this has been treated by the Government, I will say in view of the absolutely negligent way in which it has been treated, of anything being done at all. Only the other day, when there was a possibility of a bye-election, when my seat and the seat of my colleague were contested, while the enquiry was going on, a public meeting was called at once and the tunnel was again dangled before the eyes of the electors in anticipation of the possible elections which were to come. This is no way of carrying on the business of the country. I have never yet, either in Prince Edward Island or out of it, assumed a position on this question which is not defensible. I have told them time and again that if the reports of the engineers show this tunnel to be so costly as to be beyond what we could fairly ask, I for one will not ask it, but we have a right to a determination, and we have a right that the hon. gentleman shall not call "question," and "carried" to treat it in that cavalier way.

Mr. FOSTER. Don't you want it carried?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want it carried, but I want the hon. gentleman to take advantage of the occasion of the motion to express to this House whether it is his intention to carry out what he promised, and if it is not, why he will not do so. I do not want the people I represent to be fooled with, I want common justice done them. That hon. gentleman himself has straightforwardness and honesty enough to know that my argument is correct, and that he ought to state that he is not dealing fairly when he is trifling with this question, and the people have a right to know whether the Government are going to take this upon a practical way and complete the work, or whether they have come to the conclusion that it is too costly. Sir, I did not press it last year very hard; I acknowledged frankly and freely at that time, that the Government ought to have plenty of time to consider the report made by Sir Douglas Fox, because the amount of money that would be required was very large, and one could not ask the Government of the day hastily to come to a conclusion, and I did not press them unduly. My hon. friend from King's County (Mr. McLean) who spoke here last year, in a very able speech presented the case in answer to the speech made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn); he presented the case in a way that settled once and for ever the hon. gentleman and his arguments, which were opposed to the construction of this tunnel. Therefore the only question that remained was not whether the Government were under an obligation to build this, if built it should be, for a

reasonable sum, because they were bound by the terms of Union to do that—the only question that remained was: Is the cost of the tunnel unreasonable or not? I say now that after having had twelve months to consider the estimates made by that eminent engineer, Sir Douglas Fox, it is time for the Government to tell us whether they have concluded to build it or not. I would invite the hon. gentleman not to let the question go by in silence but to give us his frank opinion and his frank intentions.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the motion being carried, and the information being brought down, at which time I think it will be more in order to discuss the question.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the number and names of men and vessel-owners applying for bounties for the years 1889, 1890 and 1891, and not receiving the same, giving the reasons why such applications were not granted: also whether any were refused and afterwards granted, the names, amounts and reasons given why such were afterwards granted; also all papers and correspondence since 1888 in reference to the bounty system and in regard to applications granted and ungranted.—(Mr. Bowers.)

Return showing which of the Dominion buildings in Canada are lighted by electricity: the respective system used in each such building whether arc or incandescent; the number of sixteen candle power lamps or their equivalents used in each such building; the cost per lamp of sixteen candle power or equivalent in each building; and the average annual cost for lighting each such building. Also showing in what buildings the plants are owned and maintained by the Government, and in cases where not so owned and maintained from whom the current is obtained or supplied, and whether from central station or private parties; also whether in cases of leased currents the renewal lamps are supplied at Government expense, and if so, in what buildings and at what annual cost; also the names of the parties contracting to light any of such buildings, with the names of the buildings, and the dates and duration of each such contract. Also showing which of the public buildings of the Dominion are lighted with gas, and the annual cost of lighting each such building.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Return giving an abstract of all the contracts:

1. For the enlargement of the Welland, St. Lawrence, Lachine and Ottawa Canals: including basins, drainage, dams, deepening of approaches, removal of shoals, &c., &c. 2. For the construction of the Murray, Tay, Culbute, Fenelon Falls, Buckhorn, Burleigh and the Sault Ste. Marie Canals; including basins, drainage, dams, deepening of approaches, removal of shoals, &c., &c. 3. For the improvement of Toronto Harbour, of Kingston Harbour and Graving Dock: of Port Arthur Harbour and Breakwater, and for the lock, dam and improvement of River aux Lièvres. 4. For the construction of that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway built by the Canadian Government, comprising sections "A" and "B," from English River to Rat Portage; and that portion in British Columbia from Yale to Kamloops. The return to comprise the following information about each contract:—

(*a*) The name or designation of the contract.
(*b*) The name and address of contractor.
(*c*) The date of contract.
(*d*) The date for completion as per conditions of contract.
(*e*) The date when work was completed and accepted.
(*f*) The date of cancellation, if contract abandoned or cancelled.
(*g*) The total cost of the work as per contract.
(*h*) The actual amount paid the contractor as per final settlement, including changes, extras, &c.
(*i*) Of contracts yet unfinished, the amount earned to date of last progress estimate; and the estimated cost of the unfinished portion.
(*j*) Of contracts cancelled or abandoned, the amount paid the contractor, and the estimated cost to do the uncompleted portion.
(*k*) The amount of each tender lower than the accepted one.
(*l*) The names of each tenderer lower than the accepted one.
(*m*) To state if the contract was awarded other than by public competition: if lower tenders were passed over, explain why.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

Copies of all letters, complaints, charges, and other papers, and the evidence taken thereon relating to irregularities on the part of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, or charges or complaints made against him or against the department of which he was Deputy Head.—(Mr. McMullen.)

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 36) to amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Tyrwhitt for Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sproule for Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ives for Mr. Carpenter.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. FLINT moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act of 1888. He said: I think this is a very favourable opportunity, at this early part of the session, to again bring forward the Bill which I had the honour to move the second reading of on 3rd August last, and which passed its second reading in this House but failed to reach its third reading, owing to pressure of Government business. In doing so, I will claim the indulgence of the House to make a more lengthy explanation than I did on that occasion, for the sake of those members of the House who have not specially looked into the Canada Temperance Act and not studied the Bill now before us. The Canada Temperance Act, I may say at the outset, is not in force throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. It is, unfortunately, in force in a very small portion of the Dominion, and consequently to a large degree the discussion of this Bill will lose interest among those hon. members who represent those constituencies in which the Act is not in force. For the information of those who have not followed the discussion of last year, I will state that the Canada Temperance Act which I seek to amend by this Bill is in force in ten counties or districts in the Province of New Brunswick, in twelve counties or districts in Nova Scotia, in three counties in Prince Edward Island, two counties in Manitoba and four counties in Quebec. With the exception of those thirty-one districts in the whole Dominion the Bill I am now discussing will not lie, and consequently, I suppose, will lose interest to hon. gentlemen who represent those other districts. At the same time, I would ask their courteous consideration to the matter which I bring before them. The Canada Temperance

Act, which was passed in 1878 was an Act to permit certain districts to prohibit within the bounds of those districts the sale of intoxicating liquors, except for certain purposes. When the Act was brought into force by the popular vote, the restriction in the sale of intoxicating liquors amounted to this: that from the day on which the second part of the Temperance Act came into force in any county or district, or so long as it should continue in force, no intoxicating liquors should be sold, speaking in a general way, except as follows—and I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the exceptions, because the Bill which I am introducing deals in a rather technical manner with these exceptions:

"Provided always, that the sale of wine for exclusively sacramental purposes may, on the certificate of a clergyman affirming that the wine is required for sacramental purpose, be made by druggists and vendors thereto, specially licensed by the Lieutenant Governor in each province; but the number of such licensed druggists and vendors shall not exceed one in each township or parish, or two in each town, or one for every four thousand inhabitants in each city.

"Provided also, that the sale of intoxicating liquor for exclusively medicinal purposes or for *bonâ fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture, may be made by such licensed druggists or vendors: but such sale, when for medicinal purposes, shall be in quantities of not less than one pint, to be removed from the premises, and shall be made only on the certificate of a medical man having no interest in the sale, affirming that such liquor has been prescribed for the person named therein: and when such sale is for its use in some art, trade or manufacture, the same shall be made only on the certificate signed by two justices of the peace of the good faith of the application, accompanied by the affirmation of the applicant that the liquor is to be used only for the particular purposes set forth in the affirmation; and such druggist or vendor shall file such certificate and keep a register of all such sales, indicating the name of the purchaser and the quantity sold, and shall make an annual return of all such sales, on the thirty-first day of December in every year, to the collector of Inland Revenue, within whose revenue division the county or city is situated."

In calling the attention of the House to this clause, I desire to say that I have repeated this clause verbatim in the Bill I present, with the exception of one or two words. I have left out the phrase "who shall not be interested in such sale." In the Bill of last year that phrase was contained and it passed the committee, with strenuous objection from friends on both sides of the House, who were known as strong friends of the Canada Temperance Act and strong friends of the utmost prohibition than can be procured, but who were of the opinion that the introduction of that clause was not absolutely necessary. In speaking of that and other points I may say that I have not included in this Bill all the provisions which a great many friends of the temperance cause were anxious to have included, and I have left them out for this reason, not that I did not think well of the suggestions kindly made to me from a great many quarters, but because I did not think wise to encumber the proposal I brought before the House with several important suggestions, but which might tend to distract the attention of the House from the point immediately before them, I preferred as regards legislation on that matter, to have one or two simple, clear and well-defined amendments passed at a time, rather than to undertake too many, and by confusing the subject be liable to defeat such an amendment as the House might otherwise be inclined to adopt. This being the position of the Canada Temperance Act, and it having worked very favourably in a great many districts throughout various provinces, an amendment was brought in during 1888, which I cannot but believe had a very damaging effect upon the minds of the ultra-temperance element in those various districts, and tended very materially to impair the efficiency and good working of the Act. The object of the Act was to prevent the sale of liquors which should be used as beverages, and to surround the sale of those liquors or alcohol when they should be used for medicinal or sacramental purposes, or be properly used in some art or trade, with such safeguards as would guarantee the public against improper use being made of the other terms of the Act by those who should be licensed for that purpose. Under the original Act, the only persons who could sell alcohol or intoxicating liquors in the districts to which I have referred, were druggists or licensed vendors thereof, specially licensed. The whole turning point of this amendment depends upon this phrase, that the vendor, under the original Act, must have been specially licensed for that purpose. The amendment of 1888, among other things introduced a new element into the sale of alcohol and intoxicating liquors. It provided that every chemist or druggist as such, by virtue of his office as a chemist, should be able to occupy the position previously occupied by a vendor specially licensed. This was deemed by many thoughtful observers a very dangerous provision, because, as hon. gentlemen must be very well aware, a large number of chemists and druggists in various portions of the country were not strong temperance men, were not strongly interested in carefully considering all the sales they should make, and there was great laxity on the part of chemists and druggists who occupied the position of licensed vendors supplying liquors because they were chemists. The Act of 1888 introduced this new element, that a chemist or druggist by virtue of his office as such was placed in the same position as were those who were formerly specially licensed. When we consider what a special license meant we can see that that in itself necessarily surrounded the sale of intoxicating liquors or alcohol which might be used for medicinal purposes with a very reasonable safeguard, because these gentlemen had to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor of each province, and the Lieutenant Governor would only act upon the representation of local persons who would certify to those issuing licenses that the vendor was not a person to be entrusted with the dangerous power, from a temperance standpoint, which the Act gave him. The Act of 1888, in addition to permitting any chemists or druggists to sell intoxicating liquors or alcohol, by virtue of his position as a chemist or druggist, proceeded to restrict the chemist or druggist in the sale of many articles which the strongest temperance men in this House would not consider by any means injurious to the public interest, and which they might be permitted to sell without surrounding them with all the restrictions and regulations which this amendment surrounded them with. To make clear the point that I am alluding to, I will read the amendment of 1888:

"Nothing in the Canada Temperance Act shall be held to interfere with the purchase or sale by legally qualified physicians, chemists or druggists of the following articles, that is to say:

"(a) The official preparations for the authorized pharmacopœias when made of full medicinal strength and sold only for medicinal purposes."

I may say that in the Bill I am now proposing that clause is left untouched.

"(*b*) Physicians' prescriptions containing spirituous liquors, if sold in quantities of not more than ten ounces at any one time.

This clause I have omitted from the amendment which I now propose, and for this reason: In the first place, the wording is very unfortunate, and that led to, and must necessarily lead to, a large amount of discussion and produce a great deal of indefiniteness. I think it was unfortunately worded, and I think it was unnecessary, because the Act as I have worded it in this Bill covers this ground in language much better calculated to place the vendors in a better position, between the public and those interested in the temperance cause. The Act says:

"Physicians' prescriptions containing spirituous liquors."

The "physicians' prescriptions" do not contain spirituous liquors. The provision in regard to the quantity of ten ounces I have kept in the amended Act. Clause *c* of the Act of 1888 says:

"Any patent medicine, unless such patent medicine is known to the vendor to be capable of being used as a beverage, the sale of which is a violation of the Canada Temperance Act."

I have retained this clause in the measure before the House. Clause *d* says:

"Eau de cologne, bay rum, or other articles of perfumery, lotions, extracts, varnishes, tinctures, or other pharmaceutical preparations containing alcohol but not intended for use as beverages."

I have retained this clause in the measure before the House. Clause *e* reads:

"Alcohol or methylated spirits for pharmaceutical, chemical or mechanical uses."

I have struck out of this clause the word "alcohol." Now, if the House will indulge me I will explain the present position of the druggist selling these articles. The Act of 1888 allows the druggist to sell all these articles but insists that he should keep a record of them in a book with the name and address of the purchaser, the quantity and name of liquor, the medical man prescribing same, and the purpose for which it is required, and the book shall be kept open for inspection by the proposed county inspector at all times. In the first place this apparent restriction is not a real restriction; it is not a proviso the violation of which can be punished by any penalty and it is practically a dead letter. But then if it were not a dead letter I think it is inadvisable to compel druggists or chemists in counties where the Scott Act is in force to keep a record of the preparations of the authorized pharmacopœia, patent medicine, eau de cologne and other such articles, because none of the articles are at all obnoxious to the temperance community, and I think that druggists ought to be allowed to sell them without the present restrictions in the Act of 1888. The consequence is that I throw the sale of these articles on the druggists without placing upon them any restrictions whatever, because in the first place, the present law does not create a restriction, in the second place if it did create a restriction, I believe it is practically impossible for any druggist to keep a record with any due regard to reasonable business rules; and, in the next place, I do not think it advisable from a temperance standpoint. But when we come to alcohol and spirituous liquors, then I think the full force of the principle of the original Canada Temperance Act should be made to apply to chemists and druggists to the same extent precisely as the original law contemplated to apply to the licensed vendors under this Act. This is the whole sum and substance of the Bill before the House. I provided in this Bill:

"(*e*.) Spirituous liquors or alcohol for exclusively medical purposes, or for *bonâ fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture; provided that such spirituous liquor or alcohol, when sold for medicinal purposes, shall not exceed in quantity ten ounces at any one time, and shall be removed from the premises, and that the sale thereof be made on the certificate or prescription of a legally qualified physician, affirming that such liquor or alcohol has been prescribed for the person named therein; provided also, that when such sale is for its use in some art, trade or manufacture, such sale shall be made only on a certificate signed by two justices of the peace, of the good faith of the application, accompanied by the affirmation of the applicant that such liquor or alcohol is to be used only for the purposes set forth in the application; provided further that the vendor shall file all such certificates and prescriptions, and shall record every such sale in a book kept for that purpose, giving the name and address of the purchaser, the quantity of liquor or alcohol so sold, the name and address of the physician prescribing it, and of the person for whom it is prescribed, and of the justices whose names are appended to the certificate above referred to, and of the purpose for which the liquor or alcohol is prescribed; and the said file and book shall be kept for inspection by the inspector for the county or district at all proper times; and the vendor shall make an annual return of all such sales on the 31st day of December in every year to the collector of Inland Revenue within whose revenue division the county or district is situated."

Although this clause is somewhat lengthy, and my explanation may not have been perfectly clear, I may state that it is the exact wording of the original Canada Temperance Act, as amended in 1888, with the exception of the words:

"That the person prescribing shall have no interest in the sale."

I repeat this clause in order to give it the benefit of all the decisions which have been held on the various points of that Act in the courts during many years of its trial. Here I may observe that one great benefit of permanency of the Canada Temperance Act arises from the fact that it has stood the test of a good many trials at law, that every sentence and passage of that Act has been weighed in courts of law, until these various provisions are now understood and well settled wherever the Act has been carried through the courts. The reason why the Act has been repealed in more than one district has arisen from the fact that owing to the weakness of the Act in the part I desire to amend, many strong temperance people have begun to believe that it is not likely to carry out the intentions of its original promoters. Therefore it is that I ask the House to allow the details of this Bill to be threshed out in a committee, where the verbiage can perhaps be considered more carefully than in a general discussion. The main points of the Act apply to the sale of alcohol and spirituous liquors by chemists and druggists, the reasonable restrictions originally applied when that sale was in the hands of specially licensed vendors, leaving those chemists and druggists free and untrammelled in the sale of the articles which were alluded to in clauses *a*, *b*, *c* and *e*, and which I believe temperance men did not generally believe to be particularly harmful. There are unfortunately in every community persons whose appetites have become depraved, who will make use of every sort of art and device to procure that

which has done them such moral and physical harm; and by placing the chemists and druggists in a position to insist on a proper certificate from a justice of the peace when alcohol or spirituous liquors are required for mechanical purposes, from clergymen in cases where wine is wanted for sacramental purposes, or from physicians when alcohol or spirituous liquors are required for medicinal purposes, we are protecting not only the public but the chemists and druggists, from being improperly charged, by those who are suspicious of their attitude in relation to this matter, with violating the reasonable intentions of the promoters of temperance legislation. The book is to be open for the inspection of the proper officers at proper times, and a return is to be made to the collector of Inland Revenue in the district; and thus every public as well as private interest seems to be subserved. I trust and I believe, from the generous manner in which the principle of this Bill was received last session, that it will receive the same this session. It is a matter of comparatively small importance to a large number of hon. members, and of no importance to a great many more, in whose districts the Act is not in force. But I can assure them that in those communities where the Act is in force, and where the public are anxiously watching the manner in which it is administered, this amendment is required and will be of a great deal of benefit. It will surround the sale of alcohol and spirituous liquors with the restrictions which were found wise and reasonable and prudent in the original Act, and which I believe will commend themselves favourably to all who have interested themselves in promoting temperance, so far as legislation of this kind can promote it. I think the ground has been pretty well covered; and if I have been at all prolix, it is because last session when this matter was brought forward, my esteemed friend, who is not now with us, but who, I am happy to say, has been promoted to a judgeship, and who was for a long time a leader in temperance matters here, did not understand my measure; but after discussion was had, and more light was thrown upon it, he threw the weight of his influence and his ability in support of it. I therefore move the second reading, trusting that the Bill will go to a committee, where all minor points of verbiage can be discussed with greater freedom and perhaps with better effects than they could in the House itself.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House, I would crave that indulgence and forbearance which I believe is always extended to young and particularly new members of the House. I have listened, Sir, with I trust becoming attention, to the Budget debate so far as it has proceeded; and I must say that, looking at it from my point of view, I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite have not seen fit to advance some reasons or some causes which might give the general public to understand why they have so greatly suffered in the recent general elections. Scarcely a year has passed away since the hon. gentlemen, flushed with victory—for victory seemed almost within their grasp—came before the House and asserted that but for certain reasons they would have been victorious in the fight on the 5th day of March, 1891. Sir, the reasons which were then potent to them are not to-day forthcoming. Notable and remarkable among those reasons was that the voters' lists had not been revised previous to those elections for some two or three years, and as a result, as stated by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), one-tenth or one-eighth of the young men of Canada had not the opportunity of recording their votes affirmatively or negatively on the policy of the then Administration of the day. Sir, the voters' lists have since then been revised, and the hon. gentlemen, I will be bound to say, dealt with them with all their usual vigour. But I will say this, though I am not in the secrets of hon. gentlemen opposite, that if they have a political litany, they will add to it a prayer that henceforth they will be spared from a revision of the voters' lists. Sir, there has been a revision of the voters' lists, and the answer has come back in clarion tones; and it ill-becomes these hon. gentlemen to tell constituencies which they carried on the 5th of March, 1891, that they have been bought up and led as sheep to the shambles. Sir, I say that is an insult and a slight to the constituency which I have the honour to represent—a constituency which on the 5th of March, 1891, was led away by the wild cry of free trade, by the alluring spectacle presented to it in glowing colours, but which, on second sober thought, changed its opinion and placed me here as its representative. I say that hon. gentlemen opposite should not go back on those who supported them in East Simcoe for many years past. We were also told by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) that if the election had taken place after the 5th of March last, the Government of the day would have been defeated by a majority of at least 60. In reply I ask, if a general election were to take place to-day, do any of the hon. gentlemen opposite think that they would again see the walls of this Parliament? The elections have taken place, and the voice of the people has been heard clearly and unmistakably. And now, Sir, I too must confess that I was disappointed in the financial critic of hon. gentlemen opposite, for I assume that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) does hold that position in their ranks. I was disappointed in that he did not see fit to propound the doctrine he would place on our Statute-books concerning reciprocal trade with the people of the United States, should he once again grace the position of Finance Minister. It may be, perhaps, the hon. gentleman thinks he will never be called upon to fill that position, and therefore does not think it worth his while to formulate any proposition. In the matter of trade relations with the United States, I am pleased and disappointed that the negotiations have ended in the way they have. I regret that the people of the United States, through their government, have seen fit not to enter into negotiations which perhaps might, on the whole, not be to their advantage or to ours, so that in the future we must need go on as we have gone in the past, each conceding, each forbearing, as from time to time the necessities of the case may

require. I admit that hon. gentlemen opposite are not responsible for their pessimistic moanings. Why, that has always distinguished the policy of that party, not only since but prior to Confederation. When that work was taken in hand by the Fathers of Confederation, was it not chiefly among the Reform leaders of the day that visions of trouble and disturbance were seen ahead? They told us that all the anticipations which the hon. gentlemen who composed the Government of the day hoped to realize would never be realized; they told us we never could possibly build a line of railway from ocean to ocean. Sir, these are now accomplished facts, and these facts to-day speak for themselves and speak most unmistakably. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been long in Opposition, and I concede it must have been to them a bitter disappointment when the victory which seemed so close within their grasp was snatched from them; and when they look to-day at their torn and tattered, aye, I might even say mangled remnant of a once formidable opposition, I can quite understand they are prepared to accept anything. What has been the policy of gentlemen opposite? On the public platform and in the public press they have from time to time stated that they were prepared to enter into a treaty of reciprocity with the people of the United States, and they look back to the era of reciprocity which existed between these two countries from 1854 to 1864, and institute a comparison, crying out that if once again that could be carried into effect, then once again would be seen in Canada an era of prosperity such as does not exist to-day. Sir, there are changed circumstances existing to-day as compared with those that existed then. Then the western States had not been opened up as they are to-day. Then the output of grain, beef, and pork was almost nothing as compared with what it is to-day. Then there were certain causes which led to the development of this country. There was notably the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway, which involved the expenditure of many thousand dollars. Also, in addition, it must be borne in mind that the agricultural trade of the people of the United States was, to a great extent paralysed, by their great internecine war; and, moreover, it must be borne in mind that the Crimean war, which had only just terminated, had virtually stopped the trade of Russia, which is to-day one of the great exporting grain countries of the world. These are reasons which existed then and do not exist to-day. Then it must be borne in mind also that while they point to the fact that there was a vast export of grain from this country to the United States, we were then, by way of the United States, shipping large quantities of grain to the maritime provinces; and though that grain doubtless was bonded, still it showed in the exports from Canada to the United States. Sir, I say that the circumstances have changed so much, that the figures prove most unmistakably that what would have been a market for us in those days is not our market to-day. Let us consider the articles of wheat and flour, and I take the year 1864 as a fair basis for comparison. In that year there was upwards of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat in store in Chicago, while in 1890 that had swelled to 227,000,000 bushels. In 1864 there were 16,000,000 bushels of oats, as against 75,000,000 in 1890. Then, in the matter of corn, in 1864 there was in stock 13,000,000 odd bushels, as against 91,000,000 in 1890. Then, turning to the matter of hogs, we find that in 1864 there were, in round numbers, 4,000,000 slaughtered in the city of Chicago, and in the west, as against 18,000,000 in 1890. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite will not contend that to-day there is a market in the United States for the surplus pork of this country? Sir, I had the pleasure the other day of being present with a representative delegation which waited on the Minister of Finance—a delegation not composed of Conservatives or Reformers, but made up of representative men from both political groups—and they demonstrated clearly, to the satisfaction of the Minister of Finance, that we in Canada were suffering, and severely suffering, from the importation of pork into this country from the United States. If we take the matter of beef, hon. gentlemen opposite will hardly assert from their place, where they can be contradicted successfully, that we can for one moment hope to enter into active competition with the people of the western States in this matter. If we did enter into a policy of reciprocity, our markets would be virtually a slaughter market for their beef, pork, oats and corn. Where would the farmers of this county be then as regards their coarse grain? It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to appeal to the farmers of this country, because they know they are the only class to which they can appeal with the shadow of a hope of success. They will not appeal to the manufacturing interest or to the labour interests. Certainly not to the labour interests, for these interests will bear in mind the fact that once upon a time a Reform Administration held power in Canada, from 1873 to 1878, when nought save depression and stagnation stalked through the land, and the reminiscences of that time have been sufficient to relegate hon. gentlemen opposite to where they have been since, in the cold shades of opposition. Now, I do not propose to go into the matter of agricultural products to any great extent; but representing an agricultural constituency, I think it is my bounden duty to express the sentiments my constituents hold and to which I owe their confidence, for you will bear in mind that that constituency was formerly confirmed in political allegiance to hon. gentlemen opposite. But we are told that there is a vast market among these 50,000,000 people for our products. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, do not bring out, as they fairly should, the fact that there are only certain portions of the United States to which we could hope to export successfully. Will the hon. gentlemen tell us that we could hope successfully to ship to the southern States, aye, even to the western States? We might, perchance, ship to some of the eastern States, but that market would be a little one compared with the market they exclaim is lying ready to be opened to us. Again, let us take the matter of butter. I find on reference to the statistics, that in 1865, there arrived in Chicago and were on store there some 5,000,000 pounds of butter, and in 1890, that had risen to 156,000,000 pounds, and yet, forsooth, hon. gentlemen tell us that is the market to which we can ship to-day. Is it not a fact that the people of the United States are shipping to other countries, and does it lie within the bounds of reason that we could have a profitable market where the people them-

selves are continually shipping to other lands? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) went rather extensively into the matter of the census, and I take issue with him on some of the points he made. The census shows that in East Simcoe there was a gain of 8,600 in the last ten years, and if hon. gentlemen would take constituency by constituency, they would find reasons for a decrease or an increase in the population. The hon. gentleman took into comparison certain states of the Union, but I can prove to him that the whole of the United States are not as prosperous as he imagines, but rather on the other hand, that they are retrograding instead of advancing. Take the border counties of Glengarry, Stormont, Dundas, Leeds and Frontenac, and we find that in those counties there has been an increase in the population, while on the other side of the river, with an equally salubrious climate and as fairly good soil, there has been a decrease in the population: and it is notorious that there is no part of the world which has more decreased in the population than the farming districts in some of the eastern States. The figures prove that clearly and unmistakably. To return to my own riding, we find that every town in the riding has increased in population, and I say it is a fair test of the prosperity of the country when towns and cities and villages increase in population. Do hon. gentlemen expect that old settled townships are going to increase? I have a case in my own riding. The only township in which there has been a decrease in the last ten years is the richest and most populous township in the riding. That proves simply this, that, after the farm has been cleared up, when three or four boys have been brought up there, it would be folly or idleness on the part of the parent to divide the farm among them; so some go out to the cities and towns, and I am glad to say that in that township many have gone to the great North-West and are doing well there. But, if the hon. gentlemen will make a comparison, they will take the older states of the Union to compare with our older provinces. Will the hon. gentlemen gainsay the statement that our North-West is developing and advancing? I think we should be proud of our North-West, and I think that, irrespective of politics, we are all proud of the development of that great country, a country which ten years ago was not exporting a bushel of grain and is now exporting millions of bushels, and it is impossible to say what the output of grain will be in the next two decades. Therefore, if we are not increasing in the older provinces as much as we would wish, it should be the aim and the object of hon. gentlemen opposite to come here in an amicable mood—because I think they have appeared to be rather in a bellicose mood—and to join with the Government in attempting to improve the condition of the country and to promote its prosperity. What is the general prosperity of the country irrespective of what we see? Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House assert that the farmers are in a depressed condition. The hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) was present in my riding during the election, though I do not attribute the defeat of my opponent to his presence there, but I am sure he will not say that in East Simcoe he saw any evidence of ruin or devastation, or that the whole country was going to wreck. If anyone will go through the whole province, his experience will be different from that which has been announced by the financial critic of the Opposition. If that hon. gentleman visits the County of Victoria, he says, you are peculiarly favoured here and consequently you are prosperous. When he goes to that asylum of refuge, South Oxford, for it is a political asylum for all on the Opposition side of the House, he does not feel free to tell the farmers of that district that they are in a pitiable or lamentable condition. On the whole, the country is fairly properous, and that is shown by the financial statements which are made from time to time; and, moreover, I believe this country is a cheap country to live in. Perhaps in Ontario the Government might improve our condition in some respects. I believe there is a class of immigration that could be directed to our country from the old land, because I believe there is a feeling amongst many there averse to settlement in the North-West, that is on the part of tenant farmers and others who would prefer to settle in Ontario, and I throw it out as a suggestion and my opinion, that, if the Government would endeavour to direct that class of immigration to this country they would be doing a benefit not only to the immigrants themselves, but also to the Province of Ontario. To come down to the matter as it is presented to our view, and to the view of the people of the Dominion in regard to our relation with the United States, we have at last received their ultimatum, and we know what they are prepared to do, and we have now to work out our destiny for ourselves as best we can. From the experience of the past I believe that we will prosper in the future, and that, as we have found a market for our agricultural products in Great Britain, and that is a friendly market, our interests will grow and will thrive. Let us take the matter as it is placed before us, let us look at our inevitable destiny as we must, and we have the choice between a policy of independence, annexation, or following the policy we have followed in the past, improving that from time to time. I do not believe that the people of this country are ready for independence, because it would carry with it such attendant circumstances that they could not face the dilemma that would be presented. We are not in a position, I believe, to undertake the great responsibility that would be incidental to our condition as an independent people. Moreover and beyond that, I believe there is a feeling of sympathy with the mother land that will disincline any of us to look forward to making independence our platform or our aim. Then, Sir, in the matter of annexation, I have only to say that I believe I voice the sentiments of the general public in Canada when I say that they are averse, they are opposed, to any form of annexation with the United States. And in this regard I think we may look upon them as entertaining a desire to force us into union, because we know they have always held up as their watchword that

> "No pent up Utica confines our powers,
> The whole boundless continent is ours."

That principle, I am bound to say, they have acted upon to a great extent in the past. Why, Sir, they picked a quarrel once with Mexico, and as a result they became possessors of California. Louisiana was gained by them, it is true, by purchase, but owing to fillibustering expeditions, and I believe by marauders in the State of Texas, they finally became possessors of that also. Therefore, I say

we have no interest up to the present time, guided as we are by our success in the past, to adopt the policy of annexation. And why should we? Sir, I believe that we have within our country the elements of future success. We have seen Canada grow, we have seen her prosper, we have seen the scattered provinces, with diverse interests, welded and blended together in one mighty Confederation; we have seen them go on day by day, prospering and thriving, and, looking back at our past, why should we not look forward hopefully to the future? In our country we have a populous and thriving agricultural class, a class who compare favourably with the agriculturists of any land under the sun; we have manufacturing interests which, I will be bound to say, treat the general public fairly and honestly; for although hon. gentlemen opposite assert from time to time that the manufacturers of this country are making princely fortunes, still I am bound to say that there is no country where, as a rule, prices are fairer, prices are more general. Why, Sir, if it is a fact that the prices obtained by our manufacturers for their goods are so excessively high, how is it that hon. gentlemen opposite—because there are many of them who are wealthy—they do not, with a view to assisting and bettering the condition of the country, invest some of this self-same wealth in our manufacturing industries? But, Sir, that is not the case. I say that comparing the prices of manufactured goods in this country with the prices of manufactured goods in other countries, competition has been so fair that it has reduced prices, so that purchasers are not placed at a great disadvantage. Now, I do not propose to exhume old newspaper files, I do not propose to inflict long tables of figures upon the House, because I believe that, looking fairly at the facts, as wayfarers by the path-side of observation, we are able to see within our borders what is going on. Then, Sir, I say, looking about us, we must arrive at the conclusion that the people of the country are satisfied with the prosperity that now exists and that has been clearly established, not only at the general elections but particularly at the bye-elections which have recently been held. As a Canadian I am proud of the land which gave me birth, and I look forward with all the fond anticipations that the forefathers of Confederation indulged in as to its future. As a Canadian I am proud of the mother land which guarantees to us freedom, liberty and equality, all that a happy and prosperous people can ask for, ever keeping before us, as our beacon lights, progress, prosperity, perseverance and a perpetuation of those bonds by which we are indissolubly linked to the mother land.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not intend to take up the time of the House at this early period of the debate in discussing questions of such vital interest to this country as were discussed last evening; but I find that I cannot, in justice to myself, and the constituency I represent, allow this opportunity to pass without, at least, expressing my views upon the all-important questions that are before this House and the country at the present moment. Now, Sir, I was rather surprised at the announcement made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bennett). He said that he was pleased with the manner in which the

discussion at Washington had closed, he was satisfied with the results that had been attained. I noticed last night when the Finance Minister addressed this House, intimating the conclusion at which they had arrived with regard to these negotiations, that hon. gentlemen opposite almost unanimously endorsed and applauded the action of the Finance Minister and the happy results to which he had brought negotiations at Washington. It is quite evident, I think, to the people of this country that the Finance Minister did not go to Washington with a determination to secure a reciprocity treaty at all. He went there for the purpose of trying to prevent a reciprocity treaty being further pressed upon the consideration of the people of this country or upon the people of the United States; he went for the purpose of frustrating completely the possibility of any extended trade relations being entered into between that country and Canada. He has come back, and he now declares that he is satisfied, the negotiations have all closed, and the whole thing has now come to an end, and it has come to that end which is satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite, and they now say to the people of this country: Rest and be quiet, be still, you are not going to have any reciprocity yet, just accept things as they are. Now, that is the conclusion to which they have come. Well, Sir, I rather fancy that he will find that the people of this country will not obey the behests of my hon. friend the Finance Minister; they will not be willing to accept his conclusions and to allow the affairs of this country to drift on in the way they are drifting at the present moment, without making some further and better effort than he has put forth at Washington, in order to secure trade relations. Now, it was rather amusing to me to listen to some of the hon. gentlemen opposite announcing from the stump their views and the competition to which the farmers of this country would be subjected under a treaty the same as we had in 1854 to 1866. They have, on all occasions, pointed out to the farmers how they would be subject to competition with the products of the United States coming in here under a treaty such as we had during that period, and that this country would be, as my hon. friend who has just addressed the House, has declared, a slaughter market for the surplus products of the United States. While they have been preaching that on the stump, while they have been telling the people of Canada that they would suffer very seriously by a treaty of that kind, at the very same moment Ministers of the Crown are down at Washington offering to the people of the United States a trade arrangement in respect to that very class of products. The Ministers go to Washington and say we are willing to do that, while their stump orators at home go round addressing the people, declaring that we would be subjected to excessive competition if American products were allowed to come into Canada and to compete with our products. I think hon. gentlemen opposite should get together and patch up the doctrines, views and ideas that they hold upon the question of trade relations with the United States. They had better either decide to adhere to the view laid down by the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Finance had better decide to change his position and bring it more in accordance with the views expressed by his supporters, because there is a very serious

divergence between the two. The hon. gentleman spoke something with respect to the impossibility of our shipping our products to the southern States. The hon. gentleman appears to have entirely forgotten the enormous market that is available within a reasonable distance without going to the south. The year before last we shipped 365,000 lambs or 1,000 for every day in the year to the United States. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the statistics of consumption in New York he will find they consume there alone over 2,000,000 lambs a year; so that we in Canada could not supply more than one-sixth they require. That city is not in the southern States; there are, in fact, a number of cities which might be conveniently reached, in which we could advantageously dispose of a great many of the commodities we raise in this country, and for which our farmers are seeking an opening. I was amused last night to listen to the Minister of Finance quoting the enormous quantities of potatoes imported into Great Britain, and in order to fill his mouth with figures of enormous quantities he gave the number of pounds of potatoes imported there every year. Perhaps next time he makes his financial statement he will give the number of ounces, in order to make the numbers larger. I might state to the hon. gentleman for his information that if he will turn up the trade returns of the United States he will find a very large quantity was imported from Liverpool into New York last year. A friend of mine came over in March last on a steamer from Liverpool to New York which carried 110 tons of potatoes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Give the quantity in pounds.

Mr. McMULLEN. The fact is the quantity in pounds would be a very large amount. I leave the Minister of Finance to figure out the number of pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. Give it in drachms.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Finance urges our farmers to ship their potatoes to Liverpool, when they are shipped from there to New York, which is twenty-four hours run from here, and which market we could obtain under a reciprocity treaty. I contend that while the British market is an open market to us, after all it is the slaughter market of the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of the British as a free market for the agricultural products of Canada. That market is, however, as free to the United States as Canada except as regards fat cattle, on which we have a little advantage; but beyond that we have not a vestige of advantage over the United States or any other country. It is folly to speak of the British market being a free market to the people of Canada when it is free to all the rest of the world. The hon. gentleman said something about our people going to our North-West. I am very glad indeed that a number of Canadians are going to the North-West, but I am exceedingly sorry to have to state that a number of Canadians are still going to the western States. When at home a short time ago I saw three young men leaving for Dakota, one of whom was taking a wife with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can give the names. They are Mr. Davis and his brother and Mr. Temple. If hon. gentlemen would like to have the name of the lady, I can give it. They were going to Dakota to settle there. I can say further that I have seen young men, and old ones too, who at the last election cheered the old flag, the old policy and the old man, and within two or three weeks I saw their traps checked to go to the north-western States. They were all ready to go to Uncle Sam's dominions, and yet they were shouting themselves hoarse during the election about the old man and the old flag. These people will come back no doubt to vote at the bye-elections. No doubt the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) had a number of them from the North-West, and though he may not be fully cognizant as to how they got back, he knows they got back when he wanted them. He said something about the products of the North-West. We are aware that the North-West has exported considerable products, but the vicious policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to that country is a very serious check to its development. The Government sold the land to speculators. Around Winnipeg you may find almost any quantity held to-day by speculators and not a soul living on it; hardly any one knows who holds it, it is held by a number of speculators to whom it was sold. Then the Government established a lot of colonization companies who have locked up land. Then they gave 25,000,000 of acres to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I contend that, instead of doing that, they should have made the land subject to a mortgage of so much an acre, and controlled the land and given it to the actual settler, and allowed whoever wanted to go in and possess the land and cultivate it to have an opportunity to do so. But in place of doing that, what does the man going to the North-West find to-day? He steps upon a section and desires to secure it: he is told that it belongs to a colonization company. He steps upon another section and is ready to take it; the answer that he receives is that it belongs to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He steps on another section; he is told that it belongs to the Hudson Bay Company. He goes on another section; he is told that he cannot secure it, because it was sold several years ago to a speculator. The man goes across the line and settles in North Dakota, where he can get whatever section he wants on which to settle. The abominable policy of this Government in relation to the North-West has cursed that country.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Is the hon. gentleman not aware that every even-numbered section of colonization and all other lands is open to homestead and pre-emption, and cannot be bought by any individual?

Mr. McMULLEN. I am aware that certain portions of the country are reserved for pre-emption but there are certain sections in which you cannot find any land which you can secure. If the Minister of the Interior were here, he would have to admit that even the ranching companies have been turning people off the lands and pulling down their houses. I admit I have not gone into speculating in the North-West, or else I might be as well posted as is the hon. gentleman. That is one of the unfortunate things connected with the North-West Territories. I do not wish further to refer to my hon. friend who has just addressed the House. I compliment him upon his first effort, which was a fairly good one, although it was

nothing but the stock and stale arguments which we have been accustomed to hear for several years. I hope that if he is permitted the pleasure and privilege of remaining in this House that he will try to catch up with the questions that are now being discussed in the country, and not go so far back in the history for his arguments as he has gone to-night. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance made some reference in his speech to the reduction of interest. He told us that in four years the interest on the public debt was reduced $400,000 and he kind of claimed credit for that reduction. We all know that the reduction is because the loans which we held on London market and otherwise, bearing large rates of interest have matured, and that the rate of interest at which money has been borrowed in recent years has been less than formerly. This is the cause of that reduction, and it is not on account of any particular efforts whatever on the part of the Minister of Finance. That reduction would have taken place no matter what kind of a man we had in his position or how stupid he possibly might be, if he only knew enough to allow the financial machine of this Dominion to run itself. As old loans at high interest get cancelled and new ones are issued at a low rate of interest, the rate of interest will fall, and every child knows that. The Minister of Finance told us with regard to the gross interest that in 1889 it was 3·40 per cent and in 1890, 3·35 per cent and in 1891, 2·98 per cent. Then he goes on to give the interest *per capita*. In 1887-88 he says it was $1.96 and in 1891, $1.76. That reduction is attributable to the same cause as I have stated with regard to the gross amount of interest, because if the rate of interest falls the gross amount *per capita* must of necessity decrease. However, the Minister of Finance does not do us justice in that statement, because he takes the year 1888 and he gives us the *per capita* of that year based upon the old census, while he gives us the *per capita* interest of 1891, based upon the new census, and, consequently, in that way, he makes a little more reduction than if he followed out the other course. The Minister of Finance also told us last year that the savings banks deposits were reduced by $1,943,892. Well, Sir, we can go back to the time in this House when hon. gentlemen opposite used to crow very loudly over the evidences of prosperity as shown by the increase in the Post Office savings banks. They pointed out from year to year that if there was any one thing above another that is a positive evidence of the improved financial condition of this country, it was the increased sums that were deposited in the savings banks. That was their stock-in-trade argument for several years. We did not hear it from the Minister of Finance this year, but he turned to the other banks and told us that if the money was not in the savings banks it was in the other banks of the Dominion. It would seem from the statement presented by the Minister of Finance that the people are beginning to lose a little confidence in the responsibility of the Government of this country. They begin to think that, after all, the chartered banks of this country are safer. They have seen so much of the exposures that have taken place in this House during the last session, the stealing that has been carried on, and the evidence of corrupt acts that have been brought to light, that I dare say a number of the people are beginning to think that their little savings in the Post Office savings banks are not quite safe, and the result is that last year they have withdrawn $1,900,000 from the care of the Government, for fear, perhaps, they might lose their little all, if hon. gentlemen opposite by some roundabout way should dip their hands a little deeper into the public chest. The Minister of Finance, after giving us some figures with regard to the exports of our agricultural products, went on to treat on the question of a reciprocity treaty. I consider that was the most important part of the hon. gentleman's statement last night. In the first place he said:

"In conference with Mr. Blaine the Canadian delegates proposed as a basis for negotiations the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 with such modifications and extensions as the changed condition of the country might render necessary."

He made that proposition, and as I have already stated while he was making that proposition in Washington, his supporters at home were declaring to the farmers of this country that it would ruin them. In the second place he says:

"They were met with the reply by Mr. Blaine, that looking into a treaty based upon natural products alone had not in it the essential elements of reciprocity."

That is the position that Mr. Blaine took upon that question and it is in accord with the expressions that nave been made by members on this side of the House, that reciprocity on the basis of the old treaty could not possibly be had with the people of the United States. The Minister of Finance continues:

"He raised the question as did also General Foster, who was his coadjutor in the conference, as to whether we were prepared to meet a proposal which would go wider than natural products, and take in and include a general reciprocity in manufactured articles as well. When that point came up the Canadian delegation immediately raised the question and discussed it fully and freely with Mr. Blaine, as to what would be the necessary conditions of such a reciprocity."

These gentlemen who went to Washington appear to have given so little consideration to this whole question notwithstanding the efforts that have been made to show the outcome of such an arrangement between us and the United States, that they went to Mr. Blaine and acknowledged to him that they did not know what reciprocity of an extended character meant, how it could be brought about, and rather than learn from those who were prepared to tell them at home, they went to the feet of the United States Gamaliel to ask him to teach them how to make a reciprocity treaty, and they have admitted that when they went there they knew nothing at all about it. The Minister of Finance further says:

"The reply came, after a full discussion of the matter, that a reciprocity would not be a reciprocity, and would have no compensating advantages to the United States of America unless they were given preferential treatment in our markets, especially against Great Britain, which was their chief competitor in nearly every line of manufactured goods, that under any scheme of reciprocity which would be looked upon favourably by them, the United States would expect to compete with Canadian manufactures in Canadian markets on even terms, but with no others. Well, when that point was reached, discussion took place as to the difficulties to be met by Canada in subscribing to a treaty of that kind, and they were fully and frankly laid before Mr. Blaine. They were, in brief, these: that in going into a treaty of that kind we should stand to lose what we were less able to lose than the United States of America, a considerable proportion of our revenue, first, the eight millions or so which we collected upon the products of the United States that came into Canada; and, secondly, the diminu-

tion, whatever it might be, which would result in the imports from the outside world owing to the competition and entrance of United States goods free of duty into our country. Mr. Blaine raised the question whether we had not other methods of taxation. We explained that we had methods of taxation by internal revenue as they themselves had, upon which he remarked that it would be necessary in a treaty of this kind that these inland revenue duties on liquors and tobaccos should be equalized."

He goes on to say :

"We raised the question, after a full and thorough discussion of things, of our difficulties and presented them plainly. At this point another question came up. Suppose that Canada were willing to discriminate against the goods of the outside world and of Great Britain on this proposed basis of a treaty, who should fix the discrimination and what should be the measure of that discrimination ?"

Now, it is quite clear from the manner in which all these questions were put by the delegation from this country, that they were put for the purpose of hampering the United States and frustrating the possibility of their accepting any terms upon which extended trade relations could be secured. The Canadian Ministers went there with their mouths full of arguments in opposition to reciprocity. They presented the difficult side of the whole problem : but they never made a single attempt to point a way out of the difficulties.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I submit that my hon. friend is entitled to a little courtesy from the other side.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not mind the actions of the ex-Minister of Customs. I am accustomed to that kind of thing.

Mr. BOWELL. You are under the protection of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister of Finance says further :

"Well, Sir, this question passed on in discussion until we had pretty well exhausted the subject, when the Canadian delegates, after having presented these difficulties and canvassed them fairly and thoroughly, said to Mr. Blaine : These are our difficulties : you acknowledge them, Now, you have had large experience in framing reciprocity treaties and have had much to do in the study and arrangements of reciprocal matters : we lay these points before you and we ask you whether or not, out of your experience, you cannot be prepared to propose a modification of this basis in order that we may diminish, at least to some extent, the difficulties we are under."

Now, Sir, it is quite clear that the Canadian delegation went there to raise all the difficulties they possibly could, but they offered no suggestion for removing any of those difficulties. Then they turned around and said to Mr. Blaine : "You have had a good deal of experience, Mr. Blaine, in making trade treaties ; we acknowledge our difficulties ; the one thing that stands in the way is the loss of revenue ; in making this statement we admit that reciprocity would be of decided advantage to Canada ; and we shall willingly assent to enlarge trade relations if you will show us how to raise the money necessary to meet the demands on our treasury. The money consideration is all that troubles us. The future prosperity of the farming population, or the question of enlarged markets for the manufacturers, does not concern us at all. If you will point out the way in which we can escape the revenue difficulty, we are prepared to negotiate with you. That was practically the proposition they made. But, Mr. Blaine did not help them out of the woods. I have no doubt that he looked upon them with pity, perhaps mingled with a little contempt, astonished that men from another nation would come to negotiate a trade treaty and confess that they had so little resources in themselves for devising a satisfactory trade policy, that they had to ask his advice as to how they could escape the difficulty. That was virtually the position they took on this important question. Now, I contend that the farmers of this country will not allow this matter to rest where it is. Their past experience of the advantages of the American market was such that they will not be content to be put off in the way the Finance Minister proposes to put them off. Those advantages the farmers of this country are longing to realize again. Under the reciprocity treaty of 1854-66 we had prosperity in this country : but since the inception of the National Policy, twelve or thirteen years ago, the farmers of this country have been growing poorer. Notwithstanding the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, I maintain that there is not a farming section of this country to-day where the people generally are in as prosperous a condition as they were some years ago. You will find more mortgages recorded, more farms for sale. The best evidence of the impoverished condition of any class of men is found in their desire to sell out and leave the country ; it is pretty good evidence that they are not satisfied with the condition of things in the country where they live ; and that is the condition of the farmers of Canada to-day. There are more farmers ready and willing and anxious to sell out than there ever were in Canada before. I can remember when many farmers of this country would hesitate to put a value on their farm, and before you could buy it you would have to pay a fancy price for it. But to-day, in any farming district in the country, if you call at any farm house and ask: "Is your farm for sale?" the owner will say "yes," and will be glad to enter into negotiation at once. That has been the experience for the last twelve or thirteen years, during which the products of the farms have been shrinking in value. Our farmers have not been receiving the prices they did years ago. There were then many articles which they could sell in the United States at good prices. But to-day that market is closed against them, and hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to have any pity for them at all. The Finance Minister says : Gentlemen, the thing is now settled and fixed, and you must look forward to the present condition of things remaining just as it is. This reminds me of a story which I heard of a southern planter who had moved up to Dakota. His great business was to raise hogs, which in the south he had been accustomed to feed on corn. But in Dakota he found the frost so strong that it killed the corn ; so he made up his mind that he would raise potatoes instead of corn. He planted a large quantity, and he decided that he would save himself the trouble of taking up the potatoes by allowing the hogs to go in among them when they were about ripe, and let them root. A neighbour said to him : "What will you do when the frost comes ? Your hogs will not be able to raise the potatoes then." "Well," said he, "that is a problem I never thought of. I suppose we shall have an object lesson of the old adage, 'root, hog, or die.'" That is what it is going to come to with the farmers of Canada. While the McKinley Bill has frozen the farmers of this country out of the American market, hon. gentlemen opposite are not trying to

get any other market for them, and I suppose in their case we shall have the object lesson of root, hog, or die. These hon. gentlemen propose to do nothing, and the result is that our farmers have to sell what they raise in the slaughter market of Great Britain, and take there whatever they can get for it. That is the position we are placed in to-day. Now, to give you some little idea of what the American market has been worth to the farmers of this country, I shall give you some quotations of the shipments of produce to that country during the last ten years. We exported to the United States 9,939,745 bushels of barley in 1890, and in that year we only exported to England 27,000. In 1891 our exports of barley to the United States fell to just one-half. We only exported 4,751,000 bushels, and during the same period we exported 132,000 bushels to Great Britain. So that our export of barley fell off, under the operation of the McKinley Bill, which only came into operation the 6th of October, 1891, 50 per cent. Now, from 1881 to 1891, we exported to the United States to the amount of $61,818,512. We drew during the same time over $20,000,000 in gold for horses. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite say to us we will send our horses to England—that is the market for our horses; but if you will take the trade returns for 1891, you will find we sent to Great Britain 904 horses, but took from Great Britain in the same period 1,217 horses, so that in place of Great Britain being a market for Canadian horses, Canada is a market for Great Britain, since we take more horses from them than we send them. We sent every year, previous to the passage of the McKinley Bill, from 18,000 to 20,000 horses, and last year, under the operation of that Bill, we shipped to the United States 6,019 horses less than we shipped the year before. Now, I give my hon. friends a statement with regard to potatoes, and am sorry the Finance Minister is not in his place, because he gave us some quotations with regard to potatoes last night. From 1st October to 1st April, 1891, we shipped two and a quarter million bushels of potatoes. Out of that quantity, we sent 1,850,000 bushels to the United States, in order to get which across, under the operation of the McKinley Bill, we paid $437,000 duty. Now, what we are anxious for, and labouring to secure, is the removal of that duty. We are anxious to secure that market, for notwithstanding the fact that the McKinley Bill was in force last year, our farmers were compelled to send their potatoes to the American market and pay 25 cents duty per bushel, rather than send them to the English market, because in the English market they got the bottom price. What is the bottom price? It was arranged at a figure which enabled Englishmen to reship those potatoes to the New York market, and pay 25 cents a bushel to get them in, and sell them at a profit. Still the Finance Minister would advise us to send all our commodities to the English market. Now, I contend, notwithstanding the statement the Finance Minister has made, that the farmers of this country are not going to be satisfied with the condition of things as they are now. While the United States are finding better and more extensive markets for their people, the Government of Canada are at a standstill. They have not made a single treaty within the last year, or in any way opened up a new outlet for the products of the farm. We have had promises with regard to a treaty being made with Spain, but we have realized nothing. We are always being promised new treaties of one kind or another, and we get nothing but the promises. We sent the Minister of Finance away to the West India Islands for the purpose of securing a treaty with Jamaica. He went down at considerable expense to that country. He told the people what he was willing to do, and when he came back here he did the very opposite. He was to admit raw sugar in exchange for their admission of commodities we proposed to send them, such as farm produce, but when he came back the sugar refiners said they would never consent to all sugars under 16 Dutch standard coming into the country free, as it would ruin their trade, by cutting off a very large amount which they would otherwise realize from the consumers of the country. Thus he had to come down to 14 Dutch standard in place of 16. There was a market which we could have got for some of our commodities, but which, owing to the vacillation of the Minister of Finance, we have lost. Now, we know well that under the operations of the present tariff, in place of the farmers of this country becoming better off they are getting worse off. We know that five of the largest implement manufacturing institutions of this country have formed a combine recently in the production of binders. We know that to-day binders are being manufactured in this country under a combine, and the farmers will just have to pay the price that combine is disposed to ask, and there will be no reduction. I have no doubt that there are combines on the other side, too, but while they have combines to arrange prices at which they will sell to their own people, they have at the same time reduced prices at which they are willing to sell to exporters, and we want the advantage of securing that. Another question which has been discussed in this debate, and one of considerable interest, is the question of binding twine. That was up last year, and there is a notice on the paper this year urging the advisability of placing it on the free list. I consider binding twine just as much raw material of the farmer as twine is of the fisherman. The fisherman is permitted to import twine for fishing purposes free of duty. In the name of common sense, why are not the farmers permitted to import twine for their work on the same conditions? Again, I contend that they should be allowed to import corn. If hon. gentlemen opposite would put corn on the free list and place farmers in the position of being able to get a very much greater amount of feed for cattle, that would be a decided advantage, because now it is quite evident that the only outlet they have for their stock is the British market, and the placing of corn on the free list would facilitate the production of fat stock, and thus be a decided advantage. Such acts as these would be in the right direction, but the only object and aim of hon. gentlemen opposite was to give a quietus to this agitation with regard to unrestricted reciprocity. They felt that it was a disturbing element in the country, they felt that the farmers were beginning to realize that some relief would have to come from some source, and I am quite satisfied that had the speech of the Finance Minister been made before some of the bye-elections, some of the constituencies which sent men here to support the Government would have sent supporters of the Opposition. I know there are hundreds of

Conservatives in this country, now looking forward, hopefully and earnestly, to the ultimate consummation of reciprocity with the United States. If hon. gentlemen opposite were not scared that the people of this country were sincere in this demand, why did they humbug the people by announcing in March, 1891, that on the 4th of March they were going to send a delegation to Washington to negotiate a treaty. That was the reason they gave to the country for holding the elections at the time they did. They went to Washington, and they saw, and they returned. A few moments satisfied them on that occasion. They did not accomplish the object of their mission but they fancy they have struck the nail on the head this time. They have so completely prevented, as the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said last night, they have so bolted the door, locked it and pocketed the key that they think no further effort can be or will be made to obtain extended trade relations with that country. There has been a good deal said in this House and outside of it as to the value of lands. It is for every man to give his personal experience as to whether there has been an increase or shrinkage in the value of lands throughout this Province of Ontario. I speak for myself and from my own knowledge. About two and a half miles from where I live, there was a farm which thirteen years ago was valued at $4,200. There was a barn there which was afterwards burnt down. This farm was purchased for $4,200, and a mortgage of $2,200 and $2,000 cash was paid. That farm has been offered for sale under the hammer since I came to Ottawa, and the largest amount bid for it was $1,700, though it is in the same condition with the exception of the barn being burnt down. That proves that the value of land is not what it was some years ago. Some gentlemen may say that is not a good section of country, but I think they will find it is a very nice country. There are some favoured sections, but I know in the London district and in the Woodstock district farms are offered for sale that never were in the market before, that have remained from year to year and from generation to generation in the same family, and now they are for sale because of the unremunerative prices obtained by the farmers and the hampered condition of the farmers in getting fair prices for what they have to sell. For any man to say that there has not been a shrinkage in the value of real estate is to state what is not true, and, if those hon. gentlemen will consult the money lending associations in Ontario, they will find that they are getting every year more land on their hands, and are offering lands for sale for less than the mortgaged encumbrance in some cases. I am very sorry to state that this is the case, and I hope that things may soon be better than they are now. The Finance Minister spoke of the taxation and of the revenue from the Department of Customs. He stated that the customs taxation was now very little in excess of what it was in 1878. I find that in 1879 the customs tax amounted to $12,900,659, or $3.12 per head, while in 1890 the amount was $23,968,953, or $4.60 per head. There is another thing to be considered. The National Policy has failed to produce the home market which was promised to the people of this country. That promise has been broken as well as all the other promises. Hon. gentlemen cannot point to a single vestige of all the promises they made to the farmers that has been fulfilled. They promised a home market to the farmers, and what do we find? In 1878 we shipped $32,000,000 of the products of the farm, and in 1890 we shipped $42,000,000, or $10,000,000 more. Where has the home market been, because the shipments have been increasing every year instead of decreasing? Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to be very sensitive about discrimination against Great Britain. They appear to be in love with that country. I have no objection to that, and we claim to have as much love for that country on our side as they have on theirs. We do not boast of our loyalty. We do not keep it on the tip of our tongue, as they do, but when any trouble comes it is found that Reformers are just as ready as Conservatives to defend the privileges we enjoy under British institutions, and that is the best proof of loyalty. We find that in 1891 our imports from Great Britain amounted to $31,447,660 of dutiable goods and $10,599,866 of free goods. Altogether we took from them $42,047,526 worth. From the United States in the same year, we imported $29,790,402 of dutiable goods and $23,895,255 of free goods, or a total of $53,685,657. We took double the quantity of free goods from the United States that we took from Great Britain, and yet hon. gentlemen are yelling that we on this side want to discriminate against the mother country. Are they not doing that now, because their tariff is making us take twice as much free goods from the United States as from England? Then the duty collected on goods from Great Britain amounted to $9,114,271.75, while the duty we collected on imported goods from the United States, on more goods than we imported from England, was only $7,734,514.71. So in reality the gross amount of dutiable goods imported from the United States, is very nearly as large as the gross amount imported from Great Britain, while the duty collected is two millions less than the duty collected on the goods which come from Great Britain. Now, to give you a little idea of how the want of unrestricted trade relations affects the province from which I come, I will give the exports and imports from Ontario. Last year, Ontario imported from the United States dutiable goods to the value of $15,414,618, and free goods to the value of $10,478,392, or a total of $25,892,990. The whole Dominion exported to the United States $37,288,572. Of that export, animals and their products amounted to $4,316,978; agriculture, $7,291,246, or a total of the products of the farm of $11,508,225. Products of the forest, $11,763,058; products of the mine, $4,600,800; products of the fisheries, $3,807,786; manufactured goods, $3,006,423. Ontario exported altogether to the United States in 1891, $20,693,049. Of animals and their products that province exported $2,737,539, and of agriculture, $5,389,492. That shows how very much interested the Province of Ontario is in the matter of extended trade with the people of the United States; and I contend that we will not have a better condition of things in the Province of Ontario, and I fear in the Dominion of Canada, until such time as we secure better trade relations with those people than we have got at the present time. It is said by our opponents, and said with some considerable force, that the American farmer is worse off than the Canadian farmer. They tell us: Why do you want extended trade relations with a

country where the agriculturists are worse off than they are in Canada? I admit that is true to some extent, and why is it true? Simply because the American farmer has been labouring under the operation of a protective tariff for 25 years, and if the Canadian farmer is subject to the exactions of a protective tariff for twelve years and a half more, his condition will be worse off than that of the American farmer is to-day. As Canadian farmers we have been pauperised under the operations of this law. As has been truly stated by the hon. member for South Oxford, there has been a double duty extorted from the people of this country, one duty goes into the revenue and the other duty goes into the pocket of the monopolist, and the result is, as that hon. gentleman showed last night, that our Government, in place of collecting $36,000,000 out of the people of this country, collect more like $70,000,000 a year, because the one portion is taken for revenue and the other portion is virtually stolen under the operation of combines and the advantages given to manufacturers under the operation of the present tariff. Sir, we want to get rid of that condition of things, and until such time as we do get rid of it, we will have no improvement in this country. Now, the exports of the Province of Quebec to the United States last year amounted to $4,406,751. I have given you the exports of Ontario. I have here the exports of the other different provinces. Those of Nova Scotia were $3,463,826; New Brunswick, $3,646,333; Manitoba, $1,021,606; British Columbia, $3,211,158. So that when we look over these figures it can easily be seen that of all the provinces of this Dominion, the Province of Ontario is the most deeply interested in the question of extended trade relations with the United States. We do not wish for a moment to go on our knees and beg from the Americans the privileges that we want. We claim that we have the wherewith to offer inducements to them to give us those privileges. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they have nailed their colours to the mast, and what are their colours? They say: We will enter into a treaty with you, the Americans, if you will not interfere with our manufacturing interests. We want to preserve to our sugar refiners the privilege of making $1,600,000 a year, free from outside competition, and they want to be allowed to inherit that advantage for years to come. We have protected the producers of agricultural machinery, the producers of furniture and of every other article that is made in this country under the benign operations of a tariff of protection, and we cannot allow these people to be interfered with. They are still called infant industries, and they always will be as long as we treat them as infants, but the very moment you let them stand alone, some of them at least, will get up and show that they can compete with the Americans. But as long as they are protected they will suck at the resources of the people of this Dominion, and they will perform the peculiar duties of barnacles of state, sucking at the people's life blood. Now, we want to put a stop to all that. We say the people have been subjected to that too long, we say it is time a change should be made. The Finance Minister had better not fancy that he has locked the door and put the key in his pocket. He will find that he is not in absolute possession of the entire situation, and that the people of this country will not give up without a struggle, their efforts to get clear of the difficulties that are staring them in the face. He will find, unless he makes some effort to relieve the farming community, that they will begin to open their eyes. A great many of them have been going to the polls and shutting their eyes to the pernicious effect of this policy, but they will begin to get their eyes open, they will begin to realize by hard experience that the National Policy has been robbing them, they will begin to realize that this policy is a piece of unjust legislation that has been drawing from them their resources and putting them into the pockets of the manufacturers. I say that the sooner hon. gentlemen opposite realize that the farming community are not satisfied, the better it will be for themselves, and the better it will be for this country. Now, Sir, I do not wish to touch upon any other point except the all-important point of our trade relations. That is the question of all questions that are before this House and this country at the present moment. It is the question that the people of this country are disposed to listen to, and any other question that might be discussed in the Budget debate had better be left to one side. We are willing to hang our fate upon the result of this policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite have thrown out hints that we had better look around for a new policy. We want to announce to hon. gentlemen opposite that we cling with united tenacity to the policy we have already adopted. We are going to stick to that policy. Notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Finance says he has closed the door and locked up all hope of any further efforts being made, we are not willing to accept his conclusion. We tell the people of this country: If you are prepared to place us in the position of entering into negotiations with the United States, clothe us with authority and we will open the markets of that country on fair and equitable terms for you in a very short time, and give you a little sip of the advantages you enjoyed years ago when you were under such favourable circumstances for disposing of your products in the American market. Unrestricted reciprocity without any unjust exactions, that is what we are labouring for, that is what we are going to fight for. Hon. gentlemen opposite must not fancy that they are going to scare us into the adoption of something else. If they have nailed their colours to the mast with a determination to make no further effort to secure a treaty, we, on this side, have adopted a different course. We are determined to cling to that principle until we carry it out, to some extent at least. We have nailed our colours to the mast also, and we want hon. gentlemen opposite to know, if it is any source of comfort or satisfaction to them, that we are going to fight until the people realize plainly the position they are in; we are going to fight this battle out to the bitter end until we have convinced the people of this country that it is in their interest to support us in the policy of securing unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. We are never going to slacken our efforts until we secure for the hampered people of this country the relief of which they stand so much in need. This course we are going to take and follow it out until the end. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to dwell further upon this subject. I could not permit the opportunity to pass without, at least, making known my views with regard to this important question.

I contend it is the duty of every man who represents a rural constituency in which he knows, from his own experience and the intimacy that exists between a representative and his constituents, the hardships, privations and inconveniences under which the community which he has the privilege of representing is labouring. I know the condition of our people; I know how anxious they are to secure better returns for their farm products, and I can say this, that I believe—and I believe it honestly—that if you open up to the farmers of this country the markets of the United States on a liberal basis, so that they can secure for their products free sale in that open market, it will be worth $1 per acre for every acre of cleared land in this Dominion. If you do that I contend that the farmers of this country in a very short time would wipe out the entire national debt, and be no poorer than they are under the operation of the present tariff.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, on rising as a new member to address a few remarks to the House on the questions of the day, I equally with those who have preceded me, must request the indulgence of members of the House in case I should trespass on any of the established rules and usages which are unfamiliar to a new member. I have been surprised on coming to this chamber, and hearing the trade questions discussed, to find that the members of the Opposition are taking the same view as that which they have been presenting in the rural districts. Those who come from the rural districts expect to find a somewhat different style of speech delivered on these questions as compared with those with which we are favoured in the rural districts. But I find hon. gentlemen have nothing new to tell us. It is the same old story we have heard during the recent bye-elections, and during the general elections last year. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken had the honour of visiting the riding I represent, not very long since, and the same musical voice uttered the very same arguments then which he advanced here this evening. I notice that hon. members of the Opposition here, as in the rural districts, are very anxious for the welfare of the farmers, in fact, they go further outside than they do in the House. There they all pose as farmers, or as the farmer's friend. This brings to mind one of those gentlemen when expressing his friendship for the farmers, told them how he was brought up on the farm, that he had planted the potatoes, and hoed the corn, and done all sorts of farm work, and that he had almost grown up between two rows of corn. A boy on the back seat called out, "A pumpkin." In their desire to pose as the farmer's friend I think those hon. gentlemen are certainly not far out of the line suggested by the boy. We find the same cry used here to-night as is used in the country; a decrease of population, farms have declined in value and those various other pessimistic cries that have returned, during the bye-elections, this little colony existing on this side of the House. We find that when those hon. gentlemen lay down the policy of free trade between Canada and the United States, they declare they have pinned their colours to the mast and are going to sink or fall by their trade policy. I quite agree with a remark that has fallen from the hon. gentleman that the Government are here to stay. Whoever may see the result of the general elections, unless hon. gentlemen of the Opposition change their policy, will find them sitting where they now are, only in still further reduced numbers. In contradistinction to their policy, the Minister of Finance has laid before this country a proposition for fair trade with the world. We have seen during the past generation, twenty-one years, a policy pursued of building up this Canadian nation, uniting province with province, constructing various public works, railways and canals and the final work of constructing Canada is all but consummated. There remains but one further link in the great work of construction, and that I hope will soon be accomplished, our union with the sister colony in the ocean; Newfoundland. The second part of the great national policy is being pursued, the extension of trade within our own borders and with the nations of the world at large. We find on an examination of the policy laid down by the Opposition that those hon. gentlemen invariably refrain from stating the details of their policy. They will tell you how severely the country is suffering under the present Administration, they will tell you how badly off the farmers are and the difficulties under which they labour, but they will never go into details with respect to their policy; and with the permission of the House I will briefly review what their policy means. First, they do not hesitate to admit, and it cannot be denied after the speech of the Minister of Finance, that it involves discrimination against the mother land. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has stated that the supporters of the Government last night applauded when the Minister of Finance made the statement that we could not get free trade with the American people without discriminating against England and in making that statement the hon. member for Wellington misled the House. The applause occurred when the Minister of Finance said that we would not consent to any reciprocity with the United States that involved retaliation against Great Britain. The hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks stated that under the present policy we protect various articles, such, for instance, as furniture and binders; and it was time that this protection was stopped. If his policy was carried out, if there was free trade between Canada and the United States, not only would those classes be doubly protected as compared with their protection at present, but they would be protected in such a way that our infant manufactures would be left to the mercy of the great monopolies across the line, and would be wiped out within a short time. There can be no doubt that their policy involves the largest amount of protection with the loss of our industries at home. While on the one hand they talk of free trade with the United States, they are, on the other hand, shutting us out from the rest of the world; it is simply free trade with the United States and exclusion from all the rest of the world, and it is the most novel kind of free trade which any politician ever advanced. Their policy would further involve the loss of all the industries we now enjoy, and which we are building up in this country, and in which we are making progress at the present time. I need not dwell on this point; it is self-evident. Their policy would further mean the centralization of the trade of the country, not at the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, but in New York

and Boston. It is well known that the American promoters of the scheme of free trade between Canada and the United States are largely interested in the transportation lines which centre in those American cities, and it is one of their plans for building up their own property and their own lines of railway to the detriment of our Canadian roads. It would further involve us in competition with the western farmers of the United States. A preceding speaker has very clearly and explicitly pointed out some of the disadvantages under which we would labour had we free trade with the United States, but I desire to refer for a few moments to American statistical records to show what the trade would mean. At present we are protected from the United States in all articles of farm produce; and here I may digress to ask the hon. member who preceded me to explain a statement which he made. He stated that in 1878 we enjoyed a free market with the United States and that we then produced many articles of farm produce which we were not able to produce to-day and sell to the United States. In all my experience of farm products I cannot recollect one article that was produced and sold to the Americans under the old reciprocity treaty that we cannot produce and sell to them to-day. I am sure that the House will be more than obliged to the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) if he would kindly name one article which we produced under the old reciprocity treaty and which we do not produce now. Perhaps the chief article in which we come in competition with the United States is the article of wheat, and when I look at the official reports of the United States, issued last year, I find that there were in the hands of the farmers of that country, and for which they were unable to find a market in any part of the world, 156,000,000 bushels of wheat. The House can easily understand that if that were turned into flour and sold in our Canadian markets it would greatly reduce the price of our wheat there. The millers of this country are at the present time putting forth extraordinary efforts in order to secure the entrance of our flour into Newfoundland on favourable terms. If we were exposed to the competition of the Americans in our home markets, the foreign markets would amount to nothing, because the Americans have cheaper transportation rates than we have as yet, and we would find ourselves undersold in our home markets by their cheap western products. We find that on the 1st of March last year the Americans had in their granaries, and unable to find a market for it throughout the world, 970,000,000 bushels of corn. The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. McMullen) spoke of having American corn coming into this country free. There are men in this House who in the days prior to 1878 know that the American corn was fed to the horses in this country, and in the lumber camps in this neighbourhood and throughout northern Ontario, while our farmers had oats in their granaries which they could not sell at more than from 10 to 15 cents per bushel. Yet the Liberal members in this House would wish to return to the old days prior to 1878, when oats, which formed one of the staple products of the Canadian farmer, were rendered almost valueless. I find also from the official reports of the United States that the oats market is up into the six and seven hundred million bushels every year. Turning to the cattle trade, we find that under our relations with Great Britain we enjoy a preferential trade in the English market, and the Americans themselves, in the interests of their people, are so fully alive to this that the Secretary of Agriculture for the United States has seen fit to make a report to Congress on the subject. He says:

"The greatest hindrance to the export trade in live cattle is the regulation of the British Government requiring that all American cattle shall be slaughtered on the docks within a period of ten days after they are landed. This prevents the owner from holding them until they can recover from the effects of the voyage and until the market is in the best condition for selling. Canadian cattle, which are allowed to enter England without any restrictions, are said to yield the shipper from $10 to $15 per head more than can be realized from steers shipped from the United States. The effect of this difference in returns is very marked, both upon our trade and upon the market value of cattle in the United States. If our shippers were able to secure $10 or $15 per head more for their animals it would of course stimulate the trade, and they would be able to pay nearly that amount more for steers purchased in this country. Such an advance in the price of export cattle would have a strong tendency to increase the price of all other kinds of stocks. In this respect, then, the removal of the restrictions would be of the very greatest advantage to American cattle-raisers.

"The removal of the English restriction would also enable our shippers to send a kind of cattle which now cannot be exported at all to Great Britain. There is no doubt but that our thin steers, or feeders, as they are called, could be supplied to the English farmers for feeding purposes much cheaper than store cattle are now obtained from Ireland. The vast numbers of this class of our steers which have been thrown upon the market of the United States during the last three or four years have so exceeded the supply that prices have declined below the cost of production. The inevitable tendency is to force down the price of all meat-producing animals? If the foreign trade would take a considerable number of these thin steers it would be of the greatest benefit in sustaining the prices in this country."

Now, Sir, turning again to the reports of the United States, we find in that country that the number of cattle is increasing, not by hundreds or thousands, but by hundreds of thousands and millions. For instance, the increase in the number of cattle alone in 1890 over 1889 was 2,470,865 head in the United States. The increase in the number of swine in that year was 1,301,188, and last year again the increase in the number of cattle was in the United States 1,172,251 head over the previous year; and we find also that the average price of these animals is far below the average price in Canada. We find, turning to the hog industry of the United States, that there were 51,602,780 animals in the markets in 1890, which was an increase over 1889 of 1,300,000, besides 3,105,000 which died of hog cholera. In 1891 we find that there was an increase of 1,722,917 in the hog markets of the United States and an increased value in the hog products of the United States of $30,837,492. If our farmers had to compete with American farmers in the production of pork, the effect on our trade would simply be ruinous. The deputation which waited on the Minister of Finance the other day was assured that American barrelled pork was being placed in Canada at the present time at about $7.50 per barrel. We find that the export of hog products from the United States amounted last year to 1,300,000,000 lbs., besides live hogs amounting to 45,000 in number, and this year the hog products of the United States, not including the cities and towns, amounted to 3,470,000,000 lbs. The official report of the United States in speaking of this matter says:

"No account is taken of the hogs killed and consumed by farmers or sold in villages, towns and cities, and which are not packed, as there are no definite data from which it can be determined."

Now, I will turn to the question of horses. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) endeavoured to show that Canadian farmers would benefit by free trade with the United States in horses. I am free to admit that in the days that he has spoken of, that is, under the old treaty of 1854, we did enjoy a market with the United States for our horses. We all know, Sir, that at that time the American war was going on and horses had a ready sale for cavalry. At that time also the western states were being settled up and the farmers of the east were sending horses to these states; whereas to-day, from these same western states, they are exporting horses in thousands and tens of thousands. We also know that in the cities and towns of the United States horses have been largely used until recent years for street cars, but other motive power has taken the place of horses, and the number employed in this service is gradually lessening, so that on account of this the demand for horses has fallen off considerably. If we turn to the official report of the United States we find that in 1889 the average price per head of horses in the United States was $71.89, in 1890 it was $68.84, and last year it had fallen to the low sum of an $65.01 in the United States markets. We find that in place of looking for a market for horses in the United States that it behoves us to look at home. In turning to our North-West you will find that thousands of horses are annually smuggled into that country or brought through the customs. Last year the aggregate value of horses imported into Canada from the United States was over $116,000. Of course, we sold a large number to the United States; but the day is fast approaching when it will become the duty of the Canadian Government to protect our farmers against horses from the western prairies. In almost any article of farm produce our Canadian farmers cannot compete with the cheap products of the western prairie farms of the United States. There the farmer, when he goes on to his land, finds it already cleared; there is no necessity of fencing it; as a rule, his house is very cheap; and he is not obliged to indulge in the luxury of expensive buildings. In the older provinces of the Dominion the farmer has in the first instance to clear the land, which, with stumpage and stoning, occupies several years of severe labour. I am free to say that the fences and buildings on almost any Ontario or Quebec farm represent fully the value of any western prairie farm. Further, Sir, in the western states the farmers are not subject to the long winters that we have here. On the average, our farmers have to provide for feeding their stock six or seven months every year, and it is utterly impossible for them to raise pork or cattle, or animals of any kind, in Canada, to compete with the cheap products of the western states. If you turn to the eastern states, you will find that the farmers there are made poor by the competition of the western farmers. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is supposed to represent the financial brains of the Opposition, in his addresses throughout the country, preaches of the desolation that exists in Ontario from the reduced values of farms. Well, I can point him to the Genesee valley, considered by many to be the garden of America, where farms have been reduced in value one-third or one-half by the same cause. It has been remarkable to me why these hon. gentlemen, in passing through the country, have not sought for an honest explanation of the decrease in the value of farm lands throughout the old provinces. In discussing these matters one might as well be fair; and I am satisfied that if they had discussed that matter on a fair basis, and had not attempted to mislead the electors, the bye-elections recently held would not have resulted so disastrously as they have done. The hon. member for South Oxford, in his speeches throughout the country, has been asserting that the cause of the decreased value in the farm lands of this country is the financial policy of the Government. Is there an hon. member in this House, or even a school boy throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, who does not know the real cause of that depreciation in value? We admit that there is depreciation, but there is an honest cause for it—the cause of supply and demand. In our North-West we have millions of acres opened up, and our young men who have money to invest or who wish to settle down on farms for themselves, in place of paying the large prices demanded in the older provinces, go there with their stock of implements and take up land. The consequence is, that when land is thrown on the market here, it does not find as ready purchasers as it otherwise would. This is the honest explanation of the depreciation in value, and it is one which involves no reflection on the policy of the Government. Now, these hon. gentlemen tell us that our natural market lies alongside of us. It would be just as reasonable for the hon. member for North Wellington to tell the people of the adjoining county of Grey: Now, gentlemen, we lie alongside of you, and consequently you are our natural market; we will take our hogs and sheep and cattle and farm produce generally over to the county of Grey and sell them to you. So also a gentleman from Grey might as well say to the people of North Wellington: Because you lie alongside of us you are our natural market, and we will take our hogs and cattle and produce and sell them to you. No, Sir; the people of both these counties, producing similar commodities, take them where they are wanted in our Canadian towns and cities. The city of Toronto alone consumes twelve or fifteen million dollars worth of farm produce every year. The market of that city alone is worth more to the Canadian farmer than the market of the whole 65,000,000 people to the south of us. These hon. gentlemen are not at all satisfied with the result of the trip of the Ministers to Washington. They complain of it very greatly, and they seem to be disappointed that the mission was not successful. They find fault with the hon. Finance Minister for not suggesting to Mr. Blaine some solution of the difficulty in regard to raising a revenue. We have had the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) on a visit to North Victoria in the recent bye-election, when the policy represented by these gentlemen met with such a cool reception. We also had the eloquent member for North York (Mr. Mulock) there; we had the great financier, the hon. member for South Oxford, there; we had various others of the burning and shining lights of the Opposition there; and these

gentlemen were asked again and again to point out how they would raise a revenue in case their policy was brought into effect; and neither directly nor indirectly did one of them answer the question how they would raise the revenue. I have read their speeches delivered in various localities, and I have failed to discover where they have presented any solution of that question. Yet they will come here and seek to cast discredit on the Finance Minister because he failed to present a solution of this difficulty to Mr. Blaine. I conceive that it was none of his business to present a solution to Mr. Blaine. We know what the result would be; we know how the revenue would be raised. It would be raised, as I am afraid it will have to be raised in provincial affairs before very long—by direct taxation: and I am satisfied that the people will never consent to that. The hon. gentlemen are in the habit, I see, on the floor of the House, as on the political hustings, of misrepresenting the attitude of the Government in relation to the old reciprocity treaty of 1854-66. The present proposal of the Dominion Government in reference to that treaty is this, as these hon. gentlemen right well know: A renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with such modifications as are required to suit the altered conditions of the two countries, and with such extensions as are admitted to be in the interest of Canada and the United States—the most material difference; and when the hon. member for North Wellington stated that while the Ministers were opposing that treaty at Washington, members on the stump in Canada were calling for a return to it, I cannot agree with them. I know that in our county such was not the case, and I do not believe it was in any other. The chief cry of hon. gentlemen opposite has reference to the condition of the population of Canada. In this matter I would like to see a little more honesty of purpose displayed by the members of the Opposition. When the census of 1881 was taken they objected to the manner in which it was done, and said it was not a true representation of the population. In our own locality, gentlemen who were enumerators at both times, tell me that at that time if a young man were living in Toronto and his home was in Victoria county, he was enumerated at home, and the chances were ten to one he was also enumerated in Toronto, so that in this way I am satisfied the difference in the census returns must be very large, and the increase in population is much larger than is shown by the census. However, whether our increase has been substantial or otherwise in numbers, it certainly has been substantial in quality. On turning to the reports, we find that the value of immigrant effects brought into the country last year amounted to $3,842,901 as compared with the value in 1876-77 of about $686,205. We find that although in the neighbouring Republic there has been an increase in population, through immigration, much larger than ours, yet it is of a different quality. I shall take the liberty of quoting from an address recently delivered by Rev. Dr. Banks, of Boston, in which he says, speaking of Boston:

"It seems strange, indeed, to go up and down some of these old, historic streets, and yet never in the course of one's walk hear spoken the language of the country. In the course of my investigations during the past few months I have found it impossible to do anything practical without an interpreter. Often in entering an old rear tenement house, where filth and misery held riot, I have been astonished at the splendidly-carved ornaments over the doorways and the still-to-be-traced carving on the balustrade.

"Once these old rear tenements were the abode of Boston's wealthiest and most cultivated citizenship, but the old world tide has come in, and house after house, block after block, and street upon street, have been overwhelmed by the waves of people who speak other languages, and whose habits of life are more foreign than their speech.

"The consideration which causes the most sober thought among earnest men to-day, is the entirely different class of immigration coming to us now from that of former times.

"In the earlier days of American history it was the intelligent, self-reliant part of the European communities who dared the expense and hardship of the long sea voyage by a sailing vessel, and faced the exigencies of the new world. The immigrants of those days were mostly farmers and skilled mechanics, who brought with them the habit and prestige of success.

"The rapid incoming of these old world tides has very close relation to the wages of labouring people. Large numbers of these alien labourers who are coming now are little better than 'slaves to contractors, steamship lines and the professional European jobbers in pauper labour.' They come in direct competition with the native-born and the worthy foreign immigrant—who comes here for the purpose of applying for citizenship and securing a home. At every point of contact with our labour system they debase it.

"This is very easy to understand when one investigates a little the methods used to encourage emigration to this country. It is now known, beyond a doubt, that prisoners' aid societies in various European countries have been steadily shipping convicts to the United States. Neither has it been an uncommon thing for criminals to be let off by the courts on the condition of their emigration to America."

Such is the class of immigration which has tended to swell the percentage of increase in the United States. I repeat that if our increase has been moderate, it has been very substantial in quality, and it is well to proceed slowly in building up this great Dominion, laying a good substantial foundation on which to build up future millions which are certain to be here in a very few years. The hon. gentleman who preceded me took occasion to refer to the mortgages of Canada. Now, I shall not enter into a comparison of the figures, but I shall take the liberty of quoting a resolution passed by the recent General Farmers Union of the State of Minnesota, showing that the United States Government deliberately took steps to see that their census enumeration would not be such as to show the actual mortgage indebtedness of the United States. The Minnesota Alliance passed this resolution:

"Whereas, the Act of Congress approved Feb. 22, 1890, provided that the superintendent of the census should ascertain the number of farms and homes which are under mortgage, the amount of the mortgage debt, and the value of the property mortgaged; and

"Whereas, the superintendent of the census, for the purpose of concealing from the people the grievous results of misgovernment by the old political parties, has directly violated the above statutes by directing his enumerators to report only those mortgages which are a lien upon farms and homes 'occupied by owners,' and to 'include no valuations of real estate occupied by tenants or hired, nor the indebtedness upon the same, if it may be reasonably avoided': and,

"Whereas, this violation of the statutes renders the census of 1890, taken at great expense to the people, of no value as a report, either of the number of tenants on land in the United States or the real amount of mortgage indebtedness of our citizens; therefore,

"Resolved, that the Alliance senators and members of Congress are respectfully requested to take steps to secure a *bonâ fide* census of the indebtedness of the people of the United States, and also to have the superintendent of the census prosecuted at law for his gross violation of the laws of the country."

I would respectfully point out that when the Government of the United States connives at what these farmers are pleased to describe a fraud, there must be something very improper which they are

desirous of concealing from the public. I find here in a newspapaper from Dakota, of date March the 16th, 1892, the following extract :—

"During the first week in March there were 170 mortgage foreclosures advertised in Brown county alone, or at the rate of a thousand a year in one county. Here is the list, giving the number in each newspaper:

In Democrat	36	Verdon Times	15
In News	35	Frederick Free Press	11
In Sun	34	Colombia Sentinel	4
In Star	31	Groton Independent	4

Total for Brown county, 170.

"Faulk, Spink, Edmunds, and many other counties make a showing even more appalling than Brown."

And yet the hon. gentleman who preceded me seemed to delight in pointing out that the people were emigrating from the fertile district of North Wellington to the barren district of Dakota. It seemed to point to the fact that the hon. gentleman must have been traversing that riding advertising the territory or the state of Northern Dakota to a very alarming extent. He asks why these people are in the United States. Well, all we can point to is this, that if the western States are not well advertised among the people of Canada it is no fault of the hon. gentlemen who make up the Opposition. Since my earliest recollection in the active field of politics, I find these gentlemen preaching, in season and out of season, the advantages of the western territories of the United States for settlement. They show the difficulties under which the Canadian farmer labours, and point with seeming pleasure and pride to the western fields of the United States, and we find that the 500,000 odd emigrants who left Canada for the United States during the regime of the hon. gentlemen opposite have proved very successful agents in inducing Canadian settlers to leave their homes and settle out there. The hon. gentleman points to the decrease of the census in various parts of the Dominion, especially the older provinces. The hon. member for East Simcoe who preceded him, very properly pointed out that a number of the young men here who grow up—three or four sons on a farm— emigrate to the North-West and take up land. There is another fact which accounts for a decrease in the population. A number of years ago the old methods of farming were resorted to by the people. Now you can scarcely enter on a farm in the province of Ontario and the better portions of Canada but you will find improved agricultural implements doing away with manual labour to a large extent, and thus rendering it useless for these young men to stay at home. As my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has pointed out, it allows them to pass to the North-West and into our Canadian cities and towns and engage in other occupations in life. The member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) pointed to only two products of Canadian farms that had found a market in the United States. Last year the average price for potatoes was 37 cents in the United States, while in Canada it was fully 50 per cent more. Lambs they do import in large quantities, but, being obliged to purchase these from Canada, no matter what the duty may be, they have to pay it. It may seem strange that in regard to barley and lambs, as soon as the McKinley Bill came into force, the price in Canada increased, and it is shown that the price of barley in the United States is now the lowest ever known, while in Canada it is the highest that has been known for many years. Owing to the energetic policy of the Minister of Agriculture in opening up a market in England for our two-rowed barley we are entirely independent of the United States. Their farmers declare that they must have our barley, and we know now that we can grow a barley which is more productive than the six-rowed which we grew before. In our county, Victoria, we raised an average of 60 to 75 bushels an acre which brought from 50 cents to 55 cents a bushel, as compared with 30 to 33 bushels an acre of the six-rowed barley, bringing from 40 cents to 45 cents a bushel. We can do without the six-rowed barley. It is known at the present time there is a market in Great Britain for six-rowed barley, which is used there for feed purposes, and that malting houses are being established there to introduce the six-rowed barley for malting purposes. I do not know that there is much more that the hon. gentleman who preceded me has referred to. We have already taken the liberty of pointing out that in the visit the Ministers were pleased to pay to Washington recently they met with a very courteous reception, and, whether it was that our friends the gentlemen of the Opposition learned from the American Government or that the American Government learned from the Opposition that no reciprocity relations would be accorded to Canada, which did not discriminate against Great Britain, it was certainly learned, and it gave tone to the already strong suspicion that each of those parties was conversant with the ideas of the other. We find a statement sometimes advanced and hinted at by the hon. gentleman who spoke here this evening, that the cities and towns of the eastern States, if we had free trade, would afford a lucrative market for our farm products. I may take the liberty of pointing out here, in reply to an argument frequently advanced, that the farming lands of the United States are being fairly well taken up and that in a few years the production of the United States will reach the maximum, and then we will reap the harvest in those cities and towns. I remember in the maps which were put before us in our boyish days that Illinois was considered the far west, and all west of that was represented as the Great American Desert. In that Great American Desert are to-day the homes of tens of thousands of people. I find here a reference to these districts :

"In a visit to Yuma, Colorado, farmers were found who had fled from the droughts of Illinois, some old men of sixty starting anew on a desert homestead, who had broken the soil deeply with horses and cattle and even cows and are getting wheat yielding twenty bushels per acre, cribbing hundreds of bushels of corn, growing oats and potatoes, hay and vegetables, and converting a former scene of desolation into one of beauty and bloom. Deep breaking, subsoiling and frequent cultivation, processes the very reverse of those practised by the pioneer farmer, are the sources of the new prosperity. Colorado agriculture is contesting with mining for superiority in value of production, and her wisest publicists assert that one-third will this year be produced without irrigation."

I could also point to parts where irrigation on a very large scale is being carried on in Arizona and in those other places in the west which were looked on as deserts, but I shall not detain you. In the report of this year, speaking of the same desert and the productive capacity of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture met the argument that the United States has nearly reached the limit of production as follows :—

"Scarcely more than a third of the south is included in farms and the proportion of farm land in Maine is no larger. The land in the west is not all taken, and an

immense area of arid lands can be irrigated and made highly productive. Then a considerable area of farm lands is not now utilized in production, and much of the tilled land is not half cultivated. High culture upon a scientific and common-sense basis might increase materially if not double the present rate of yield. It will be time enough to talk of importation of food products when our population is five times as large as at present. The following extract further enlarges upon this theme:

"'With 9,000,000 farmers and farm labourers, cultivating over 5,000,000 farms, but a third of the land is taken up, but a small part of that is under crop, and the area under nominal cultivation is superficially treated and scarcely up to half its maximum production.'"

I do not see from my view-point what is to be gained by the Canadian farmer in any sense except perhaps in regard to land, by free trade between Canada and the United States. On the other hand, I can see staring him in the face direct taxation and additional burdens thrown upon the land and the farmer. Under our present system of a revenue tariff the burdens of taxation fall very lightly on the farmer, but under the free trade proposals of the Opposition they will be increased. I am glad to see that the late leader of the Opposition party, the Hon. Edward Blake, bears out that theory, and that I can also refer to him in order to show that the policy which these gentlemen boast they will stand by and in regard to which they have nailed their colours to the mast, is one which leads to the control of our revenue by the Government of the United States, and ultimately to the control of our country by the United States—in other words, to annexation. If the hon. gentlemen choose to nail their colours to the mast, choose to stand by the policy enunciated by them during the past bye-elections, then I am certain the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada will have no fault to find with them. We find that under the administration of the present Government the country is progressing; we find that our public debt is represented in our canal system, in our public works, and in the splendid system of railways which are found throughout Canada, and other works which tend towards the development and building of this great and glorious country which we are all proud to live in. I shall not detain the House any further at this late hour of the night, and will close by thanking hon. gentlemen of both parties for the courteous hearing they extended to me on this my first effort in addressing the House.

Mr. DAWSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 24th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of George Guillet, Esq., for the Electoral District of West Northumberland, and of Arthur Boyle, Esq., for the Electoral District of Monck.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

GEORGE GUILLET, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of West Northumberland; introduced by Mr. Weldon and Mr. Sproule.

ARTHUR BOYLE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Monck; introduced by Sir John Thompson and Mr. Montague.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 42) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company—(Mr. Taylor.)

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved:

That the time for presenting petitions for private Bills be extended till Friday, the 1st April next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

THE SEAT FOR WELLAND.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was understood, when the debate on the question of privilege was adjourned yesterday, that it would be adjourned until to-day, and that if any further matter arose in reference to the position of the member, it should be mentioned to-day. I understand that yesterday the hon. member for Norfolk, who made the motion, telegraphed to Welland, but I understand it would be about 4 o'clock before Mr. German could receive the message, and therefore, I would like to know if any proposal is to be made on the subject. If the leader of the Opposition is of the same opinion as he was yesterday, that the motion should stand until sufficient time was allowed for Mr. German to come here, I would suggest that the matter should stand until Tuesday.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) asked, Whether the existing tariff of Newfoundland discriminates against any and which of the natural productions of Canada; and if so, to what extent and how long has such discriminating tariff been in operation?

Mr. BOWELL. Section 13 of the Revenue Act, 1891, cap. 3, 54 Vic. of Newfoundland, reads as follows:—

"In addition to the duties hereinbefore provided to be levied, collected and paid on goods, wares and merchandize, hereinafter mentioned, imported into this colony and its dependencies from countries, the fishermen of which have the privilege of taking fish on all parts of the coast of Newfoundland and its dependencies, and in which countries duties are or shall hereafter be levied upon fish and the produce of the fisheries, exported from this colony to such countries, the following duties, namely:—

Flour, per bbl	$0.75
Pork, per bbl	0.75
Butter, per 100 lbs	0.75
Tobacco, per 100 lbs	5.00
Kerosene oil, per gall	0.05
Corn meal, per bbl	0.25½
Hay, per ton	5.00
Oats, per bush	0.10
Potatoes, per bush	0.25
Turnips, per bush	0.25
Cabbages, per doz. heads	0.40

Unenumerated vegetables, 30 per cent.

The ordinary table of duties under the same Act is as follows:—

Flour, per bbl	$0.30
Pork, per bbl. 200 lbs	1.75
Butter, per 100 lbs	3.00
Tobacco, manufactured, per lb	20c. and 5 p.c.
Tobacco, leaf and stems, per lb	0.20
Kerosene oil, per gall	0.06
Corn meal, per bbl	0.25
Hay, per ton	20 p.c. *ad val.*
Oats, per bush	0.05
Potatoes, per bush	0.05
Turnips, per bush	0.10
Cabbages, per doz heads	2.00 p h
Unenumerated vegetables	10 p.c. *ad val.*

"Provided always, that the Governor in Council may, at any time, when it shall be made to appear to be for the interest of this colony, by proclamation to be published in the *Royal Gazette*, suspend the operation of this clause for a limited period, the duration of such period to be stated in the said proclamation."

The said Act was passed 30th May, 1891; took effect on and after 1st April, 1891; to continue in force until 11th June, 1892. We have examined the *Royal Gazette* from 1st April, 1891, to latest copy received, but find no such proclamation as that referred to in said clause.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. FLINT moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 6) to amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act of 1888.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FLINT. I would state that sub-section *a* makes no change in the Amendment Act, except that it relieves the druggist or chemist from the necessity of keeping a record. I may say the same of sub-section *b*, which is worded the same as sub-section *c* of the Act amended, the only change in the law being that, in regard to the articles named in the sub-section, druggists are relieved from the restrictions in the original Act. With regard to the last sub-section, that is also subject to the same explanation which I gave in regard to the previous sub-sections.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that in sub-section *b*, after the word "which" in the third line, the word "beverage" be inserted.

Mr. FLINT. I am afraid that my hon. friend is a little hypercritical in this matter; the change does not appear to me to be necessary. I do not wish to change the wording of the original Act any more than is absolutely necessary to carry out the intention that I had in view.

On sub-section *d*,

Mr. FLINT. This sub-section leaves out the word "alcohol" that is contained in the original sub-section of the Act of 1888. With that exception it is the same. Alcohol is taken out of that sub-section because alcohol, more than methylated spirits, is subject to improper use by those who purchase it for that purpose. The alcohol mentioned in sub-section *e* of the Act of 1888, being left out of this sub-section, is placed in the next sub-section, next to spirituous liquors. That is the substantial gain in the Act.

Bill reported.

Mr. BOWELL.

INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved second reading of Bill (No. 3) further to amend the Insurance Act. He said: I presume, Mr. Speaker, that, in accordance with the usual practice, the Bill will receive its second reading now, and will be sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, where its provisions will be fully considered. I may say that I will ask the committee to make several modifications in its terms, and that I propose to introduce a clause exempting fraternal societies from its provisions. Measures of a similar character have been in operation for some years past in most of the states of the neighbouring country, and have been found very beneficial. The principle of the Bill is in the direction of preserving the mutuality which should exist between policy-holders in the same company, and doing away with the discriminations which now too often prevail as between large and small policy-holders.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

INCOMES OF THE PEOPLE.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to ask the Government whether it would not be possible to lay on the Table at a very early day, a statement of the number of persons having incomes over $500 or $1,000 in the Dominion?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot say at the moment how long it will take to get such a return. I will ascertain it.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all admired the eloquence with which the young member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) presented his case last night. We also must have admired the frankness with which he condemned the Government for the manner in which they took the census in 1881. His friends will hardly thank him for being so unkind as to question their honesty in taking the census that year. The Minister of Finance must not blame him for having published the iniquity of the Government in going to Washington to propose a treaty which he says is contrary to the interests of the farmers of this country. The hon. member said that the Canadian farmers cannot compete with American farmers. The Minister of Finance seems to agree with this sentiment, and says that the very treaty which they went to Washington to negotiate would subject the Canadian farmers to a great and dangerous competition. Neither of those hon. gentlemen have explained to the House or the country how the Canadian farmer will be able to compete with the American farmer when their products meet in a market common to both of them, which is said by hon. gentlemen opposite to be the natural market for Canadian products. When the products of those farmers meet in the common markets of England, how will the Canadian farmer be able to compete with the American farmer there? If he cannot compete in the home market, how can he compete in the market across the sea? It was distinctly stated that the Ministers who went to

Washington proposed to negotiate a reciprocity treaty on the basis of the treaty of 1854, with modifications and extensions such as the changed conditions of the country have made it necessary or desirable, and to press for a conclusion of a treaty on that basis. All hon. gentlemen opposite, speaking of this question, seemed to agree that any extensions of that treaty would be disastrous, and modifications, if we are to accept the words of the member for North Victoria, would reduce the items on which reciprocity can be obtained to the single item of the little Canadian lamb. The hon. gentleman says reciprocity in lambs is the only reciprocity which will be advantageous to the Canadian farmer. We imported from the United States last year 43,000 sheep; we sold them 244,000. Our Ministers, he says, are prepared to negotiate a fair reciprocity treaty with the United States. It is scarcely fair to expect the Americans to grant us reciprocity in sheep when we sell them 244,000 against 43,000 they send to us. I should think that such a treaty would certainly lack the essential elements of reciprocity. Fancy the Ministers going to Washington and asking Mr. Blaine to show them some way by which the Government of this country could be carried on, when suffering the loss of revenue which we now collect on the imports of sheep from the United States. $29,949 was the sum total of the revenue which we collected upon our importations of American sheep; and so our Ministers are in the position that they went to Mr. Blaine and asked him to show some means by which the Government of this country could be carried on without this revenue, or to suggest some method by which this revenue should be replaced. All the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who had spoken on this subject seem to accent the fact that the Ministers were received at Washington with kindness and courtesy. Each speaker refers to this fact as if it were a matter of wonder to him that our Ministers received courteous treatment from Mr. Blaine. Are we at war with the people of the United States? If not, why is it a matter of wonder that our Ministers should be courteously received there? Is it the recollection of the unkind words that have been spoken so often of their neighbours? Have they so often proclaimed them to be a hostile nation that they now believe their slanders to be true and wonder because their silly vapourings seem not to have exasperated the Americans altogether? The census figures certainly seem to terribly disturb hon. gentlemen opposite, and well they may. They admit that the populations of rural constituencies have woefully decreased. They admit the lamentable fall in the values of lands, and they attempt in many ways to account for this alarming state of affairs. The loss of our rural population is very great. Take the seven counties which form the barley-growing section of the Province of Ontario, and we find that the loss has been very serious indeed. The County of Frontenac, according to the census enumeration, has had an actual loss since 1881 of 1,548 of its population; if we add to this the natural increase, which is placed at 20 per cent, we find that that county has suffered a loss during ten years of 4,546. Lennox suffered an actual loss of 1,412, plus the natural loss of increase, 3,263, showing that 4,675 persons have found their way out of that constituency. Prince Edward County has lost 2,152, which with their natural increase, shows a loss of 6,360. East Hastings, exclusive of Deseronto, hast lost 928 in addition to the natural increase, showing that 4,056 have gone away from that constituency. West Hastings has lost 1,563 in addition to their natural increase, showing a loss here of 5,043. East Northumberland lost 990, besides the natural increase, showing an emigration from that constituency of 5,588. West Northumberland has suffered an actual loss of 2,037, plus the natural increase, showing in that constituency, embracing three townships, that 5,433 people have gone away during the past ten years. These seven constituencies have suffered an actual loss of 10,630 in addition to the natural increase of 25,071, showing that 35,701 have departed from these counties during the past ten years; 35,701 in addition to their share of the emigrants who were said to have taken up their abodes in this country of ours. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) says that this loss which these constituencies have sustained is not a loss to the Dominion, but merely a displacement of population, and that if we seek them we will find that these men have taken up their abode in our great North-West. The census reveals the fact that the total population of the North-West from Lake Superior to the Pacific, is only 346,931, not double the population of the city of Toronto. The total increase there during these ten years only amounts to 178,766, not twice the increase of the city of Toronto. If Ontario farmers have gone in such numbers to the North-West, whither have the immigrants gone who are said to have arrived in Canada? We are told that 886,000 have landed among us? Where are their homes? Have none of them gone to the North-West? Has the North-West been filled up by the hardy sons of Ontario? If so, I ask again, where are the immigrants who are said to have arrived here, and to induce whom to come here, we have spent a large sum during the past ten years? It is next contended that the rural population has been absorbed by our cities. Why is it that our agricultural classes are attracted to our cities; why is it they wish to leave the farm and risk the battle of life in the already over-populated cities of Canada—over-populated in comparison with the country districts? The reason for it, I think, is perfectly plain; it is the disabilities under which farmers labour, they having to force a great proportion, in many cases the bulk of their products, through the high American tariff. This has so reduced the profit upon their operations that they have become discouraged with their calling, and many of them have been driven in despair to seek a living in the cities of our land. In addition to this tribute to the American treasury they have to pay also an excessive tribute to our own treasury here on the goods imported for their use, and a heavier tribute still, into the pockets of the protected manufacturers of our country. The McKinley Bill has most certainly increased this disability. Is the drain from our rural constituencies to be continued? Are the people to flee from our rural districts and mass themselves in the cities of our country? Surely if this movement is to go on, the danger of it must be apparent to any thinking men. It cannot be in the interest of this country to have our population massed in the cities, draining the agricultural sections of the country and drawing away the people from that industry which above all

others is the most important industry of the Dominion of Canada. These attempted explanations do not account for the loss of our people ; our people have gone neither to the North-West nor have they all massed themselves in the cities of our land. Knowing this, other efforts are made by hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends to show where the people have gone, and lately the electors of West Northumberland were informed that it was nonsense to say that 2,037 actually lost to that riding were to be found in the United States. They said : If you sought for them you would find them peacefully sleeping beneath the snow in the cemeteries of that constituency. They stated that any one who doubted the statement that the population was dying off there, could find confirmation at the hands of the undertakers and "engravers" in that constituency. The Canadians are slowly dying off; no natural increase in our land ! Shame I say ; shame on men who so libel a vigorous race. Canada has suffered a grievous loss of population, and I think that the matter ought to be spoken about and a remedy suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is not meet that hon. gentlemen sent here to govern this country should sit down in despair, and say that nothing can be done to remedy this lamentable state of affairs. There is a natural increase in this country ; no person can deny it. I estimate the natural increase in ten years as equivalent to 20 per cent. If you add this natural increase to the population which we had in 1881, and add also the 886,173 immigrants who came to our shores in the last ten years, and then deduct the population as we have it, taken in the year 1891, we find that this country has suffered an actual loss during ths past ten years of 1,246,534 souls. But if 20 per cent is too high an estimate for the natural increase, take 10 per cent, and we find that Canada sustained a loss during the ten years of 814,000 souls, who have fled from the country overburdened with the questionable blessing of a National Policy. Has nothing been done to attract population to this country ? Has nothing been done to find employment for our people here ? During the past thirteen years our railways have doubled their mileage. In the construction of this additional mileage, over $400,000,000 has been spent during the past thirteen years, graving docks have been built, wet basins constructed, canals dug, custom houses and post offices erected. Every effort has been made by the Government to attract population here and to find employment for those who are here. And yet, in spite of it all, we find the people hastening in droves out of our country. It is not infants in arms who go, but the very best of our young life. Our stalwart and hardy sons and our noble young women are departing from this country, leaving behind them the infants in arms, to be reared—if the present condition of things continues—to manhood's estate, only to follow those who have gone before to the United States. But some hon. gentlemen—I am sorry to say an hon. Minister of the Crown among others—state that few go except craven Grits, who leave their country for their country's good. Well, perhaps they are Grits, and that may account for the seven constituencies which I have named being now represented by Conservatives. But if they are cravens, at least they prove on American soil that they are more than equal for the Americans, in whose midst they forge ahead to the front, and are to-day leaders of men in their new home. But I would ask the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), whose two sons are in the United States, if he will admit that they are cravens who have left their country for their country's good ? That we are driving our young people away is not only apparent to us in Canada, but it is equally apparent to the mother country across the sea. In England it is seen that something is wrong in Canada, and there a remedy has been suggested. The *Review of Reviews* says :

"In this past decade a continuous and strikingly bold attempt has been made by the Canadian Government, through such means as enormous railway subsidies, protective tariffs and assistance to immigration, to build up Canada as an independent economic community. The so-called National Policy has been pursued in heroic defiance of all the natural laws that governed the situation. Five millions of Canadians are scattered along 4,000 miles of boundary line. Nearly all of them live within a few miles of that line. A nation of 65,000,000 of people is on the other side of the artificial barrier. The 5,000,000 can thrive only in such degree as they can enter freely into the commercial system of their own continent. If the trade barriers were removed, men and capital would freely flow into the great undeveloped north. So long as the barriers are maintained Canada will drive away her best blood instead of stimulating growth and industrial development."

We wish these trade barriers removed. We are told that reciprocity can be had, but only by consenting to discriminate in favour of the United States in such articles as may be named in the treaty. And why not consent to such discrimination ? Is it true, as we have often heard Conservative orators state, that the only tie which binds us to Great Britain is our trade relation to that country ? Are we to sit idly here and see our sons, one by one, drift southward, followed by immigrants whom England entrusts to our care—is our natural wealth never to be developed—because we must not disturb that trade which forms the only tie which, according to the words of these hon. gentlemen, binds us to the mother country ? When the tariff law known as the National Policy was proposed many years ago, it was shown that the raising of a high tariff against British goods was a hard blow at the development of trade with Great Britain. It was not framed for the encouragement or development of that trade. I grant that the framers of that tariff held it up as in the interest of Canada. They said that they wished to develop the industries of Canada, and that if it did strike a blow, and a heavy blow, against British trade it mattered not, because it was done in the interest of Canada. It was suggested that this might possibly imperil British connection if the only tie that bound us to Great Britain was our trade relation. The advocates of that policy answered : We framed this policy wholly in the interest of Canada, and if it imperils British connection, so much the worse for British connection. We do not go so far as these hon. gentlemen. We do not believe that the only tie which binds us to the mother land is our trade relation with that country. We believe that the great heart of England beats for us, not solely for the trade we give her. We are her children and the mother heart yearns to see us prospering and able to keep our kinsmen whom she sends among us, and able with their aid to build up a mighty nation here, whose achievements will reflect

honour on the stock from which we spring. Our trade relation is not the only tie which binds us to England. Our destiny has brought us here. When Great Britain granted to us the priceless boon of responsible government, giving us absolute control over the destinies of this country, she intended that we should so govern it as to bring about the highest destiny attainable for it. If in the working out of that destiny the trade relation with the old land should in a measure be disturbed, I am sure it will not in any degree imperil our political connection with the mother country, or dim in the least the love which England has for us. Now, that hon. gentlemen have failed to open the American market, they endeavour to belittle it. They endeavour to show us that it is after all of but slight consequence to us. The Trade and Navigation Returns present a different picture. They show that that market is of vast importance, nay, of vital importance to us. Our total exports last year were $88,000,000, of which the United States took $37,000,000, while England took $43,000,000. The Trade and Navigation Returns divide our exports under seven heads. Under every head, except that of animals and their products, we find that the United States took from us more than England. The items are as follows:—

—	England.	United States.
Animals and products	$29,991,143	$ 4,316,979
Other farm products	5,254,028	7,291,246
Products of mine	851,794	4,600,800
Fisheries	2,747,882	3,807,786
Forest products	11,146,282	11,763,053
Manufactured goods	2,252,295	3,006,423
Miscellaneous	360	43,144
		$34,829,436
Amount short returned at inland ports		2,913,994
	$43,243,784	$37,743,430

In the face of these figures, it cannot be said that the American market is not of tremendous importance to us. It cannot be shown that it is possible to us to open up a market which will replace it in any other country under the sun. I have said our farmers labour under a disability, because they have to force their products, through the American tariff, into the best markets for many of their products. The Minister of Finance says: England is our best market for beans, lambs, eggs, barley and all other products. Well, if England is our best market, why do we not send our products there? We have had the McKinley Bill in force some time now, yet great as are the restrictions put upon our shipments by it, our goods have not gone seeking any other market in such volume as we are told they have. Take the first item mentioned by the Minister of Finance, the item of beans. We find that last year we sent not one dollar's worth to England, but $493,486 worth to the United States, upon which, under the McKinley Bill, we paid a duty of $128,759. The following table will show the volume of our exports of a few items of farm produce respectively to England and the United States, and the amount we paid in duty on said exports to the latter country:—

Articles.	England Bought, 1891.	U. S. Bought, 1891.	Duty under McKinley Bill.
Beans	None.	$ 493,486	$ 128,759
Sheep	$ 344,405	759,081	225,000
Eggs	83,589	1,074,247	307,711
Hay	150,291	375,813	200,280
Horses	156,254	1,215,022	298,710
Potatoes	1,400	1,478,092	831,636
Barley	75,225	2,849,269	1,437,862
	$811,164	$8,245,010	$3,489,958

Under these seven items, the value of our exports to England was $811,164 against $8,245,010 to the United States, on which we paid $3,500,000 taxes under the McKinley Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that the shipper on this side does not pay this duty. In the old days they held the contrary opinion. Then they endeavoured to prove, and I think it was an easy matter, that the Canadian shipper paid the duties upon products shipped to the United States. Sir John Macdonald held this view, the Hon. Mr. Colby held this view, so did Dr. Orton, Mr. Farrow, and Mr. Gibbs. All these gentlemen contended that the Canadian shipper of natural products paid the duty levied by the Americans upon goods crossing the line. Hon. gentlemen opposite deny this contention now, but some of them are frank enough to admit that there is truth in it, and I have myself heard the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) admit that the Canadian shipper of farm produce pays one-half the duty upon the goods he sends to the United States. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) contended it was nonsense to say that the Americans were the natural purchasers of our horses. He said they were cheaper there than here. He said they were smuggling from the North-West States into Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Now, I happen to know that a carload of horses was sent from Pontypool, in Ontario, a station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to Northern Dakota and sold there. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we can buy potatoes cheaper there than here. Why, then, is it that the Americans come here and purchase from us to the amount of $1,500,000 in a single year? It is said that England is our natural market for barley. If so, why is it that such a small quantity of our barley found a sale there during the past year? The McKinley Bill, they say, is a blessing in disguise, as it will teach Canadians self-dependence and cause them to look elsewhere for markets than in the United States. England is held up as our natural market, the only market to which Canadians have any right to send their products. Yet during the past year we find that this market was not able to take from us the whole quantity of trade we have lost under the operation of the McKinley Bill. Last year our shipments to the United States of sheep fell off $248,400, while our shipments to England also fell off $141,894. Under the operation of the McKinley tariff our shipments of hay to the United States fell off last year $546,984, and our shipments to England increased only $50,687. Our sales of horses to the United States fell off over $682,000, while our sales in England increased but $138,000. Our sales of eggs fell off $718,415, while they increased in England only $82,000. Our sales of barley fell off $1,733,293 against an increase in England of but

$63,208. The American market is no longer as profitable to us as it was in the past, and never will be so profitable again until, under reciprocity, we are relieved from the pressure of the Mc Kinley Bill. Our farmers are coolly told now that the Government can do nothing for them, and that they must seek other markets for their wares. They are told that they can no longer depend on the Government for relief from their present depressed condition. All hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of saying that hon. gentlemen on this side decry the country, that they are forever painting blue ruin, and proclaiming abroad that Canada is a bad place to live in, and that it is not the country which we would fain believe it to be. Now, the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) laboured here last night to show that Canada was not as favourable a place for farmers to settle in as the United States. He said that the farmers here could not compete with the Americans, that they laboured under disadvantages which the American farmers did not labour under, and that our farmers were unable to compete with the Americans even in our own market. The Minister of Finance says that competition with the American farmer in the same market would be very injurious to our own farmer. What do these hon. gentlemen mean? Do they mean that the farming people who come from Europe will be labouring under disadvantages if they settle in Canada, under disadvantages which are unknown to the American farmer? Such language will not encourage emigrants to come to us. These are "blue ruin" speeches. We believe that our country is one of vast possibilities, we know that it is. We know that vast stores of mineral wealth lie unused in the bowels of the earth, and that all we require is a market for this mineral, and that this is true especially in regard to iron ore. There is no use for the mineral wealth of Ontario unless we have the American market. Now that market is cut off it is no longer possible for the owners of mines in Ontario to utilize those mines and derive a profit from their business. Their mines are of no more use to them than a sack of gold would be to a shipwrecked mariner starving on a barren rock in mid-ocean. We are now told that we can no longer hope for any improvement, that those who own mines in Ontario must not look upon them any longer as a possession of value. Owners of cedar are told that there is no relief for them, that the heavy American duty of 20 per cent is not to be lifted, that no arrangement is possible by which that duty will be removed from the cedar. We are told that it is wrong to advocate the policy which is advocated by the Liberal party, that it is wrong to remove the artificial barriers that have been erected between the trade of this country and the trade of our neighbours to the south of us, people of the same flesh and blood, people largely of the same nationality, people who feel and act as we do. Yet these very men strongly endorse the efforts of capitalists to bridge the natural barriers between the two countries. It is right to construct at enormous cost railway bridges over, and tunnels under, rivers to overcome the natural barriers, but it is wrong to remove the artificial barriers we ourselves have placed between these two countries. The hon. the Minister of Justice is credited with saying that our standard is not one that will rally the youth, the hope and the pride of Canada under it, that our policy will not attract the youth of this country. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they believe it appeals to the young manhood of Canadians to ask them in constituency after constituency to vote for the Government candidate and they will get a railway subsidy, if it appeals to their manhood to ask them to vote for the Government candidate and they will get their harbour dredged to vote for the Government candidate or the mills and factories will be shut down, and they will be thrown out of employment, that they must vote for the Government candidate or the Prince Edward Island tunnel will not be built, that they must vote for the Government candidate or the bridge at Quebec will not be constructed, that they must vote for the Government candidate or the railway through North Victoria will not be subsidized, that they must vote for the Government candidate or a post office at Picton will not be built, that they must vote for the Government candidate and the harbour at Goderich will be improved. I do not think it appeals to the manhood of young Canadians to gerrymander the constituencies, in such a way that the people are cheated out of the possibility of expressing their opinions constitutionally through their representatives in this House to say they will hive the Grits so that the Conservative party shall be able to capture a majority of the seats for Ontario when the popular vote puts them in a minority of over 7,000. Does it appeal to them for the Government to construct a wonderful engine for the destruction of their opponents and call it a Franchise Act? Does it appeal to the manhood of young Canadians to tie the hands of the opponents of the Government and then bravely say: Stand up and fight us? I think an honest effort to better the condition of this country and to battle for the oppressed should appeal to the minds of young Canadians, and I know that it does in spite of the victories which the policy of the Conservative party appears to have won in the bye-elections. Certainly a great change is contemplated by us, and the trade of the country will no doubt be disturbed if the policy of the Liberal party comes into force. We know there are risks to be run, but the pluck which carried the Liberals through the battle for representation by population, responsible government and the reforms of abuses in the past, will nerve their arm now to go on and to fight against a policy which is sapping the life-blood of our nation. It is silly to say that there is nothing in the history of the Liberal party or in their policy to attract young Canadians. What we ask is fair-play to enable the people of this country to speak freely upon the public issues of the day, and not to so arrange matters that the Government may be able to gain a victory in spite of the fact that they have not a majority of the electors of the country at their back. There is nothing in our policy of which we are ashamed. The advocacy of it is not to be abandoned by the Liberal party. We are not to be taunted by our opponents because of our temporary defeats. Cowardly attacks were made during the by-elections, which amounted almost to a general election. It was said that the Liberal party were in despair, that they would abandon their discredited policy, and it was even stated that the leader of the party had handed in his resignation. If those gentlemen had heard the ringing cheers with which the Liberal

party welcomed their leader, they would have known that the firm abiding faith of the Liberals in their leader is unimpaired. There is no intention on the part of the Liberal party to abandon the policy which they have been advocating, and there is certainly less intention on their part to sever the connection which binds them to the noble leader, who will yet, in spite of Franchise Bills and Gerrymander Acts, lead them to victory in this country.

Mr. CRAIG. I intend to occupy the attention of the House for only a short time. I do not propose to answer any of the arguments that have been adduced by hon. gentlemen opposite; I think there is no need of my doing so. The people of this country, in the bye-elections, have completely answered all the arguments offered in defence of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and have shown that they do not approve of their policy. Now, we have been told that these bye-elections were carried by boodle, by promises of all kinds. Sir, I think hon. gentlemen opposite are very foolish to deceive themselves in that way. I believe the people have voted as they did because they are loyal to this country, because they are loyal to the connection with Great Britain, and because, whatever the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Dawson) may think, the people of this country, by a large majority, have determined that there must be no discrimination against the mother country in favour of the United States. I propose to offer a few reflections on the Budget speech, a speech which I listened to with a great deal of pleasure. I thought that speech was a most admirable one because of its hopeful spirit. I regretted to hear, as I did for the first time, that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had issued that pamphlet, intending and tending thereby to injure the credit of this country. I am satisfied that the speech to which we listened a day or two ago by the Finance Minister will have the effect from its hopeful tone and its encouraging statements, of raising the credit of this country. I was pleased to learn from that speech a fact which many of us already knew, and which the country now will learn authoritatively, that the debt of this country is not increasing. In the elections we hear a great deal about the debt of our country. I do not think myself that a debt is an advantage to any country. But a country like this has to have a debt, and I am glad to know that we have something to show for this debt. At the same time I am exceedingly pleased to know, and I believe we are all pleased to know, that the debt is not increasing, but is stationary, and I hope we will soon be able to lessen it. I was also pleased to listen to the statement that the taxes on the people of this country are not increasing. We all know that taxes are no blessing to any country, and I am rejoiced to think that the taxes in this country are so light a burden upon the people, and are so easily borne. Why, Sir, it requires speakers in an election to show the people how they are robbed before they know it. The taxes in this country are not taken out of the people in such a way as to oppress any of them. I am satisfied of this, that the men who pay the principal part of the taxes in this country are men who are abundantly able to pay them, are the wealthy men of the country, and that the farmers of the country, about whom we hear so much, and for whom such sympathy is expressed at election times, are the men who pay a very small proportion of these taxes. At the same time I am very glad to know that the taxes are not increasing, that the burden of debt and taxation is very little more than it was many years ago, while at the same time we have a great many more public works to show for it. Sir, I was also pleased to listen to the statement that the exports of this country were increasing. While the debt is not increasing, and while the taxes are not increasing, the exports are increasing. This is a sign of prosperity. We might have been prepared to learn that the exports are decreasing when we have heard so much about the McKinley Bill. I wish here to say that I do not think the McKinley Bill is a blessing in disguise. I am willing to admit that the McKinley Bill is an injury to this country, and I believe it was partly intended to be so, at least, it was directed in some respects against the products of this country. I do not know that it was directly intended to injure the country, but I do believe that it was intended to remove from competition with the United States farmers certain articles which have been largely exported from this country to the United States. But in spite of the McKinley tariff, in spite of that wall which has been built up by the great nation to the south of us, I am pleased to learn that our exports are increasing. Sir, this McKinley tariff wall was not built up by us. Why, some hon. gentlemen talk as if the McKinley tariff had been made by this Parliament, as if the Government in power at present was responsible for it. Now, Sir, we are not responsible in any degree for the McKinley tariff, and as I say, in spite of it, our exports to Great Britain are increasing. I think we sometimes undervalue that market because it is so far away, and we are constantly thinking of what a good market we would have if that wall was taken down between us and the neighbouring Republic. Sir, there is a market in Great Britain with no wall around it; there is a market that is open to the very things we have to export; there is an admirable market where the highest prices are paid, and I think the Government deserve all credit for turning the attention of the people to that market. There is another fact mentioned in the Budget speech worthy of notice, and that is, that the savings of the people of this country are increasing. We might think, from listening to some of the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that our people were constantly becoming poorer, but when we look at their savings in our banks, when we see that at the present time they amount to over $200,000,000, I think it would be hard to persuade any one that the people are becoming poorer. I am disposed in this matter to agree with our friend, the Premier of Ontario, who, in an admirable letter, made the statement that the farmers of this country are just as well off, and just as comfortable, as the farmers in the great Republic to the south. I am satisfied that that is the case; but I will go further, and I will say that I believe that the people of this country generally, from one end to the other, are more comfortable than the people in the neighbouring Republic. Certainly we have not so many millionaires, but I do not know that it is any great loss to be without them. Nevertheless our people

generally have money in the banks, they are gradually improving their position. I know that in the district of country that I represent, the farmers are not the men to be most pitied, because they are as comfortable as any other class of the community. Sir, there was another part of that speech to which I listened with a great deal of interest, and that was the part that related to the negotiations carried on at Washington. We learned then what is the meaning of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, that is something that I have been trying to find out for a long time. We have been told by some of the members on the other side of the House that it did not mean discrimination against Great Britain. I do not know that any of them asserted distinctly that it did, but some of then hinted that, perhaps, it might. It was impossible, however, to find out just exactly what it did mean. Now we know from the statement made by the Minister of Finance that it means exactly that, and only that, that if we have unrestricted reciprocity with the country south of us we must have discrimination against Great Britain and against every other country in the world. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, say that he was prepared to go in for that discrimination against Great Britain; I was rather surprised to hear him express the opinion that it was better to have free trade with the United States and to shut ourselves out from the rest of the world. I am not of that opinion; I believe it would be a misfortune instead of a benefit to us. Sir, I was a little surprised to hear the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) the other evening, twitting the members on this side of the House for applauding that statement of the Finance Minister. He said he had never witnessed such a scene in the House of Commons before—the Minister of Finance saying that there was no chance of obtaining a treaty with the United States, and the statement being applauded by members on the ministerial side of the House. Sir, I applauded on that occasion, and I will tell you why, and I believe my reason was that of every other member on this side of the House who applauded that statement. We did not applaud because the opinion was expressed that at the present time there was no chance of getting reciprocity with the United States, but we applauded for the reason that the statement confirmed what had been stated by Conservatives on every platform in this country, that is, that unrestricted reciprocity meant discrimination against Great Britain and against every other country except the United States. Sir, that had been done, and it showed we were right in rejecting unrestricted reciprocity just because it did mean that very thing. Sir, a great deal has been said by some speakers about the Minister of Finance asking Mr. Blaine how to raise the revenue. It has been said that it was very strange for the Minister of Finance to say to Mr. Blaine: We shall lose this revenue; will you tell us how to raise the amount. I did not, in listening to the statement of the Minister of Finance, gather from it any such meaning. I listened to the statement, and I gathered from it this meaning: It was said we must have discrimination. In reply it was asked: How, then, are we going to raise the revenue? We shall be very glad to make a treaty if at all possible; but if we enter into such a treaty, how can we raise a revenue? You, Mr. Blaine, will see distinctly that it will be impossible for us to do it. That is the way I understood the statement of the Minister of Finance, and the way it was meant to be understood. I say here frankly that I am rather disappointed that a reciprocity treaty is not possible at present. I believe a reciprocity treaty made on a fair basis would be an advantage to this country. I have always thought so, I think so to-day, and if I can do anything to aid the attainment of that result I am willing to do it. My constituents are of this opinion, and I agree with them in this respect. But I am satisfied of this, that my constituents will bear out the Government in refusing to enter into a treaty on such terms, which are the only terms according to Mr. Blaine. I am satisfied they will not consent to have a treaty made on the condition of discrimination against Great Britain. I do not say that is the only objection to unrestricted reciprocity; I have several other objections to it. I see a great objection in American manufactures coming into competition with our own. I believe that would be most disastrous. It may be asked, why cannot we compete? We might do so if we had manufactories on the same scale. The Americans possess large factories, adapted to supply a large market; our factories are adapted to supply a small market. It would undoubtedly take a long time to catch up to the Americans, and in the meantime many of our industries would be ruined. That is the view I take of unrestricted reciprocity, and I could not vote for it. But I should be gratified to see reciprocity in a limited sense, such a treaty as we had before, with perhaps some additions; not unrestricted reciprocity, for that would not be for the good of the country, even if it was not open to the fatal objection of discriminating against all other countries. But while we have not been able to obtain a reciprocity treaty satisfactory to this country, yet I do not despair that at some future time the United States will see it to their advantage to enter into such a treaty. I know that the present is an unfortunate time to make one. The American people are getting ready for a presidential election, a great struggle will ensue, and I do not think we can expect to receive from them due consideration at this time of a proposal for a reciprocity treaty. But I hope the United States will themselves be able to see in a short time that such a treaty would be not advantageous to this country alone, but would conduce to the advantage of the great Republic itself. What should be our attitude to the United States of America? Sir, I do not sympathize with any who speak unfriendly words of that country. I do not sympathize with any one who would endeavour to raise or increase unfriendly feelings on their part. We are here on this continent together. We must live together in peace; we must be friends. Let us do our part to be friends with them. Let us sometimes bear with some things we do not think exactly right from them. They have a difficult task to fulfil, as we sometimes find we have in this country. They have a large mixed population to please, and I am satisfied that things are done sometimes by politicians of which they themselves do not approve, and which the best part of the American people do not approve either. So I say, I believe in the maintenance of a friendly attitude towards the United States; but at the same time, I believe in being firm. This country

has rights. This country must stand up for its rights, and this can be done in no unfriendly spirit but in a spirit of friendliness. I believe that if we take this stand, and are firm but friendly, and are friendly but firm, we will not only command their friendship but at the same time command their respect. Sir, I believe the true policy of this country is what is called the National Policy, the protection of our manufactures, but not excessive protection. I am not in favour of excessive protection. I believe in just such protection as will encourage our manufactures, but at the same time I am well aware that there are a great many articles which cannot be made in this country. I would advise that, if possible, our manufacturers should obtain all necessary protection, while at the same time we should lessen the burdens on the people as much as possible. In order to do this, we should be economical. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance say, that this was the determination of the Government. All hon. members of this House should assist the Government in carrying into effect that determination. We should assist them by abstaining from pressing claims which we do not think the finances of the country will be able to stand. I believe in being economical, but, at the same time, we must carry on public works in the country. They can, however, be carried on in an economical spirit. If we have a policy of this kind : protection to our manufactures, as low a tariff as possible on goods which cannot be manufactured here, the burdens of the people lessened and an economical expenditure of the public money, I am satisfied the people of this country will sustain the Government which carries out this policy. Sir, I believe in a hopeful spirit for this country. I rejoice that the speech of the Minister of Finance was full of hope for this Dominion. I see no reason why we should despair. I believe in speaking words of praise for our country. I regret the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) is not in his seat, for I endorse heartily his glowing words in favour of Canada, spoken the other evening. If more such words were spoken, they would redound to the credit of those who uttered them, as well as to the credit of the people. I rejoice to belong to the hopeful party, to the party which sees that this country has a future before it, and I hope that our friends opposite will at last, after they have seen the results of the elections which have taken place, drop their despairing policy, drop their "blue ruin" cry to which we have so often listened with regret. If they will let that alone and adopt a policy of hope for the future, they will have a much better chance of regaining the confidence of the people of this country, than by maintaining the course they have pursued so long.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I wish to engage the attention of the House for a short time in discussing this question. The Budget debate embraces so many subjects that it is really difficult to discern what line of discussion it would be best to adopt. But the Minister of Finance the other day brought certain charges against the hon. member for South Oxford in regard to statements he had made as to the position of this country, and I do not think I could do better than to follow the statements which he has made. I am in a position to show that the statements made by the hon. member for South Oxford are substantially true. The first statement the Minister of Finance made—and in respect to which he blamed the hon. member for South Oxford—was, that he declared in the document published in the *Economist* that during 13 years Canada had trebled her taxation. My impression is that I can show by figures that the statement of the member for South Oxford was within the limit of truth. The Minister of Finance will know from the Public Accounts that the taxation from Customs and Excise in 1879 amounted to about $18,000,000. Three times that sum would be $54,000,000. So that the expenditure must have proved to be $54,000,000 in order to prove the correctness of the hon. gentleman's statement in the *Economist*. That taxation is now $30,000,000 and over, leaving $24,000,000 to account for. The writer in the *Economist* did not say that $54,000,000 was collected from the people in the form of Customs duties, but in the form of taxation. It is well known to every one who understands the protective system, that it was inaugurated for the purpose of giving protection to those who are engaged in the manufacturing industries of our country, and before there is protection granted there must be an increased price that must be paid to persons engaged therein, so as to enable them to realize a better position than the manufacturers in other countries who send their goods here to compete with them. I am satisfied that the people of this country pay, not in Customs tax, but in increased price on account of the protective system, far more than $24,000,000. Take, for instance, the article of sugar. The Finance Minister stated last year that he was about to remove with one fell stroke, to use his own words, three and a-half million dollars of taxation off the shoulders of the people of this country. Now if that taxation was not imposed upon the shoulders of the people of Canada he could not remove it, and therefore three and a-half millions was paid by the people on that single article of sugar. Again, take the article of coal oil. We pay no less than $1,800,000 more for the coal oil consumed by the Canadian people than the same number of people pay in the United States for "No. 1 water white" of their own coal oil. Then again, if I had time, I might show the extraordinary tax imposed upon the people of this country by the high protective duty on all kinds of hardware ; iron and other things of that kind, and I might go on to roll up a sum which would come to more than $24,000,000 ; and this $24,000,000 added to the $30,000,000 collected on Customs and Excise, would three times exceed the taxes of 1879. The Minister of Finance said that the statement of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not true, but he did not take the trouble to give his reasons for his conclusion, and you must know, Mr. Speaker, that a contradiction of a statement is far different from the confutation of a statement. The Minister of Finance gave the contradiction but he did not dare to enter upon the confutation of the fact, because he knew it was impossible to do so. The Minister of Finance read from the letter of the member for South Oxford :

"There exists a very great depreciation in farm lands."

Is that a falsehood? Is it not a correct statement Will a single member supporting the Government ge

up in his place, and upon his responsibility as a member give us any instance where the value of farm lands in this country has increased during the last ten years? Will he name a few farms that have been sold eight or ten years for a certain price, and will he name the same farms which have been sold lately for a higher price than they sold for a few years ago? I gave a statement last year, which it is not necessary for me to repeat, of a number of farmers within twenty miles of where I live, in the finest county of the Dominion, which were sold eight or ten years ago, and which within three years changed hands at an average reduction in the sums paid for these farms of 22½ per cent. Will the hon. gentlemen who say that lands are not being depreciated in this country give us facts to show the correctness of the position which they take? If they consult the report of the Bureau of Industries, a book published by the Legislature of Ontario irrespective of party predilections or any thing of that kind, we will find that farm lands, irrespective of improvements have largely decreased during the past five years. When you take that authority, and also actual statements made by responsible parties in regard to the conditions of land throughout the country, we must conclude that the statement made by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is in every particular true. The Minister of Finance charges the hon. member for South Oxford with writing in the *Economist*:

"There has been an immense increase in the aggregate debt of this country."

Now, Sir, that is another fact which is well known to all parties who examine the public accounts of this country. It is well known that the net debt in 1868 was only $75,000,000, and that in the first five years of the Conservative administration it had increased to $108,000,000. It is said that during the administration of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie the debt went up by nearly $40,000,000, and therefore the increase was in a larger proportion per annum than it was under the Conservative administration. Let me give you the reason of that according to the statements made up by the authority of a member of the Conservative Government. Sir Leonard Tilley, in his Budget speech of 1873, said:

"We are, however, entering upon a new and increased engagement involving a very large sum of money. We are entering upon work—we have already done so—which will require a large increase of our debt. We have $10,000,000 to spend on the Intercolonial Railway. We have $30,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the canal system which has been accepted by the Government will involve an expenditure of $20,000,000. These are serious matters inasmuch as they add $60,000,000 to our existing debt."

You will notice from that paragraph of Sir Leonard Tilley's speech that the Government of the day was about entering upon large expenditures of public works; not only "was about to enter," but, as Sir Leonard said, "had already entered." Now, the expenditure which took place under the Liberal Government afterwards was largely owing to engagements entered into by Sir John Macdonald previous to the Liberal Administration taking office. The Hon. A. Mackenzie spent during his administration the following sums on the public works portrayed by Sir Leonard Tilley, namely: $17,469,000 on the canals, $11,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and $5,283,000 on the Intercolonial Railway; altogether a total expenditure of $33,982,963. Now, Mr. Speaker, you will bear in mind that $8,967,000 of this money was voted by Parliament previous to the accession of Mr. Mackenzie to power, and only $200,000 was spent by Mr. Mackenzie outside of the necessity of carrying on the engagements and responsibilities placed upon him by the Conservative Government. You will, therefore, see that the expenditure during the Mackenzie administration was not altogether undertaken by him, and Mr. Mackenzie was not responsible for the whole amount of money expended during his term of five years. The Minister of Finance also told us that the burden of our debt was measured by the interest. That is not the proper view to take of our debt. It is a view which is never taken of it outside of this House. The United States Government does not take that view of its debt, but it seeks from year to year to set by a large sum of money for the purpose of reducing the debt. However, it appears to be the principle of the present Government to measure the indebtedness by the amount of interest we pay. That debt remains upon us, and is an obligation to pay which we should meet, because those who come after us must make provision for public works and improvements in the country for which they themselves will be responsible. We must and should set aside a yearly sinking fund, larger by far than we do now, for the purpose of meeting our present obligations. The United States has established that system, and within the last few years they have reduced their large indebtedness from $2,700,000,000 to a little over $734,000,000, and in a few more years the United States will be paid, and then she will be ready to undertake new schemes for the progress and advancement of the country. And that is the way we should look upon the public debt of this country, and not, as was done by the hon. Minister of Finance, by saying that now we pay only $1.76 per head in the way of interest, whereas a few years ago we paid $1.58. The hon. member for South Oxford was charged with having said that the mass of the people, notably the farmers, are distinctly poorer than they were twelve years ago. Mr. Speaker, I would not desire to say that our people are getting poorer, if I were not in a position to say that they are, the farmers particularly. Considering the amount of energy the farmers have put forth in the last twelve or thirteen years, they are not as well off as they should be, and in many respects they are worse off than they were at that time. How is it possible that they can be otherwise? I know that the Minister of Finance will say: There is the pessimist decrying the country again; but he must remember that his own friends spoke in similar language when they thought it necessary. He will remember what Sir John Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley and Sir David Macpherson said in regard to the condition of the country in 1878; and if the statements made by us go to the old country and prevent immigration coming here, as hon. gentlemen opposite say they will, how can they justify the language of those men who spoke in a similar strain in 1878? I say it is the duty of both the Opposition and those who support the Government, to look at the facts as they stare them in the face; and if our people are not thriving, as their pluck, energy and push would justify, it is our duty to try to ascertain the cause of this want of pros-

perity, and seek by legislation, or by some other means, to improve the position of our people, so that their prosperity in the future will be much greater than it has been in the past. How can it be possible for our farmers to be as well off to-day as they were twelve years ago? Are the crops as good now as they were then? Are the foreign prices for their products as high as they were at that time? Is the property they own now as valuable as it was twelve years ago? Neither one nor the other is the case. If the crops fail, if the prices fail, and if the land has depreciated in value, I ask, as a common-sense question, how can it be said that the farmers are better off to-day than they were twelve years ago? But even admitting that to a certain extent they are better off, is it not reasonable to suppose that a man, after spending twelve years of his life and energies, should be better off irrespective of any assistance he could receive from the Government? And if by economy, frugality, care and wisdom some have increased the value of their property, they have no thanks to give to the Government for any aid they have received from them. But the hon. Finance Minister again charges the hon. member for South Oxford with saying that the census returns show that Canada has lost, during the last ten years, no less than a million and a-half of people. Well, as to the number being exactly a million and a-half, it is very hard to say. It will depend wholly and entirely upon the percentage we take for the natural increase. The hon. member for South Oxford, I believe, took 2½ per cent per annum. But suppose, for the sake of argument, we take the natural increase in the United States during the last ten years, which I think is fair, being 14 per cent. Now, 14 per cent of our population in 1881, 4,429,000, is something over 600,000 people who should be added to the population by natural increase. Now, we are told by the report of the Minister of Agriculture —and I suppose it is true—that the number of immigrants who came into Canada during those ten years, expressing their intention to remain here as citizens, was no less than 866,000. If you add these to the natural increase, according to the rate in the United States, you have 1,486,000 people added to the population during the last ten years. Now, the census returns show that the actual net increase in the population of Canada during the last ten years has been 504,000. Deducting 504,000 from 1,486,000 we have nearly a million people who have left our country and gone somewhere else. I challenge any hon. member opposite, I challenge the Finance Minister, to explain away the statement I have made, and I will sit down while he attempts to explain it. He surely will not say that the natural increase of this country should be less than that of the United States. I have always regarded the natural increase in Canada as much more than that of the United States under ordinary conditions. But taking the natural increase in the two countries to be the same, and the statements in the report of the Minister of Agriculture to be true, I ask where this million of people have gone? If this statement shows the country to be in a prosperous condition, then I do not know what a prosperous condition is. Now, the discrepancy between this conclusion of mine and that of the hon. member for South Oxford is just this, that he has taken the natural increase at 2½ per cent per annum, which it has been in some years; and doing that, his conclusion is perfectly just. Then, the hon. gentleman charges the hon. member for South Oxford with having declared that bribery is a pure matter of business routine in Canada. I am rather astonished that the hon. Minister of Finance mentioned that at all, because I believe that he understands in his innermost soul that that statement is absolutely correct. Some men may say that this is strong language; but if you consider the whole system upon which the Government has been conducted under the Liberal-Conservative regime, you will find that there has been a system of bribing provinces, bribing municipalities and bribing individuals, for a number of years past. How is this done? The system of subsidizing railways is one by which whole constituencies are bribed; better terms to the provinces is another method; the building of bridges, the erection of post offices and custom houses in various municipalities, are other methods employed for the purpose of securing votes. I know, Sir, that $16,000 was granted for a small railway which passed through my own constituency, and no less than four able-bodied men, members of the Government, came to my town for the purpose of rubbing it in to me by saying that the former representative of the constituency was the sole person to whom credit was due. Enquire in every constituency and province of Canada, and it will be found that bribery lies at the foundation of the success of the Liberal-Conservative party in maintaining itself in office so long. It is true, every word of it. Now, Sir, that is not only my opinion. The hon. member for South Oxford was condemned the other day for having sent across the water a statement of the present condition of this country. But it was not necessary that the hon. gentleman should do anything of the kind. The people of England know very well the position of the country, and had expressed their opinion on it previous to seeing the letter of the hon. member for South Oxford in the *Economist*. Let me give you the opinion of some English journals in connection with this question of bribery. They speak for themselves. The writers are intelligent men; and some of the journals are Tory journals, and I propose to read you a few extracts showing their opinion as to how Sir John Macdonald kept himself in power for so many years. The London *Daily Chronicle* says:

"It seems to be possible in the Dominion to secure the political support, not only of individuals, but of whole provinces, by gifts of money. The locality is bribed as well as the member, and the consequent demoralization spreads through all ranks."

Now, that is the opinion of an English paper, and that opinion was expressed before the article of the hon. member for South Oxford appeared in the *Economist*. Let me read again. The *Saturday Review* said:

"The whole tone of Sir Hector Langevin's apology, and of all that has been said during the enquiry, goes to show that in Canada, though it would be allowed to be wrong to pocket sums of thousands of dollars for one's personal use, it is perfectly fair to bleed a railway company or a firm of contractors for money to be spent in corrupting the constituencies."

That is another English opinion expressed in regard to the corruption carried on by the Conservative party of this country. Let me give you another opinion, and this is from a leading Tory paper, the *St. James Gazette*:

"While America is filling up and brimming over and increasing its population by millions, Canada, if not exactly stationary, is increasing very slowly indeed. It had been commonly supposed that, with the great boom in the North-West, Canada would have shown an increase of at least 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 during the last decade, and would be well on its way to something like the population of a second-rate European state; but all such hopes have been dashed by the census. Over the vast territory of the Dominion, which on the map looks as large as Europe and which in fact contains habitable territory enough to hold the populations of France and Austria with ease, there are not nearly as many people as are to be found within the London police district. Canada, with its thousands of square miles of prairie, its mighty rivers, its inland seas, its ports and harbours on two oceans, its mercantile marine, its pretensions to be a nation with a foreign policy, and even a navy of its own; ranks, so far as population goes, alongside of Bavaria or Holland or Roumania. The increase of population spills over the border and fills up the northern and western States of the neighbouring Republic. The men who were born in Canada and should become citizens of the empire, grow up and die under the Stars and Stripes. The fact is not to be blinked. Whether we like it or not, Canada is not doing well, has not been doing well for some time past. It has tried modified free trade, and that has been a failure; it has tried close protection, and that has been a failure too."

Here is another opinion from a paper called *The Speaker*:

"He won the general elections of 1878, 1882, 1887 and 1891 with large sums voted by manufacturers out of the extra profits which he guaranteed them by a high import tariff. Whole constituencies have been bribed by the offer of a bridge here and a dock there, and a new post office or custom house yonder, to vote for the man who could get the Government to spend most public money in the locality, quite irrespective of the general interests of the country."

Let me still give you another opinion. The *Star* said:

"For 23 years he and his party had maintained themselves in power without a break by a colossal system of bribery. He succeeded in throttling democracy and in debauching public opinion."

The Newcastle *Journal*, a Tory paper, said:

"But it is to the Minister of Public Works the scandal is really traceable, for 'passive connivance'—though too strong a phrase to meet the view of the majority or of Parliament—is probably as near as so very vague a phrase can be to an accurate description of the 'it's all right, as long as I'm not in it' sort of sentiment that is at the bottom of a good many scandals in this world."

I think I have given sufficient opinions to show that the English press corroborate the statements I have made with regard to the system of bribery on which this Administration is constructed. The Liberal-Conservative party have appealed to the selfish side of humanity in the country. They have appealed to their pockets, and as a venal vote stands between the extremes on both sides, they have sought with success to purchase the votes of that venal portion and thus change the elections in their favour. This has been done in the bye-elections. The hon. gentleman who is to follow me knows that full well, because he has passed through the county adjoining mine and is aware of the work done by the innumerable boodlers who have no ability except that of paying money for this venal vote; and those very boodlers who worked their nefarious traffic in this County of Bruce moved immediately afterwards into the County of West Huron and there conducted their same boodling plans during that election. The result of these corrupt manœuvres was that they debauched the constituency. Hon. gentlemen opposite say there is a revolution against the free trade policy of the Liberal party. Nothing of the kind. Nine farmers out of ten will agree that free trade with the United States would be profitable to them, but when you bring the influence of money and boodlers to bear upon them, you gather from the ranks of farmers and others sufficient in a close constituency to carry the day.

Some hon. MEMBERS Shame, shame.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.) Yes, shame upon the party that would use such means, and I am thankful to the hon. gentlemen for expressing their honest opinions so loudly.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of your men when you got into the courts?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. member for South Oxford was blamed for stating what is known over the length and breadth of the country, that there has been a system of bribery put in force, from the highest to the lowest, in order to maintain the Government in office. Now, the hon. gentleman, having cast away from the hon. member for South Oxford, thought fit to state that the trade of the country was reasonably progressive. I cannot understand what he means by "reasonably progressive." If he turns up the Trade and Navigation Returns and compares our present trade with that of 1873, he will find the advance is very slight. Allow me, Sir, to draw your attention to a few figures taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns, and I will ask the hon. gentleman who will succeed me to say if he is pleased with this advancement of trade. We must measure the advancement of the country by our export trade. I notice that the Finance Minister, when he found that the export trade was against us, spoke very forcibly of the home trade, and when the export trade was in our favour he spoke of the export trade; but hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that our prosperity must be largely measured by our export trade, for it is by what we send to other countries and get back in exchange that our prosperity is measured. In 1873, we sent to Great Britain $38,743,848 worth. That was increased in 1891 to $49,280,858. That is a reasonable increase because the products of this country have increased in that time. Four millions of people have been working in this country for that time, and it would be terrible if the energy of those people would not increase our trade with a country whose markets and ports are open to all we send them, and yet we have only increased about $10,000,000 in all those years. Our exports to the United States in 1873 were $42,072,526, and last year we sent to them $41,138,695, a slight reduction. Does that show that our trade is increasing, notwithstanding all the energy shown in this country in attempting to develop it? To France our export trade in 1873 amounted to $631,907, and, after a great effort on the part of the Government to increase our trade with that country and after great promises in that regard, our trade has dwindled down to $253,734. Is that satisfactory? We exported to Spain in 1873 $25,080 worth of goods, and in 1891 that had only increased to $67,110. Then take Newfoundland, our sister colony, which is willing to take a large proportion of our surplus products. In 1873, we had a larger trade with Newfoundland than we have to-day. My hon. friend, the Finance Minister, has promised every year that we were about to extend our trade with the West Indies, but instead of that we find that our trade with the West Indies has been re-

duced from $3,988,493 in 1873, to $3,122,770 in 1891. Is that a satisfactory condition of trade? Does that satisfy the Tories? It does not satisfy the Liberals, and I believe, that if the Liberals were in power, the trade with foreign lands would increase by leaps and bounds. There is one country with which our trade has largely increased, and that is Australia. In 1873 our exports to Australia amounted to $41,822, and in 1891 they reached the figure of $589,100. But that does not open up a market for the farmers of Canada, because no farm products go to Australia, and there is no market there for our farmers. The markets of the United States are barred against us and all that we send there goes in spite of the barriers which two foolish Governments have placed in the way. My hon. friend goes on to say that the trend of trade is towards Britain, in order, I suppose, to show that Britain is our natural market. He says:

"I have a table here which I will read, simply to show the trend of trade within the last few years, and to give us hope and confidence that no McKinley Bill or any other of a like nature necessarily bars the current of Canada's export trade or the current of its general business. Comparing 1888 with 1891, our exports of animals and their products to the United States fell from $7,595,000 to $4,316,000, a decrease of 42 per cent, whereas the exports of the same to Great Britain rose from $16,500,000 in 1888 to $21,000,000 in 1891, an increase of 29 per cent. The exports of agricultural products to the United States fell from $10,000,000 in 1888 to $7,000,000 in 1891, a decrease of 29 per cent, while those sent to England rose from $4,292,000 in 1888 to $5,254,000 in 1891, an increase of 25 per cent."

The hon. the Finance Minister could not but know that there was a cause for the decrease of our trade with the United States. In the first instance he said that the McKinley Bill did not interfere with the trend or current of our export trade, and then he contradicts himself, because he shows that our trade with the United States has been reduced while our trade with England has been increased. The McKinley Bill imposed a very heavy duty on our barley, and the result was that, instead of sending to the United States 10,000,000 bushels as we did in 1889, we only sent 4,751,000 bushels in 1891. What was the cause of that? Was the trend of trade changed by the McKinley Bill or was it not? Any one with one eye open could see that the trend of trade was changed. Take another article, the article of horses. Previous to the adoption of the McKinley Bill, in 1889, we exported to the United States 16,118 horses. The hon. gentleman says that the McKinley Bill did not disturb the current of trade, but in 1891 we only sent to the United States 9,937 horses. Did not that disturb the current of trade? Where did the horses go? They remain still in the hands of Canadian farmers, and horses now sell for $20 or $30 less per head than they would have fetched if the McKinley Bill had not been passed. But. the hon. gentleman said that this Government did not pass the McKinley Bill and were not responsible for it. No one on this side of the House said they did, but we maintain that, if we could get freer trade relations with the United States, the McKinley Bill would have to be removed, and the difficulties we have to contend against would cease to exist, so that we would have the advantages which we have lost under the operation of the McKinley Bill. In order to show how the current of trade has been affected by the McKinley Bill, I may refer to another article, that of poultry. We only sent last year about one-half of what we sent, previous to the passage of the McKinley Bill, to the United States. In eggs we sent over 13,000,000 dozen previously to the passage of that Bill, and last year we only sent 7,500,000 dozen, or a little more than one-half. Then in the article of hay, we sent over 100,000 tons to the United States before the passage of that Bill and last year we only sent 54,000 tons. Yet the hon. gentlemen will state before the House and the country what the figures of the Trade and Navigation Returns do not bear out, that the McKinley Bill did not alter the trend of exportation from this country. What have the Canadians done with their barley? Have they sent it to the United Kingdom? Not at all. The farmers found that they were blocked out of the United States, and we find that, instead of having 750,000 acres under crop as they had in 1888, last year that was reduced to 550,000 acres, or about one-third, simply because they could not sell the crop which pays the farmer more than any cereal he produces on his farm. Now I want to say something about the expenditure. I look upon the expenditure of this country as being enormous in comparison with our population, and when I compare it with the expenditure of the United States I am still more astonished that it takes so much money to govern the people in this country when compared with the government on the other side. The hon. the Finance Minister last year stated in his Budget speech that there were a large number of payments made by Canada which were not made by the United States, therefore the two expenditures were not comparable. In the estimate that I am going to give I have shown that class of expenditure in Canada which has an equivalent expenditure in the United States, in order that I may bring the expenditures along the same lines in both countries. We were told last year by the Minister of Finance that we paid for pensions $104,000; the administration of justice, $727,000; for the sinking fund, $1,938,000; subventions to steamboats, $321,000; militia, $1,280,000; provincial subsidies, $3,940,000; penitentiaries, $353,000. Now, he said that these items had no corresponding items in the expenditure of the United States, and therefore it was not fair to compare the expenditure of both countries on account of those expenditures being extra in Canada. If we take out those items I have mentioned from the total expenditure of last year of $36,343,000, we have left $27,716,000, showing that 76 per cent of the whole expenditure is made upon other items of expenditure in Canada. Now, if it is fair to throw up on the one side the expenditures which the United States have not, then it is perfectly fair to throw out of the account the expenditures which we have not. Now, the following are the expenditures which we have not in this country: The navy cost the United States $22,007,000; military, $44,583,000; pensions, $107,000,000; foreign intercourse, $1,649,000; expenses of the District of Columbia over income, $2,869,000; sinking fund last year, $48,104,000; administration borne by the Central Government, $500,000, making a total of $226,702,000. Now, subtract that from the total expenditure of the United States last year, $345,831,000, there is left for the other expenditures of the United States $119,129,000, or 35 per cent only of the whole income to be expended in carrying out all the other departments of the Government, or, in other words,

$2 per head for the United States as compared with $5.50 per head of the Canadian people. Now, Sir, I challenge a successful contradiction of these facts, I challenge any one to put them in any way that they will not show that we are largely burdened by taxation over that country. Then, again, let us submit another view of the matter. We had an expenditure in 1868 of $13,486,000; five years afterwards, under the Conservatives, the expenditure had risen to $23,316,000, or an annual increase of $1,966,000, or 73 per cent of an increase during those years. Now, the Liberal Administration came in with an expenditure of $23,316,000, and five years afterwards they left power with an expenditure of $23,503,000, or an increase of only ⅛ of 1 per cent Now, the Conservatives came in in 1878, and have been in, I am sorry to say, until the present day. The expenditure now is $36,343,000, or an increase of 55 per cent, as compared with ⅛ of 1 per cent under the Liberal Administration. Still, they tell us they are just as economical and saving as the Liberals. Now let us take another comparison. Comparisons are sometimes said to be odious, but I do not think they should be odious when they are made in the interest of the country. Now let us see if we expended more according to population under a Conservative Government than was spent under a Liberal Government. In 1868 we had a population of 3,630,000, and a controllable expenditure, for which I hold the late Government responsible, of $8,324,000, or an increase from 1868 to 1874 of 50 per cent. Now, when the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie came into power in 1874 the controllable expenditure under the control of the Government was reduced to $6,543,000, or 21 per cent of a reduction. Now, the Conservatives came in again, and have been in until the present time, and while they were in, the controllable expenditure rose from $6,543,000 to what it was last year, $11,202,000, or 70 per cent of an increase under the Conservative regime. Now, how will this compare with the expenditure in the United States at different periods? Let us see the economy that has been exercised in the United States; on this economy a large portion of the prosperity and advancement of the United States depended, and the results have been, from that economy, that the United States are going on faster than we are:

RATE—UNITED STATES EXPENDITURE ACCORDING TO POPULATION.

Year.	Population.	Expenditure.	Amount *per Capita.*
			$ cts.
1830	12,886,000	$15,141,000	1 25
1840	17,000,000	24,313,000	1 50
1850	23,191,000	41,000,000	1 80
1860	31,500,000	63,190,000	2 00
1890	63,000,000	345,000,009	5 50

So that in 1890 their expenditure amounted *per capita* to $5.50 as compared with our expenditure *per capita* of $7.47. With a large population the United States pay a less *per capita* expenditure than does our country with a small population. Now, no person will have the hardihood to say that the United States did not progress as rapidly as Canada is progressing. Our opponents say that Canada to-day is not able to compete with the United States on equal terms; they say that our institutions are in their infancy, that they still wear long clothes, they are still on the sucking bottles and have to be nursed by the Canadian protective tariff so as to give them an advantage in the markets of the world. Sir, the individual states of that country compete with every other state in the American Union. There is the State of Michigan, only across the river from the Province of Ontario, a state that is competing successfully with all the manufacturing institutions of every other part of the American Union; still it is said we cannot compete with her. Who are the Canadians who say we are not equal in ability, we are not equal in industry, we are not equal in skill, and push and energy, to any American that ever stood upon two legs? I am a Canadian, and I believe we are their equals. Have we not machinery at our disposal to manufacture articles as well as they? Have we not raw material at our hands as well as Michigan? Why is it that they can compete over in Michigan in their wooden manufactures, their woollen manufactures, and every other form of manufacturing industries, with every one of the older states, and keep up their own progress and advancement, and make money? You must remember also that a large number of those institutions in Michigan are worked by Canadians who have gone across the river to take positions in those manufacturing industries, and is not a Canadian on this side of the river equal in energy, push and capacity to a Canadian on the other side of the river? Still those hon. gentlemen tell us that our industries are in their infancy and that we must throw around them certain protective duties in order that they may increase and advance and multiply in our country. I never heard such nonsense spoken. I am ashamed of my country when I hear the Conservative blusterers upon public platforms say that we are not able to compete with our cousins across the line. But now it appears that we are not to get reciprocity, according to the statements made by the Minister of Finance; and the hon. gentleman who spoke last, said that he was very sorry that we were not, he was in favour of reciprocity. I do not believe, as I have often stated from my place in Parliament, that the Tory party is in favour of reciprocity of any kind. How could I come to any other conclusion? I have met Tory orators upon the public platforms of this country, I have discussed this question with them, and in every case they denounce reciprocity as being injurious to the farming interests of Canada. I see an hon. gentleman looking at me, who, no doubt, will answer that reciprocity in natural products would be injurious to Canada. He said it would destroy our pork and fruit interests, our cattle interests, and our butter and cheese interests. Well, if it would destroy these, how was it the Government went to Washington and offered, within the last few months, to negotiate a reciprocity treaty on the very basis which the hon. gentleman said if we got it would destroy the interests of the very parties on whose behalf they pretend to have gone to Washington. In the riding of West Huron during the bye-elections there was on the platform at one of the meetings a Cabinet Minister, the Secretary of State. I heard him say

that he was in a position to tell the country that three Ministers had gone from Ottawa to Washington for the purpose of negotiating a treaty on the lines of the treaty of 1854; and he said: I am in a position to tell you, farmers, that two articles which will be included in that treaty are binding twine and agricultural implements. Why did the hon. gentleman make that statement to the farmers? Because he knew that the farmers were paying higher prices for binding twine than they otherwise would pay. I am simply giving the statements of a Minister made on a public platform; and, in order to catch the support of the farming community, he went so far as to say that the Government were in favour of reciprocity. Mr. Montague, who spoke subsequently, from the beginning to the end of his speech denounced reciprocity in every phase and feature. Here were two hon. gentlemen, one speaking for one section and the other for another section. Ministers went to Washington. Did they go there earnestly desiring to procure a reciprocity treaty? It appears to me the greatest folly, nothing but burlesque in legislation, to say that three able-bodied men going to Washington should ask the man to whom they went, what, in his opinion, was the best thing to be done for Canada, how were we to raise the necessary funds to carry on the affairs of the Dominion. It appears as if the three statesmen could not devise means to raise the necessary funds, and so they asked Mr. Blaine how he would propose to help them out of the difficulty. Mr. Blaine was further asked how he would negotiate a treaty, and as he had had large experience in negotiating treaties, perhaps he would be kind enough to instruct the Ministers and inform them what would be the best to do in the interest of Canada, from which they came. Then Mr. Blaine went on to tell them: If you cannot afford to pull down the barriers and realize the blessings of free trade, if you cannot raise a revenue, if your people cannot afford to be prosperous, it is not my duty to give you advice. I believe all these incidents will yet be worked up in the form of a play. I think you will see these men pictured on the public platform. There will be three Canadian Ministers going down with solemn countenances,—some of them have faces that are naturally long. One will wear spectacles, and he will be the wisest looking of them all, and two other representatives would be present, asking Mr. Blaine how he would do if he were a Canadian? and seated by him would be General Foster, Blaine's coadjutor, ready to give his advice. This piece would be termed a screaming farce, and it would be given in order to amuse the people at the close of a popular entertainment. I may not be very learned politically, but I never heard such a simple statement as that made by the Minister of Finance. We want to be in earnest about this matter. I suppose it will be stated that there was difficulty with regard to woollen blankets in regard to negotiating a treaty. Then the question of tin plates would be raised, in view of a great industry established in the States for making these wares, and an objection might be raised on that head. I suppose there would be some talk about tin pans and other articles. This is the most ridiculous and farcical thing I ever heard of. The people would not believe that such statements had been made without authority, or without any report being made to the Governor in Council in regard to the conclusions at which the Ministers arrived—we have nothing but the verbal statement of the Minister of Finance delivered in the course of his Budget speech. Would you not suppose that the representatives of 70,000,000 of people would have had a secretary to write down the conclusions at which they arrived, and that Parliament would have received a protocol in advance of the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance. The whole thing is farcical, and no person of intelligence can believe that the negotiations were conducted with the view of obtaining a treaty, or even with honest intent. The Minister of Finance said they had ended, and added: I am very sorry they ended thus. I hope and trust that every member of the Liberal party, at least, will place no confidence whatever in the statements made by the Minister of Finance in regard to the impossibility of getting reciprocity with the United States. I am as satisfied as I am that I am standing here this afternoon, that if the Liberal party were in power, and if we sent delegates to Washington to negotiate a treaty on fair and honourable terms to all parties, and were willing to give as well as take—and whoever heard of making treaties with all the advantages on one side—such a treaty could be secured. But if we were willing to give the same advantages to Great Britain and other countries as we gave to the United States, and allowed their goods to come in equally as free, what benefit would the treaty be to the Americans? None at all. If they gave us a free market for our raw materials and many other articles, they might reasonably expect that we would receive their products upon different terms from those on which we receive the products of any other country. Unless we go that far it is no use to think of obtaining a commercial treaty, for we could only secure it upon a proper basis, and that is the basis only on which we could accept it, for any country not to surrender its dignity, honour and interests, but to go in a broad-minded statesmanlike manner and discuss the whole commercial relations between the two countries and arrive at an arrangement that would be fair and equitable between the two countries.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the question that we are now discussing is put by the Chair, I desire to offer some remarks on the financial statement presented to the House the other day. I think, however, that after the able and eloquent speech that has been delivered by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald), some gentlemen on the opposite side of the House should have felt disposed to rise and answer the arguments which were advanced by him. I certainly expected that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), at all events, who is always so ready to stand in the breach, would have made an attempt to answer the arguments of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald.)

Mr. SPROULE. There was nothing to answer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman says there was nothing to answer, but he evidently means that there was nothing that he could answer.

The arguments of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) were so plain and put so well that he found it impossible to answer them, and hence he considered it was better for him not to attempt it. The subject which we have been discussing is one of very great importance to the people of this country, and one which I think we should discuss thoroughly in order to ascertain if, upon this great and important question, we cannot arrive at a better solution of the difficulty that stares us in the face, than the proposal which the hon. Minister of Finance presents to us. Let me say in the first place that the Minister of Finance and the Government have not done what I think they should do. I believe that in the present condition of the country, with a debt of nearly $300,000,000, it would be wise for the Government to consider well the question of whether they cannot curtail and reduce the expense of government. The Minister of Finance tells us that he estimates the expenditure for next year will be $36,500,000, and that the income will be about the same. Now, it appears to me that $36,500,000 is altogether too large an expenditure, and that we ought to carry on the affairs of this country just as well, and serve the interest of the country just as well, with an expenditure of a great deal less money than that. Let us remember that in 1878 the affairs of this country were carried on by the Liberal Administration for $23,500,000. We have not a single acre of land more now than we had then; we have only a bare half million of people more than we had then, and does it not seem strange that the affairs of the country could be carried on in 1878 for $23,500,000 while we are now spending $36,500,000? I take the opportunity of saying that, in my opinion, there is no country in this wide world in which it costs the people so much to govern themselves as it does in the Dominion of Canada. What is this $36,500,000 spent for? It is not to build our canals, not to bonus our railways, not even to build our public works, because we are borrowing money year after year for that purpose. We have increased the debt of this Dominion within the last ten years by about $100,000,000 to enlarge our canals, and bonus our railways, and erect our public buildings, so that, in order to keep up the machinery of government in this Dominion, we are spending $36,500,000 a year, which means a cost of $7.47 for every man, woman and child in this Dominion, simply for the purpose of governing themselves. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is altogether too much, and I believe that we could largely reduce this expenditure without any detriment to the public interest. I propose to show a few ways in which I think our expenditures could be reduced. It was stated by the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) and he gave authority for it, that in the United Sates in 1830, with a population of 12,000,000, their expenses were only $15,000,000 a year, while in Canada with a bare 5,000,000 of of population we are spending $36,500,000. In the first place we see that our expenditure on the militia forces in 1878 was only $618,000 in round numbers, while last year we spent $1,279,000 on the service. Here is an increase of just about 100 per cent on the militia service of this country in thirteen years. I believe that a large saving can be made in that department. I know, for instance, that it was stated here two years ago by Gen. Laurie who then represented the County of Shelburne—and his statement was confirmed by other gentlemen who are conversant with the militia forces of this Dominion—that while we were spending $1,200,000 on the militia only about $250,000 went to the men and the balance went to the officials and staff. That was the statement of Gen. Laurie, a man who was thoroughly conversant with the militia forces of the Dominion and who knew whereof he spoke. I believe that that statement is entirely correct. I hope and trust that our new Minister of Militia will exercise more caution, and I believe that if he does he will find that the militia forces of the Dominion can be looked after just as well for about one-half of the money now spent. We are also spending about $100,000 a year on the Royal Military College in Kingston, and I believe that that institution should be wiped out and the money saved, as there are very few of the great mass of the people of this Dominion who ever get one dollar's worth of benefit from the Military College. Then take the North-West Mounted Police. In 1878 that force only cost us $334,000, while last year it cost us $740,000 or nearly 125 per cent of an increase in a few years. I do not believe that it is necessary that we should keep ten or eleven hundred men in the North-West. It, perhaps, might have been necessary a few years ago, when the rebellion broke out, but to-day I am firmly of the opinion that a large saving could be effected in the expenditure on that force. Now with regard to superannuation. In 1878 we spent $106,000 under this head, while last year it cost us $241,000, and I believe since the public accounts were closed on the 30th July we have added to our expense in this connection about $20,000 more. Year by year that expenditure is largely increased; I am not in favour, and have expressed myself on former occasions as not being in favour, of this superannuation at all. I think that it is a fraud and an injustice perpetrated on the people of this country and that it should be abolished. The civil servants are paid large salaries, and if their salaries are not sufficient to provide for themselves and to lay sufficient for their old days, then I contend that it is right and proper that their salaries should be increased. But after men have been in the service for ten and twenty years, with large salaries, light duties to perform, and short hours of labour, there is no excuse for continuing to saddle them on the country for ever after, at a large expense to the Dominion treasury. I think it is well that the Government should consider whether the time has not arrived for abolishing this system altogether. When it was first introduced in 1873 there was some reason for it. At that time it was proposed that the fund should provide for those who had grown old in the public service, and had become unable to perform the duties devolving upon them. But since then grave abuses have grown up under the system, and to-day we find that active, stirring, enterprising men in the prime of life have been superannuated in order to provide positions for some of the needy supporters of the Government; and thus they are saddled on the people of this country at an enormous expense for all the rest of their days. I think under this head a very large saving could be made by the abolition of the system. I find that under the head of Excise in 1878 $215,000 was spent and in 1891 $378,000. Why should there be such a large increase in this item? If the popu-

lation of the country had grown very much, we could all understand why that service should cost the country more; but while the population has increased at a very small rate, the expense has increased enormously. Then, civil government in 1878 cost only $823,000, whereas last year it cost $1,334,000. The care of our Indians in 1878 cost $421,000, against $987,000 last year. In all these items, I think a very large saving could be made without at all impairing the efficiency of the service. Then, by a righteous act on the part of the Government, they could, by one fell stroke of the pen, as the hon. Finance Minister stated last year, wipe out an expenditure of $400,000 to the people of this country in the preparation of the voters' lists. Although we spent $400,000 last year in the preparation of the list, yet out of the 215 constituencies about 175 or 180 will never use the list at all, unless possibly the sitting member should die, or unless for any other cause a vacancy should occur. We had a better voters' list prepared by the municipalities every year, which did not cost us a farthing, and it is utterly useless to expend such a large amount of money in preparing a list that is not required. Moreover, the preparation of this list not only costs such an enormous amount of money directly out of the public chest, but as every member of this House knows, it costs the two political parties a large sum in addition. In the county which I have the honour to represent, I venture to say that it costs the Conservative party at least $500, and I am sure that it costs our side an equal amount to revise the voters' lists. Now, I regret very much that the Finance Minister, when moulding legislation for the country, did not consider these matters; but I trust that before the session closes he will endeavour to reduce the enormous expenditure to which I have referred. The Finance Minister, in delivering his Budget speech, has been pleased to give us the result of his recent visit to Washington, and I propose to speak a little upon that question, because I think that no question has ever come before the people of this Dominion fraught with such importance to the weal or woe of the people of this Dominion. In my opinion, Parliament could not place upon the Statute-book a law of any sort that would confer equal advantages upon the people of this country to those that would be conferred by a measure of unrestricted reciprocity with the people of the United States. The Finance Minister has told us that he for one is glad that the question is now settled. I am also pleased to know that we have now arrived at a stage in the proceedings when we can clearly define without any uncertain sound the position of the political parties on this question. There is no hope or expectation on the part of the Conservative party of any change in our trade relations with the people of the United States. The Finance Minister tells us that the matter is now closed and settled. Mr. Speaker, he does not know whereof he speaks. In my opinion he might as well try to stem the Niagara River as to try to stem the tide of free trade. When it has once set in in this Dominion you cannot stop it. The people of this country cannot afford to go on, as they have been going on, sacrificing their interests in order to bolster up a few manufactures and to create a few millionaires in this Dominion. The great mass of the people are losing too much. Why, in the county which I represent, I venture to say—and I know whereof I speak—there is not a farmer possessing a hundred acres of land who does not lose $250 a year by not having free access to the markets of the United States. Neither the Conservative nor the Reform party can afford to have the present condition of things continued. One side can afford it as well as the other; the Reformers can stand it as well as their opponents; but neither of us can afford it. It is costing us too much, and in my opinion this question has taken hold of the people, and it is going to flow on and on until some settlement is arrived at; and although the Finance Minister may think it is closed so far as he is concerned, yet the people will tell him that they are not satisfied and they have not lost hope, and they are bound that if he cannot succeed in changing the trade relations of this country to entrust their affairs to a man who can and will succeed. He tells us farther that: For my own part I am not at all afraid to face the future. No, with his nice little fat office and handsome salary, he is not afraid to face the future. He need not be afraid; he is all right. What is the matter with him? With his $8,000 as Minister of Finance per year, he need not be afraid to face the future; but how about the thousands and tens of thousands of people of this country, the bone and sinew of this country, who have not got a handsome position such as he has, and who are struggling for the bread they require to feed their families? Are they satisfied that this country should go on as it has been going on for the last 10 or 15 years? I venture to say they are not. Then the hon. gentleman throws out a further hope to us that if the Canadian farmer is to be debarred in part from the United States market:

> "If the Canadian farmer is to be debarred in great part from a market in the United States for his products, which market at the best is partial, sectional and variable, he will at least have this satisfaction, that under due and adequate protection he will not be exposed to the great and dangerous competition, in the products of this country, from the great western country of the United States. He can prepare himself to find a market for his wares in other countries where they get more favourable entrance, and he can especially prepare himself for that almost inexhaustible market which awaits him for all his products in Great Britain, our mother land. In that country, already, by force of good quality and by prudence in selection, his apples, his cheese, his wheat, his cattle, his bacon and ham, find large and constantly increasing markets; and have to-day secured a permanent place in the market, and practically overtop all competition."

Why, Sir, you would think that for the first time the markets of England were being opened to us. If I am not mistaken, we have had the markets of the old country open to us for the last twenty or thirty years. Have we any more favourable terms for our goods in the English markets than we had twenty years ago? Have we any more favourable terms in that market than any other country? With the exception of our cattle, we enter the English market precisely on the same terms as the United States, France, Germany, South America, Africa and any other country in the wide world. England is a free trade country which does not ask where her goods come from or what tariffs other countries impose against her exports. The United States send their cheese, wheat, flour and butter and other goods to England on exactly the same terms as we, so that we have no advantage over them except in the matter of cattle, the

American cattle being scheduled, while no restriction is put upon ours. Why have our cattle this advantage? Is it because they come from Canada? Not at all, but solely because the cattle of the western States have been diseased and the English people are afraid that disease will spread. But if that disease broke out among Canadian cattle, they would be scheduled just as are those of the United States. Suppose we had free trade or reciprocity with the United States, is there any man who thinks for a moment we would give up the right to quarantine American cattle or the cattle of any other country? Why, the states of the Union have the right to quarantine cattle from one state to another. New York has the right to quarantine cattle from Ohio or any other state: and if we go to the old country, we will find that one county has the right to schedule the cattle of every other county in England, Ireland and Scotland.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do not those states which have cattle and no disease get the benefit of the English market?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because the people of England know that pleuro-pneumonia has broken out in the United States and are afraid to admit their cattle on the same terms as those of Canada where there is no disease. If we had reciprocity with the United States, we would not think for one moment of giving up our quarantine regulations: and if the cattle from the United States which pass through Canada did not undergo quarantine, our cattle would soon be scheduled. It is solely on account of the precautions we have taken to stamp out the disease that our cattle enjoy this privilege of not being scheduled: and if we had free trade, we would not give up that regulation, and our cattle would still go to England free of duty. The hon. gentleman was pleased to tell us that we would find a market in England for all those things. I am free to say this, that the old country is our natural market for many things. But our natural market for many others is the United States, as I think I will be able conclusively to establish before I take my seat. England is our natural market for our wheat, flour, cheese and other things. We sent 80,000,000 pounds of cheese there last year and not one single pound to the United States. Whether we could send any to the United States if there had been no duty I am not prepared to say, but I do not think we could to any great extent, because the United States themselves send 70,000,000 pounds to the old country, their cheese is admitted into England on the same terms as ours. Then the markets of the United States are our natural market for many others things. Take barley, horses, wool, sheep and other things, for these the American market is our natural market. We sent 4,700,000 bushels of barley to the United States last year, and only 132,000 bushels to England. Why did we send such a small quantity to England and such a large quantity to the United States? We could send our barley to England free of duty, yet we sent nearly 5,000,000 bushels to the United States, and paid 30 cents per bushel duty on it instead of sending it to the old country free. Do we send our barley to the United States because we prefer to deal with them, or because their money is better than that of the old country? No; but because we get more money there for it. The fact that we were able to send 5,000,000 bushels there notwithstanding the fact that there was a duty of 30 cents a bushel while we only sent 133,000 bushels to the old country, shows that either the people of Canada did not know their own business or that the United States is our natural market. If there was no duty on the barley we send to the United States, I venture to say that there would not be a single bushel sent to the old country. The year before the McKinley Bill was adopted our exports to the United States amounted to 10,000,000 bushels, while to England we only sent a few thousand bushels. There was no duty imposed on barley in England, but our people could get more money by sending their barley to the United States and paying the duty than they could by sending it to England where there was no duty at all. Then, in the article of beans, we exported 321,898 bushels to the United States and not one bushel to England. There was no duty on beans in England, and yet, notwithstanding there was a duty of 40 cents a bushel in the United States, our people sent their beans to the United States. The Finance Minister says that our natural market is England, and the people of this country evidently do not know it, and have been very foolish in sending their products to the United States. Surely the people of Canada must have learned experience from the number of years they have been sending their goods to the United States and paying the duty because they knew where the best market was. Take away the duty, and the price of those beans would be 40 cents a bushel higher to the farmers of Canada. Then the article of apples is another which we export very largely. The Finance Minister stated very truly that we send a great many of these apples to the old country. We sent 390,000 barrels to England and only 58,000 barrels to the United States. One market is free, and there is a heavy duty on the importation of apples to the other. Why did our people send that quantity to the United States? Because it paid them best. There is a quality of apple for winter use which every farmer knows it would not pay to send 3,000 miles away to the old country, but there are now thousands of bushels of apples rotting on the ground in this country because there is no market for them. Still, even with the high duty which is placed upon them in the United States, we sent them 58,000 barrels last year. If we had free trade with Boston and New York and the other American cities, where they do not raise one-tenth of what they consume, you would find an abundant market for all the varieties of fruit which we raise, and the farmers would realize a very large amount for what they cannot send across the ocean. Then what is our natural market for hay? Last year we sent 50,000 tons of hay to the United States and 11,850 tons to England. England is not our natural market for hay. There is a duty of $4 a ton on hay going into the United States, and yet the people of Canada sent that amount to their market. No doubt our natural market for horses is in the United States. We have a limited market in England for a certain class of horses, but England does not import all told from the whole world as many horses as we export in a year. England only imported 12,300 horses last year, while we exported nearly 40,000 horses to the United States alone, and formerly we have exported from 16,000 to 20,000 a

year. Since Confederation we have exported to the United States 305,000 horses, and only 5,500 to England. There is no duty in England on horses and there is a heavy duty on horses going into the United States, and yet our people sent 16,000 horses a year to the United States before the adoption of the McKinley tariff, though they had to pay a duty of 20 per cent on each horse, and only about 135 horses to the old country. Now the duty has been raised and yet, with the tremendous duty we have to pay, we actually sent nearly 10,000 horses to the United States and only 1,222 to the old country. That shows that our natural market for horses is in the United States, and we find that our country is being flooded with horses. In the western part of the country the price of horses has gone down enormously. There is no demand for them. The class of horses we have to sell is not generally in demand in the old country, and the only market open to us for many years has been the market of the United States. And, when we are deprived of that market, our farmers are being overrun with horses for which there is no sale unless the price is made so low that they cannot afford to pay the duty and send them into the United States. Then the Minister of Finance told us that we had a great market in England for wool. Last year we exported 1,107,000 lbs. of wool, and not a pound of that went to the old country, though it would be admitted there free and we had 12 cents a pound to pay in the United States, yet we sent more than a million of pounds to the United States, because that was our natural market, and it was sent there as a business transaction because we could get more money there, notwithstanding the duty, than we could get in England without having to pay any duty at all. It is the same thing in regard to sheep. We sent 244,000 head of sheep to the United States where the duty is very high, and only 40,000 head to England where they went free. Will any man say that, if these duties were removed and we had free trade between these two countries, it would not enhance the value of every farm property in Canada, increase the output of the farm, and increase the prosperity of the farmers by increasing the value of what they have to sell? It costs the farmer just as much to raise a bushel of barley or to raise a cow or a horse or to raise any kind of grain no matter what price he gets for it, and, if he gets the last few cents, that is clear profit and goes into his pocket or to the credit of his account in the bank. Then, as to potatoes. That is an article we export very largely. Last year we exported to the United States 3,326,000 bushels, on which there was a duty of 25 cents a bushel, and, though they could go into England free of any duty, we sent them only 2,278 bushels, and that is what the Finance Minister tell us is our natural market which we should strive to gain. And so far as our fishery products that we have to sell are concerned, there is not a question that if we had the markets of the United States open to us the profits of our fishermen would be largely increased. There is no doubt that our lumbermen would reap much greater profits; the value of our immense lumber regions would be greatly increased, the wealth and prosperity of the lumbermen would be enhanced, and the thousands and tens of thousands of men who are employed in the lumber mills and in the woods, would enjoy more remunerative prices for their labour because the lumbermen themselves would enjoy increased wealth and prosperity. Then, so far as our mineral resources are concerned, it would be of immense advantage to the people of this country if we had the markets of the United States open to us for our minerals. It is a well known fact that Canada is the richest country in this wide world; it is an admitted fact that there is no country so rich in mineral wealth as the Dominion of Canada. We have all the mills and all the resources for developing and mining our minerals. Down by the sea, in addition to our great fishing resources, we have mines of coal and iron lying alongside each other, right on the line of railway and on the sea coast, where they are easy of access and could be shipped to all parts of the world; and yet the mills of Londonderry, Nova Scotia, are not doing as much business as they ought to do because there is no market for their products. They cannot send their goods to Manitoba or to British Columbia, they cannot even send many varieties to Ontario because the freight would eat up the profit, and it would pay us better to get those heavy articles from the United States or from the old country. We all know that north of Lake Superior we have a great deal of mineral wealth that is altogether undeveloped. Along the south shore there are villages and towns springing up; the villages are becoming towns, the towns are becoming cities, and there is life, and activity, and stir, and bustle going on because their mineral resources are being developed, and they have a market for their goods; while along the northern shores of Lake Superior all is solemn and all is desolation, because it does not pay a man to go to work and spend the fortunes that would be necessary to open up and develop those mines and construct the necessary railways and facilities for getting in and out of the mines; for after he has done all this he has not got a market where he can send his goods. The markets of the Dominion are limited. He cannot sell his heavy iron goods except in a limited area; he cannot sell his coal except in a limited area, and so it happens that it does not pay, and that is the reason why these mines are not being developed. But once you throw down the walls and open up the markets of the United States, and immediately there is some object before a man to induce him to invest his money in developing these mines, and the result would be that immediately capital would flow in, and there would be a great development of these mines, thousands and thousands of men would be employed, and millions of dollars would be invested in constructing railways to carry that ore from the mines to the market, there would be work for our vessels that ply upon the lakes, and there would be immediately a great impetus given to the Dominion of Canada. We have in this Dominion of Canada only one industry to-day that I can recall that is enjoying unrestricted reciprocity. Our railway system in this Dominion does enjoy reciprocity with the United States. Everybody knows that the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Michigan Central, that run from the west to the east, have reciprocity with the people of the United States. They can load a car at Detroit and draw it through Canada in bond to Boston, or to Buffalo, or to New

York, without let or hindrance. They can transport American goods in bond from one American port in the west to another American port in the east. That is the only industry in Canada, that I can remember, that is enjoying reciprocity, and what is the result? Notwithstanding that our railways are hampered, and hindered, and cramped on account of the difficulties that stand in their way, notwithstanding that they have 60 cents a ton duty to pay upon every ton of coal they consume, notwithstanding that they have a duty of $4 a ton to pay upon the pig iron that they consume, and $13 a ton duty upon the bar iron and round iron and steel they consume, and 35 per cent duty upon the oils and paints and varnishes that enter into the construction of their cars—notwithstanding all these things, what do we find? We find that our railways are gradually improving their condition, they are double-tracking their roads, they are increasing their rolling stock, their receipts are gradually climbing up from year to year, they are competing, and competing successfully, with the railways that run entirely through American territory, showing that they are able to compete successfully with those roads, although they have many difficulties to contend with that the American roads have not. Now, if you compare for one moment our railway system with our vessels, you find that notwithstanding that we own half the lakes and half the coast line, yet it is a lamentable fact that of all the millions of tons of freight that come down from the west to the east last year, there was only a bare 5 per cent of it carried in Canadian vessels. Why was this? Simply and solely because our vessels do not enjoy the same privilege that our railways do. A vessel cannot load at Detroit for Buffalo. It cannot load at one American port and tranship at another American port without first calling at a Canadian port and discharging the cargo and getting a clearance, and the consequence is that of all the millions of tons that came down the lakes last year 95 per cent were carried in American vessels. Why, we can remember a few years ago when we had a great many flourishing shipyards in this Canada of ours. I remember that in my own town, the town of Chatham, we had a shipyard that employed 150 skilled mechanics. Some of the largest propellers that are plying on the lakes within the last few years, were built there. At St. Catharines on the Welland Canal, there were thousands of men employed in building vessels for plying on the lakes. But to-day our own shipyards have disappeared, the sound of the hammer is unheard, the workmen have gone away, and all is desolation and solitude, where before were bustle and activity in building vessels to ply on the lakes, simply because there is nothing for the vessels to do. But once you open up the coasting trade of this Dominion for Canadian vessels, and you afford employment for Canadian vessels, and our Canadian boys would not have to go away to seek employment in a foreign country. There would be plenty of work for our Canadian boys on our Canadian vessels, plying upon the lakes that separate these two countries. I believe it would be a great advantage to the people of Canada, that it would afford immense employment to the skilled mechanics, to the ship-builders, and a vast amount of capital would be employed in building and constructing vessels to ply upon the lakes and across from one American port to another, if we had the barriers removed. In many other ways it would be of great advantage to the people if we had these barriers to trade and commerce removed. But the Minister of Finance told us that in the conference at Washington, it was impossible to procure a reciprocity treaty with the United States, except upon such terms as they could not accept. I am disposed not to place too much confidence in the statement that was delivered to this House some days ago. In the first place, I have very little confidence in a delegation that goes to Washington to secure a treaty that they do not want. They never wanted it, they would not accept it if it was offered them, and consequently, any negotiations that took place there simply amounted to a blind and a great farce. I can imagine them going there—and hon. gentlemen will notice how fully he has told us about this matter—and how it was that our delegates pointed out the lions in the way: we raised questions, we did this and that. The Canadian delegates, after having presented these difficulties and canvassed themselves freely and thoroughly, said to Mr. Blaine: My dear Mr. Blaine, these are our difficulties, you acknowledge them: now, my dear Mr. Blaine, you have had large experience in arranging reciprocity treaties: we never had any reciprocity treaties to frame, and consequently our experience in that respect is very limited indeed, and, my dear Mr. Blaine, we come here now and ask you as an old man, as a man of great experience in reciprocity treaties, to tell us how to act: we are prepared to accept a treaty if you can, with your experience, point out any way to which we can overcome the difficulties. They continued: But, my dear Mr. Blaine, we want you to give us some information and some help: we are ignorant, as we have never had any reciprocity treaties to frame, while you have had great experience, and, my dear Mr. Blaine, come to our rescue in this our time of need, for the bye-elections are coming on.

Mr. FOSTER. They are over.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Come and help us in this our need and give us your advice. Did members of this House ever hear of a greater farce? The idea of the Minister of Finance of the great Dominion of Canada, with the Minister of Justice and the Minister of War going to Washington and making such an exhibition. I am surprised such language should have been used by the hon. gentlemen who went there. It must have been used in a moment of weakness, which struck them about that time. I do not think that a delegation going to Washington to obtain what they did not want, what they would not be prepared to accept if it were offered, should receive any confidence in regard to the causes of the failure of their mission. They had, however, a nice trip, it did not cost them anything, but I would not object to that if they had exhibited a sincere desire to obtain a reciprocity treaty. They were probably taking private lessons from my dear Mr. Blaine, and these may result in something later on. This, however, is too serious a matter, for the people cannot afford to continue without a measure that would confer such enormous advantages on them. If hon. gentlemen opposite cannot point out any way by which to remove these difficulties, they must make way

for those who are able to point out the way. Delegates to Washington should not have been the first to raise objections. The Minister of Finance emphasized the fact that we pointed out difficulties and raised objections. Such should come from another source, and not for those earnestly seeking a reciprocity treaty. Besides, they knew very well before they went to Washington that the people of the United States would not grant a reciprocity treaty which would embrace only natural products. I am glad, however, that the Minister of Finance was kind enough to say that he did make Americans that offer, because, listening to the arguments addressed by the hon. gentleman opposite it is apparent that many hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to a reciprocity treaty even in natural products. One hon. gentleman yesterday admitted he was prepared to admit corn from the United States, although he pointed out that it would injure the raisers of wheat; and yet that hon. gentleman supports a Government which proceeded to Washington and deliberately offered the people of the United States to throw down the wall so far as natural products were concerned. The Government were willing to sacrifice the farmers of the Dominion. We know that if we had a reciprocity treaty in natural products, so far as corn, beef and pork are concerned, I believe the prices would be a little lower. Our farmers would be a little injured by a reciprocity treaty; but whatever injury arose on that account would be counteracted tenfold by the advantages that would arise in other ways. But the delegates to Washington deliberately offered to sacrifice the farmers; at the same time they took good care not to surrender one jot or tittle of the National Policy which bolsters up a few manufacturers. The farmers may go, but the manufactures must have all the protection they now enjoy. I do not think that would be fair. We should have one law for all and no favour for any. Why should one man be protected at the expense of the entire community; why should one man be able to have a law placed upon the Statute-book, by which a few men can fleece the whole of Canada? In this country we want manufacturers who can maintain themselves without artificial assistance; we do not want a manufacturer who has to be bolstered up with 25 or 30 per cent duty in order to enable him to compete; if he cannot do it himself let him go to the wall and let him turn his attention to something else. I take the ground that if unrestricted reciprocity would injure every manufacturer in this Dominion, that it would benefit our great agricultural classes, then, on the principle of the greater good to the greater number, I must still support it. I am glad to believe, however, that the great mass of our manufacturers would greatly benefit if we had free trade with the States. I know that the great milling industry with which I am more intimately acquainted would find a bonanza if we had the tariff which now separates us from the United States removed. We would be able to sell an enormous quantity of our products in the New England States where they do not raise the goods they require. We would be able to sell to the city of Buffalo, with its population of 200,000 people, and which is within a stone's throw of the largest mills in Ontario. In the city of New York, with its population of about 1,000,000 of people, we would also find a market for an enormous quantity of our goods. I am also glad to know that in the town of Chatham, in which reside some of the largest carriage manufacturers on the continent, these gentlemen are heartily in favour of free trade with the United States. They say that they are handicapped now, that they have to pay $4 per ton duty on pig iron, $13 per ton on round bar iron, 35 per cent on paints, oils and varnish, and 60 cents per ton on blacksmith's coal. They are also curtailed in their markets. They have only the over-stocked markets of some of the provinces in Canada, but if you find them free trade and enable them to buy the raw material in the cheapest markets, and give them the chances of supplying Michigan, New York and all the New England States they would be able to compete against the world. We have just as good mechanics, just as enterprising men, and just as ample facilities in Canada as they have in any country in the world. What occasion has the Canadian manufacturers to fear competition with the States when they are meeting the competition of the States every day in the year? We meet them on common ground in the old country and in Newfoundland, and surely no man would say that we cannot hold our own in our own country and in our own homes. There is no place where manufacturing can be done so cheaply as in this city of Ottawa, with its unlimited water power, its magnificent facilities for shipping in the raw material and the finished products out, and its enormous quantity of abundant cheap labour. Look along the St. Lawrence, all the way down, and there you have unlimited water power. Take our cotton mills at Dundas Cornwall and Valleyfield. Is there any reason why our cotton and woollen manufacturers should not compete against the world? They are able to get the raw cotton from the south as cheaply as the manufacturers can in the States. They have all the machinery and labour necessary, they have the ability, the push, the vigour, the vim and the capital, and there is no reason why they should not compete with any manufacturers in the wide world. If they had the United States market for their goods they could double and treble their output and confer immense advantages on the labouring people of this community. Throw down the walls and remove the barriers that now disturb trade and commerce, and immediately there would be an enormous development of capital, thousands of men would be employed where there are hundreds now, the value of property would be enhanced, and I believe that in ten years the population of this Dominion would be doubled. It has been stated by the Minister of Finance that we can only get reciprocity on certain terms which he has laid down. I do not believe that. I believe that if proper representations are made to the people of the United States that we could obtain reciprocity on very favourable terms. As the Minister of Finance told us the United States has negotiated reciprocity treaties with many other countries. They have even made a treaty with the British West India Islands, a colony of England standing in the same position to England as Canada does. Is there any discrimination for American goods there and against English goods? If I am not mistaken the British goods enter the British West India Islands upon the same terms as do the goods of the United States. I believe that the people of the United States want our trade as badly as

we want theirs, and you cannot have any treaty between the two countries unless it is mutually advantageous. I believe that a reciprocity treaty with Canada would be a great advantage to the people of the United States. They would have a market of five millions of people right at their doors, with four thousand miles of an imaginary line separating the two countries, people descended from the same stock, speaking the same language, of the same religious persuasions, and with their objects and aims in life much the same. Surely the trade of five millions people right at their own doors would be far better than a trade of five millions of people with a thousand miles of water communication separating them. The people of the New England States want to have our coal, our lumber, our fish and minerals, and the people of Ohio and New York want our barley, our horses, our lambs, and any other articles that we have got to sell them. They can buy them cheaper from us than they can from any other country. We want to trade with them because it pays us to sell our goods to them and it will also pay them to buy their goods from us: and that to my mind is a clear evidence that if proper representations are made to the people of the United States, a treaty, and a very favourable treaty, can be negotiated between the two countries. Now, some of our friends state that it would be disloyal, would lead to annexation, would lead to direct taxation, if we secured such a treaty. Now, these are questions which we have to consider. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe that any such results would flow from it at all. I do not believe it is even necessary for us to discriminate against the mother land. I believe a treaty can be arranged by which the people of Canada will obtain all the advantages that they choose. It must of course be a mutually advantageous treaty, which will confer benefits upon our neighbours as well as upon us, and I do not believe there is anything disloyal in trying to do the best we can for this Canada of ours. We have all the same object in view. I take it that every representative of the people here wants to see this fair Canada increase in prosperity and become great, developing its immense resources, increasing its population, and promoting the happiness of its people; and if we can best advance these laudable objects and aims by negotiating a treaty with the country to the south of us, and removing the barriers that separate us, surely we would be disloyal to our own land, we would be untrue to our best interests, if we failed to seek for such a treaty. Why, England has great interests in Canada. England has to-day eight or nine hundred million dollars invested in this Dominion. England wants to see Canada become great and prosperous, because that insures dividends to those who have their money invested here, and it insures our purchasing a largely increased quantity of goods from the manufacturers of England. I verily believe that if we doubled our population in ten years, as we ought to do, we should buy a very much greater quantity of goods from England than we do to-day. Although there might be a little temporary fall in our purchases from England, yet in the long run such a treaty would tend greatly to increase them by increasing the prosperity and population of Canada. Why, it seems to me that the people of Canada fifty years from now will look back and wonder what kind of people there were in this Dominion in 1892. Why, what are we doing? We are spending millions of dollars in removing the natural barriers that separate this country from the United States. Last year, the Grand Trunk Railway Company spent $3,000,000 in building a tunnel under the St. Clair River. What did they do it for? For amusement—only to look at it? No: but it was done solely to increase the facilities for transporting trade between the east and the west. Then, go to the Niagara River, and what do you see there? You find that capitalists have invested their millions of dollars in building the iron and steel bridges that span that beautiful river, for the sole purpose of endeavouring to remove the natural barriers to trade and commerce between this country and the country to the south of us. And all this time, while the people of Canada have been investing millions of dollars in trying to remove the barriers which nature has placed in the way of trade and commerce, flowing from the west to the east, what have our Government and the Congress at Washington been doing? The Congress at Washington and the House of Commons at Ottawa have been engaged in the noble and laudable enterprise of building higher and higher obstructions in the way of trade and commerce, trying to undo the work which we have been spending our millions of dollars in accomplishing. It seems to me that that is a foolish and stupid thing for us to do—after spending millions of dollars in removing barriers, to turn around and raise up other barriers. Why, if we want to have barriers between us, we had better go to work and destroy the bridges which span the Niagara River, blow up the tunnel that undermines the St. Clair River, blow up the boats that carry the trains across, and sink the schooners that trade between the two countries, then we shall have all the barriers that nature has placed in the way, and we shall save ourselves the trouble of raising higher and higher walls to prevent us from trading with each other. But our friends tell us that this would be a disloyal treaty, and therefore objectionable. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, you know that before that treaty could become law, it would have to receive the sanction of the Imperial Government and be signed by Her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria. Surely that fact in itself is a sufficient guarantee that the interests of the Empire as a whole, and the interests of this Dominion, would not be prejudicially affected thereby. We are also told that it would lead to annexation. Well, for my part I have no sympathy for those who desire closer political relations with the United States. I know that there are a great many people in this country, both on the Conservative side, and a few on the Reform side—

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, not one

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not many, but a few of the weaker sort, who favour annexation. For my part I do not think it would have that effect at all, for this reason, because all the connection we want with the people of the United States is the privilege of buying from them those things which we can buy to advantage, and the privilege of selling to them those things which we can sell to advantage. We have a better form of government than theirs. In my opinion, our form of government is the best in the world.

Mr. WELDON. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad that the hon. member for Albert agrees with me in one thing. I believe that our laws and institutions taken as a whole are the best in this world. There are many things which we can learn from the people of the United States, and profit by. I certainly think that our laws are sometimes very badly administered, and our form of government very much abused, but that is the fault of the Administration and not of the form of government. On the whole, our form of government, our laws and institutions, are the best in the world, and for my part, I am quite satisfied with them. Now, what are we to gain, after we have free trade with the United States, by annexation? It seems to me we will have gained all the advantages we can possibly hope for by free trade, without any of the disadvantages, and would naturally stand all the more firmly by our own laws and institutions, so that instead of free trade leading to annexation, it would lead exactly in the opposite direction. We all know that the head of the Conservative party, whatever his political views may be now, was at one time very strongly in favour of annexation, as were also many of his colleagues. What opinions they hold now I would not like to say, but we know they were at one time in favour of it; but if we had free trade, the advantages we would gain would be such that all desire for annexation would disappear like the morning dew before the morning sun, and we would have a contented, happy and prosperous people in this fair land of ours. Another point made is that it will lead to direct taxation. I do not think there is any danger whatever of that, but after all it is only a question of changing the pocket out of which you take the money. The people will have to pay in either case, and it seems to me it does not make much difference out of which pocket the money comes. I believe, however, that we could carry on the affairs of the country without putting our hands into the pockets of the people at all in the way of direct taxation. I think I have already pointed out many ways in which the enormous expenditure of the country could be cut down and the affairs of the country carried on efficiently at a cost of many millions of dollars less than are now expended. I have no doubt that if the leader of the Reform party were entrusted with the reins of government, as he will be in a very short time, should the Conservative party adhere to their present policy of remaining still, he will find an effective solution of the difficulty. We know the means which have been adopted to carry the elections by our hon. friends opposite. We need only take up the Conservative organs in Northumberland, Monck, and other counties in which there have have been bye-elections, to find the reasons why these counties were carried against the Opposition. Such means cannot be adopted at a general election, and I believe the time will come, and come speedily, when the people will rise in their might, knowing that there is no hope under the present Government of better trade relations with the United States, and insist on their public affairs being conducted by abler and better men than those now in charge. I believe the tide of free trade is rushing with such mighty force that no party can withstand it. Look at the results of the census. Are they not most shameful? Notwithstanding the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been spent in developing our railways, deepening our canals, and enlarging our public works, notwithstanding the many million dollars spent on immigration, this fair Dominion had only increased its population by a bare half million people in the last ten years. The beautiful Province of Ontario, rich in mineral wealth, with agricultural resources that cannot be paralleled by any country in the world, inhabited by a frugal and industrious people, with all advantages, situated as it is on the highway of the west and east, that ought to make it advance in prosperity, only increased its population in the last ten years by 186,000 people, while the little state to the west, Michigan, which cannot be compared for a moment with the Province of Ontario, increased its population fourfold. There is evidently something wrong. It cannot be in the people, nor in the soil, nor in our advantages and facilities for reaching the markets of the world. It can only be accounted for in one way, and that is, that the trade policy of this Government does not tend to advance the prosperity of the country. We are like a young giant shackled and hampered. We are like a city surrounded by a great wall, dying from mere inanition and want of connection with the trade of the outside country. The flower and the youth of our country have gone into a foreign land, where without any means or position they have risen step by step up the ladder of success. Go into the workshops and marts of commerce, and railway shops, along the lines of railway, and you will find at the head of these large concerns Canadians who owe their positions solely to their skill, courage and ability, and yet we are to be told that Canadians are not able to hold their own in their own country against foreign competition. This is a slander upon the people of Canada. I believe that free trade will benefit the mechanic, the artizan, the miner, the fisherman, the lumberman, and agriculturist, in fact all classes in this country. I believe the time will soon come when the people of this Dominion will entrust the affairs of this country to a set of men who are in sympathy with their views, who will go to Washington to get a fair and straightforward treaty accepted which will promote the interests of this Dominion, and I hope the day will speedily come when the men in whom the people of Canada have confidence will thus be able to obtain this great boon which the people of Canada desire.

Mr. DEVLIN. It was not my intention to take part in this discussion, but having heard from two or three members on the opposite side to-day and yesterday certain charges levelled against the party to which I have the honour to belong, I think it proper to give at least a short reply to these charges. This afternoon we heard that the success of the Conservative party in the last election was due to their loyalty, and we heard another member, as he cast a tender and loving eye on his colleagues, asking what was the secret of the success of their party in the recent elections. No one disputes the loyalty of the great body of the Conservative party, but the history of our party and of its leaders in the past shows that the charge of disloyalty cannot be laid at our door. They say on the opposite side that the spirit of loyalty that animates them lies at the bottom of their success, but, when the head is disloyal, it is hard to believe that the body is loyal Do not they belong to a party which, after the death

of their late leader, invited a gentleman who, by profession, by signature, by aspiration and by feeling, is more strongly in favour of annexation to the United States than anyone on this side of the House, to take the place of their leader? They made that hon. gentleman the leader of their party. The cry of loyalty then comes on their part with less grace than it could come from the lips of members of the Liberal party. Then, we naturally ask: Are we in the British Parliament or a Canadian Parliament? Judging from their constant references to the mother country, one would think that their only interest was to look to the mother country and to neglect the Canadian people and Canadian homes. In March last it seems their programme was entire devotion to the interests of the Canadian people, but now we hear of nothing but devotion to the interests of the mother country. A profession made by them was that the secret of their success was in the policy which they adopted. It may be a good policy for a Government anxious to remain in power to pursue, but is it a good policy for the country to follow? What was their policy during the recent bye-elections? I had the pleasure of visiting the riding of West Northumberland when the election was taking place there, and we found placarded on almost every fence, Vote for the Government candidate and the railway boom. The cry was: Vote for the Government candidate and harbour improvements, vote for public works, vote for post offices, vote for the custom house, vote in fact for everything that the Government can give except for the policy which has been held out and perhaps explained to the people. That is the secret of their success, and there are other secrets which should not be mentioned in Parliament perhaps, but which are known by those who have followed the attitude of that party during the recent elections. I fear not to say that every constituency in which a bye-election took place, was visited not by one, two, or three, but by twenty or thirty outsiders, who went thither not to educate the people by speech, but to convert them by other means which should not be mentioned in Parliament. And yet they presumptuously ask: What is the secret of their success? How is it that they have come here with such a majority? They have managed to get here by following out the policy which the Conservative party has pursued for the last twenty years, of purchasing constituencies by means of railways, of public buildings, of offers of distribution of public moneys, and they will have to satisfy the demands made on the strength of these promises during the next three or four years if they wish to remain in power. Never more astonished in my life was I than when I heard in the same constituency of West Northumberland, that the Government had sent up inspectors to examine a port there, and to lay out certain works which it was proposed to construct. The works were laid out on the ice, the spring came, and the ice passed away with the designs of the works upon it, and nothing further was done until a month ago, when the people were informed that the policy of the Government would be carried out and the harbour works would be completed; and yet here we are asked what is the secret of the success of the ministerial party during the recent bye-elections? We know the secret. Any one with the eye or ear closed could find out that secret. Further, they have won their elections by vilification of the Liberal party, by vilification of our respected and beloved leader in the bye-elections of the Province of Ontario. In every way they have tried to crush the Liberal party and its leaders, but they have not yet succeeded. They have also tried to crush the policy to which we are attached and which we shall follow. Only a year ago or a little more Parliament was dissolved. Why? Because on that occasion the Premier announced to the Canadian people that he was about completing arrangements for a treaty of reciprocity between Canada and the United States. In March last, the people were not asked to pronounce upon the National Policy, but they were asked to approve of the course the late Premier of Canada had adopted in attempting to bring about trade relations with the United States. We were informed that these trade relations were about to be completed. But what did we hear the other day from the Minister of Finance? That all such negotiations were at an end, that no treaty of reciprocity would be concluded between Canada and the United States. Such was the information given to Parliament and given to the people of Canada. What a strange contradiction, what an immense contradiction, between the words uttered here by the Minister of Finance and the profession of political faith made by his late leader previous to the dissolution of Parliament? Parliament was dissolved in order that a treaty might be concluded and approved, and the Minister of Finance comes here and tells us that in reality their only object was to go and find out whether they could have such a treaty. It reminds me very much of a man trying to get into a house by every means except through the open door. The open door was there, but he would not go in by that means. He pretends to have tried by all other possible ways to get in, and comes back to tell us that he could not get into that house of reciprocity; the door was open, but he would not walk in through it. Sir, we have been assured that the farmer is prosperous; we have been told in the course of this debate that he is perfectly prosperous, that the industries of the country are flourishing, and that the country itself is in a prosperous and healthy condition. I believe that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who make such statements are beginning to believe themselves that the country is prosperous, because they have said it so often that they have actually convinced themselves that such is the case. Sir, without taking up the statistics of the country I would ask them to look around and to tell us where is this great prosperity of which we hear so much. If they go across the river to the neighbouring city of Hull they will be told by the manufacturers of lumber that trade, and the lumber trade especially, is in a state of uncertainty, owing to the policy of the Government. To-day a duty of one kind is imposed, to-morrow it may be removed, and perhaps the day after it will be reimposed. The lumber merchants are actually afraid to make investments for fear that the policy of the Government may be such that those investments will prove enormous losses. Sir, with regard to this degree of prosperity of which we hear so much, this measure of happiness, I maintain that the farmer under the existing trade relations between Canada and the United States cannot be in as happy and as prosperous a condition as he would be were the high wall which now exists between the

two countries removed. How is it to be contended, for instance, that if he could sell his barley at 20 cents a bushel more than he can now, that he would not be more prosperous? And if he could obtain $30 more for every horse that he sells, would that not be at least $30 to his advantage? And, Sir, for every dozen of eggs that he sells, if he could obtain 5 cents more, and 40 cents more for a bushel of beans, and $4 more for a ton of hay, and 5 cents more a pound for poultry, would he not be, at all events, benefited by so much the more? It is only a few weeks ago—and this gives an idea of how heavily the taxation which is now imposed bears upon the agricultural class of Canada—a train consisting of 12 car loads of poultry was shipped from Smith's Falls, Perth and Brockville. The value of the shipment amounted to $26,000. What was the duty collected upon that poultry at Rouse's Point? The duty was $8,750 upon this one train load of poultry shipped from this country to the United States. Yet we will be told, notwithstanding this heavy tax, notwithstanding this heavy duty of over $8,000 upon one shipment of poultry, that the Canadian farmer is as prosperous as he could be, and if the high wall were removed it would not help him. Sir, the trade of Canada has fallen off largely also. Upon these very articles which I have just mentioned, since the McKinley Bill came into operation, the sale of eggs to the United States fell off over $718,000, and the increase to Great Britain was only $82,000. The sale of hay fell off by $546,000, and has only increased to Great Britain by $30,000. The sale of horses has fallen off over $683,000 to the United States, and it only increased by $138,000. With regard to the item of barley, the falling off is much more marked. It has been $1,733,293, and the corresponding increase has merely been $63,000. Still, notwithstanding these alarming figures, we will be told that the farmers are in a prosperous condition, because, forsooth, they have the home market. It was pointed out by the hon. gentleman who preceded me that they had this market even before we lost the American market. We have had this market since we lost the American market, and no matter what market we may obtain, no matter what market may be opened out to us, we shall continue to have the English market. Sir, if reciprocity is not a good thing, how comes it that hon. gentlemen opposite have gone so frequently to the United States begging for reciprocity? If reciprocity were not a good thing, how comes it that a promise was made over and over again, not by the Liberal party, but by hon. gentlemen opposite, that a treaty of reciprocity would be made with Spain? And what has become of that treaty which was promised? If reciprocity is not a good thing, how comes it that they have in Paris an official, or I should rather say an ambassador, whose mission it is to look after precisely those matters affecting treaties of reciprocity? How comes it that the Minister of Finance himself went last summer down to the West Indies? It was not a mere pleasure trip, it was not for his political or any other kind of health; he went there, I believe, in search of a treaty of reciprocity. And how comes it that we send the products of Canada to every exhibition, whether in Europe or in America, and that probably we shall send a large quantity of products to the great international exhibition at Chicago? What is the object of these missions? What is the object of the expenditure connected with such missions, if not to find new markets? And simply because the Government do not wish to lose the support of the manufacturers of this country, and especially because they do not wish to lose their contributions, which are so useful in times of election, the people of Canada must be deprived of this valuable treaty of reciprocity. That is about the state of affairs. I do not wish to detain the House very long, but before proceeding I wish to quote an article from the London *Chronicle* which, speaking of this very question, has the following words:—

"A more effective method of realizing Sir Charles Tupper's aspirations would be unrestricted reciprocity between England and Canada. We do not expect that Sir Charles will agree with us when we affirm that it would be better for Canada to establish free trade both with America and ourselves, but it is of the highest importance to preserve friendly relations with America. If we are to use the Canadian Pacific Railway as a highway to the east, this is an additional reason why Canada should aim not only to strengthen the bonds of union with England, but to maintain such relations with America as will obviate any just cause of American jealousy against England. America hopes to compel the entrance of Canada into the Union by the severity of her commercial policy. The best way to defeat such tactics is not to be found in intimation, for a nation of five millions cannot wage a successful commercial war against a nation of sixty-five millions, but in a policy of unrestricted commercial intercourse with the rest of the world."

Here we find an English organ telling us that if we wish to be loyal to England and loyal to ourselves we should adopt this very same policy which is the policy of the Liberal party, namely, unrestricted commercial intercourse with the United States. I think that is an answer to those who claim that unrestricted reciprocity means disloyalty. With respect to those who claim that this country is in such a prosperous state, I desire to take this occasion to recall the remarks of the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) during a discussion last session. That hon. member, speaking of the State of Vermont, said that there was an actual decrease in population during the last seven years, and he pointed that out as a great evil; and he also affirmed that in Maine, out of 16 counties, 7 had declined in population. Speaking of the State of New York, he claimed there was a decrease in 23 out of 60 counties, and he added: "I venture that you will find no such startling statement in any of the provinces of Canada." Remember, he pronounced it a startling statement, because there was a decrease in the population of the State of Vermont and a decrease in 7 counties out of 16 in Maine. Referring to Ohio, he said that out of 89 counties there was a decrease in 28. Referring to Indiana he said that out of 92 counties there was a decrease in 25. He added: "To be sure I have read the strongest as illustrating my position, but there are a good many other states in which the decline, though not quite so striking, is striking and discouraging indeed." Thus we have the words startling, striking and discouraging. How the hon. gentleman must have been struck with the census returns of his own province; how he must have found them striking, startling and discouraging. But what the hon. gentleman condemned last year he will be willing to palliate this year, for it will not suit him to state that as striking, startling and discouraging, which last year he pronounced as such. What are the figures our census shows? In New Brunswick

alone there was a decrease in 8 out of 15 counties; in Nova Scotia a decrease in 8 out of 19 counties; in Ontario a decrease in 39 out of 91 counties; in Prince Edward Island a decrease in 1 out of 3 counties, in Quebec a decrease in 25 out of 65 counties. The percentage of decrease in the counties of the states of the United States to which I have referred was 28 per cent, whereas the decrease in the counties I have referred to in Canada was 43½ per cent, and yet a decrease of 28½ per cent was described by the hon. member for Albert as striking, startling and discouraging. How must the hon. gentleman be impressed by the decrease of 43½ per cent as illustrated by the returns of certain counties in his own Province? We are further told that another reason for the reverses which the Liberal party have suffered during the recent bye-elections was a letter written by Mr. Blake. I fail to see what great comfort our opponents can draw from that letter. I find among other passages the following:—

"The Conservative policy has failed to accomplish the predictions of its promoters. It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration, a North-West empty still, with an enormous addition to our public debt and a corrupt and extravagant system of expenditure and an unjust and expensive tariff."

As an instance of the loss caused by the present policy of the Government I will glance at the foreign trade of St. John, N.B., which declined $729,344 as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year. The decline in imports was $218,765, and in exports, $540,579. The Customs duty declined $40,476. The import trade of that port for the first four months of the last two and the current fiscal years, stands as follows: 1889-90, $1,593,457; 1890-91, $1,495,502; 1891-92, $1,276,737. I find here, to use the expression adopted last year by the member for Albert, that these figures are certainly striking, startling and discouraging. Again I could quote from the Toronto *Merchant*, which is not a political paper, but simply a commercial journal, and it says:

"Notwithstanding the auspicious prognostications and glowing reports of the crops, the results of the unusually bountiful harvest have hardly yet began to be felt, and from all parts of the Dominion come tidings of business dull and money scarce."

Is that the evidence brought forward of the prosperity of the country? Is it not a fact that in almost every manufacturing town there are to be found hundreds of unemployed men at the street corners; that only a month or two ago in Quebec a large procession of the unemployed proceeded to the Provincial Government beseeching them to furnish employment; and that in Toronto unemployed people are to be counted not by hundreds but by thousands? And this is the contented, happy, wealthy population, regarding whom we have had such glowing pictures painted by hon. gentlemen opposite. I cannot allow the present occasion to pass without once more expressing the opinion, representing as I do a large and prosperous agricultural and manufacturing county, that we should pronounce in favour of the policy of the Liberal party, which is unrestricted reciprocity. And why? Because we have every reason to believe that that policy would give better markets for every one. As was pointed out by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, we would have better markets in every respect. Our lumber market would be in a healthy condition, the mineral mines of the various provinces would be developed, and our farmers would be satisfied. We would certainly get cheaper manufactured goods for the toiler, and what is especially of vast importance to Ontario, there would be a revival of our lake shipping. What is the position to-day? Certainly in one respect we have no reason to complain. We have the wealth of the forest, and the wealth of the stream, and the wealth of the land. That we do not owe to the Government. Again, as was said by other speakers before me, we have an excellent form of government, as free and independent as any under the sun; and with regard to the different policies spoken of—annexation, colonial dependence and independence—I believe that, considering all the circumstances and the population we have in Canada to-day, our present position is satisfactory. We have no reason to complain; but if ever a change should come I must join in the sentiments which were expressed here this afternoon that instead of annexation political independence would be preferable. I think that the same opinion will be expressed by the vast majority of the younger Canadians. We have a free constitution, an unstained history, an excellent reputation as a people, but we lack an honest Government, that want is evident; it was made manifest last session, and it is quite possible that we will have opportunities to make it still more manifest this session. In consequence of the mistaken policy of the Government we have stagnation of trade, and on that account we cannot boast of the prosperity which should be ours. We have tried the National Policy and we have found that it is a failure. What we ask now is that the policy of unrestricted reciprocity should be given a trial. Why should we feel as strangers with regard to the people to the south of us? They are in common with us in matters of religious persuasion, in feeling, in sentiment and in aspirations. True, they are under another flag, but they speak the same language as we do, they have the same feelings as we have, and our country lies side by side with theirs for several thousand miles. We have everything to gain by being free in our commercial relations with the United States, and everything to lose by maintaining an unfriendly attitude with that country. We know, as was pointed out this afternoon by a Tory journal of the city of Ottawa, that these relations are far from being harmonious. This journal says that we are actually on the verge of a war with the United States, and that is not the confession of a Liberal paper but it is the statement of the Tory *Evening Journal* of this city. Would it not be better to entertain towards the people of the south of us more kindly sentiments, have with them freer trade relations and enjoy the degree of prosperity which we know exists under their flag, and which would exist under ours, if we had unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, this subject which we are now discussing is a very important one indeed. It is not exhausted, and what is the reason that we are not gratified with the opinion of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House on this question? Is it that the announcement of the Minister of Finance the other night, that we are not to expect trade with the United States has so stunned and dumbfounded them or what is it? I do not wonder at gentlemen on the Government benches not having the strength to come forward to give

expression to their sentiments on this occasion, because a great many of them, especially gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, had pledged themselves on the eve of the last general elections, that they were in favour of free trade with the United States. I am aware that in my province the candidates on both sides of politics expressed themselves for unrestricted reciprocity, and I am also aware that they did the same thing in Nova Scotia. In fact, I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries pledged himself at one meeting that he would give the people unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. We, however, find now that the actions of these gentlemen speak louder than their words, and when free trade is proposed from this side of the House hon. gentlemen opposite vote straight against it. It would seem as if free trade was something like the cable of the Indian when it slipped at the end he was ashamed and frightened. I believe that if before the elections the people had known that they were not going to get unrestricted reciprocity, and that the Government were only hypocrites, the majority of the electors would have voted the other way. Some members of the Government had gone to Washington during the elections and the people believed that they were going to have reciprocity. I believe that they went there without being invited, and that when they knocked at the door of the office of Mr. Blaine they appeared as strangers and that Mr. Blaine did not know they were coming. We are told by the Minister of Finance that they spent four or five days in Washington and that they had a good time. I suppose that when the Auditor General's Report comes next year we will have reason to believe they had a good time, but I hope there will not be any corkscrews charged in the account. I believe they were self-constituted messengers and that the authority is very questionable on which they went to Washington. I believe they did not represent the majority of the people of Canada but that they misrepresented them, because it is a well known fact that if the question were put fairly and squarely before the electors of the Dominion, they would be in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. The Minister of Finance may tell us here that the day is gone by for unrestricted reciprocity with the States, but his predictions are just about as reliable as the predictions of Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Leonard Tilley when they stated that, in 1892, the treasury of this country would receive $70,000,000 as proceeds of the sales of land in the North-West. What is the result? What are the facts? The facts are, that up to this day the revenue obtained from the sale of lands in the North-West is still less than the expenditure. We were told by no less a person than Sir Charles Tupper, in Charlottetown, P.E.I., in 1878, that if the country would return the Conservative party to power, in less than two years we would have free trade with the United States. Well, the people of Prince Edward Island were very much in love with free trade, having had experience of it from 1854 to 1866, and during those years they were prosperous, they made money by trading with the Americans. In fact, the farmers and fishermen of Prince Edward Island exported to the United States everything they could produce and got good prices for it all; but after that treaty was abrogated and the Government of Canada began to build Chinese walls between the two countries the people of Prince Edward Island began to grow less prosperous. Sir, it is no great wonder, because most of our exports from the island must go to the United States, notwithstanding the barriers that have been built up between the two countries. Our potatoes must go to the United States, although taxed 25 cents a bushel; our horses must go to the United States, though taxed $30 each; our lambs must go to the United States, though taxed 75 cents each; our sheep must go to the United States, though taxed $1.50 per head; the cod and mackerel cured by the fishermen of Prince Edward Island must go the United States, because there is no other market for them anywhere, though they are taxed $2 a barrel. We may be asked, why we do not send our mackerel, cod, potatoes, horses and sheep up to Ontario? We cannot get a greater interprovincial market than we have already. I remember that five years ago a fish merchant of Tignish sent 10 barrels of mackerel to Ottawa. He kept them here three months, and during that time he sold ten mackerel, and he had finally to send the whole shipment to Chicago and pay $2 duty on each barrel before he could sell them. This is the kind of trade we have between the Maritime Provinces and the Upper Provinces. Of course the agents of agricultural machinery manufacturers from Ontario come to Prince Edward Island and sell to our farmers their machinery which is protected at the rate or 20 or 25 per cent, and the consumer in Prince Edward Island pays that much more for his machinery than he would have to pay if there were free trade between us and the United States. When the time of payment comes, those farmers have to meet their bills for this machinery—because, let me tell you, the people of Prince Edward Island are an honest people who pay their debts; they pay a hundred cents for every dollar they owe; and notwithstanding the burdens which this Government has placed upon them, when the time comes they have to sell their productions in the United States market in order to pay the Ontario manufacturers for this machinery. The people of Prince Edward Island are not able to sell their potatoes in Canada, or their eggs, their horses, their lambs, their sheep, their mackerel, or anything else that they have to export from the Island. They must find a market for all these things in the United States; and what is the result? Let me show you one picture for a moment. We will suppose that a farmer of Prince Edward Island having a farm of 100 acres of land has 300 bushels of potatoes to sell, and I believe he could have that quantity and much more. He sells them in the United States market. How much duty is he obliged to pay on these 300 bushels of potatoes? The sum of $75. Suppose he sends 300 dozens of eggs; on them he has to pay $15. Suppose he sends one horse; he has to pay $30 on it. Suppose he sells 10 lambs; on them he has to pay $7.50. Suppose he sells 10 sheep; on them he has to pay $15. Suppose he lives near the sea and does some fishing, and sends 10 barrels of mackerel to the United States; he has to pay $20 on them. In all, that poor farmer in Prince Edward Island, in order to meet the bills which he owes to the manufacturers of Ontario for his farming machinery and other things, is compelled to sell his produce to the United States market, and pay in one year $147 of

taxes into the treasury of the United States. Is that not a frightful condition of things? Is it any wonder that the people of Prince Edward Island cry out for free trade with the United States? Where else can they obtain free trade? We were told by the Minister of Finance a year or two ago: Send your eggs to England; there you will find a market for them; the people of England want your eggs; they are hungry for them. Well, the experiment was tried, and what was the result? I saw the statement of a large shipper in Ontario, who said: "I sold so many dozens in England for so much, but still it was less than I could get in the United States; but I had a certain quantity left, and, in order that they should not come back to Canada, the High Commissioner took them to use in his kitchen." That is the London market. We know that the people of Canada are not able to compete in the supply of eggs for the English market with the people of France, Italy and Germany. Why, Sir, eggs can be landed there in 24 hours, and I suppose less from France, Germany and other countries, whereas by the time our eggs reach England they are stale and unfit for use. Besides, I believe the English people are far more particular as to the size and the quality of eggs than the people of the United States. In England eggs are bought, not by the dozen, but by the score, and the 20 eggs are expected to reach a certain weight. That is not the case in the United States. Take up the statistics for the year 1890 and you will find that while we did not ship one dozen of eggs to England, we shipped nearly $2,000,000 worth to the United States. The same results appear in fish and barley. What is the reason? We have always had the English market open to us. We know there is no tariff against us on our exports to the British market, and that we have to meet a high tariff in the United States, yet we export to the United States in preference to England. Why is it? It is because the United States are handier to us and more profitable than England. We have been told that the Americans have become prosperous under protection. I agree in that proposition, but it must be remembered that the American people, comprising 65,000,000, enjoy free trade among themselves. Suppose there was protection between the cities of Chicago and New York, how could these people live? We are told that our manufactures here will be destroyed if we have free commercial intercourse with the people of the United States. Can any man be convinced that if 5,000,000 people open trade with 65,000,000 people they are not going to be benefited? It seems to me there can be no disputing the plain fact that the smaller population must enjoy the greater benefit. We have the labour and all the facilities required to make our people prosperous and happy if the Government will only not tinker with our tariff but give the people perfect liberty to trade where they deem best. If the Government will instead give us the United States market, we will have a happy and prosperous people in a very short time. We are told also that this will be disloyal and tend to annexation. A more rotten argument I never heard. I am a Grit and my hon. friends opposite are Tories, I want to buy goods, and if my Tory friends could sell them cheaper, I will buy from them; but because I buy from them, is it to be said that I am going to be a Tory? No; not a bit. With just as much reason is it said that because we desire to trade with the Yankees we are becoming annexationists. My hon. friend from Kent said a while ago that although a Liberal he was a loyal subject. For my part, I would sooner live under the laws of Canada than under those of the United States. I was born under the British constitution and I hope to die under it. There is no doubt the Government have not carried out their promises. They have failed in a good many cases, and I cannot say but that perhaps, if I left them alone a little further, they may do such strange things that the people may take it into their heads to put them out of power. They say the people are happy and prosperous and contented, but take up the newspapers published in this city and you will find no less than 6 or 7 deputations waiting daily on the Minister regarding additions to the tariff or reductions, which does not show much contentment.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. BOWELL moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 28th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

JOHN HEARN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Quebec West: introduced by Sir Adolphe Caron and Hon. Mr. Costigan.

WILLIAM PRIDHAM, Esq., Member for the South Riding of the County of Perth; introduced by Hon. Mr. Bowell and Hon. Mr. Costigan.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 44) further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Gordon.)

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to ask the Minister of Marine when the papers promised with respect to Newfoundland, which are being eagerly looked for by a large number of members, may be expected?

Mr. TUPPER. The papers are ready with the exception of the examination which is necessary to be made. They have been prepared and are ready to be laid on the Table of the House as soon as authority is obtained.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman tell me—if Mr. Speaker will excuse me for putting the question now—whether a proclamation has been issued with respect to the admission of Newfoundland goods into Canada, putting a duty upon those goods, and when it was issued?

Mr. TUPPER. I cannot give the exact date of the proclamation issued. But the Act is in force.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would remark that the fees have not been exacted under the Act passed some years ago.

Mr. TUPPER. They were not collected, but instructions were sent to the officers to collect them. The Act was not suspended.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 42) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company.--(Mr. Taylor.)

GRANITE—EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Mr. LISTER (for Mr. GILLMOR) asked, Is the Government aware that the United States Customs officials compel Canadians, who export manufactured granite to that country, to give a diagram of each separate manufactured piece of granite exported to that country, attached to the invoice, and the value sworn to before an American Consul? What means do the Customs officials of Canada employ to ascertain the value of manufactured granite coming into Canada from Great Britain and the United States?

Mr. BOWELL. We are not aware what the Americans do, nor the orders they give to their officials in connection with the articles that are exported from this country to the United States. In answer to the second part of the question, the same rule applies to that article as to all others. If the hon. gentleman will refer to sections 67, 68 and 69 and some following sections of the Customs Act, he will find what the rule is on this matter.

CANADA AND SPANISH WEST INDIES.

Mr. BORDEN asked, Have any and what steps been taken to secure for Canada a continuation of the present arrangement, ending 30th June next, with Spain, by which Canadian products—notably potatoes, fish and lumber—are admitted to the Spanish West Indies upon the same terms as the products of the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. The matter has been represented to the British Government, and Sir Charles Tupper has been given full plenipotentiary powers, with Sir John Wolffe, to enter into negotiations with the Spanish Government in regard to this matter.

DUTY ON A BRITISH FLAG.

Mr. BORDEN (for Mr. LANDERKIN) asked, Did the Government collect the other day a duty of $52.75 on a British flag presented by H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught as a prize to the best drilled corps of Montreal Cadets?

Mr. BOWELL. The Customs officials at Montreal collected the duty, as it was under the law their duty to do, but as soon as the attention of the Government was drawn to the fact by the importers, the sum collected was ordered to be refunded.

CANADIAN PACIFIC AND THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES asked, What was the total amount paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the Intercolonial Railway for the six months ending 31st December last, for running privileges and station and other accommodation over the latter road between St. John and Halifax and its stations? What was the total amount paid by the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the six months ending 31st December last, for running trains over the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and St. John?

Mr. HAGGART. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company pay nothing for running privileges and stations or other accommodations over the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and Halifax, as all trains running between these points are trains of the latter road, the fares on which over that section of road accrue to the Intercolonial Railway. Nothing is paid by the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for running trains over the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and Halifax, as the fares accrue to the Intercolonial Railway, but, as is the regular practice, a car mileage charge is made for the cars of one road running on the road of another.

THE KAMOURASKA WHARF.

Mr. CARROLL (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all accounts, pay-lists and correspondence, in the year 1890, in relation to the construction of a wharf at the village of Kamouraska, Province of Quebec.

He said: I regret, Mr. Speaker, to see that the Hon. Minister of Public Works is not in his seat: but I hope that he will read in the *Hansard* the report of the remarks I am to make on this question. In 1886 the Government decided that a wharf should be built at the village of Kamouraska. The work was commenced very late in the fall, and the result was that what was done was carried away by the ice of the spring. For two years nothing more was attempted, until my lamented predecessor, Mr. Dessaint, having called the matter to the attention of the then Minister of Public Works, the latter concluded to have the work resumed. The wharf was to be 200 feet long. That length has been reached in 1890, but the head of the wharf remains to be completed. This work was undertaken in the public interest, and I hope that the Government will finish it now that it is begun. Kamouraska is one of the most important ports on the south shore of the St. Lawrence for inland navigation. It is a very safe harbour, the safest between Quebec and Rimouski, a distance of two hundred miles, and I have no hesitation in saying, that with the exception of that at Fraserville, the Kamouraska harbour is the most important on the southern shore. A very considerable business is done there, not only between the village and parish of Kamouraska, but also with the county of Charlevoix, the farmers of which buy the Kamouraska hay and oats, while they bring in their wood in large quantities through the harbour, so that not only the parish and county are interested in the accommodation afforded by this wharf, but the general public as well. My intention is not to make a long speech upon this question, and I have briefly shown that

in the public interest the Government should send to the spot an agent of the Department of Public Works, to ascertain what remains to be done, and to finish these works, which are useless now, but which must be of great advantage as soon as completed.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN RESERVES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BARNARD moved for:

Return showing:—1. The number of Indian Reserves in British Columbia: 2. The location of each and name of tribe to whom allotted: 3. The area in acreage of each: 4. The area cultivated on each reserve: 5. The population of each tribe when reserves were first established: 6. The present population of each tribe: 7. The area (estimated) of pastoral land on each reserve: 8. The number of horses, cattle and sheep owned by each tribe; 9. The estimated area of timber land on each reserve.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving for certain information regarding Indian reserves in British Columbia, I do so with the object of having this House placed in possession of information, which I am satisfied will show that the time has arrived for a readjustment, a rearrangement or inauguration of a different policy with regard to these reserves. Unfortunately for the Province of British Columbia, the Commission that was appointed in 1876 or 1877, during the Mackenzie Administration, for the purpose of setting aside lands for the benefit of the Indians, took it for granted that British Columbia was never to have any white settlers, and that their duty was to give all the valuable lands along the different streams and rivers, and in the rich valleys, fit for agricultural purposes, to the Indians. I may point to such fertile valleys as the Fraser River, Okanagon, Nicola, Thompson and Bridge River valleys which were then reserved for the use of the Indians. The result is that to-day, when we have a large influx of white settlers, they find the best lands are set aside as Indian reserves and they cannot utilize them. The Indians have some of the best lands in the country, but they make very little use of them. It is true that, in some cases, they follow agricultural pursuits and cultivate a small area, but, as a rule, the greater portion of this Indian land is left uncultivated. There are, I believe, 700 or 800 Indian reserves in the Provinces and if any hon. member will take the trouble to examine the map which has been issued, with the report of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, he will, I think, conclude that a very large proportion, indeed, of the land in British Columbia has been reserved for the Indians. There are, as I have said, 700 or 800 Indian reserves, comprising 600,000 or 700,000 acres of land. In one instance, the Indians have, in Okanagon valley, something like 200 acres to each man, woman and child in the tribe. That valley contains some particularly fine agricultural land, and it has been opened up lately by the construction of a railway south from the Canadian Pacific. A very large portion of that valley, something like 41,000 acres, is an Indian reserve; and in a province like British Columbia, although very large in area and very extensive in territory, and although it has a great deal of good land, yet at the same time this fertile land lies in the different valleys, and the land of the Okanagon valley is particularly rich. The settlers going in there to-day are, however, unable to utilize this land and the community as a whole suffers thereby. If the Indians cultivated the land there would not be the same objection that there is at the present time; but the lands are not being cultivated. I have confined my remarks to the agricultural lands, but, in addition to that, there is a large extent of good mining ground on the different streams and rivers of the Indian reserves. These mining lands are now lying idle. The Indian himself can make no use of it; it is of no value to him, and the white man is not allowed to take up any of the ground without first making application to the Government and having the land surrendered by the Indians to the Government and disposed of by the Government. It is a difficult matter to induce these Indians to give up any rights appertaining to this land; and although they cannot use it themselves they still insist upon retaining it and in refusing to surrender it. As one instance I may point out, that a short time ago a strong company, financially, was formed in Victoria for the purpose of mining 160 or 180 acres of ground upon what is known as the Bridge River Indian Reserve in our province. This ground is utterly valueless to the Indians; it is unfit for pasture or farming purposes, but it is supposed to contain a great deal of gold, and to take out that gold means the expenditure of large capital and a great deal of time and labour. Notwithstanding that the Indians cannot make any use of that land, they have refused to surrender it. The matter has been placed before them and by a vote of 27 to 17 they refused to surrender, so that it lies there to-day of no value to either the Indians or the white men, and an important enterprise has thus, so to speak, been squelched. Another reason for inaugurating some policy with regard to Indian lands in British Columbia is that the Indian population is decreasing. At the time that these reserves were set apart the population was much larger than it is to-day. La grippe, the measles, and other diseases of that kind have had a very serious effect, and they have died out in large numbers during the past two seasons. For that reason I think something should be done by the Government in the way of disposing of these reserves for their benefit. The Indians in British Columbia are not like the Indians of the North-West Territories. They are all industrious, and there is not an able-bodied Indian who is not able to earn his living and who cannot make from $1.50 to $2.50 per day. He does not require the land he has in his reserve, unless he happens to be the owner of horses or cattle or sheep. He leaves the land to earn wages of from $1.50 to $2.50 per day, and he has no trouble in getting these wages. If this land were disposed of in some way for the benefit of the Indians and the proceeds set aside as an Indian education fund, it would, in my opinion, be much more to their benefit than it is at present. It is true that industrial schools have already been established in British Columbia, and they have had a very beneficial effect on the Indians, so that I believe that if the Indian fund were augmented by the sale of these lands, and schools established, and the Indians educated in industrial pursuits, it would be of greater value to them than to have the land lying idle as it is at the present moment. I may mention that

right in the heart of the city of Victoria there is an Indian reserve of about 110 acres, and that reserve is worth to-day at least $300,000 or $400,000. I believe that only three Indians have a claim to that reserve, and these Indians have refused to surrender it. The land is practically in the heart of the city, and could be sold and utilized. It would be a benefit to the city to have the Indians removed, and it would be a great benefit to the Indians themselves to have such a large amount of money set aside for their wants. However, they have actually refused to abandon that 110 acres in the city of Victoria. The same thing applies to some extent to the city of Vancouver, where there is a large extent of land in a somewhat similar position. It is not so near the centre of the city as in Victoria, but it is close to it, and the day is not far distant when it might become a business portion of the city. That reserve also could be used with advantage to the Indians by disposing of it and providing a fund for their education. If our Indians in British Columbia were likely to cultivate the land, or to become farmers, it would be a different matter, but they are not. It is true that the Indian in our province is not provident as a rule, but he is always willing to work if he requires the money. Probably he will spend the money as soon as he gets it, but he can always earn a living. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when it would be advisable for the Government to consider some policy such as that which has been adopted to a certain extent in the United States, namely, that of disposing of the lands in the Indian reserves for the benefit of the Indians and utilizing the money for their maintenance and moral improvement, instead of allowing the land to be idle and be of no use either to the Indian or the white man. I, therefore, beg to propose, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Mara, the motion which I have placed in your hands.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution has presented a most important matter for the consideration of this House, in recommending the adoption of a new policy in dealing with Indian property in British Columbia. As an old British Columbian, and knowing something of the Indians in that province, their nature, their character, and the advantages they enjoy, it is not a policy which I could recommend. When we commence to deal with Indian property, Indian lands especially, we have to be very careful. The hon. gentleman started out by saying that the time had arrived when he thought that a readjustment of the reserves should be made, and that some of these reserves should be brought into the market for sale for the benefit of the Indians. For some years past we have had an Indian Reserve Commission, whose duty it has been to adjust the reserves in British Columbia. The old Commission, which was referred to by the hon. gentleman, did, I think, travel through the country and rather recklessly apportioned lands which they suggested should be set apart for Indian reserves for the southern and more civilized Indians of British Columbia. Those reserves, although located some on maps and some on the ground, were never accepted as reserves by the Local Government of British Columbia, and a new compromise arrangement was arrived at between the Dominion and Local Governments, by which a new Commission was appointed, which is now at work. The head of that Commission is a gentleman who has been in British Columbia some twenty or thirty years and has a perfect knowledge of the country, the Indians and their wants, and it was agreed that he should revise the locations recommended by the old Commission, and that the Local Government should accept the recommendations which he should make. That work has been going on, and now a great portion of the more settled districts of British Columbia has been gone over, and the reserves settled, some of them definitely. A very large number of the Indian reserves are shown on the map which we submitted this year with our report. From the nature and configuration of the country, the Indians are scattered in small bands all over British Columbia, living on little locations, to which they are attached for many reasons, a large number being fishing stations on the coast. We have no less than 778 reserves in British Columbia altogether; but the acreage does not appear to be excessive, because the average per head at present is only a little over 29 acres. In some districts, for instance, the Okanagon district, to which the hon. gentleman referred, the average is necessarily higher, being 230 acres per head, because the Indians there are engaged in cattle raising and horse raising. In the Kamloops district the average is 50 acres, and in the Kootenay district 60 acres. In other portions of the country the acreage is much less, being, in the Lower Fraser and Vancouver Island, only 7 and 7½ acres per head respectively. I do not think we have been too liberal in the reserves we have located. Of course there must necessarily be reserves situated close to important centres, such as Victoria and Vancouver, and these have attracted the greedy eyes of speculators, who try, in every possible way they can, to induce the Indians to part with their property. The Government have endeavoured, in every way, to protect the Indians in that regard. Some of their property, both on Vancouver and on the mainland, is of very great value, and I think that if anybody should derive a benefit from it it should be the Indians themselves, and when they feel inclined to surrender it, which, up to the present time they have not communicated their willingness to do, the property should be dealt with in such a way as to bring about that result. There is also mining property on some of the reserves which is of no use to the Indians; yet, on the very reserve which my hon. friend has mentioned, the Indians have been digging for gold, some of the old women washing it in their baskets, and have been making considerable money in that way. They know that the gold is there, and they attach considerable value to it. As time goes on, and the Indians come to be assured that they will derive as much benefit from the sale of their lands as by retaining them, we might deal with them, but I do not think we should dispose of their property without their consent. In the older provinces, similar applications have been made to me; and where the Indians absolutely refuse to agree to an improvement which the Government knows would be of advantage to them, and the want of which is detrimental to their neighbours, I think there would be an excuse in adopting some legislation to compel the Indians to do what would be of benefit to themselves; but I do not think the time has

arrived when we should arbitrarily take their reserves and deal with them as we please. I am of opinion that we should go on as we are doing, protecting them in their property, and not dealing with it without their consent. With regard to the properties mentioned or others which are of exceptional value, and which it is detrimental to the public good to allow to remain idle, the Government would be willing to assist through their agents in bringing about a surrender of the properties, which would leave us free to deal with them: but I do not think we should endeavour to force the hands of the Indians, but should continue to do as we have done in the past, protect them in every way we possibly can.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say that I agree with a very great deal of what has been said by the hon. Minister of Interior on this subject. I am rather surprised to hear him say that the Indian Commissioners, who were first appointed for the locating of the Indian reserves in British Columbia, had acted recklessly, that they had set aside larger areas in those reserves than were required, and that the Government had appointed a new Commission who were revising the work, and, as I understood the hon. gentleman, diminishing the areas the first Commission had actually marked out as adequate, and not more than adequate, for the uses of the Indian population. Sir, there are several matters to be carefully considered in connection with the relations of the Indians of British Columbia to the Government of this country, and the obligations which the Government of Canada have undertaken with reference to that Indian population. It is well known that in the older provinces, or some of them at least, the Indians were recognized as having a sort of possessory interest in the soil. It was recognized that the right of use and occupation for hunting and fishing purposes belonged to them in their tribal capacity, and that before these were terminated, before their right to wander over the entire country for these purposes for which the possession of the country had long been enjoyed by them, was taken away, some compensation was to be given them for the extinguishment of this imperfect species of title. The Crown never recognized the Indians as having a legal or proprietary interest in the soil. The recognition of the Indian title to the extent I have mentioned was a recognition, in the first instance, based on public policy, but was ultimately regarded as an equitable right which a humane Government, disposed to act fairly towards the aboriginal population, could not altogether ignore. The Government of British Columbia, in dealing with the Indian population, acted in a way altogether different from the policy pursued by the English Government in all her colonies, towards the aboriginal population. The British Columbia Government, prior to the Union of Canada, refused to recognize any interest of the Indian population in the soil generally, and in the terms of Union they provided that the Government of Canada should deal as liberally with the Indian population as that population had been dealt with by the Government of British Columbia prior to the Union. Now, from the fact that no right of use or occupation was recognized in the Indians in the entire country, there was no such thing in the conduct of the Government of British Columbia as the extinguishment of the Indian title. There was no title recognized. The Indians were permitted to hold small areas of land for their own use, but beyond those limited areas, they were not admitted to have any interest whatever, and so, at the time of the Union, there was no Indian fund, and there could be no Indian fund out of which any compensation or any gratuity or annuity could be paid to the aboriginal inhabitants. In the Province of Ontario, the charges incurred by the Indian Department are met out of the Indian Fund. There is a large sum invested, through the extinguishment of the Indian title - not merely the sale of portions of the reserves that the Indian population do not require, but the extinction of the Indian title in the whole country—and so a considerable fund has arisen from these sales, from sales of portions of land expressly reserved, and thus the Indian population in the Province of Ontario, and to some extent in the Province of Quebec, are not a burden upon the public treasury. So far as the Indian population in the Province of British Columbia is concerned, there was no legal obligation resting on the Government of Canada to provide for it, or to incur any expense with reference to its maintenance or its material or moral progress. The Government of Canada had to administer the trust committed to it with care. It was authorized to set apart portions of the territory of British Columbia for the use of the Indians, and to that extent they were to deal at least as liberally as the Government of British Columbia previously had. Whether the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia, dealing as they did with reference to the subject of the Union, had a right to ignore the right of the Indian population to any possessory interest in the soil, according to the uniform policy of the Imperial authorities, I do not think it necessary, on the present occasion, to discuss. But it is clear that, so far as the Government of British Columbia was concerned, it placed nothing at the disposal of the Parliament of Canada except the reserves which had been recognized prior to the Union, and those reserves are for the use and occupation of those Indians who had not, up to the time of Union, already been set out and described. Now, these constitute a very large proportion of the Indian population of British Columbia. But few of the Indians had been dealt with by the Government of British Columbia, and the great majority of them still had to be dealt with, after the Union, by the Government of Canada. So that when the Government of Canada came to deal with the Indian population not provided for, and when it came to see that reserves were made from the territories of British Columbia for the use of that Indian population, it was their business to see that these provisions, relating to reserves, in the terms of the Union between British Columbia and Canada should be liberally interpreted in the interest of the Indian population. It was not in accordance with the spirit any more than with the terms of the Union that as no fund was placed at the disposal of the Government of Canada for the use of the Indians that the reserves should be of adequate extent. It was required by the spirit and the letter of the Dominion Government that the Indian interests should not be sacrificed between the two Governments. Now, Sir, when a Commission was appointed consisting of three, one representing, if I remember rightly, the Government of British Columbia, the second the Government of Canada, and the third the both,

these parties acted, in my opinion, in the first instance, in accordance with the spirit and intention of the terms of the Union. Look at the manner in which we are told the Indians have dealt with the Indian population of the North-West. We have recognized their interest as hunters and as fishers in the entire country, and in dealing with them we have extinguished what we call their right in the soil, and we have not assumed that they had no right beyond the reserves we chose to set apart for them. Now, when the Government came to deal with the Government of British Columbia, and when the Government of British Columbia had refused to recognize any Indian title of occupation or possession in the soil of British Columbia further than that which might be claimed by any other portion of the population, it was the duty of the Government of Canada to see that the Indian population were fairly dealt with, and that in so large a province as that of British Columbia they were not to be stinted in the reserves laid out, that the lands should be secured to them at all events for agricultural purposes, and that those should be reserved so that with ordinary care and industry the Indians might obtain for themselves a comfortable subsistence. With regard to lands on the coast where fishing is the principal industry, the area of land required for the Indian population of course was less, and the commissioners appointed to mark out those reservations were instructed to mark out a less area for the Indians engaged in fishing than for those who were engaged in agricultural pursuits. Now the Minister informs us that the whole area of the lands set apart for the use of the Indian population so far—and he has not said whether all the Indians are provided for yet or not, but I apprehend they are not—the average is 29 acres to an Indian, and the House will see how very small that area is in such a large province which so far is so sparsely populated. In the Okanagon district, the hon. gentleman told us 250 acres were allowed to each Indian, in Kamloops, 50 acres, and in Kootenay, 60 acres, while on the Fraser River, where the Indians are chiefly fishermen, they were allowed 11½ acres and 7 acres respectively. The House will see that the territory is very limited and forms but a small fraction of the area of that great province, the largest province in the whole Dominion of Canada. It seems to me that, under the circumstances, the Minister of the Interior should be specially watchful that the small territory that has been given to the Indians of British Columbia should not be encroached upon, and it should be the duty of the House to see that the department does not infringe upon its trust, and does not permit the white population to obtain from the Indians any portion of their territories, except in the ordinary way and after the most careful consideration, and also to see that the Indian reservation, simply because it may happen to be in a desirable location, should not be improperly taken from them. One hon. gentleman, who represents a constituency in British Columbia, in addressing the House on this subject, has referred to the Indian reserve in the vicinity of the city of Victoria, and over and over again attempts have been made to get possession of that territory for what would be regarded anywhere else as a very inadequate consideration. It seems to me that the department should be especially careful that, if that reserve is put on the market and sold or disposed of, it should be at its full value, and the funds should be invested for the Indians to whom the rights of property actually belong. I do not understand that that reservation in the vicinity of Victoria has been surrendered to the Crown for disposal. The Minister of the Interior has not made any such statement. That property is still held in trust for the use of the Indian population, and I do not think that any undue pressure should be brought to bear upon those Indians to force them to dispose of the land that they hold. I can well understand that the reservation in the vicinity of Victoria would be a valuable reservation, and that the lands, if disposed of for a valuable consideration, could perhaps be more beneficially employed for the use of the city and towards its extension, but care should be taken that the property is not sacrificed, that the Indian interest is not sacrificed, and that the funds that may be obtained from the sale of that property, whenever it is put on the market, should be invested for the use of the Indian population. It is most desirable that, before anything is done by way of restricting these reserves or disposing of any portion of them, this House should be put in possession of the information, and it is only after the House has been so informed that any sale should take place. The House will understand that the position in regard to the Indians in British Columbia is not at all the same as that in regard to the Indians in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In the Province of Ontario the Indians are no burden on the public treasury. They are supported out of their own funds. But in British Columbia the Provincial Government has handed over to us nothing; we have received no moneys out of which we can give the Indians any aid or support. The Indians of British Columbia have up to the present time been a very considerable charge upon the public treasury. Large sums of money have annually been taken out of the public treasury towards the maintenance and improvement of this Indian population, and therefore it becomes all the more necessary, when it is proposed that any portion of the Indian reservation is to be sold, to see that a proper disposal of the receipts is made, not only in the interest of the Indians but also in the interest of the public treasury. I think the House should take care that nothing is done that will place the Indians in a less favourable condition than they are at the present time. I regret to hear the Minister say that the first commissioners set out the reserves recklessly. That was not my view of what they did. I thought they dealt fairly with the Indians and recognized that the Indians should get fair compensation for the lands set apart by the British Columbia Government, and where the reserves were set apart, that they should be compensated to a considerable extent and that they should receive an amount of land larger than that which would be required to support a similar number of white population, as the Indian population is less skilled in agricultural pursuits and would necessarily require a larger proportion of land than that required by a white population, and to give them less than would be given to an enterprising number of white settlers would not be dealing fairly with the Indian population or conforming properly with the terms of Union.

Mr. MARA. Every British Columbian will agree with the proposition laid down by the Minister of the Interior, that good faith should be kept with the Indians. The Indians were the first possessors of the soil; they were entitled to the pick of the land, and they were entitled to all the lands they could use. They certainly did get the first choice, and they got all the land they could use, and more, too. But the position now is this: If, as the hon. Minister of the Interior has stated, some reserves were made recklessly, that mistakes in the alloting were made, should these mistakes not be rectified? If it can be shown that some Indians received too little land, and that others got too much, should the allotments not be equalized by taking from those who got too much, and allowing that land to be settled by whites, and giving the proceeds to those who got too little? Then, again, if it can be shown that a band of Indians have decreased so that the quantity of land they have is out of all proportion to those now living, should the Government not be in a position to step in and say: You have more land than you can use, more land than you can cultivate, we must take a portion from you and sell it to the white men, but the proceeds shall go to you and you will get the benefit of it. Now, the very case that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has cited, is a very strong illustration. Here is a large reserve near the city of Victoria that could be sold to-day for something like three or four hundred thousand dollars, and only three Indians have a vested right in that valuable piece of land. These three Indians can say whether that piece of land, worth three or four hundred thousand dollars, shall remain locked up as a reserve, or whether it shall be sold and the money used for the benefit of the Indians. Now, neither the hon. member for Bothwell nor any other member of the House will say that that position is a correct one. Surely in a case of that kind the Government ought to have some power, or if they feel that it would be inadvisable to take that power to themselves, there should be a proper court to whom it could be referred, to say when an Indian reserve should be sold and how the money should be dealt with. Now, with regard to the acreage, I am not disposed to accept as quite correct the figures given by the Minister of the Interior. He knows as well as I do that it was very difficult for the commissioners to ascertain the exact population of the different bands of Indians when they were allotting the reserves. I know for a fact that on the Thompson River, as soon as the Indian Commissioner would be ready to leave Kamloops, several families would precede him to Shuswap, the same would be repeated to Spallumcheen, others to Okanagon, therefore after having participated in the allotment given at the first mentioned places, and when he took the heads of families there they would be counted and of course the acreage would appear very much smaller than it really is. Now, my attention has been called to one particular reserve on Fraser River, called Seabird Island. When that reserve was laid out the commissioner, in his report, stated:

"If they have not in six years from June 13, 1879, sufficiently used this land in the opinion of the Government, the unused portion is to cease to be Indian land."

Later, in a subsequent report, he also refers to it and states:

"I put the limit of six years when the assignment must be reconsidered."

Now, I have here an affidavit from three men who settled on this land last year. I may state that this Seabird Island comprises an area of 4,500 acres of good arable land—land that is worth to-day, if put in the market, $10 and $20 an acre. These men with a number of others, about 20, squatted on the land, built houses and commenced clearing, but were ordered off by the Indian agent and policemen. Here is a copy of their affidavit:

"British Columbia }
"To Wit. }

"We, W. E. Johnstone, T. J. Beatty and Geo. H. Blair, Squatters on Seabird Island, make oath and say as follows:—

"That when we settled on said Island (about the first week in February, 1891), the only Indians on the Island were Cheam Indians named Sam, a Squaditch Indian named Charlie and two brothers living together (tribe and name unknown to us). Besides those there were a few cutting wood for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but not making the Island their home. The Indian Charlie had about three acres cleared, but the others had nothing but a house built. In several places on the Island we found small pieces of land where some brush had been cut and a few potatoes had been planted among logs and stumps. In quite a number of those places the potatoes and other vegetables had not been taken up, but had been left to rot all winter; not more than five or six acres had at that time been cleared by the Indians on the Island. After we and other settlers had located on the Island, built houses and started clearing the land, a number of Indians, principally of the Cheam tribe, came on and cut some brush, and built a cabin or two; some of the Indians told us that the priests made them go on the Island. After working a week or so they left and did not come back till a short time before the visit of the Indian agent. On 20th April Mr. McTiernan, Indian agent, came up with a squad of policemen and ordered us off, and stated that he had orders to evict us and to put Indians in each of our houses. We then left the Island under protest, claiming that as the Indians had never occupied the land, they had forfeited their claim and that the Island was public lands and therefore open for settlement.

"Sworn before me at Vancouver, B.C., this eighteenth day of June, A.D. 1891. } W. E. JOHNSTONE, T. J. BEATTY, GEO. H. BLAIR."

These men are all respectable citizens of Vancouver. I merely give this as an illustration to show that the Indians have neither occupied nor cultivated their reserves as they agreed to do when these reserves were given to them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman advocate the right of these squatters to hold on to this land?

Mr. MARA. No, I certainly do not; and I say that the Indian agent acted perfectly right in ordering them off—he only did his duty. But what I say is this: That I think the time has arrived when the Government should look into the question to see whether, as the Minister of the Interior admits that mistakes have been made, it is too late to rectify these mistakes. I say that in a case like this it is not right that 4,500 acres of land should be lying idle, untilled and untouched, a piece of land capable of supporting 45 families, when the Indians virtually refuse to cultivate it. That is the position I take. I think it is well worth the serious consideration of the Government, and I think, if they do look into cases like this and that of Victoria, they will admit that the time has arrived when they should take some extra powers that they do not now possess, to deal with the Indian reserve question.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The question apparently before the House is one just asking for in-

formation and papers. As the Minister says there can be no objection to bringing these down, we will know then, perhaps, more than what the Minister has already told us. But I judge from what he has already stated, that while there are exceptional cases where large holdings are held by individual Indians, the average is not excessive —29 acres, I think, he stated to a head, and that cannot be considered excessive. The hon. gentleman may see some difficulties in the matter, but I am very glad indeed, for myself, to hear the Minister say that he is not prepared to move in the direction of taking greater power to himself to dispose of the Indian lands without the consent of the Indians. I can understand that certain individuals, perhaps, might be anxious that the Indians should consent to move in a certain direction, but those Indians have rights, and I should judge from what the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Mara) has said, that the Indians themselves there are very intelligent men. I take it from the fact that the franchise clauses of the Indian Act are being extended to them, that they understand their affairs pretty well, that they are supposed to be pretty well advanced in civilization and in taking care of their affairs; and if they consider it is not in their interests to surrender a portion of their reserve in order that it may be sold, it seems to me it would be apart from the old British principle and the Canadian principle that the Minister should take power without their consent and in defiance of their wishes, to sell that land for them. There are cases in which certain white men hold property in the vicinity of thickly-populated towns, which they are not using or improving. I have known cases of that kind. It is possible that there might be in British Columbia—though I know nothing of the kind—as well as in other places—white men who hold land adjoining a thriving city. It might be objected, and it might be charged against such an individual, that he was lacking in public spirit by not improving those lands, that he was standing in the way of the public good because he did not consent to their sale. But the hon. gentleman opposite does not pretend that the law should be changed in the direction of permitting the Government to take the land from him and sell it for the good of the community.

Mr. BARNARD. He would have to pay his taxes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, there would be that remedy so far as it goes, but the hon. gentleman knows how little use is made of the power of taxation even in cases of that kind. What the hon. gentleman asks from the Minister is a radical departure from Indian legislation, so far as both Canadian and British tradition and action are concerned. I understand at present that no land can be sold by the Crown without the consent of the Indians being obtained, and there must be an amendment to the Indian Act to enable this to be done. There must be first the consent of a majority of the members of the band over 21 years of age obtained, and when they have consented, then the Government can dispose of the land in the best interests of the people. As to whether the Minister would propose modifications in the law, under which power would be given the Government to dispose of the land whether the Indians wished it or not, I was glad to hear the Minister say that he did not propose legislation in that direction at the present time. I am fully confident that none of the members from British Columbia are seeking to do any injustice to the Indians. Their remarks are not couched in that spirit, but I have pointed out to them what I think would be the injury of a departure from the course we have followed in respect to this matter. It may be that with the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act made applicable to them as they now are, these Indians, who seem to be very well advanced, judging from the information given as to their capacity to maintain themselves, may avail themselves of these clauses. It is at their option whether they desire to take the benefit of that Franchise Bill, but if they consider it to be in their interest to do so, they will gradually become entitled more and more to the management of their own property; and the solution of the matter may come about in that way. But to endeavour to force anything, would be contrary to the traditions of legislation, and I was glad to hear from the Minister that he would hesitate before he took any steps in that direction.

Mr. MARA. The Indians do not object to selling the land; what they do object to is that they will not have the handling of the money.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have they surrendered?

Mr. MARA. In every case where asked to surrender they would be willing to do so, if they could get the money; but what they do not like is that the money should be left with the Government and funded, they drawing only the interest on it. They would sell readily enough if they could get the money.

Mr. BARNARD. We are all of one accord in regard to protecting the rights and interests of the Indians. The only difference of opinion is this: The member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) thinks it should be left entirely to the judgment of the Indian whether it is to his interest that the land should be sold. I contend that although the Indian with us is industrious and able to earn his living, and Indian labour is always in demand, he is not the best judge of what is in his own interests.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is it with the white men?

Mr. BARNARD. We take it for granted that they are, although they make mistakes. I contend the Indian is not the best judge; that the Government, who are the guardians of the Indian, he being their ward, are in a better position to know whether the sale of the portion of their land is in the Indian's interest or not. The hon. member for Brant has alluded to the fact that the franchise is to be extended to them in British Columbia. Although they are industrious and can earn money, they are not educated, and are not qualified, and will not be for some time, to come under the Franchise Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Under the franchise clauses of the Indian Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can they vote in British Columbia now?

Mr. BARNARD. No, I think not. So we are all of one accord. There is no intention on the

part of the members for British Columbia to advocate that Indian rights should be interfered with or that any of his lands should be obtained by speculators. We contend that the Indian, who has the lands, is not the best judge as to whether they should be sold for the benefit of the Indians or not, but that the Government should place themselves in the position to be the judges in that respect and utilize the money received for their benefit. The Minister of Interior says that greedy speculators desire to get these lands. No doubt they do; but these speculators are willing to pay for the land, and the money received would be used by the Government for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They will become still more valuable as time goes on.

Mr. BARNARD. That is quite true. But the Indian of the present day will probably require the money more than the Indian of a subsequent date, because in three or four generations there will be very few Indians left. Disease is making great ravages among them, and they are gradually dying off. At the present time the money derived from these lands will be of greater advantage to them than at a future date. Another advantage from the disposal of these lands is that we procure white settlers, and thus generally benefit the community. The Minister has also referred to mining, and he stated that the Indians on a particular reserve were mining and taking the gold out of the bars of the river. That has been the case, but placer-mining is over now. The Indians do not mine to any extent. There is no gold, except that obtained by an expenditure of large sums of money. The land I referred to on that reserve is high bench land, and it will require an expenditure of from $20,000 to $30,000 to work it, and make it available. The Indians cannot possibly do that. A company want to buy it, and are prepared to pay what the Government consider a just figure, placing the money aside for the benefit of the Indians. I contend that it will be advantageous to the Indians and the country generally to have the land utilized in that way. The Indians will derive employment from the working of the ground and the public would be generally benefited, whereas, the land is now idle and is of no advantage to the Indians themselves. Thirty or forty Indians own this land, which covers an area of 30,000 or 40,000 acres, and they refused to sell it by a vote of 27 to 12. If the Government were in a position to-day to say that it was in the interests of the Indians that they should realize the value of the land, it would be to their advantage. The Indians are often biassed by people who entertain feelings of jealousy towards companies who undertake to develop land near them, and are apt to be influenced by these people who do not appreciate what is in their own interests. I hope the information when it comes down will be as full as possible.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no doubt that a great deal can be said in favour of the view which the hon. gentleman takes, and I can well see that the reservation of these lands, at the time the reservations were made, might be equitable and just, but that circumstances may have so changed now that it might be desirable to give power to the department to sell. It seems to me, however, that the danger of outside parties influencing the Indian is more in the direction of inducing him to sell improperly and improvidently, than inducing him to withhold his assent to the sale. I remember, four years ago, I was in the United States Congress, and a bill was before Congress for the purpose of reinvesting in the State an enormous territory which had been reserved for the Indians, but had been granted to speculative companies. It was found, after the transfer, that these companies had obtained the lands by fraudulent misrepresentations, and that the Indians had been deprived of a most valuable property improvidently and improperly; and it was necessary to escheat the territory back to the State. That was done by an Act of the Legislature. It took three or four days to carry that Act through, because the company was so large and so wealthy that it resorted to all manner of devices to obstruct this remedial legislation. However, the legislation was carried through, and the Indians had the land reinvested in the State for their benefit. It would be very awkward if anything of a similar kind happened here, and, therefore, I was very glad to hear that, so far as the Minister of the Interior was concerned, he would hasten very slowly in this matter. I do not mean to say that the time may not come when, for the benefit of the Indian, as well as for the benefit of the State, it will be advisable to sell these lands. It is, however, a matter that should not be done hastily, and in which we should proceed in a very conservative manner.

Motion agreed to.

NEW BRIDGE ACROSS LACHINE CANAL AT MONTREAL.

Mr. CURRAN moved for:

Return of all petitions of Boards of Trade, railway companies, and documents generally, concerning the construction of a new bridge across the Lachine Canal at Montreal.

He said: This is a question which I have brought before the attention of the House several times already, and the last time during the last session of Parliament. The construction of a bridge in the city of Montreal over the Lachine Canal has been agitated for a very great number of years. I spent five years, after my first entrance into Parliament, in endeavouring to convince the then engineer-in-chief of the importance, as well as the absolute necessity of a bridge to relieve the present Wellington street bridge of an amount of the travel and traffic which has to pass over it and for which it is utterly inadequate. After five years of representation, there was a sum of $25,000 put in the Estimates for the construction of a new bridge between the Wellington bridge and what is known as McGee's bridge on the Lachine Canal. Nothing was done with the $25,000 which had been voted then, and the engineer-in-chief stated that the reason for not proceeding with the bridge was that $25,000 was found to be an insufficient sum to erect the bridge in question, and, in conformity with a promise made, the then Minister of Railways inserted in the Estimates a sum of $45,000 for a new bridge. Prior to the time for erecting the bridge, the engineer-in-chief of the department died, and another gentleman was appointed to the office after considerable delay. The work was not proceeded with; and the complaints that had been made

were renewed. The Government had been memorialized by the Board of Trade of Montreal, by the Grand Trunk Railway Co., by forty thousand people living on the river side of the Wellington bridge, as well as by those interested in all the large factories foundries and industrial establishments which are located there. I thought it my duty to bring the matter before the late Sir John Macdonald, who was Minister of Railways at the time, and during the month of December, 1890, finding that nothing was being done, although the money had been voted, I wrote him, asking what was the cause of the delay, as I had been informed that there was not much prospect of operations being commenced. In reply I received from the Prime Minister the following letter:—

"MY DEAR CURRAN,—I have been discussing with Trudeau the bridge question. He has formed the opinion that the Wellington Bridge being far too narrow, had better be removed, and a wider bridge built with sidewalks. This will involve the building of wider piers. The stone can be prepared during the winter as well as the iron superstructure. In the spring the lock will be empty as it is every spring for about a month, and during that time the pier can be built, and the iron structure if ready, can be placed without delay. The fact of this subject being under consideration, is the reason why no steps have been taken to call for tenders.

"Yours faithfully,

"JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"J. J. CURRAN, Esq., M.P."

I understand that the present engineer-in-chief has different views from those entertained by Mr. Page. The former engineer was of the opinion that he should construct a new bridge, and the present engineer it appears from this letter was of the opinion that a bridge with double tracks, able to accommodate the traffic and facilitate the travel, would be a better plan. As I represented myself, voicing the sentiments of the Board of Trade and the other persons concerned in this matter, I stated that it was a question of no importance so far as we were concerned, whether we had two bridges or one, provided that greater accommodation was given. Now another year has elapsed and nothing has been done. I understand that there is not even a plan ready yet, and the condition of affairs at the bridge there is not only an obstruction to the traffic at this most important point, but it is a source of constant danger. There are hundreds of vehicles detained at this point at each side of the bridge when it is open for five or ten minutes to let boats pass through, and day by day the trouble and the danger to life and limb is increasing there. I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Railways to the crying want that exists for bridge accommodation at that point. The matter has been delayed so often and so many promises have been made, that the people are beginning to despair of ever having justice done them on this really urgent matter. I am satisfied that the letter I have read states fully what may be done, and done without any trouble, during the forthcoming winter. Provision was made, even last year, by the acting Minister of Railways at that time, who promised me then that the matter would be pushed forward at once. If provision is made for this bridge now, the stone can be cut and everything prepared for building the necessary piers during the forthcoming winter, and we can have a new bridge there next spring. The cost is really trifling. Parliament has voted the amount required on three different occasions. I am satisfied that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will see that during the forthcoming winter this urgent matter will be attended to, and that if we are not to have two bridges there, at all events we shall have one large bridge with double tracks, capable of accommodating all the traffic at that point, and in that way put an end to the demand that is being constantly made.

Mr. HAGGART. I have no doubt, from the statement of the hon. member, that the bridge which he speaks of is greatly needed. I must apologize to him for not being able to speak authoritatively on the subject, as, though I sent to my department for the fullest information in regard to it, I have not yet got it. I will promise the hon. gentleman to make a statement when the item comes up in the Estimates, as to when the bridge will be commenced and will probably be finished; and I have no doubt, from the statement he makes, and the amount asked, that the requirements are such as to justify us in proceeding with the bridge immediately, and continuing the work until it is completed.

Motion agreed to.

ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) moved for:

Return showing the quantity of artificial fertilizers imported between the 1st of July, 1891, and the 1st January, 1892.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I felt at one time that there would perhaps be some changes in the tariff, but the speech of the hon. Finance Minister makes it evident that there is not much chance of any being made this session. But one change should be to place fertilizers on the free list. I have been examining the records, and I find that we import into this country only a very small quantity of fertilizers. That has been given as one reason why the duty should not be removed. I find, however, that we export a large quantity of phosphates to the United States, where they are admitted free of duty, and that class of manures is manufactured there and sent back to Canada in small quantities. I also find that fertilizers can be manufactured more cheaply in Canada than in almost any other country. At one time there was no establishment in the country for the manufacture of sulphuric acid, one of the principal ingredients of fertilizers; but an English company has erected works and is now manufacturing sulphuric acid and fertilizers of the very best description. So that Canada is in a position to manufacture these ingredients; and, as stated by the Finance Minister and the late Minister of Railways, Canada has better opportunities than any other country for the manufacture of fertilizers. A good many reasons have been given why artificial fertilizers should not be put on the free list. One reason is, that the duty prevents the importation of worthless fertilizers into the Dominion. I do not see why the Government cannot have a regulation providing for their inspection. There are in reality, in these fertilizers, only three elements which are beneficial, namely, nitrogen, phosphoric acid and potash; and when a fertilizer is analyzed, and we ascertain the exact quantities of these elements in a ton, we can judge of its value as a manure. At present the subject is in an experimental stage. Our experimental farms have not had sufficient time yet to give us the result of their experiments, though I hope we shall learn something in the next

report. Still, a report of the effect of these fertilizers on one field will not give a fair idea of their effect on another field. Artificial fertilizers have not been used for a great length of time. I think it was only about 1842 that phosphates were first used. In the older countries there is still a good deal of doubt as to their value, and that doubt will remain until a large number of experiments are made. Chemists can tell us exactly the quantity of fertilizing matter contained in any soil; but it is only through actual experiment that we can tell what the effect of fertilizers will be on the land. We have been told by the Minister of Finance that we have the best deposits of raw material that the world has seen, and we have also been told that we have the very best elements for the manufacture of sulphuric acid. He also tells us that the great difference between an industry when started and after it has had years to grow is found in the action of the Government. Now, the manufacturers of fertilizers have had protection for the last thirteen years, and they ought certainly by this time, considering all the natural advantages they possess, to be in a position to manufacture fertilizers in competition with any other country. Taking into consideration the amount of capital invested in the agricultural industries of this country, and their depressed condition for some time past, it is the duty of the Government to give us all the possible relief they can. I would appeal to the Minister of Agriculture, who must know that in the Province of Ontario at the present time the agriculturists require to adopt every means placed within our reach, in order to increase the produce of our farms and to cheapen production. We can do very little in the way of regulating the prices of farm products, but we can do a good deal in the way of cheapening production and improving the quality of the goods we produce, by the judicious use of fertilizers. It is important to remember that the effect which a farmer will obtain from fertilizers on a low lying field is no criterion of what their effect will be on high land. The effect of fertilizers in light soil, suitable for vegetables, would be no criterion of their effect on heavy clay soil, so that the farmers have to experiment to a great extent, and I hope the Government, seeing we have all the natural products necessary for the manufacture of fertilizers, will remove, as far as possible, all the burdens placed on agriculturists, as the Government of almost every other country has found it necessary to do. There being a very small amount of fertilizers imported into the country, the revenue which would be taken out of the treasury would be very small, so that it cannot be on the ground of lack of revenue that the Government does not give us relief. Our manufacturers have had sufficient time given them to establish their industry and have had every opportunity to make it solid, and now when agriculture is not to get relief in other directions, which we expected to get, it is the duty of the Government to remove the protection from the raw material and give every assistance possible to the farmer. This is a matter in which the farmers are deeply interested. At present we have got to change the system of farming to a considerable extent on account of the changes taking place by our exportation of produce to the other side, and we will have to change our use of different manures and use more fertilizers than we have done. After the Government has spent such large sums of money in maintaining experimental farms, I hold it is their duty to give us this small measure of relief which will affect to no extent the revenue of the country. It is a measure of relief which will not allow the manufacturers of any other country to supply this country with fertilizers, if the statements are true, which I believe them to be, which have been made both by the Minister of Finance and by the late Minister of Railways and Canals as regards the effect of this tariff, namely, that Canada has the raw material in abundance of a richer quality than is to be found in almost any other country, so that, with such facilities, our manufacturers ought to be able to compete against any other country in the world. I hope, therefore, the Government will take this into their consideration, and that the Minister of Agriculture, standing as the representative of the farmers in the Council, will take this into his consideration and bring his influence to bear on the Government of the day in order to give us this small amount of redress.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to the passage of the motion, should the hon. gentleman not be satisfied with the information I now give him. The total amount of these fertilizers imported between the dates mentioned in his motion is $5,845. The quantity of fertilizers is not specified, but this is the value imported for the six months ending the 31st of December last. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion and not insist on my bringing down in a formal form the same information.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have no desire to cause any return to be brought down which is not necessary. Now that we have the information, I hope the Government will take it into their consideration and remove the duty on fertilizers. That was the object of my making this motion.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the motion is withdrawn, I think we should hear from the Minister of Agriculture, not only upon the merits of the motion itself, but the observations of my hon. friend from Huron with regard to fertilizers. One would have expected the hon. Minister of Agriculture to have made some observations upon this motion. I am surprised that the acting Minister of Customs, who on this occasion is rather assuming the *rôle* of a Minister of Finance in his aggressiveness, should have undertaken the duty devolving on the Minister of Agriculture, and act in this double-headed capacity. My hon. friend has suggested that the duty on fertilizers should be removed, and I entirely agree with him. Some years ago we had the subject under discussion. At that time, there was a specific duty of $6 per ton on fertilizers; and when it was proposed it should be done away with, or at all events take the form of an *ad valorem* duty, the Government and their supporters advocated the maintenance of a specific duty on the ground that such was necessary to protect the farmers from being imposed upon. It was said there were cheap and dear fertilizers, and it would not do to trust the farmer to his own intelligence or the machinery of the law to protect him, but he must be protected by a specific duty. They all sang the same tune, until one day the Minister of Customs got up and suggested that it would be a good thing to have an *ad valorem* duty, and immediately the

reasons for specific duty disappeared, and they all said it was right to have an *ad valorem* duty. Now we have had an *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent, which, according to the statement of the acting Minister of Finance, means 20 per cent on fertilizers reaching in value from $20 to $60 a ton. So that there is to-day a duty of from $4 to $12 a ton upon one of the raw materials necessary to the proper carrying on of agriculture in Canada. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that certain countries, such as Great Britain, admit fertilizers free. Not only does Great Britain do so, but the United States, whom my hon. friends are so fond of imitating in many ways, especially with regard to their protective tariff, does the same. The United States, with all their protective fallacies, have never gone so far as to tax the farmers for fertilizing the soil which is to produce food for man. It has remained for this Administration to do that monumental act of folly. A few years ago the House was asked to put on the free list one of the raw materials necessary for the manufacture of fertilizers, sulphuric acid, which enters very largely into the composition of superphosphates, it being necessary in order to make the lime soluble, and, if hon. gentlemen will refer to the debate of the year to which I refer, they will find it stated by the then member for Sherbrooke that an industry had been started there for the manufacture of sulphuric acid, and that it was so successful as to be able not only to keep out importations but also to export its acids to the United States. The freight on acids is in itself an immense protection. It is a dangerous thing to transfer acids and there is a high railway rate on such freight, so that the cost of the transport of acid is of itself a great protection to the American manufacturer. But, according to the statement of the hon. member at that time, the Canadian manufacturer at Capelton was able to export his product to the United States at a profit. Yet, if he reimported that acid after the manufacture, he would have to pay 25 per cent *ad valorem*. For an article which enters so largely into manufactures, the duty is decidedly high, amounting to perhaps not less than $10 a ton. So, whether the raw material is exported or the article manufactured in Canada, the farmer is taxed 20 per cent, or from $4 to $12 a ton for the fertilizer which he requires for the carrying on of his industry. What is the effect of this? Has this duty had the effect of causing our own raw material for the manufacture of fertilizers to be manufactured in Canada? By the Trade and Navigation Returns we find that we are exporting about half a million dollars worth to England of phosphates which are to be manufactured there, to enable the English farmer to compete with us. Our phosphates are being driven out of the country. Why? Perhaps my hon. friends may say it is because there is no demand for them here, but the higher the cost of them the less demand there is for them. If you want to get them into the farmers' hands you must make them popular and cheap. Now, there is a large duty on the raw material and there is no competition for the manufacturer, and there is hardly any manufactured in Canada and practically there is none used by the general farmer. Thus we are losing our raw material, we are losing our natural wealth, and not only is it a loss to the Canadian farmer, but it allows his rivals to successfully compete with him; and that is what is called the National Policy. I suppose that four-fifths of the labouring population of Canada are engaged in tilling the soil, but they are deprived of the benefits which the soil provides for them, and their rivals are enabled to compete with them successfully in this matter. I do not see how the Administration can justify this act. A few years ago, when the tax on the acid was established, it was declared that it would have the effect of building up the manufacture in this country. How many years are you going to allow for the working out of this experiment? A great many years have elapsed, and the only result has been to handicap the Canadian farmer, and to-day the Minister of Agriculture is dumb and does not offer an excuse for this tax. It is the same sort of tax as that on agricultural implements. Hon. gentlemen pick up the blue-book, and they say: We find we imported four or five thousand dollars worth of artificial fertilizers, and the duty on that is all the farmers paid on this tax. The fact is, of course, that the tax is not paid to the customs house in this case but to the manufacturer at Capelton and elsewhere. I think the time has arrived when the farmer should have some consideration. Great consideration is shown to him at election times but, when the Administration is placed firmly in office again, a deaf ear is turned to the demands of the farmer until the next election is about to arrive. Now, with the prospect of an election at a remote period, let us see whether the farmer will have any consideration from the Administration, or whether they will simply wait until the election is near at hand and then make promises which will soon be forgotten.

Mr. IVES. I would like to correct some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman, no doubt in good faith. We can hardly expect him to have correct information on agricultural questions. I presume that if it were a matter connected with the University of Toronto, of which he has the honour to be vice-chancellor, or a matter affecting education generally, as he is known to be a distinguished scholar, we might receive valuable information from him—at all events he would not be likely to make any statements which were not correct. I understood him to state that the late member for Sherbrooke promised that, if protection were given to the manufacture of agricultural fertilizers at Capelton, they would be made there, and now he says that that promise has not been fulfilled, and that artificial fertilizers have not been made there as promised. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman and the House that not only has the manufacture of artificial fertilizers been successfully carried on at Capelton, but that it has been extensively carried on, and that an article has been made there which is rapidly becoming popular with the farmers of my hon. friend's own province as well as of the rest of the Dominion; that they are making an article there which is received by scientific farmers and by scientists with great favour, as being far superior for the price to that manufactured in any other country, whether the United States or England. I may further inform him that they can make there ten times as much as they can find a market for, though the market is growing as the farmers find the qualities of the fertilizers

which are made there, If the hon. gentleman were to enquire among his friends, he would find that they are from year to year using this product more largely and with better results. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture has been appealed to as if it were a subject he could not defend. The Minister of Agriculture can state, and Prof. Saunders can state, that the fertilizers made in Capelton have been subject to the severest possible test on the Government farm, and have proved themselves to be better in quality than the fertilizers of either the United States or England. The manufacture of these fertilizers is increasing, the trade is increasing, and the Trade and Navigation Returns published by the Government show that the want has been supplied, otherwise there would be a larger importation. He says they are not exported. I find in the Trade and Navigation Returns of last year they were exported, and exported to the United States, to the extent of four or five thousand dollars—not much, it is true, but it shows they were to be bought, and that their reputation is growing. I merely make these remarks in justice to the late member for Sherbrooke, whose promises have been amply and fully carried out, and in justice to the industry in my own constituency, which I am proud of, and which gives employment to a thousand men at the present time, and I presume that reason is obnoxious to hon. gentlemen. It always happens if there is any industry in this country that furnishes a market for the poor farmer and employment for labour, it vexes and annoys hon. gentlemen opposite. A thousand men are being employed in this industry in my constituency: they are being paid steady and constant wages, and the industry is growing. It is employing men here in this Ottawa region, getting out the crude phosphate which is being shipped to Capelton and being manufactured. It is giving, probably, 12,000 cars a year freight to Canadian and American railways; and yet the hon. gentleman has the hardihood, knowing nothing about the matter, to get up in his place in this House and say that the late member for Sherbrooke made promises which have not been carried out, and that artificial fertilizers are not yet manufactured in Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman say that one thousand men are being employed in his county in the manufacture of superphosphates for fertilizing?

Mr. IVES. I would say a great deal more than that. I undertake to say that this one company, the Nichols Chemical Company, employ a thousand men in raising the copper ore and reducing it, and getting the sulphur from it, and in manufacturing artificial manure—not the copper mining, of which this is the principal business, but in their whole business, they are now employing and paying over a thousand men.

Mr. LAURIER. In how many counties does this Nichols Company operate?

Mr. IVES. I say in the one county of Sherbrooke they are employing one thousand men.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman say that a thousand men are employed in the manufacture of fertilizers? I understand from the quotation I made from Mr. Hall, the late member, that the industry in question is a by-product of the production of copper pyrites.

Mr. IVES.

Mr. SPEAKER. You cannot discuss that question now.

Mr. MULOCK. I am putting the hon. gentleman right with his mistakes.

Mr. BOWELL. I will take the opportunity of doing precisely what the hon. gentleman has done. In his facetious remarks when he rose, he stated that I had displayed an aggressive character.

Mr. MULOCK. Bellicose.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, bellicose, just as you please. The motion pertained exclusively to the Trade and Navigation Returns, and as ex-Minister of Customs, I was strictly within my province in giving that information. It is impossible to please hon. gentlemen; when they get information they do not like, then they object; when they do not get it, then they abuse.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If I understand the question before the House, it is not a question as to the prosperity of that particular county. It is well known that the Nichols Company have been very successful in the development of the particular line of business in which they are engaged. But the question to me is this: Is it right to oppose a tax upon the large number of people who consume fertilizers, for the purpose of benefiting and putting large profits into the hands of a few individuals? Mr. Hall, when he was here, told us that the Nichols Company had invested, I think he said, $100,000. Now, unless that they have increased that investment very much during the last few years, they certainly have not a thousand men engaged in this industry. I am satisfied now that the hon. gentleman who has last spoken is thoroughly mistaken in regard to the number of men employed in producing artificial fertilizers in his county. If it is true, as the Minister of Railways and Canals stated two years ago, that we have every facility in this country for producing artificial fertilizers and sulphuric acid, that we have a greater abundance of phosphate of lime than any other country in the world, and have greater facilities for producing sulphuric acid than any other country in the world, I would ask how many men, in the circumstances, and with these facilities surrounding us, can say that there is any necessity of imposing a duty upon the importation of similar articles, thus burdening the people who have to consume them? Hon. gentlemen will say that this is an infant industry. I call to your mind the testimony of the Finance Minister in that discussion two years ago, when he said that we were commencing this industry and it was being developed. Now, is there anything in regard to the development of artificial fertilizers that requires any particular skill that is not to be found in this country, or any particular article that we do not now possess, to the same extent now that we will have twelve years hence? And if we had a protection for this industry four or five years ago and under it this great development has taken place, is it not time now that this infant should be able to walk on its own feet? When we find every facility existing in this country in point of raw material, and every facility for its production, I cannot, for the life of me, understand why an import duty is necesary in order to increase the price to those who are using that material in their industry. The Minister of Rail-

ways, in speaking upon this question two years ago, said:

"In this country, strange to say, we have the largest deposits of phosphate of lime in any part of the world, and that in its purest and best form. It has been exported continuously from this country to Great Britain and Germany and other parts."

Now, if we had this large abundance of phosphates, surely we can find capital enough to mine them without additional protection. But he goes on further and says:

"We have the material for the manufacture of such an article, with the greatest percentage of phosphate of lime lying at our very doors. The other ingredient necessary, to make superphosphate of lime (as is known to every individual who has studied the question) is sulphuric acid. We were in the habit of importing that and manufacturing it out of the sulphur found in Sicily and in the southern part of Italy. It has been found that we have lots of material in our own country—iron pyrites and copper pyrites, which contain sulphuric acids—which can be extracted cheaper than by bringing the sulphuric acid from Sicily to this country."

Now, there is a protection, according to the statement made by the hon. Minister himself, which surely ought to be sufficient for our producers. The hon. gentleman said that the cost to bring it here would be equal to that of manufacturing it in this country, and therefore, it would not be brought in this country and so come into competition with the products manufactured. With our present facilities, it is surely not in accordance with justice to give 20 per cent of protection to the parties engaged in the business. The farmers are a very important body of men, constituting about 60 per cent of our population, and when they come to Parliament and ask the removal of this duty, the Government should listen to that request made on their behalf. An argument used by the Minister of Finance a few years ago would not hold water, that the Opposition were making a very great noise about a very small matter. He declared that only $2,800 had been paid on duty on agricultural fertilizers. Is that the case? True, the duty is so high under the present tariff that sulphuric acid is almost prohibited, and that small quantities of fertilizers are imported. This argument would be stronger still if the duty was increased to such an extent that not one dollar's worth could be imported; indeed, the argument of the Minister of Finance would then be complete, for it could then be said that the use of the fertilizers did not pay $1 in duty. But, as has already been shown, that is not the point. The point is, that manufacturers of fertilizers here, owing to the protection they enjoy, are increasing the prices of their fertilizers to such an extent that the farmers have to pay for them very large prices, irrespective of the small amount of duty that is annually paid. Under these special circumstances, I believe it is only right and just that the farmers should receive this small notice and cognizance at the hands of the Government. Another objection that has been brought against the arguments advanced by this side of the House is this, that by giving this protection it would encourage foreign capital to come in for investment in the development of these mines. Does any individual suppose that foreign capital would stay out when all these facilities are offered, when there is an abundance of phosphate mines in the country, and when we are in the very neighbourhood of iron and copper pyrites from which sulphuric acid can be made, and in this way we can manufacture fertilizers cheaper than any other country in the world? Then, if these fertilizers can be manufactured here at such rates, which I believe to be the truth, why should a duty be imposed in order to prevent articles of the same character which cannot be manufactured as cheaply abroad, coming into competition? For instance, say that a ton of an artificial fertilizer can be manufactured in this country for $25, and that a similar article can be manufactured in the United States for $30, do you suppose that fertilizers costing in the United States $5 more per ton would be brought in here and displace the Canadian article in the Canadian market, when there must be added to the increased cost of manufacture the cost of freight into this country? It appears to me that such an argument has no point or force in it. If we can manufacture an article in this country cheaper than elsewhere, we require no protection other than the freight necessary to bring it here. Accordingly, if this protection should not be given it might injure those engaged in that business, but give an opportunity to the farmers of purchasing cheaper that fertilizing material which in very large sections of the country they use to a very large extent. Another argument advanced is that the American fertilizers are very inferior, and our farmers are defrauded by the importation of an inferior article. We had a law placed on the Statute-book in 1884, which made provision that those articles must be inspected and the brand of purity stamped on the barrels containing the fertilizers, and therefore there is a safeguard placed around the importation of these articles by the farmers. If the law is not sufficient, it can be made sufficient by the legislation of Parliament. Looking the whole question over, I think that the least the Government can do in this matter is to remove the duty from fertilizers, and place them on the free list, and I am sure the farmers would rejoice to see this attempt made to meet their requirements. It is well known that the farmers have been compelled to make strenuous efforts of late years to make both ends meet. The fertility of the soil is not what it was 10 or 15 years ago; the prices of their products are not as high as 10 or 12 years ago, and the Government cannot increase the prices received by the farmer, which are governed by prices in foreign markets. How can the Government aid the farmer? By placing him in such a position that he may be able to raise his products as cheaply as possible. That result can be obtained in this way: by enabling him to obtain as cheaply as possible the raw material placed on the soil, in order to enrich it and cause it to bring forth more abundant crops. This is one way in which benefit can be extended to the farmer, by giving him free the raw material used in this way. It is a principle known to the Government, and it has been carried out largely, that the raw material for manufactures shall be given to the manufacturers as cheaply as possible. This is proper, right and just; and why should we make fish of one and flesh of another? If the Government give manufacturers free wool, or free iron and other raw materials, why should not the same principle be extended to the farmer, who is as much in need of free raw material, such as free fertilizers, free binding twine, and free corn, and many other articles which he can use advantageously? It is nothing but right and just that fertilizers should be placed on the free list, and these advantages ex-

tended to the farmers which are extended to any other class.

Mr. HAGGART. I desire to offer a few remarks in reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, who seems to manifest such an interest in the farming community. He seems to think that this impost is a dreadful thing for the farmers. Let him look at the Trade and Navigation Returns for fertilizers, and he will find that the total quantity imported into this province was of the value of $838.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I answered that argument a few moments ago.

Mr. HAGGART. That argument was used a few years ago by the advocates of the policy of the Conservative party, which is a development of the manufactures of the country. We declared that, of all the countries on the North American continent, Canada was best suited for the purpose of making artificial manures; that the articles entering into their composition were found in abundance in all sections of the country; that the two articles that principally enter into the composition of superphosphates, phosphate of lime and sulphuric acid, were found in such abundance here that half a million dollars of phosphates were exported annually, and a large quantity of iron and copper pyrites were sent to New Jersey for the purpose of making sulphuric acid. The member for Sherbrooke, in the last Parliament, declared that if the principle of protection was applied to that as to other manufactures we would be able to build up an industry that would supply our own farmers with material for fertilizing their soil, and in a few years would furnish them cheaper than it could be imported. What was the statement of the hon. gentleman who spoke a few moments ago, that the effect of our policy was such that at Capelton there has been established a superphosphate industry which at present was supplying different parts of the community with that important fertilizer, with a better article and at a cheaper rate than it could be brought in from abroad. From an analysis of fertilizers imported into Ontario and Quebec, the hon. gentleman will find that the superphosphates enter very little into their composition, that it is rather ammonia and other substances. It is well known that in the manufacture of fertilizers from bones and blood in the United States the principal article is phosphoric acid. There is one mine in my section of the country, near Smith's Falls, and another in Capelton, and we are supplying, as fast as the intelligence of the farmers of the country need it, mineral fertilizers for the purpose of improving their farms. As soon as they have educated themselves up to the necessity of using it we are able to supply it in this country. That was the promise made a few years ago. The hon. gentleman says that the person who first spoke upon the subject is surely intelligent enough to know whether the fertilizer is of sufficient value or not, without inspection; but, I believe there is no farmer in the world who can afford the chemical education which is necessary to know whether a fertilizer is of any value or not; whether there is a percentage of one or two per cent more of sulphuric acid or phosphate of lime in it than what is necessary, and which over-percentage may destroy the intermingling of the two acids and may not set the phosphoric acid free. The ingredients may be there for the purpose of making an excellent fertilizer, but the manufacturing of it may be such that they would not be set free and so it would be entirely useless. It requires the most skilled labour, because every article of material that enters into the composition of this stuff requires a chemical analysis to know the proper amount of sulphuric acid necessary to set the phosphoric acid free. It needs a chemist at every stage of the proceedings to see that the fertilizers are properly manufactured. I think that the legislation fully justifies the statement made in the House by me when I was acting Minister of Agriculture, that the policy of the Government should be to protect that industry in the country, one that we have set on foot now, and that we are able to furnish a better article of this fertilizer at a cheaper price that can be imported into the country. Our policy in that respect has proved a benefit to the farmers of Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, this is, in my judgment, a grave and important question, and yet the Government are treating it with a levity which is an insult to the common sense of the House. In the first place, I would expect that the Minister of Agriculture would have something to say on this occasion. He should have told us in the first place whether we ought to choose between the farmers on the one side or the manufacturers on the other; because the question, as it has been placed before the House by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, is simply reduced to this: that either the manufacturers are to be sacrificed or the farmers have to be sacrificed to the interest of the manufacturers. What is the answer which is made by the Government in the present instance? It is: Oh, after all, it is not worth making a fuss about this duty; it only amounts to $6,000 in half a year.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that. I said that was the total value, but not the duty.

Mr. LAURIER. The total value imported is only $6,000 in one half year, or let us say $12,000 in a year. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say, therefore, that this is the whole extent of the tribute which is paid by the farmers? The Minister of Railways has stated that the total value of the duty was something like $800.

Mr. HAGGART. I said it was $166 in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that this $166 is the only tribute paid by the farmers of Ontario for the fertilizers they use? If the only object of the duty is to raise a revenue, why is it not abolished when the revenue is a mere trifle? It is not abolished simply because thereby the farmer is forced to pay a tribute to the manufacturer for his fertilizers. The farmers of Ontario pay $166 into the treasury, but how much do they pay to the manufacturer? That is the question which we have to look into. If the hon. gentleman only derives $166 in duty, surely the very first thing he would do would be to take off the duty, because it would not be worth while to maintain it for the sake of the revenue. But there is something beyond that and which we have had explained by the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). He tells us that there are 1,000 men employed in his county producing directly and indirectly sulphuric acid, and it is for the protection of the proprietor of those works that the farmer of Ontario is compelled

to pay $166 into the treasury. He is compelled to pay that increased price for the benefit of the proprietor of the works at Sherbrooke. That is the summing up of the argument. There is only a small quantity, it it is true, but the quantity imported does not represent what is consumed. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the quantity which is imported into the Province of Ontario, and upon which $166 duty has been paid, does not in any way represent the quantity which has been consumed. There have been large quantities besides that used in the Province of Ontario, and for every pound of that, the farmer of Ontario has had to pay tribute to the manufacturer in Capelton, Quebec. That is the short and long of the argument on this matter. Then, again, we are told by members of the Government: Oh, this is an infant industry. We have been accustomed to that. But, when shall this industry cease to be an infant: when shall it be a grown up person and be able to stand upon its own legs; when will it be in a position not to need to be propped up by the Government? It seems to me that the statement of the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) ought to show us that by this time at least this infant industry might be treated as a grown up person. This infant industry at one time required aid to enable it to stand on its legs, but now it has so far advanced that it is not only producing for the Canadian farmer but for the American market as well. If that infant industry has reached the condition where at the present moment it can not only supply the Canadian farmer but the American farmer also, and go into competition with the American commodities, is it not time that we should reduce the duty to the same level as the American duty? The duty should be reduced to the extent that it is reduced in the United States, and the Canadian farmer should be placed in this matter in exactly the same position as the American farmer. If there is one thing which is more certain than another it is this: That at the present time the condition of the Canadian farmer is a most precarious one, and he has to be helped in every way he can be helped. If there is an opportunity as there is here to reduce to him the cost of this article, which is after all his raw material, there is ample reason that the Government should do so.

Motion withdrawn.

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

After Recess.

BINDING TWINE.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved for:

Return showing the quantity of binding twine imported for consumption in the Dominion from the first of July, 1891, up to the first day of January, 1892; the country from which the same was imported, and the amount of duty paid thereon.

He said: In moving for this return, my object is to lay before the House and the country certain facts which will enable it to arrive at a right conclusion as to whether the time has not arrived when the duty on binding twine should be removed altogether. In my opinion, it is a most objectionable duty, as it taxes the raw material which is necessary to enable the farmers of this country to bind their crops. I find, on looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, that the County of Kent, which I have the honour to represent, is taxed to a very large extent for binding twine. According to the returns of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, the acreage of the crops that required to be bound in that county for 1890, was as follows:—Fall wheat, 84,259 acres; spring wheat, 10,243; barley, 8,739; oats, 35,034; rye, 1,484; making a total of 103,759 acres in that county alone. Now, we may fairly estimate that three-fourths of that crop, equal to about 78,000 acres, would have to be bound by binders. Estimating 2½ pounds to the acre, and the difference in price at 3 cents a pound, this is equal to a difference of 7½ cents an acre, so that the farmers of Kent alone had to pay the handsome little sum of $5,800 extra on account of binding twine. Taking the Province of Ontario as a whole, the total estimated crop in 1890 was over 4,000,000 acres; and if we estimate in the same way that three-fourths of that had to be bound by binders, the result is that the farmers of Ontario have to pay an extra price for their binding twine of over $225,000. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the Government should have no hesitation at all in removing this duty upon an article of such prime necessity to the great agricultural classes of the country, more especially because in doing so they will lose but comparatively little revenue. Last year the total revenue derived from this duty was only about $6,000, and if by removing that duty they can save to the farmers of Ontario alone the enormous sum of $225,000 it seems to me that this is a case in which they should take action at once. Now, it has been said against removing the duty, that the farmers do not pay it. That argument was advanced a short time ago in regard to the duty on sugar, but the event proved that it was not a good argument, because the very moment the duty on sugar was removed the price fell to the extent of the duty removed. You remember, also, that for years the Opposition had been urging the Government to reduce the duty on salt, which had enabled the salt manufacturers in the Province of Ontario to form themselves into a combination under the name of the Canada Salt Association, appointing one man to sell the output of the wells, and fixing a schedule of prices below which no salt manufacturer was permitted to sell. The Government, listening to the remonstrances of the Opposition, and becoming somewhat alarmed at the enormous proportions of this salt combination, wisely, in my opinion, last year reduced the duty on salt by one-half. The very moment the duties were reduced, down went the price of salt to the amount of that reduction, showing clearly that the duty placed on the article enhanced its price to every one in Ontario who consumed salt. The same rule will follow in regard to binding twine. The moment you remove the duty, that moment the price will go down, and the farmers of Ontario and of the whole Dominion will be able to buy their twine at a much lower price than they do to-day. I think also it is very unfair that the farmers should be treated differently from the fishermen. We know that in the Maritime Provinces the fishermen are allowed to import the twine they use free of duty. For instance, we find that the fishermen imported last year some $424,000 worth of twine free of duty for use in their fisheries. I believe the Government did wisely in allowing the fishermen to buy an article

which they absolutely require in the prosecution of their business, at the lowest possible price, and in refusing to place a burden on those people, whose lot we all know is hard enough.—But why should they not treat in the same way the farmers of Canada, who are prosecuting their business under a great many difficulties? I say it is unfair to discriminate against the agricultural classes in this way. Another advantage which the fishermen have over the farmers is that they are allowed to import all the salt they require free. Last year their imports of salt, on which they paid no duty at all, amounted to $150,000, while the farmers of Ontario are taxed 25 cents a barrel on all the salt they use, which enables the salt manufacturers in Canada to increase the price just to that amount. Now, I say we should have one law for all, and no favours for any. No demand has ever come before the Parliament of Canada which has received such support from the people of Canada as that for the abolition of the duty on binding twine. You will remember the enormous petition sent from 20,000 farmers of the Province of Ontario which was presented last year by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), praying that the Government would remove the duty on this article; and this session other petitions have flowed in, scarcely a day passing without some hon. member on either side presenting one or more to the same effect. Surely it is the duty of the Government to take note of these petitions, which show the extent to which the people are interested in the subject, and desire relief from this imposition. The hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who I believe is the president of a great cordage combination, stated last year that binding twine was sold as cheaply in Canada as it was in the United States. This statement was clearly shown to be incorrect, and it was clearly shown, from samples and from prices quoted here last year, that the difference was from 2½ to 3 cents a pound. It was shown that, when you took a pound of binding twine and measured it, you found that the American article, being so much longer than the Canadian, it made an average of 2 to 3 pounds cheaper than Canadian twine. The hon. junior member for Halifax argued that Canadian twine was sold as cheap as American twine. If so, what necessity is there for the tax. Why put 25 per cent on this article if it can be manufactured as cheaply in Canada as elsewhere? There is no possible reason why we should not manufacture twine just as cheap in Canada as it can be in any other country, and when we find that a combine has existed for many years, which takes advantage of the full amount of the tariff, it is the bounden duty of the Government to step in and relieve the people of this country of the enormous duty they have to pay. You will remember it has always been asserted that the people of Canada do not pay the duties upon these things. That has been stated with regard to sugar and salt, but the Finance Minister, a few years ago, when he increased the duties on pork, said that while it would enhance the value to the lumbermen of this Dominion yet he intended to give compensation to the Maritime Provinces by taking the duty off molasses and corn meal as human food, thus showing clearly that he believed the taking these duties off would immediately lower prices and benefit the consumers. I think that, considering the question in all its bearings, considering the enormous quantity of binding twine consumed every year in the Dominion, and which must be used if we properly secure the crops, and also recollecting that, owing to the combine and the duty upon this article, the price has been advanced to the extent I have already stated, and the burdens of the people of Ontario and the Dominion generally increased to such a large amount, I do think it is time the Government stepped in and relieved the farmers of this enormous burden, more especially when they can do it without loss to the revenue. If the whole revenue went to the States we might understand the Government hesitating before deciding that they could do without a revenue raised from that source, but when we find that the revenue amounted only last year to the small sum of $6,000, and that by throwing off the $6,000 we can relieve the farmers of a burden of $400,000 every year, it is the bounden duty of the Government to relieve them of that burden. When this return, which I have moved for comes down, it will give us an idea of the exact quantity imported since the 30th of June, 1891, and enable us to decide whether it is not time the Government should step in and relieve the people of this enormous tax.

Mr. WATSON. I have much pleasure in seconding this resolution. I think that now is the most opportune time for discussing the question, as we happen to have two resolutions on the Notice Paper asking the removal of the duty on binding twine. This matter was discussed at length during the last two sessions, and a great deal of what was said then must be fresh in the memory of the House to-day. There can be no doubt now, if there was doubt a year or two ago, that the time has arrived when the Government should relieve the farmers from this tax from which they derive little or no revenue, and which is simply imposed for the purpose of benefiting a large combine now exacting an enormous sum from the farmers each year and giving no value in return. To show that I consider the time has arrived, I take the liberty to quote from a speech delivered in this House a year ago by the Minister of Militia, then Minister of Customs. The hon. gentleman then said:

"The Government are always alive to that which they believe to be in the interests of the consumer as well as the manufacturer. Whenever they found that the salt industry was controlled to such an extent as to become at all burdensome to the people, they took the first opportunity to reduce the duty. And if it be true that the American combination for the manufacture of twine has, or is about to secure all the cordage factories in this country and keep up the price, then it will be the duty of the Government to see how far they will go in regulating it, in order to prevent the colossal fortunes to which hon. gentlemen have referred being made by the manufacturers."

Now I think there is no doubt in the minds of the people of Canada that a combination has been formed of the American and Canadian twine companies, and there is no doubt in my mind that they are exacting an enormous sum annually from our farmers, through the protection we give them. Our tariff of 25 per cent means, according to the revenue received last year, about 3$\frac{1}{16}$ cents per pound I take it for granted that $\frac{1}{16}$ of a cent per pound will keep out the American article. If such be the case, our manufacturers in Canada will exact every cent they can from the farmers and charge 3 cents more per pound than they ought to. As evidence that a combine has been formed by the National Cordage Company and that they have

purchased the cordage factories in Canada, I find that the Boston *Daily Advertiser*, in the course of a favourable notice of the National Cordage Company's affairs, says:

"The company actually has purchased all the cordage mills in Canada, and the cordage business of the Dominion of Canada is protected by a tariff wall which enables the business to work at a profit."

That shows clearly that the American newspapers feel that if the National Cordage Company purchase the cordage factories of Canada they will be able, on account of our duty, to charge a higher price than they otherwise could. We have further evidence that the duty does raise the price on binding twine. I will quote from the evidence given by Mr. Massey before the Combines Committee in this House, some three years ago. Mr. Bain, the member for Wentworth, asked him what was the actual cost, including the duty, of the American article, and Mr. Massey says:

"We had to import a large quantity for the North-West last year. We could not get it in Canada. We laid it down in Manitoba at about the price which we had to pay in New York, and duty added. It cost us about the duty extra."

Now, I do not think that any doubt can exist in the minds of the members of this House, after reading the evidence of Mr. Massey, and other evidence which was produced before that committee, that twine is sold in Canada at just the duty higher than it is sold in the United States. During the last session I took the trouble to lay before this House a number of samples of twine, giving the average cost in the United States and the average cost in Canada, and I proved, I think, successfully—at least I was not successfully contradicted—that my contention at that time was right. We find that in Manitoba this duty is a very heavy tax on the people. It is not the same as a duty paid on a binder or a plough, but it is an annual tax, it has to be borne by the people every year their harvest comes round. I have made an estimate of the total quantity of twine used in Canada every year, and the amount that was used to bind last year's crop, and allowing that one-fourth of the grain in Canada was cut by a reaper, and bound otherwise than with binding twine, I find that last year it required 14,000,000 pounds of binding twine to bind the crops of Canada. At 3 cents a pound, that means about $450,000 that is exacted from the farmers of Canada by this obnoxious tariff. I may say, as I come from Manitoba, that the people of that province and of the North-West suffer more, proportionately, than the people of any other portion of the Dominion, inasmuch as *per capita* they are taxed in this respect much heavier than the eastern farmer. In the west, when a farmer has 160 to 2,000 acres of a crop, it becomes an enormous tax upon him to pay annually for his binding twine manufactured in Canada, 3 cents a pound more than he should pay. Last year we had 1,300,000 acres of grain cut and bound with a binder, and if we estimate three pounds of twine per acre it means 3,900,000 pounds of binding twine, and the 3 cents a pound extra upon the cost of that twine, means an additional tax upon the farmers of Manitoba of $117,000. In the North-West Territories they are affected the same as we are in Manitoba and throughout the rest of the Dominion, but as I said, they pay, *per capita*, a heavier tax than the people in the eastern part of Canada, because their crops are larger *per capita*. In the North-West Territories last year over 300,000 acres of crop were cut by the binder, and estimating that three pounds of twine are required per acre, they use 900,000 pounds, which means, at 3 cents a pound extra, $27,000 that the farmers of the North-West Territories had to pay for their binding twine in excess of what they ought to pay by reason of this tariff. In Manitoba and the North-West Territories the people paid $144,000 more than they should have paid for their twine to bind the last year's crop with. Now, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), it has been contended by hon. gentlemen opposite, who are advocates of protection, that the sugar duties would not affect the price of sugar; but we know that last year when they made a reduction of the duty of sugar, the price of that article fell immediately as every consumer in Canada knows well. The same with salt. When the duties were reduced, the price of salt immediately fell. Now when we consider that this enormous tax of some $450,000 is levied on the farmers of Canada for the sake of this $6,000 odd of revenue, I say it is time that the Government should remove this duty on binding twine. Last year we had an explanation from the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) who, I believe, is largely interested in binding twine, and that hon. gentleman could not successfully contradict the statements made in this House. He claimed that his cordage factory in Halifax was free and independent of the American cordage factories; but it is now a matter of public notoriety that the National Cordage Company has control of the Canadian Cordage Factory, and by this tax being set off as a little preserve for the amount of twine manufactured in Canada, they are able to charge that excessive price. This year, as last year, I have received figures from the Western States, and comparing them with the prices in Canada, I find that this year, as last year, the difference in price is about the same. I think there can be no doubt in the minds of any hon. member in this House, who carefully looks into this matter, that we are compelled to pay that extra price for binding twine. I do not object, Mr. Speaker, to the fishermen receiving free the twine they use in their industry, I do not object to that at all: but I say this, that the farmers of Canada have as much right to receive free the binding twine that they require to bind their crops, as the fishermen have to receive their twine free. Now, as to how the combines work, I find in looking over the report of the Journals of the House of 1888, on page 403, that Mr. Alexander W. Morris, of Montreal, manufacturer, gives evidence as to how a combination was formed in Canada, and as to what their operations were. He was being examined by Mr. Gillmor:

"Q. Mr. Connors is in your combination? A. He was in, but there is no combination now.

"Q. How many were there in the combination? A. Five.

"Q. You would proportion out what each one should make? A. Yes; we each had a stated percentage.

"Q. What proportion of all the quantity that was to be made for Canada did he make? A. On binder twine last year he had a percentage, I think, 10 per cent of the whole. And I think he manufactured about two tons of twine.

"Q. How much did you get last year out of the pool, as you call it, as near as you can tell? A. I think about $6,000 or $7,000. Perhaps as much as that; it might be $5,000.

"Q. For not making rope? A. No; not making binder twine."

According to this evidence there was one factory receiving $7,000 simply because they ceased making binding twine. Now, this evidence must be conclusive, as it was given on oath by a man who knew what he was talking about. Last year I gave the values of twine in Canada and the United States, of various grades, and I find there has been little or no change since. There is plenty of evidence to show that on other articles as well as on binding twine, the people of Canada are unjustly taxed on account of these combinations being formed. We know, however, that the farmers of Canada are waking up to see the manner in which they are being bled for the benefit of a few manufacturers of binding twine. We find that Farmers' Institutes and the Patrons of Industry all over Canada are sending in petitions to the House of Commons, asking that the duty on binding twine should be removed. When a person figures up the amount that is annually paid on binding twine by this extra cost of 9 cents an acre, it is easy to see how it reduces the value and the profits of a man's farm considerably. I think this is an opportune time to discuss this question before the House resolves itself into Committee of Ways and Means, and I hope the Government will see fit to relieve the farmers of this unnecessary tax, a tax that simply goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. Last year the Government received a revenue on this article of only $6,192. The total imports last year were 196,358 pounds, of the value of $24,696. The revenue of $6,192 went into the pockets of the Government treasury, while the value of the twine imported altogether was $424,000. If the Government can relieve the farmers of that tax they will be moving in the right direction. If the money were going into our own treasury it would be a different thing, but at present it is a system of legalized robbery. The amount of $424,000 is exacted from the farmers of Canada, while only $6,192 is collected for our revenue; consequently, I say it is only legalized robbery, and I hope the Government will give its attention to this matter at the earliest possible opportunity, and will not allow these men to steal this large amount of $400,000 a year from our farmers. I hope they will see that the duty is removed from binding twine.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I find that there is a talk of the cordage companies raising the price of binding twine from 3 to 4 cents a pound. The Chicago *Canadian-American* has the following:—

"The greedy binding twine trust is not satisfied with the enormous profit accruing from last year's operations. One million four hundred thousand dollars was cleared in 1891 by the trust. That sum, considering its opportunities in the field of legalized robbery, is now regarded as being short of actual requirements. It is to be greatly exceeded this year, and to that end the price of twine for the coming season has been advanced from 3 to 4 cents. Competition has been shut out by the duty, and this is the secret of the trust's unholy raid on the pockets of the wheat growers of the west. But what are the farmers going to do about it? Knowing that the protection afforded the trust by the Government makes the robbery complained of possible, do they intend to vote for a continuance of the fiscal policy that bears so heavily upon them? That is the question. They can easily break the trust and similar appendages of a paternal Government by using their franchise in their own interest."

This is the case in the United States, and, if the statement is correct, that the cordage companies in Canada have been bought out by the large cordage companies in the United States, it will be the duty of the Government to see to this matter. When a foreign combine is got up for a purpose of skinning the farmers of Canada, it is time that the Government took up the question. The only means we have of getting quit of this matter of having a large amount of money taken out of our pockets for the benefit of foreign companies is to take the duty off binding twine. Allow that to come into Canada free of duty, and that will break up the whole combination. We have heard a great deal about loyalty, about attending to British interests and Canadian interests, but will the Government show their loyalty here where only $6,000 are taken for the benefit of the treasury, while the manufacturers make a profit of some $400,000? Will they allow the manufacturers to send in their binding twine free? It is their duty to give us some redress, because, if the American cordage companies have decided to increase the price of twine three or four cents, we will have to pay the duty and the increase in the price also, and that will be between $700,000 and $800,000 which will be extracted each year from the pockets of the farmers of Canada in that article alone. We know that in many cases the raw material comes in free of duty. The furniture manufacturers are allowed to import their lumber free to the extent of $1,700,000. We find that the tanners import hides free to the extent of $2,000,000, and that reduces the value of hides to the farmers in this country. Then, wool is imported free to the extent of $1,398,746 for the benefit of the manufacturers of woollen goods, and there, again, the farmers of this country suffer, as our wool is displaced to that extent, and we lose 12 cents a pound on the 5,000,000 pounds that we produce, or about $600,000 a year. It is certainly the duty of the Government to give us this small means of redress, especially when it is a foreign company into whose pockets this money is going, and if the Government and those behind them are true to their idea of loyalty, surely they will give us this concession as a means of redress.

Mr. DAVIN. I need hardly say that I do not subscribe to all the propositions laid down by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. I venture to say that I have been a protectionist as long as any other man in this House. I know that I advocated protection before it was taken up by any party in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Customs will dispute that proposition.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not hear what my hon. friend the philosopher from Bothwell said. If he would speak up, we might hear him. In regard to binding twine, where you have a combine and where competition has ceased to exist, it is contrary to the theory of scientific protection to give any protection to that industry, and on general principles, therefore, I hope the Government will consider the suggestions which have been thrown out and will either reduce or take away entirely the duty on binding twine. In the North-West, in the constituency whence I come, and in other constituencies, agricultural constituencies, a great interest is taken in this question, and at one of the last meetings held in my constituency before I came away, at a very large and crowded meeting, I was asked what I thought of the duty on binding twine, and I had no difficulty whatever in complying with their unanimous request that in Parliament I would express the opinion that I

expressed to them there. Whether or not the taking off the duty on binding twine would reduce the price to the farmer, the very fact that the manufacturers have gone into a combine or those who have not have given over or have sold their interest to a combine, is quite sufficient reason for a Government pledged to protection to at once take the alarm and deprive that combine of all aid. The argument is used that there would be no use in taking off the duty on binding twine, because the combine is not merely a Canadian combine but an international combine, a combine that has its grasp not merely on Canada, but also on the United States. It is further said that no hope can come from England, because binding twine is not manufactured there cheap enough. Grant all this, we have the history of tariff legislation in the United States before us, and from the history of protection in the United States and from the nature of the case we know this, that a country which adopts the true policy, as I believe protection is for a young country like Canada or for a country like the United States especially in its past history, the Government have to be perpetually on the watch or else the beneficent principles of protection will be used against the interests of the people. The very nature of the case will suggest what has actually often taken place. What takes place is this: that where a Government places on any article a sufficient protection, further pressure is put on it to increase that protection, and unless it is always on the *qui vive* it may actually in its desire for the development of the industries of the country enter upon a course directly contrary to the principle that is at the base of its protective policy. I think it is on the face of it, at all events, probable, that the price of binding twine will be reduced if the duty is taken off. I say that is probable. I doubt very much if it would be as much reduced as the hon. gentleman for Marquette says; but I again say that, in order to arrive at a decision, I do not care one fig whether it would be reduced or not, for in principle the very minute you are face to face with a combine, a Government pledged to a protective policy is bound to act against that combine. It was successful in regard to salt and although it is said it will not be successful in this case, because we have an international combine, it is worth trying whether it will be successful or not. Let me point out that what we have at present is this: You have got a combine in Canada controlling a small area comparatively, hedged in by a protective wall. Then you have got a large area in which you have also a combine. The combine in the large area is associated with the combine in the small area. What I say is this, that if you throw down that wall, so far as the small area is concerned you increase the chance of competition arising against the combine to the extent of the added area. I deal with general principles because my hon. friends have sufficiently gone into figures in regard to the matter. It may be said, too, in fact in conversation it has been said to me: Why, in Ontario, when we were discussing this matter, the farmers did not care one pin about the binding twine. I grant you that may be so. What that shows is this, that the farmers of Ontario have such a clear perception and such a strong grasp of the fact that this National Policy as a whole is beneficent in its operations in this country, they were actually ready to accept that one item against themselves because of the great advantage they have gained from that policy. The farmers in the North-West will make a similar statement. They say, which is a fact: We do not get any advantage from the National Policy, but we are not merely North-West men, we are Canadians before we are North-West men; therefore we will support this National Policy which is for the general development of the country and for Canada's welfare. And so these Ontario farmers may have felt. But that is no argument to a Government that wishes to deal scientifically with the application of protection to the nation it governs, because they lay down the general principle that the very minute in any industry a combine develops, that minute the Government is bound to act. I will go further. I will say this, that if the combine takes such an obnoxious form as this combine has taken, international in its character, harassing not merely a great colony of 5,000,000, but darkening 65,000,000 of people with its malign scheme, I say—I do not advocate that now—that circumstances might arise when a Government might not merely consider the wisdom of removing the duty, but of giving a bonus for a certain period to any two men who would go into the same industry to break up the combine, because, as a protectionist, I say this, there is nothing so truly protective in its character as this principle, that a Government pledged to protection is bound to act against combinations.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I was somewhat surprised at the statement made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that the National Policy has benefited the farmers of this country. When I have discussed this question on the public platform, I have usually put this question: I ask any farmer present, Conservative or Reformer, to mention where the National Policy has ever put one dollar into his pocket directly or indirectly. During the discussions at many meetings, only at one meeting did a man at the door, declare his ability to do so, and he happened to be drunk. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he can point out any particular way in which the farmers are benefited as regards prices, crops or in other direction by the National Policy, and which they would not have obtained otherwise? Can the hon. gentleman point to any article that is cheaper by the National Policy?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. Lots.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Does the hon. gentleman know that by his own admission a tariff of protection increases the value of the articles manufactured in the country, and the hon. gentleman knows that during his speech he made that statement.

Mr. DAVIN. No, no.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman stated in regard to salt, which we manufacture in this country, and for which we have the raw material, that when the tariff was lowered on salt last year the price fell 25 cents per barrel. I might mention also that when the duties on sugar were removed last year, the Minister of Finance said that taxes to the amount of $3,500,000 were removed. This amount was placed on the shoulders of the people, and if the farmers compose 60 per cent of the population, I ask any man

whether in connection with the sugar interests the farmers of this country got an advantage. I might carry the hon. gentleman through many articles to show that the farmers have been burdened by the action of the National Policy rather than benefited by it. On the other hand, they have not the same access to the American markets as they had before the National Policy was established. Can they send their horses there and realize the same profits which they would realize if the tariff were removed? Can they send their barley, their poultry, their eggs, and many other articles of the produce of the farm into the American markets and realize the benefit under the National Policy which they did before it was established? Do not the farmers receive much less now than they did before the National Policy was established for their wheat, barley, pork, cheese and eggs, showing that the National Policy either in buying or selling is against the interests of this country. More than that, I will go this far, and say that not a single member of this House who represents a rural constituency can state that he believes that in the interests of the farmers the duty on binding twine should continue. In the late contest in the bye-elections, was there a single person who presented himself as a supporter of the Government, who would state on the public platform that he was opposed to removing that duty? I know a member of the Government who went into an adjoining riding to mine and stated upon the public platform that he believed the removal of the duty on binding twine would be in the interests of the farmers, and that it was intended to remove it when they negotiated a treaty at Washington. If, as some say, the farmers do not pay an increased price for their binding twine on account of the duty, what would be the object of a Minister attending a meeting of farmers and stating that the duty would be removed. It was quite plain that the farmers knew, and that the Minister knew that because of the duty, the farmers were paying 3 cents per pound more for their twine. How is it that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is arrayed against the policy of the Government in this matter. Is it from conviction? Is it from a thorough understanding of the whole question, or is it because of the force of local pressure from his county? He knew that the farmers living around Regina are strongly convinced that they are paying more for their twine than they should pay. He has been elected as a supporter of the Government here, and yet his constituents have brought to bear on him the influence which has obliged him to express the opinion which he has given to the House to-night. His action to-night shows that the farmers, looking at their own interest with an intelligence which they deserve to get credit for, knew that they were paying too much, and although their representative is both a Tory and an upholder of the protective system, they brought such influence to bear upon him, that he is obliged to support the Liberal principles here, and speak in favour of free binding twine. His action is not from conviction, but from a knowledge of the local wants of the constituency from which he comes. In my own county—and I consider it one of the best counties in the Dominion of Canada—it costs us over $10,000 a year as an extra price for our binding twine for the purpose of binding the harvest of that county, and I will quote

figures to the House to prove this. In 1890 we had 45,000 acres under fall wheat; 9,400 under spring wheat; 32,400 under barley; 94,650 under oats; and 300 acres under rye; total 181,750 acres. Our county is an old one, and I can say without exaggeration that four-fifths of this crop is bound by the binder, which would make 145,400 acres. At seven and a half cents which is the average cost given per acre for binding twine, on account of the operation of the duty, it will be seen that my county is taxed $10,905 as an extra price for binding twine, over and above the price that would be paid if the duty were removed.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). They must have paid all the duty; the duty is only $6,000 for the whole Dominion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman is begging the question. When he hears the word duty mentioned, he attaches the meaning to it that it must be customs duty, but a duty may be placed in the form of taxation upon the shoulders of those who pay nothing into the Customs Department. It is nevertheless taken out of the pockets of those who use that article just as much as if it was paid into the custom house. It matters not a fig whether he pays it to the custom house or to the combine who charge so much more on account of the duty, the farmer has to pay it all the same. There is this difference, however. If he paid into the Customs it could be used in defraying the expenses of the country, but as it is paid now, it goes to the pockets of the manufacturers who use it for their own private gains. There is the difference, and I challenge any person to say that the duty does not impose a higher price. Such a contention is altogether against the principles of political economy, as taught by the very wisest men. Hon. gentlemen will remember that Sir A. T. Galt said a few years ago: That the effect of the protective tariff was not only to increase the price of the article imported into this country, but that it would equally increase the price of an article of a similar nature manufactured in this country. That was the opinion of one of the most learned politicians the Conservative party ever produced. If that be true, and true it is, it can be applied to binding twine as well as to any other article. Let me ask the Government why do they allow twine to come in free to the Eastern Provinces for the use of the fishermen. The fishermen are poor, they have a hard life and make very little in the end, and the Government have acknowledged the fact, that if they would allow twine to come in free the fishermen would obtain it cheaper than if there were a duty imposed upon it. Consequently the Government have allowed the fishermen to get in $400,000 of twine free of duty. I ask in the name of the farmers of this country, why they are denied the same privilege? The fishermen of the Eastern Provinces receive a bonus of $150,000 in order to assist them to live, and they also are allowed to bring in free from England their coarse salt for the purpose of using in their business. That is also an acknowledgment on the part of the Government that every article they admit free of duty, is cheaper than if a duty were imposed. That being the principle in the Eastern Provinces, does it not equally apply to the farmers of Ontario in regard to twine and fertilizers and every other article they use? When we

are met with the argument that only $6,000 are paid in duty on binding twine, let me ask, does any individual who for a moment understands the action of the protective duty upon importations and exportations say, that that is all the tax that is paid by those who use that article? I thought that theory was exploded years ago, and so it has for those who have given any study to political questions. If this were an article upon which we derived a revenue, there would be some excuse for the Government saying that it was important that revenue should be raised, and that the farmers should contribute a portion towards the expenses of the country. That would be a fair argument, but when we only raise $6,000 revenue from this article, the question arises, not between the revenue and the farmers, but between the combine on the one side and the farmer on the other. The Government are determined—I hope they are, but I am afraid they are not—to support the combine in opposition to the farming interests. If the Government refuse to remove this duty and to relieve the farmers of this country of this tax of $420,000 they are simply adopting a policy which puts that large amount into the pockets of the manufacturers of twine at the expense of the farmers of this country. I will give a few figures in order to corroborate what has been said by those who have already spoken on this matter. My figures have been gotten up independent of theirs, showing that the facts have been arrived at from a different standpoint, and they therefore go far to substantiate the correctness of the figures already given by members on this side of the House. In Manitoba it is estimated that 1,300,000 acres are under crops. That would make a total expenditure, over and above the necessary expenditure for binding twine, of about $97,500. For the Province of Ontario we have more definite information furnished by the statistics of the Bureau of Industries. The Ontario acreage under crop in 1890 was as follows: Fall wheat, 720,000 acres; spring wheat, 602,000 acres; barley, 702,000 acres; oats, 1,883,000 acres; and rye, 103,000 acres; making a total of 4,010,000 acres. Say that only three-fourths of this crop was cut by binders, or in other words 3,010,000 acres. At 7½ cents per acre, the increased price which the operation of the tariff imposed on the people of Ontario amounted to $225,750. The total increased price which the farmers of Manitoba and Ontario together had to pay was $323,000. Now, if we estimate that all the other Eastern Provinces together would use as much as the Province of Ontario, there would be a total of 13,785,000 pounds of twine used for binding the crops of the Dominion in 1890, which, at 3 cents a pound additional, meant that $413,550 was taken out of the pockets of the farmer, not in Customs taxes, but by the increased price they had to pay to the combined manufacturers of twine on account of the protective duty imposed by the Government. In view of these facts, I hope that the Government will look at this matter from a farmer's standpoint. The Conservative party in this House know that they have not the confidence of the farmers of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Say that again.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Conservatives of this House, Mr. Speaker, know very well that they have not the confidence of the farmers of this country. If the votes of the farmers of this country were counted to-morrow, I am satisfied that the members of the Liberal party who are sitting here would be found to have received three-fifths of them. Sir, look at the members on your right, and you will find that the largest majorities given to them have been from towns and cities, and in the last general election we had a popular majority in Ontario of 10,000.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. How many farmers on your side of the House have spoken of binding twine?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman knows very well that he could not go into South Victoria and tell the farmers there that he is opposed to the removal of the duty on binding twine. He knows very well that the Patrons of Industry throughout the country, irrespective of their political leanings, have in large numbers petitioned this House for the removal of this duty. The hon. gentleman who is continually molesting me, knows well also that the Farmers' Institutes of Ontario, the most respectable and intelligent body in the whole country, irrespective of party politics, have expressed themselves in favour of the removal of this duty.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. Although I had to contend with this question, I increased my majority 201.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman knows that if he consulted the interests of the farmers, he would favour removing this burden of $420,000 from their shoulders, instead of keeping it for the sake of the $6,000 revenue obtained from it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Bosh.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Why, we have the figures here to prove that this is the case. Let these hon. gentlemen dare to go among the farmers of the country and speak against the removal of this duty, and they will find that the intelligent farmers will not justify their action here, but will hold them responsible, and send them about their business at the next general election. Now, I am going to conclude by expressing the hope that the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson) will rise now and give us some of his eloquence on this subject. He is a good interrupter. I do not know whether he is a good orator or not, but I hope we shall hear now the reasons for his opposition to us on this subject. I hope the Government will take this matter into their consideration and give the farmers relief from this taxation. Do not make them the beasts of burden, hewers of wood and drawers of water, as they have been for many years; but give them an opportunity to make a living in this country, lest more of them leave and go to the United States. I hope also that the junior member for Halifax, who represents the cordage combination in this country, will now give his views of the matter, and show if he can that it is the interest of the farmers to continue the duty on binding twine.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is to be regretted that we have not had any expression of opinion from the Treasury benches on this important question. It received some consideration a year ago, and the House then by a limited majority voted down the proposition to put binding twine on the free list. I am not aware that the position

of the trade of manufacturing the article in question has materially changed since then. At that time, as to-day, the National Cordage Company of the United States had captured the trade both in Canada and the United States. At that time, as to-day, the farmers of this country, in respect of this article, were entirely at the mercy of a corporation, and it happens a corporation of foreign origin, which had succeeded in gathering into its fold all the factories of Canada. It was so stated on the floor of Parliament last session, and if any doubt exists upon the subject, all one has to do is to read as I have read the last annual report of the National Cordage Company of the United States, and there he will find the statement that the company has succeeded in capturing, I forget the exact number, but all the manufactories of Canada, enumerating them. Therefore, the position of the farmers of Canada to-day in respect of this article is simply this: that they have to pay whatever price is exacted from them; they are not free men: and we are told that while we must protect other people, while we must consider the interests of those outside of the country, while we must carry on business in Canada, so as not to interfere with the trade of England, yet we are disregarding the interests of four-fifths of the people of Canada. I congratulate my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) on his partial conversion to sound principles. It has happened that since he left this House last summer, he has received a mandate from his constituents. The last message he got from them before leaving for Ottawa was that he must improve his methods in the House—that it would not do to go it blind as he had done in the past with regard to the National Policy all through. Then he proceeded to congratulate the farmers of Ontario on their intelligence in seeing the matter differently from his constituents. The farmers of Ontario were so intelligent and had such a clear grasp of the National Policy in all its bearings, that they would not allow one single item in it to be interfered with—not they. But at the same time his intelligent constituents in the North-West had told him that the duty on binding twine had to be removed, and so he has come down here able to please both. In other words, he tells the Government that they should not remove the duty, at the same time he squares himself with the farmers of West Assiniboia by saying that he has a mandate from them which he must obey. He lays down the proposition that wherever a combination exists the Government should step in and destroy the combination by removing the protection. Well, Sir, I will accept his doctrine, and if the Government accepts it, what becomes of the National Policy? It was only a few days ago that I read in the papers of Canada—and undoubtedly it is a fact, because it appeared not in Conservative papers alone, but pretty generally—that the cotton lords had captured the trade of Canada, and that all the cotton mills of Canada had now been scooped in one combine just as my hon. friend, the junior member for Halifax, controls the cordage industry for Canada. What is to become, if this doctrine of combines is to obtain, of the cotton manufacture? Now, if the consumer buys cotton he has either to pay the price of the seller or go without his cotton, or with a little shorter quantity. What is to become of your oil industry? The oil men have combined, and you cannot buy oil at competition prices. What has the hon. member for East Lambton to say to this doctrine of the member for West Assiniboia. The oil trade must go according to this doctrine? What about the sugar trade? The sugar men have combined, and the vendors of sugar have got their prices. What is to become of the glass industry? It is only a short time ago since the manufacturers of glass combined, and it was only the 15th of January last that the manufacturers of nails combined again, and issued an order to buyers of nails, that on and after the 15th of January last they would have to pay half a cent a pound more for three inch nails and a small increase in proportion on other kinds. What will become of all the great industries, the iron, sugar, the cotton? If this doctrine is to obtain they must all go by the board. If the Government adopt the recommendation of the hon. member for West Assiniboia, if they desire consistency, which of course they do, they will apply this doctrine in a general way. As to this particular subject under discussion, I last year presented a case, I will admit imperfectly, but still as well as I knew how. I was able to tell the Government that, on the most modern calculation, taking the official returns as my basis, the farmers of York County paid at least $10,000 extra for binding twine used last year. I wonder that some member of the Government has not got up before this and read the Trade and Navigation Returns, and told us that as the only amount collected last year for twine was $6,000, the whole amount paid by the farmers, by reason of the maintenance of the tax, was $6,000, just as the hon. Minister of Railways told us before dinner that $166 represented all the tax on the farmers of Canada for fertilizers. He was not giving the House credit for common intelligence in making that observation, otherwise we would have members of the Government on this question also setting forth as excuse for the maintenance of this tax that it was an infinitesimal one. But this tax does not go to the Government. You have legalized the junior member for Halifax as a trustee for the cordage combines of Canada. You have authorized him to collect, in the name of the cordage companies, 25 per cent from every farmer in Canada for every pound of twine he uses, and to put that extra 25 per cent into his treasury to be distributed amongst the interested parties in that combine. That is the system you have established. There is a tax collector sitting in this House by the authority of the Government. There is an Act of Parliament enabling him to collect taxes and not apply them to the public good. That is the position of the trade, and I record my protest here, as I have done elsewhere, against this system, and as long as we have free institutions, as long as the people have a right to be heard, they have the right to have their voice listened to, and, if their cause is just, to have their grievances redressed. Last session the people presented their humble petitions to Parliament asking to have this evil redressed. It was not: and the consequence was a quarter of a million dollars, at the lowest calculation, was taken out of the pockets of the farmers and placed in the pockets of the combine I have referred to for one year's operations, and we are now to enter on another year's. Is this to continue another year? I think it is due to the House and the country that some utter-

ance should be given by the Government on this question. They may not give it because the appeal is from this side of the House; but if they listen to the appeal from their own supporters, who have given an unwilling support to the measure, they will, at this late hour, recede from the false position in which they have placed themselves—it is never too late to reform—and place on the free list this article most necessary for the proper carrying on of a great industry, and specially entitled to be placed at the least cost in the reach of consumers. Before sitting down, I will make another statement, and I will ask the junior member for Halifax to correct me if in error. I am told that cordage is now being manufactured and exported at a cent and a half per pound less than it is sold to consumers in Canada. Is that correct? I have received that information from Halifax, from the constituency the hon. gentleman represents. If it is true that cordage can be manufactured in Canada, and exported and sold at a cent and a half a pound or thereabouts less than it is sold to the people of Canada, what tale does that tell?

Mr. STAIRS. I have no objection to answering the hon. gentleman. The case, as he has put it, is not correct. I do not deny that cordage has been sold at a lower price for export, but that the same quality of cordage is sold is not correct.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had a letter from a Halifax merchant myself in the present month, in which he said he had given orders for manilla rope, and they were quoted for home consumption, 11 cents, and for export, 9½ cents.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman would not value his own advice as a lawyer at the same rate as he would the advice of others, nor, Mr. Speaker, would I. I would ask him to apply the same principle to different articles of manufacture.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you deny that they are the same quality?

Mr. STAIRS. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My information is that they are.

Mr. SEMPLE. If it appears to be proved from the manufacturers' standpoint that the farmers have no more to pay on account of the duty, and if it can also be made to appear that the duty is of no consequence to the manufacturers, then why not adopt so reasonable a proposition as to take off this duty on binding twine? The farmers as a body have petitioned for it, and it is not a party question. The Farmers' Institute, the Patrons of Industry and the Grangers, all of whom are non-political bodies, have discussed this matter on every available occasion, and have petitioned that this duty should be taken off. The organizations of the farmers are unanimous in making this small request that the duty shall be taken off binder twine. It appears, also, from the small amount of duty received by the Government that this is not of much importance to them, the amount being only $6,192. The only reasonable conclusion is that it is the manufacturers who receive the benefit, and that the farmers must pay tens of thousands of dollars in order that the manufacturers may receive that advantage. It is the old story of the few enriched at the expense of the many. In fact, in many parts of the country on small farms, the farmers consider the cost of binding twine so excessive that they consider it to be as profitable to bind their grain by hand as to bind with binding twine. It has been very well put by the hon. gentleman who preceded me and who showed clearly that one-fourth of the amount paid by a farmer for binding twine goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. If any part of the community requires some consideration, I think it is the farmers. The capital invested in that industry is from $950,000,000 to $1,000,000,000, so that, with so large an amount of capital invested, there should be some consideration given to the farmers on a question in regard to which they are unanimous. They are different from the manufacturers. If the manufacturers are not prosperous or realizing as much as they would like, they come before the House and generally get what they want in order to please them up to their heart's desire. I think, when all the farmers are unanimous in asking for the small matter of justice involved in this matter, they should receive it. I saw a statement in a newspaper that it was the intention of the Government to take this duty off. They have had the friendly advice to-night of a supporter of their own, and they have had the friendly advice of a number of members of the Opposition who have stated what is right and just; and, when the tariff duties come down, I hope a vote will be taken and that we will know how many of the gentlemen in this House who owe their seats to the farmers will vote against doing the farmers this simple act of justice. It is true that the farmers have a great amount of forbearance and forgive many their transgressions, but I do not think they will always do this. Some people appeal to the prejudices of the farmers, and interested persons have tried to throw dust into their eyes so as to make an issue different from the correct one, but this is doing an injustice to a large number of the people. I did not intend to speak on this subject, but, as I represent an agricultural community which have held a large number of meetings, all of which have been unanimous—no matter what shade of politics they belong to—in the opinion that this should be done. While believing an act of justice will benefit and please the farmers and will be a decided move in the proper direction, I desire to express my opinion that this duty should be removed.

Mr. GILLMOR. This has been quite an interesting discussion. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is and always has been a protectionist, but he is opposed to combines. We may have combines without protection, but we are likely to have a great many more with protection. As to the anxiety of my hon. friends on this side of the House about the farmers, who compose 60 per cent of the people of Canada, I think we need not trouble ourselves very much about it. If the farmers want the duty taken off binding twine, they can have that done at the polls. They can get it if they want it, but they do not want it. They like being skinned. They are like eels; they have been used to being skinned and they rather like it. There is one man only from Manitoba and the North-West opposed to this Government—I think he is a free trader—there are not very many free traders in the House any way, but I think this is one of them—this one has made a great hullabaloo about binding twine.

If the farmers want the duty on binding twine taken off, they can get it taken off. The bye-elections do not indicate that the farmers do not want protection. I would give them protection until they got sick of it. There is no doubt that this is a most infamous combination, and I should think the Government would look to it. The object of protection is to start new industries and to give work to our own people. What is the effect of the combination in St. John? There was a cordage factory there which employed 30 or 40 or 50 men, but now it is closed; it is sold out; not a man gets any employment there. This American combine has bought it up, and so it has the Halifax factory, but I believe they are still running there. There is one little cordage factory in St. John which is not bought out. Mr. Anderson has been making cordage there nearly fifty years, with five of his own family and one or two hired men. He still holds on making rope, and this cordage combine undertook to break him up and shut him down. In order to do that they put down the price of lath ties to four cents a pound, less than the material costs to make it. Because he would not sell out to them they undertook to shut him up by putting down the price on that article, and they lost thousands of dollars without getting a cent of benefit, and at last they had to raise their price again. They lost thousands and thousands of dollars and failed in their attempt to buy out this small industry; they could not bribe him to sell out, though they offered him all sorts of inducements. When they could not get him to do it they said: You will hear from us; and how did that industry hear from them? They heard from the combine by the combine putting the price of one article of lath ties which they manufactured down to four cents a pound, really lower than the cost of the raw material before it was worked. The Government ought to look after a matter of this kind. They say they are getting the cordage manufacturers, by this protective policy, to make work for the people, to keep the people at home. Why do they allow a great American combine to come over here and buy up all the manufacturers of Canada? They have a capital now, I believe, of $17,000,000, and they are getting control of all the rope, and all the binding twine, and all the hemp that is used in the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and closing up our small industries. Mr. Connors, the other proprietor of that rope manufactory in St. John, is investing no capital, he has sold out, and the men whom he employed have gone somewhere else to find work. I do not know how it is in Halifax; I believe that is running, but the others have closed up. And so this system has worked. You talk about protection! Why, the whole thing is a fraud, the whole thing is based upon selfishness, upon greed, upon theft, upon stealing by law. The whole thing is an appeal to the selfishness of human nature, from beginning to end. Every industry that is protected successfully, can combine, and they will combine, and they do combine, and they have combined. And this is a huge combination. I would like to read an article I saw in the papers to show how they combine, and how the hon. member for Halifax was a member of that combine that visited St. John and tried to get that industry to come into the combination—I have been so informed, I do not wish to misrepresent him, but I have been informed that he visited that small manufactory carried on by Mr. Anderson, and they promised to assist him by machinery, because he was making his ropes in a humble way without much machinery. He has continued over a period of more than 40 years to carry on his industry, and they tried to close him up. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Assiniboia is a protectionist, but he comes down on this tax because a combination has grown out of it. What other industry of any considerable importance has not entered into a combination? Has not the cotton industry gone into a combination? Have not nearly all the manufacturers gone into a combination, and now they are getting protectionists on the other side of the line—they have got tired, or run out there, to some extent—to come here and start their industries. I do not want any American capitalists to come in here, if they are going to be protected, to plunder Canadians. Go down to the city of Montreal and you will find how they come over. After skinning the people in the United States, they come here and begin to make Mother Winslow's Soothing Syrup, and that is protected; and Diamond Dyes, and that is protected; and some sort of lacteal food, and that is protected; and all the humbugs and nostrums you can think of. They come in here and skin the Canadians, and after making their money they return to the States. Why is not Canada more of a country than she is? I am a Canadian, and I want Canada to prosper, but Canada can never prosper under protection, Canada can never prosper unless the restrictions upon her trade are removed. Why has not Canada more than five millions of people? One hundred years ago Canada, the colonies that did not revolt, started out with as good material as the United States. Those in the colonies that did not revolt, came into Canada a hundred years ago, and where are their descendants now? How do we stand as compared with our brethren on the other side of the line? Have we not got a country here that will yet contain teeming millions of people—and there is no increase. It is no use to talk about progress, and about prosperity in Canada. It does not exist. True, there is not much poverty, and there are not many people. If there was as many people as there are in the States, there would be poverty and starvation. But there are not many people, and in order to make your protection a success, you have to keep very few people, mighty few people, you cannot keep many under your system. However, protection seems to suit Canada, the people seem to like it, and our friends opposite seem to like it. But they do not say much about binding twine, I think they must have committed themselves on that during the campaign. If they have, of course the Government can afford to take that off, they have got revenue enough without it. If the farmers of Canada wanted binding twine free as much as the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces want it free, they would get it. The fishermen wanted free twine, and they got it, and when the farmers want it they can get it.

Motion agreed to.

RUNNING PRIVILEGES OVER THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Copies of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating to the use by the Canadian Pacific Railway of run-

ning privileges over the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and St. John; and copies of all agreements between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, or any department or officer of the Government of Canada relating to the running privileges given to the Canadian Pacific Railway over the Intercolonial Railway and to the payments to be made therefor; and also, of all agreements for the payments by the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the cars and engines of the latter run over the Intercolonial Railway.

He said: My object is simply to obtain information as to the amount that I suppose was paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the privileges that were given of running over the Intercolonial Railway, and the agreement that was entered into between the two companies. I gathered to-day from the answer given by the Minister of Public Works to the question I had on the Order Paper that the Canadian Pacific Railway do not pay anything for these running privileges, but they pay a small amount to them *per diem* per car, for the cars they run. The question I had on the Order Paper was: What is the total amount already paid them? But the hon. gentleman did not answer the question in that way. He merely aswered that they paid so much per car. Now, I am very anxious to get the facts in connection with their agreement. The condition of the Intercolonial Railway is in a more lamentable state than that of any other public work of Canada, in fact it is simply appalling. Already, for the seven months of the year, the deficit has been $600,000 odd, or at the rate of $1,000,000 a year. Either it is being run in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for the purpose of handing it over holus bolus to the Canadian Pacific Railway at an early date, or it is being run at a frightful rate of extravagance. Now, the late acting Minister of Railways made a pilgrimage into the Maritime Provinces this last summer for the purpose of examining into the condition of the Intercolonial Railway. We have never had his report yet. My motion is for the purpose of getting that report, if report he made, as I assume he did. But it is within the recollection of every hon. gentleman from the Maritime Provinces that after he returned to Ottawa an order was made—at any rate the newspapers said so—having for its object the placing of that road on somewhat of a commercial basis. Some five or six hundred voters who were kept in the pay of the Government for the purpose of voting in the elections, were to be dismissed—so the newspapers reported. I thought myself that the hon. gentleman, whom I see opposite, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), who last year contended very strenuously in this House that the Intercolonial Railway should be placed in the hands of a Commission, apart altogether from politicians, and political acts eliminated from it, and that the road should be run on a commercial basis,—I thought, judging from the remarks he made that he would have been one of the first to support any hon. Minister in reducing extravagance on that road. He may have done so; I do not know. We shall see; but the newspapers credited him with being one of a deputation that waited on the Government to request the withdrawal of the obnoxious order removing unnecessary men. He will be able to say whether the newspaper reports are correct or not. The newspaper criticisms lead us to believe that from top to bottom this railway is managed and operated on principles antagonistic to commercial ones, that it is to-day run as a political machine from Moncton to Halifax, that the men are kept there, not because they are required to do the work, but a very large number of unnecessary men are kept there, and if it should turn out to be true that the Minister did recommend the removal of 400 or 500 or even 250 men, that impression on the mind of the public will be to some extent justified. I am speaking now from newspaper reports entirely. They have not been contradicted. The telegrams came down that orders had been issued for the dismissal of a large number of men, and subsequently that the hon. member for Albert and others waited on the Government and sought to induce them to withdraw the order; and beyond that Parliament has no information, and I have no information. If these reports are untrue, I shall be glad to have them contradicted, and if true, I shall be glad to have the official papers so that the House may take cognizance of the matter and discuss it fully. Everybody knows this matter cannot go on as at present. Everybody knows we cannot have the Intercolonial Railway sinking $1,000,000 a year, and it is rumoured that arrangements made between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway are entirely in the Canadian Pacific Railway's interests. It is known that the Government permit agents of the Intercolonial Railway at the different stations to be agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is believed these agents work in the interests of their special employers, and not in the interests of those who permanently employ them. Whether it is so or not, I do not know; but we do know there must be a leakage of an extraordinary, abnormal, and dreadful character which this road never could create if fairly operated. Last year the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) made a speech in which he claimed that this road should be placed altogether outside the reach of politicians.

Mr. WELDON (Albert.) Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) The hon. gentleman cheers that statement. He desires the road to be placed in the hands of Commissioners appointed during life or good behaviour, in the hands of a Commission from which political influences are to be entirely eliminated. The road was to be run the same as the Canadian Pacific Railway, on commercial principles, and the hope was indulged in that if that plan were adopted and carried out, instead of having a deficit running from $300,000 to $500,000, the road would be able to meet its expenses. What is the consequence? There was a deficit of $360,000 for the corresponding seven months last year and $600,000 or $700,000 for the seven months ending 29th February last. Everyone must regret that owing to the absence of proper control, owing to the road being run in the interests either of the Canadian Pacific Railway designedly and wilfully or recklessly and without proper control, this great deficit has arisen, because it is not possible to have a deficit running up to $1,000,000 if the officials of the road are devoting themselves to running it in the public instead of in political interests. In Halifax there are an enormous number of employés who are ready to vote on a proper occasion. In Moncton it is the same. I hope that when the papers come down we shall be able to form a correct opinion both with regard to the arrangement with the

Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, and the motion will have the effect of inducing responsible parties to make a statement with respect to the newspaper comments in order that we may know whether the Minister did report in favour of dismissing a large number of employés and was checked in doing so owing to the actions of influential supporters in this House.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I feel it proper to say a word or two seeing that my name was referred to by the member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) who has moved this motion. That hon. gentleman has done me the honour to refer to a speech I made during the last session of Parliament, urging the placing of the Intercolonial Railway in the hands of a non-political commission secured by statute, with appointments running for a term of years, which commission should have control of this railway with the effect that the influence of members of Parliament would be taken away, and the road should be managed, not politically, but on commercial principles. I take occasion to-night to say that while I will not open an argument on this question, I stand by every word I spoke in that debate. I spoke my full and free mind. I believed in what I then said, and a year's reflection and some additional study of the reports of railway commissions in the colonies, and especially the report of one of those colonies which has made the experiment during the longest period, confirmed me in the soundness of my argument last year, and before this session closes I shall endeavour to address an argument to the same effect in this House, whether with a better result than last year, I do not know. I am perfectly convinced from our experience of this railway last year, that we will soon be driven to make this experiment. I have given careful study to the financial condition of the Intercolonial Railway during the year, some study to the accounts, and from what I have learned, I have not come to the conclusion that the deficit will be as large as one million, but I am told that it will be very large, somewhat larger, I fear, than last year. I deplore it, as I stated some months ago, and I think it, in considerable measure, arises from political management. I endeavoured, in the argument I presented a year ago, to point out that this railway appeared in the discussion when Mr. Mackenzie was Minister and when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister, and the latter hon. gentleman's record was phenomenally successful in regard to the reduction of deficit. He wiped out the deficit in two or three years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By charging capital account to expenditure.

Mr. WELDON. I will not argue the question now, but if it explains any part of it it explains only a small part. I will not as I said, argue the question now, although I am prepared to do so at another time when that question is more fairly before us on the merits. When Sir John Macdonald was Minister and when Mr. Pope was Minister it had but one record. I know that hon. members and Ministers differ from me, but I give as the result of my study of the question, that the cause is largely due to this: that the road has been under both parties and in all times in some degree encumbered and retarded with political management, which I think is relatively a wasteful and inefficient management as compared with the best obtainable management. I shall say little about the question now, because I shall have more to say on it at a later stage of this session. A word with reference to another matter personal to myself. As to the representations that the hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies) says he has sent me with respect to my conduct and action with reference to the dismissals at Moncton——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And Halifax.

Mr. WELDON. Yes; I did not know about this. In reference to that matter, I feel, however, that I should state openly in the House—whether it be prudent or imprudent I do not know—what I said to the Minister privately, and that is: that I thought that the dismissing of hundreds of men at two weeks' notice was a hasty measure. I asked for consideration, and I asked for delay, and I say here now what I said to the Minister then, that in my judgment, based upon the local circumstances of the case, and on some knowledge of the condition of the shops—I speak of Moncton where most of the men were—I say here to-night, publicly, that in my judgment it would be wiser, and in the long run better and much more advisable, if, instead of dismissing five hundred men, the dismissals were limited to two hundred, and these the less efficient of the men, and if the remaining three hundred were kept employed at repairing cars, which are not now fully employed, and in repairing engines, which are not now fully employed, the system would be better all round, and would be carried out with the result that a large number of men would not be suddenly and somewhat harshly dismissed, and further, that it would allow a shrinkage in the number of employés by death, the removal of restless men who move about from one place to another, and dismissals for cause. This would accomplish in a few months, or in a year at the outside, about what the Minister is seeking to be accomplished by his rigorous measure. In the main I am bound to say—and I believe the Minister will corroborate what I do say—that I felt bound to support him for the reasons given last year. This is my answer to the personal charge. I believe the number of men on the road was large, I believe it will always be large under political management, and I believe the abuse will be twice as great if to-morrow we were to put the gentlemen across the House into power, and place the gentleman who has spoken in the position of Minister of Railways.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has told us in fact that according to some information which the Minister of Railways had, there is a small army of unnecessary employés on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Five hundred.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, a little more than the full strength of an ordinary regiment. Notwithstanding, the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) thought it advisable not to have them dismissed summarily, and I commend his goodness of heart for this.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Particularly in view of the fact that there was a bye-election in Halifax.

Mr. MULOCK. The circumstance which my hon. friend reminds me of, that there was a bye-election in Halifax, in no way, I am sure, affected the opinion of the hon. gentleman as expressed to

the Minister. But, unfortunately there are some tax payers in this country who have got to pay the bill for bye-elections in Halifax and so on. I find that according to the Public Accounts there was a deficit on the Intercolonial Railway for the fiscal year ending 15th June, 1890, of $553,392.05; or over half a million of deficit in one year on a road about 800 miles in length. And as if that were not enough, I find that for the year closing the 30th June, 1891, that deficit had gone up to $684,946. In other words I find that the working expenses of this road under Government management amounts to about 120 per cent of the gross receipts. Ordinarily it is thought that 65 or 70 per cent of the receipts of an established railway, represents a liberal allowance for working expenses, but here we have a Government railway absorbing all the gross receipts and nearly 20 per cent more. Why, it is worse than the Caraquet Railway. It is the worst showing, I fancy, that ever disgraced a country, and if this were not bad enough, the figures furnished for six months ending the 1st February last are infinitely worse. I find in the reply to the question put by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the deficit for the six months ending the 1st February, 1892, was $371,142 greater than it was for the corresponding period of last year. While last year the deficit exceeded that of the previous year by over $100,000, for the six months of the year not yet completed, the gross deficit is $645,843.02 or $371,142.67 greater than it was last year. Notwithstanding all this, we are told there are on the Intercolonial Railway five hundred men or thereabouts too many. How comes it that this enormous increase happened last year; how comes this enormous increase during the year of a general election? How comes it that the increase incurred during the last six months during bye-elections in the Maritime Provinces? There is not a man on the other side of the House who offers an explanation. We are told that it is necessary to tax enormously the people of Canada to maintain the administration of the Government on that basis; that it is necessary for the glory of Canada to maintain a tariff policy that enables these things to be done. It is wicked, it is unjustifiable, it is a disgrace to the Administration, and if it is not remedied soon I trust that steps will be taken to remove a Government that is so untrue to the best interests of the country.

Mr. HAGGART. There cannot be the slightest objection to bring down all the papers asked for by the hon. gentleman in reference to the agreement made between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway for running power over that road. As you know, we subsidized or assisted the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of having communication between older Canada and the ports of St. John, St. Andrews and Halifax, and in order to allow them to make use of it, we entered into a traffic arrangement by which they were permitted to carry traffic over our Intercolonial Railway. The agreement is simply with reference to rolling stock. We give the Canadian Pacific Railway the power of running over the Intercolonial Railway. They do not use their own engines, and we pay them the usual rates when we use their freight and passenger cars. The deficit in the preceding part of the year was caused mainly by large abnormal expenditures which were made upon the road at that time. They did amount, as the hon. gentleman says, to an enormous sum; but when he sees the expenditure for the remaining months of the year, he will find that the deficit will not amount to nearly what he expects it will. I hope that from this out the road, under proper management, will show no such enormous deficit as it has done in the past. I hope that the expenditure and the receipts will nearly balance. In order that this result may be reached, there must be extensive changes in the management of the road; there must be a large reduction in the staff, and a reduction in the number of trains run. The hon. gentleman accuses us with being influenced by members supporting the Government, not to carry out certain dismissals on the road, but the facts of the matter have been fully explained by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). I do not remember that I had even a conversation with that hon. gentleman upon the subject. A notice was simply sent to the different employés whose services would not be required, under the management which was to ensue for the purpose of greater economy, and with the view of making the receipts and expenditure nearly balance. Some of my friends urged that perhaps the notice was too short.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To take place before the bye-elections.

Mr. HAGGART. No, the bye-elections were over. As to the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the Intercolonial Railway agents being used as agents for the Canadian Pacific Railway, the instructions given to them are entirely to the contrary. They are instructed not to ask for freight either for the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway; but when a person, wishing to send goods on the railway, asks for the rates over the different routes, the instructions to the agents are to give them, and on no account to tout for freight or passengers over one line or the other. There can be no objection to bringing down the agreement, and when it comes it will be found to be a simple traffic agreement as to the conveyance of freight and passengers along the line of the road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We shall all be exceedingly glad if the hon. gentleman carries out these promises of retrenchment which he makes to the House. We have heard them before, and we know how they have been carried out before. As to the present condition of the Intercolonial Railway, I will only say this, that, if it can be found possible, as the hon. gentleman seems to intimate, to decrease the number of employés by several hundreds, that is, in itself, about as clear evidence as could be given of the extravagance, and the reasons for the extravagance, in the past management of the road. As my hon. friend has pointed out, the expenditure on this road is out of all proportion. I do not think another case of a railway in which the expenditure was twenty or thirty per cent above the total receipts has ever been known, and I may remind the House that all the time this huge expenditure on ordinary account has been going, we have seen very great additions continually made to the capital account of the Intercolonial, which now stands at a great many millions more than it did at the time Mr. Mackenzie proposed to close that account. Then, Sir, I think that the arrangement hinted at by the hon. Minister of Railways between

the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway is, to say the least, one of a very extraordinary character. As a rule, it would be very much more to the interest of the Intercolonial Railway that the traffic which passes over it should be carried for as long a distance as possible over the Intercolonial line, which connects with the Grand Trunk instead of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What I understand to have been done by the Government of Canada has been this—first of all, largely to subsidize a road passing through foreign territory, through the State of Maine, for the purpose of cutting the throat of the Intercolonial in which we have invested over $50,000,000, in which they appear to have been most notably successful, whatever their policy may have been, for they have succeeded in rendering it about as useless an asset as they possibly have; and they are now aiding and assisting the Canadian Pacific Railway —because it amounts to that—in diverting the traffic from the Intercolonial for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway. As I understand these agents along the line of the Intercolonial are the paid agents of the Government, paid to obtain and conduct traffic on the Intercolonial road.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I think it would be for the interest of the people of Canada who own the Intercolonial Railway that the traffic should be as far as possible drawn along that line, and if you throw it instead upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, you most assuredly deprive the Intercolonial Railway of a considerable proportion of the traffic it would otherwise enjoy.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a similar arrangement with the Grand Trunk.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that. It is in the interest of the people of Canada that the agents of the Intercolonial Railway should be employed to send the traffic as much as possible over the Intercolonial Railway, and for that reason —not for any preference to one road over another— it is more profitable to send it by the Grand Trunk. Every hon. gentleman who knows anything of the subject knows that. Sir, the whole business shows in the clearest possible way what we have gained for ourselves by deliberately subsidizing a road, as we did in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to cut the throat of a road which we own ourselves, and in which we have invested over $50,000,000.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. BOWELL. With the consent of the House, I desire to make a motion to add the members introduced to-day and yesterday to the different committees. I have shown the proposition I propose to make to the leader of the Opposition, who has consented to the same. I move:

That the following members be added to the Select Standing Committees:—Mr. Boyle, Railways and Canals, Banking and Commerce, Public Accounts; Mr. Gillies, Railways and Canals, Banking and Commerce, Private Bills; Mr. Pridham, Agriculture and Colonization, Expiring Laws, Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. AMYOT. I think it my duty, at this stage of the session, to say a few words about my own position and the conclusions to be drawn by me from recent events. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that the question of a revenue tariff and a protective tariff came up in 1877. In 1878 the late Sir John Macdonald proposed that a protective tariff should be substituted for a revenue tariff, so as to lead us to reciprocity with the States. Then the people were consulted and declared in favour of protection, and protection became law. For the first years things went on very well. We saw new industries, manufactures and so on, but very soon the market was overcrowded, and the manufacturers asked for further protection. Further protection was granted to some of them, but still that did not suffice. Later on the hon. leader of the Opposition, following the intimation contained in Sir John Macdonald's motion, proposed to the country that we should have reciprocity, and made of that proposal the principal plank of his platform. The people were consulted and answered, not by a majority but by a large number, that they would like reciprocity, and the Government themselves seemed anxious to have it. The Government went twice to Washington to obtain it, and to-day we have got the answer from a member of the Government that they cannot obtain reciprocity from the States. I have listened attentively to the discussion, and I have heard it said on the left that the Government were not serious, that they had only gone to the States to set forth what were the objections to reciprocity. I have considered the matter very seriously and I cannot take that view. It strikes me that if the United States wanted to come into a treaty at all with us, they would say so. They are not children, they know what they want. They are interested in reciprocity, as well as us. They are interested in buying from us as well as in selling to us, and if they are not going to give us reciprocity they must have some reason for it. By looking into the McKinley tariff, and their press, I have convinced myself that the United States will not enter into a treaty with Canada while we are a colony. They want America for the Americans. They want the Munroe doctrine to prevail, and so long as we are a colony of England we will not have reciprocity with the States. That is a very decided matter with them. At all events, such is my conviction, and I cannot understand otherwise how a nation of 60,000,000 would not be able to say: "Well, we will reciprocate with you." If the United States will not give us reciprocity, what is our position? We have got a protective tariff with which some people are not satisfied. But what have they to look out for? Will they ask for free trade, and entire free trade, because restrictive free trade is nothing but protection or revenue tariff? I am one of those who believe that free trade, generally speaking, is for the good of a country, and I even believe this country is sufficiently developed to establish free trade; but both political parties, since thirty or forty years, have educated the people to hold direct taxation in horror, and you cannot have free trade without direct taxation to provide for the

administration of affairs. Then shall we ask for Imperial Federation? It is a very fine dream, but I cannot see anything in it. Some will speak of commercial union. I am sure, and all those who have gone to London, Liverpool, Birmingham, and all those places, will agree with me, that England will never abandon her commerce with the whole world for the sake of a few colonies. She would rather lose the best of her colonies than give up that immense commerce she has with the whole world, and which makes her richness and greatness. We are therefore in this position, that we have to stick to the actual system or look for a rupture of the colonial tie in order to obtain reciprocity by means of annexation, that is commercial union or political union with the United States. For my part, I think the time has not arrived when we can speak of annexation in this House. We are a colony, and a colony we must remain until the education of the people in Canada and England will have prepared us for either independency or annexation. As the Americans will not deal with us, we must try to become more and more independent of them. We must try to use all the resources which nature has given us. Rapid navigation approaches to us France and England. We forget too much that there is a great commerce to be done with France. There are Spain and even Asia with which we can do commerce. We must encourage navigation, we must make our harbours safe, we must protect them from the operations of the ship labourers' societies. They constitute a great evil which will, at a given moment, if we do not take care, prove very dangerous, even ruinous. It has ruined one port, that of Quebec, so that no vessel will stop there now. We must look for new markets for our products, and if we continue administering public affairs with economy and wisdom, by the help of enterprises within the measure of means, we will go on in Canada being happy. A great many have gone, it is true, but if those who remain are happy what can we ask more? We have no war to endure and we are in sufficient numbers to suffice to ourselves. We contend that we are satisfied. We live happy here. Let us go on to try and do the best we can with what we have. At all events, I do not see that from the left comes any proposal better than to go on with the state in which we are at present. Being of that opinion, I believe it to be my duty not only not to throw any obstacle in the way of the Government, but to give them my humble support. I shall be asked: Why do you not remain in the ranks of the Opposition, where there is a great *rôle* to play? Mr. Speaker, I will be frank. As you know, perhaps, I was born a Conservative. I entered this House a Conservative. In 1885, due to the press of both parties, due to some Ministers whom I do not see here now, there was a great movement formed in the Province of Quebec which was called the National movement, about the hanging of Riel. I will not go into any detail. I joined that movement. I see in this House some members who joined it also, and I did my best for that movement. It was extended to provincial affairs in spite of me, but the almost unanimous view of the party was that they wanted to fight in the Local as well as in the Federal Legislature on the basis of that movement. And what has become of that movement? The chief was chosen in our province. I will not attack him. His party is scattered all over, and he, I may say, is politically dead in the mud. Can I remain with that party in the province? I do not think so. I did my best for them; I was with them to the last upon the constitutional issue. Last year, when there was an *enquête* in the Senate, and I defended them here, affirming that the affair constituted no offence, the three eminent judges who were appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, or by his order, decided that the Hon. Mr. Mercier knew nothing about the transaction. And what was the affair after all? Nothing, but the execution of the law, and so my opinion was vindicated. But after that, new commissions were appointed and, unfortunately, so many crimes were found out that the Governor was justified by the people in taking the constitution into his hands and forcing out the Ministers. So far as I am concerned I can no longer belong to the National movement, and in our province the National movement is dead. In this House of Commons there was the question of the hanging of Riel, but the people approved of the action of the Government, and that is a dead issue. Then, when the question of reciprocity came on, I did my best for that also; but to-day I say in conscience that I believe that question is a dead issue. It can no longer be a question before the people because the States will not have it. Are we going many more times to the doors of the States with a basket in our hands asking for charity? I think, in view of all these matters, I am authorized to erase from before my title of "National Conservative" the word "National" and leave only the word "Conservative." I must say that the leader under whom I served in the ranks of the left I found to be a real statesman. I know, and the country at large knows, his brilliant and abundant talents, his energy, his generous character, his perfect honesty and his sincerity, and I will tell you frankly, Sir, that, if I thought by leaving his ranks now I would injure his cause in any way or retard for one moment his accession to power, I would rather withdraw from politics than do it; but under the circumstances, when there is such a majority, how can I injure his case? At all events, if it was his desire, I would be willing to open the constituency and give him the opportunity to redeem the county I represent. A party is not composed of one man only, however eminent he may be. A party is composed of a chief and an army, and that army must support the chief. What kind of support has the hon. the leader of the Opposition received from his party? At the last general elections, I remember I was fighting in a few counties under his banner, when the words of the Hon. Edward Blake came, criticising, condemning the policy of the chief of the Opposition. The principal man in the party after the hon. leader in this House condemning the policy of the party, throwing despair into the ranks, is that giving support to the chief of the party? That was, perhaps, one of the causes why the Opposition did not come out victorious from the last general election. A party so divided is no party at all. And then we see the chief organ of the party, the *Globe*, constantly throwing obstacles and preventing the leader of the Opposition in this House from succeeding in his plans. And I am told that some of those who are expected to become Ministers, when the hon. the leader of the Opposition will be Prime Minister, are the leaders and controllers of the *Globe*, and

we do not hear any of them protesting or saying that the *Globe* is not the organ of the party. And every day in the province from which I come, and from which the leader of the opposition comes, we are exposed to the humiliation of believing that all these articles are directed against that leader because he comes from that province. I say that any party that has such an organ, and has not the energy to dissociate itself from it, to repudiate it, is not a party that should have the confidence of those soldiers who like to fight under a chief in whom all the members of the army have confidence. One of the reasons why I leave that party and go back to the party of my youth is that I find that that noble leader does not receive from his party the support he deserves. Besides, do we not find in the great Province of Ontario constituencies changing the majorities they gave for that party into large minorities, thus telling him, You are not the man we want because you are from the Province of Quebec. That, at least, is the impression in the province from which I come. And we have seen the *Globe* daily telling the people of Ontario—though it was none of their business—how bad was Mr. Mercier, and arranging things so that the other papers which were enemies to the leader of the Opposition in this House might couple his name with that of Mr. Mercier. That is another piece of treachery on the part of the *Globe* which I cannot approve. I would have liked those who sit near the hon. leader of the left to protest in time and to say: It is not our organ, it does not represent our party. For my part I resent it, and ardent fighter as I am generally, I have no heart to remain any longer in the ranks of a party which gave up its chief in that way. I will say nothing against the Opposition in other respects, but I believe they lack cohesion. They do not seem to have any definite principles or policy. They seem to live on expediency; they have nothing to do except to invent and multiply crimes, to propose Bills to protect animals, and to impose upon the people the observance of the Lord's Day. I do not see much else in their programme. I will admit with the greatest pleasure that I have found in the ranks of the left a great many eminent citizens and patriots, well learned in all the branches, but taken as a whole, I do not think that the left, as at present constituted, if they came into power, could do as much good for the country as the right can do now. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that I will be accused of joining the largest battalion. Here is my answer: In 1885, on a question of principle, I left my friends on the right. They were then in power both at Ottawa and at Quebec, and I went into the cold shades of Opposition. I think I may boast that my convictions have always been my sole master, guided, as I hope I always have been, by my anxiety to serve my country in the best way I could. Before drawing my remarks to a close I wish to thank the honoured leader of the left for his constant kindness to me, for the great service he has always rendered me. I leave the left without having, I hope, a single enemy. All I do is for the sake of my country, which I love, and which I intend to serve the best way I can.

Mr. CAMERON. At this late hour in the evening it is not my intention to detain the House at any very great length; but I deem it my duty to make a few observations in reference to a statement made by my hon. friend the senior member for Prince County, Prince Edward Island. On Friday last, when I had the honour of moving the adjournment of the debate, it was simply because my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island made a statement which I then believed, and still believe, was not accurate, and I deem it my duty in my place to correct it. He said:

"I do not wonder at gentlemen in the Government benches not having the strength to come forward to give expression to their sentiments on this occasion, because a great many of them, especially gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, had pledged themselves on the eve of the last general elections, that they were in favour of free trade with the United States. I am aware that in my province the candidates on both sides of politics expressed themselves for unrestricted reciprocity, and I am also aware that they did the same thing in Nova Scotia. In fact, I believe the Minister of Finance pledged himself at one meeting that he would give the people unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. We, however, find now that the actions of these gentlemen speak louder than their words, and when free trade is proposed from this side of the House hon. gentlemen opposite vote straight against it."

Now, I have no hesitation in saying that so far as I am aware, no candidate of the Liberal-Conservative party in any constituency in the Maritime Provinces, declared himself in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. On the contrary, at every hustings, so far as I know, the Liberal-Conservative candidates pledged themselves directly against any such policy. The basis of the policy on which the Liberal-Conservative party contested the late general election was fully explained in a dispatch from the Governor General of this Dominion to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in December, 1890. The dispatch proves the earnest desire of the Administration to develop a fair trade between the United States and Canada, but it did not contemplate unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union, or annexation. The dispatch reads as follows:—

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE, OTTAWA, 13th Dec., 1890.

"MY LORD,—I have the honour to send to Your Lordship to-day a telegraph despatch in cipher, of which the following is the substance:

"With reference to my telegram of the 10th inst., the Government is desirous to propose a joint commission to deal without limitation, and to prepare a treaty of reciprocity on the following subjects, viz.:—

"(1) Renewal of the treaty of 1854, with modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries and with the extensions deemed by the commission to be in the interest of Canada and the United States.

"(2) Reconsideration of the treaty of 1888 with respect to the Atlantic fisheries, with the aim of securing free admission into United States markets of Canadian fishery products in return for facilities to be granted to United States fishermen to buy bait and supplies, and to tranship cargoes in Canada. All such privileges to be mutual.

"(3) Protection of mackerel and other fisheries on the Atlantic ocean and in inland waters also.

"(4) Relation of sea-board coasting laws of the two countries.

"(5) Relation of the coasting laws of the two countries on the inland waters dividing Canada from the United States.

"(6) Mutual salvage and saving of wrecked vessels.

"(7) Arrangements for settling the boundary between Canada and Alaska.

"The treaty would, of course, be *ad referendum*."

This was the basis of the policy which the Liberal-Conservative party adopted, and on which they went to the country in 1891; but any assertion to the effect that the Liberal-Conservative party advocated either unrestricted reciprocity, or free trade, or commercial union with the United States, is a statement that is not borne out by the facts. The Halifax *Morning Chronicle*, of the 18th November,

1890, very fairly defines what unrestricted reciprocity means in the opinion of the Liberal party of this Dominion. In fact there are so many definitions of that policy, that it is very difficult for a person who opposes it to realize the opinion of those who advocate it. The *Chronicle* is a very high authority on the definition of policies generally, and particularly on the definition of the Liberal policy. It says:

"The Liberal party wants unrestricted reciprocity or free trade with the United States, leaving each country to have any protection it pleases against the rest of the world. It does not propose an assimilation of tariffs; on the contrary it distinctly repudiates that idea."

I presume that when the *Morning Chronicle*, the organ of the Liberal party in the Maritime Provinces, realizes the proposition which Mr. Blaine made to the Canadian delegates at the recent convention at Washington, it will either have to change its definition of what unrestricted reciprocity means, or abandon the platform which the Liberal party seems determined to adopt and pursue. Those of us who oppose unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union, feel that the effect of it would be: (1) the adoption of the McKinley tariff for Canada; (2) direct taxation for federal purposes to the extent of at least $15,000,000 per annum; (3) the closing of every blast furnace, foundry, boot and shoe factory, cotton mill, sugar refinery, and indeed, almost every manufacturing establishment; (4) the transference of the wholesale business from Halifax, St. John, Montreal and Toronto to Boston and New York; (5) the closing within twelve months of every coal mine in Nova Scotia; (6) the end forever of all hope of Louisburg becoming the winter port of Canada. I hope my hon. friends from St. John and Halifax will pardon me if I express the opinion that neither of those great cities is suitable for a winter port for this Dominion, and I claim that in course of time, when the question is thoroughly understood in this Dominion, Louisburg will be made the winter port of Canada. (7) The speedy reduction of the agricultural population of all eastern Canada to the same deplorable condition as that in which the agricultural population of New England and northern New York now find themselves,—utterly unable to contend with western competition and overwhelmed with an ever-increasing load of direct taxation. In return for this the only inducement offered by the Liberal party is Grit rule. People who remember what Grit rule was when we had it, and with what unanimity and alacrity the electorate of the country dispensed with it, can judge for themselves whether that boon is worth the price Messrs. Gould, Wiman, Longley, Farrer, and others ask for it. There is one other proof which has been lately advanced as to the injurious effect of the National Policy. That proof is based upon the exodus of population. I have examined the increase, slow as it may be, of the population in the Province of Nova Scotia. I find that in 1861 the population was 330,857, in 1871 387,800, in 1881 440,572, in 1891 450,492. The increase between 1861 and 1871 was 46,957, between 1871 and 1881 52,772, between 1881 and 1891 only 9,920. This is only the apparent increase and not the real one, as I can show from evidence which hon. gentlemen opposite will not attempt to controvert. But coming down to the population of the county which I have the honour to represent, I find the decennial falling off in the increase has also been very material and compares to a large extent with the increase in the whole population. In 1861 the population was 19,967, in 1871 23,415, an increase of 3,448; in 1881 the population was 25,651, an increase of 2,236; and in 1891 the population was 25,779 or an increase of 128. The falling off was greater between 1871 and 1881 than between 1861 and 1871 in the county, and the greatest falling off was during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. The apparent exodus from the Dominion is not real. The real cause of the loss of increase in population as shown by the census is simply because the instructions to the enumerators during the last census were very different from the instructions given for taking the previous decennial census. Previous to that time there was no time limit for absentees. At the last census enumerators were instructed to take no account of any person who was absent for over 12 months. The folly of taking the census on the basis of enumerating all those who had been absent for a long period may be inferred from expressions of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question on previous occasions. On page 2387 of *Hansard* for 1890 the member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) said:

"I know that in some cases young men who had been absent for years from Canada, and who did not belong to Canada in any sense, were still returned in the census of 1881 as belonging to Canada."

The senior member for Queen's (P.E.I.) said:

"Speaking of matters which came to my own knowledge with regard to 1881 census, I noticed that many enumerators, taking as they said their returns under instruction, took from the head of the house not only the number of his family and of the servants who were at home with him, but the names and members of those who had left many years before: the only question asked being 'Do you think he will ever return?' Well, 'ever' is a big word and the father of the house did not want to banish all hopes that some time or other, his son who had left home to make a living abroad, and was continuing to make his home abroad and to be a resident of another country, might return. In this way the names of hundreds and thousands were put down, who had, for all practical purposes, left Canada, made a new home for themselves and became naturalized in the United States. So far as my knowledge goes, and I took pains to enquire at the time, all these names were entered in the enumerators' lists and returned as composing a part of the population of Canada. Well, if the same system was followed in the larger provinces, the total results would be so misleading that no one could form even an approximate idea of what the population of this country was."

This was the verdict of the senior member for Queen's, of the manner in which the census was taken in 1881. In order to corroborate his statement I may say that Mr. Blake the late Liberal leader said:

"The information which I received from many parts of the country was that people who had been away 20 years and were permanently away were put on the enumerators' lists. As the hon. member from Queen's has said, if a father were asked whether he expected his boy who had been away some 15 or 20 years never to come back, of course, the father, in the hope of having his son pay him a visit, would say certainly he expected him back. The son's name was put down. That is the report I received from many quarters."

It is evident upon the reasoning of hon. members opposite that the census of 1861, of 1871 and of 1881 were misleading to an enormous extent, and that the census taken in 1891 was as nearly correct as it could be made under the circumstances. Now when I tell my hon. friends opposite that the exodus from Nova Scotia particularly—and I believe the same was the case all over the Dominion—was greater during the period of the Reciprocity

Treaty between 1854 and 1866 than it was during any time in the history of Canada, they will probably think that the idea had never struck them before. I have no hesitation in saying that the exodus from Nova Scotia was much larger between 1854 and 1866 than it was during any period since that time. There were many reasons for this. One special reason in Nova Scotia was that during the reciprocity between 1854 and 1866 the Americans had the right to fish on the sea coast of Nova Scotia within the three-mile limit. At that time they had not among themselves experienced fishermen who understood the nature of the fishing grounds on that coast. Hundreds of vessels from the ports of the New England States came to Nova Scotia and secured their fishermen there. They fished on the American vessels during the whole season, and in the fall of the year, these "half liners," as they were called, went to the United States and obtained their money for their summer's labour. The result of this was that a very large number of those who were engaged in fishing in the United States vessels between 1854 and 1866, became permanent residents of the States. Besides giving the summer employment to our fishermen, as soon as ever they reached the American ports in the fall of the year for the purpose of obtaining their earnings, they were immediately engaged for the prosecution of the fisheries on the banks and in the deep seas, and many a precious life of the manhood and youth of Nova Scotia has been lost on the Georges from American vessels. Now, not only was this a great cause of the exodus during the reciprocity treaty, but there was another reason also which existed, not only in Nova Scotia, but in the other parts of the Dominion as well. The trade relations which existed between these two countries during the reciprocity treaty were of such a character that they not only had an interchange of commodities between these two countries, but it also encouraged the mixing of the peoples from the two sides of the line with each other, and the consequence was that a large number of our people went to the United States then and became permanent residents. In 1871 the census enumerated all these people who left the country between 1854 and 1866. We have the evidence of this fact from the assurance given us by the senior member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), of the manner in which the census was taken in his province, and from the member from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), of the manner in which it was taken in Quebec, and from the late leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) as to the manner in which it was taken in Ontario. It is well known that between 1854 and 1866 there existed an appalling Civil War in the United States. Millions of people were called from various industries in the States, and therefore a large demand for labour was caused by the taking away of people from their various vocations to enlist them in the army. This caused a great demand for labourers from the different provinces of Canada, and the result was, that the exodus from Canada during the reciprocity treaty was so large that it formed a nucleus by which emigration was encouraged from Canada, from that period up to the present time. The census were misleading from 1861 up, because the exodus between 1854 and 1866 was included in the census of every year until 1891. I have therefore no hesitation in saying that if the census of 1891 was taken without a limit of time for the absentees from this Dominion in the same way as the previous census were taken, the proportion of increase in the population in this Dominion would be just as large as it had been under previous census. It is therefore not reasonable to charge the National Policy with the falling off in the increase of population, because the causes which led to such a large exodus were causes which I am sorry to say existed before the adoption of the National Policy, and are unfortunately likely to continue to exist. So far as I am concerned myself, I am perfectly satisfied, and I believe that every reasonable person in this Dominion will be satisfied as well, that the National Policy has had nothing to do with the exodus from Canada, but that it has arisen to a very large extent from the fact that many of our people were induced to leave the country by the conditions which existed between the two countries from 1854 to 1866, who now encourage their relatives and friends to follow them to the United States. Various attempts have been made to secure reciprocity with the United States since that time. Both political parties have attempted to secure reciprocity on fair terms. The Liberal-Conservative party showed their desire for this when they placed an offer on the Statutes of this Dominion which enabled them, even during the recesses of this Parliament, to adopt reciprocity with the United States on many articles from which the United States would remove the duty. This offer applied to all the products of the farm, the mine, the sea and the fisheries—in other words, to all the natural products of this Dominion. When our delegation asked in the late convention at Washington, whether the American people were prepared to adopt reciprocity on the terms on which we went to the country in 1891, on the basis of the reciprocity which existed between the two countries from 1854 to 1866, with such modifications as the interests of both countries demanded since that time, they were informed unhesitatingly that the American people would not agree to any such reciprocity. In a word, the American Government refused to adopt any reciprocity which would not assimilate the tariff of Canada with the tariff of the United States. They even went further and refused to agree to any reciprocity which would not assimilate the excise duties of Canada to those of the United States. This would cause an immense loss of revenue. As I have already intimated, the loss of revenue on account of the assimilation of the Customs duties would amount to not less than $15,000,000, and the assimilation of the Excise duties would involve a reduction I presume of not less than $5,000,000 more. So that under unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that the people of this Dominion would be compelled to provide by direct taxation for not less than $20,000,000 annually. It may be said that a large reduction ought to be made in the public expenditure of this Dominion in order to lessen that enormous taxation. But I am one of those who would deplore the day when any Government of this Dominion would curtail to any extent the expenses of the country, whether on railways, canals or public works, which are essential for the distribution of the products of the Dominion, or on harbours or any other public works which tend to improve the condition of our people. Any Govern-

ment which would adopt such a policy as that would fall. The Liberal Government endeavoured to curtail the expenses of this Dominion and reduce taxation, as they thought, and the result was that there was a depression all over the land, that the people could not get employment, and that owing to irritation which the failure of their policy excited in this Dominion they were hurled from power; and as long as they advocate unrestricted reciprocity, in my judgment they will never gain power in this Dominion. There is such a thing as history repeating itself. The declaration made at the late convention at Washington proves conclusively the terms on which the American people will adopt reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada. Notwithstanding various offers which have been made by Canada to the United States from 1866 up to the present time, it is a singular fact that the United States never advance one step or make any reasonable proposition whatever to the Dominion. Now, I agree with my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the opinion he expressed in Prince Edward Island while his party were in power. I think it is most humiliating to the independent people of this Dominion to be continually knocking at the doors of the United States for reciprocity, while every sensible man, woman and child in this Dominion must know that there is not the slightest intention on the part of the American people to grant Canada trade relations on favourable terms under any circumstances whatever. They are led to believe that if they turn the screw a little further, and bring a little more pressure on the people of this Dominion, they can force them into annexation. In this they are unquestionably mistaken. But, as I intimated, history repeats itself. This is not the only occasion on which our delegates failed at Washington. This is not the first occasion on which our ablest statesmen failed to make an impression on the American Government. I hope my hon. friends will pardon me if I refer to an agitation which existed, I believe in 1865, to influence the American people to continue reciprocity. At that time the agitation was conducted not by politicians. It is a deplorable state of things that this agitation has been hurled into the political arena. My own opinion is frankly that this should never have been done. The agitation for improved trade relations between Canada and the United States should be carried on between the boards of trade in various parts of the Dominion and boards of trade in the United States. I feel that using it as a party machine for such a length of time has been to a large extent a cause of retarding the consummation of reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I thought you said it could not be got.

Mr. CAMERON. I say now without any doubt whatever, that it cannot be obtained as long as we are persistently and continuously begging at the doors of the Washington authorities for a renewal of reciprocity. If my hon. friend the philosopher of Bothwell had a horse to sell, and an American approached him for the purpose of purchasing it, I do not believe he would say, "My Yankee friend, I have a valuable horse for sale, and I must sell it; unless I sell this horse in three months, I have a note due at the bank, I expect that an execution will be issued against me, and unless you buy this horse from me, I have no doubt I shall be a ruined man—blue ruin will overtake me and my family." This is the kind of argument hon. gentlemen opposite have been using with the Government of the United States; and just as the Yankee trader would pay the hon. gentleman only a small price for his horse, or possibly not buy it at all, so we shall be treated by the American Government if we tell them that we cannot live without them, and that the only way in which we can live is by obtaining unrestricted reciprocity or by annexation. This is just what they want on the other side, and while they have an idea of securing the annexation of Canada to the United States, so long will they refuse to give us reciprocity on any terms whatever. Before I digressed, owing to the interruption, I was asking the House to patiently listen to me while I read a paragraph or two from the speech of a gentleman who was attempting on a previous occasion to secure reciprocity with the United States. When I mention the name of the speaker, I am sure every liberal in this House will agree with me that he was a gentleman in whom they at least, then and now, should rely implicitly. I refer now to the convention which was held at Detroit in 1865. It was composed of delegates from the various boards of trade in several parts of this Dominion and the United States, and if it was left to them from that time up to the present, the prospects of fair reciprocity would have been very much better than they have been for the reasons I have stated. Mr. Howe, at that convention, spoke on this question as follows:—

"What is that question? Sir, we are here to determine how best we can draw together, in the bonds of peace, friendship and commercial prosperity, the three great branches of the British family. (Cheers.) In the presence of this great theme all petty interests should stand rebuked—we are not dealing with the concerns of a city, a province or a State, but with the future of our race in all time to come. Some reference has been made to 'Elevators' in your discussions. What we want is an elevator to lift our souls to the height of this argument. Why should not these three great branches of the family flourish, under different systems of government, it may be, but forming one grand whole, proud of a common origin and of their advanced civilization? We are taught to reverence the mystery of the Trinity, and our salvation depends on our belief. The clover lifts its try-foil leaves to the evening dew, yet they draw their nourishment from a single stem. Thus distinct, and yet united, let us live and flourish. Why should we not? For nearly two thousand years we were one family. Our fathers fought side by side at Hastings, and heard the curfew toll. They fought in the same ranks for the sepulchre of our Saviour—in the earlier and later civil wars. We can wear our white and red roses without a blush, and glory in the principles those conflicts established. Our common ancestors won the great Charter and the Bill of Rights—established free Parliaments, the Habeas Corpus, and Trial by Jury. Our jurisprudence comes down from Coke and Mansfield to Marshall and Story, rich in knowledge and experience, which no man can divide. From Chaucer to Shakespeare our literature is common inheritance. Tennyson and Longfellow write in one language, which is enriched by the genius developed on either side of the Atlantic. In the great navigators from Cotterel to Hudson, and in all their 'moving accidents by flood and field,' we have a common interest. On this side of the sea we have been largely reinforced by the Germans and French, but there is strength in both elements. The Germans gave to us the sovereigns who establish our freedom, and they gave to you industry, intelligence and thrift: and the French, who have distinguished themselves in arts and arms for centuries, now strengthen the provinces which the fortune of war decided they could not control. But it may be said we have been divided by two wars. What then? The noble St. Lawrence is split in two places—by Goat Island and by Anticosti—but it comes down to us from the same springs in the same mountain sides; its waters sweep together past the Pictured Rocks of Lake Superior, and

encircle in their loving embrace the shores of Huron and Michigan. They are divided at Niagara Falls as we were at the Revolutionary War: but they come together again on the peaceful bosom of Ontario. Again they are divided on their passage to the sea: but who thinks of divisions when they lift the keels of Commerce, or when drawn up to heaven they form the rainbow or the cloud? It is true that in eighty-five years we have had two wars: but what then? Since the last we have had fifty years of peace, and there have been more people killed in a single campaign in the late civil war than there were in the two national wars between this country and Great Britain The people of the United States hope to draw together the two conflicting elements and make them one people. And in that task I wish them God speed! And in the same way I feel that we ought to rule out everything disagreeable in the recollection of our old wars, and unite together as one people for all time to come. I see around the door the flags of the two countries. United as they are there, I would ever have them draped together, fold within fold, and let 'their varying tints unite and form in heaven's light, one arch of peace,'"

These were the introductory remarks to an argument in favour of a renewal of reciprocity, and the reasons given are that the people of Canada and the United States should live in harmony and peace and renew fair trade relations—not unrestricted reciprocity, not free trade—with the United States. Fair trade is what the Liberal Conservative party of to-day are willing and anxious to obtain if we can only secure it. He completed his appeal in those words:

"Mr. Chairman, I must now touch upon a subject of some delicacy and importance. It has been urged by Mr. Morrill, in Congress, and by the people of the United States, that the treaty ought not to be renewed because it had bred no friendship towards them across the lakes—that in their struggle the sympathies of the provinces were with the south. Well, if that were true in its fullest extent, which it was not, if you had not had one sympathiser among the native people and British residents of the provinces, it could be fairly pleaded in response that when Great Britain was at war with Russia the sympathies of the American people were very generally with the latter country. I was in the United States at the time, and was perfectly astonished at the feeling. Russia was at that time a country full of slaves, for the serfs had not been emancipated, and England was at war with her to prevent her aggressions upon weak neighbouring countries. How the American people could sympathise with Russia was a perfect puzzle at first sight, and could only be explained in the same manner that much of the sympathy for the South on the part of the British subjects can be explained, and when the Canadians once had a rebellion within her borders, where were the sympathies of the American people then? Were they with the Canadian Government or with the rebels? Why, you not only sympathized with them, but I am sorry to have to say it, gave them aid along the frontier in many ways, and to a very large extent. I am happy to be able to say, that during the whole four years of the late rebellion in the United States there has not been developed a particle of evidence to show that a single citizen of any British North American province put a hostile foot on your soil. Everything of which complaint can be made has been the acts of your own people, in violation of hospitality and right of asylum everywhere extended to them on the soil of Great Britain and her dependencies. I make these remarks in no spirit of anger, or of excitement, but to show how unfair it is to hold any government or people responsible for the actions in it of a few evil-disposed individuals, as well as how natural it was for sympathy to be aroused in the minds of the people on one side or the other. In our rebellion, when its attention was called to their acts, the United States Government exerted itself to keep its own citizens within its bounds, and all that could have been asked of the provincial authorities has been freely done to prevent any cause of complaint against them. It is something to be able to say that during the four long disastrous years of war just ended not a single act of which complaint could be made has been committed by a Canadian. * * * Notwithstanding the false reports that were circulated, I do not believe there was a single intelligent citizen, of my province at least, who did not believe the capture of the *Chesapeake*, off the coast of Maine, by rebellious citizens of the United States, was nothing less or more than an act of piracy. And so of the St. Alban's raid. The government of Canada acted most promptly and nobly in connection with that affair, and has repaid the money which rebellious citizens of the United States had carried into their territory from the State bank. As to their harbouring the rebels and extending to them the right of asylum, is there a single American here who would have his government surrender that right?"

And continuing, he said:

"Only a short time ago, I met three British Americans going home on a single vessel, after having served three years in the war, and having left scores of their companions behind to enrich the soil. At Washington I met with a brave nephew of one of my late colleagues in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, who had held the rank of lieutenant in a Massachusetts regiment, with only one leg to take back to his home instead of two. I met another veteran from my province who had fought in twenty battles, and was on his way home. In my own family and person I have suffered not a little by this unhappy rebellion. I have five boys, and one of them took it into his head to enter your army. He has now been for nearly two years in the 23rd Ohio Regiment, and had fought in all the battles in which that regiment has been engaged during that period. He was in both the great battles under General Sheridan, in which General Early's forces were scattered, and the Shenandoah Valley cleared."

This was to show that a large proportion of our people were enlisted in the American army during that time. Those who seemed to know the best say that no less than 40,000 Canadians were enlisted in the American army between 1861 and 1864, which proves conclusively that the exodus to the United States from Canada was greater before that time than it has been at any period since that time. He concludes in this way:

"The man who avows such a sentiment"——

That is the sentiment of annexation between Canada and the United States, which they were aiming at then as they are now—

"The man who avows such a sentiment will be scouted from society by his best friends. What other treatment would a man deserve who should turn traitor to his Sovereign and his government, and violate for pecuniary advantage all obligations to the country which gave him birth? You know what you call Copperheads, and a nice life they have of it. Just such a life will the man have who talks treason on the other side of the lines. The very boy to whom I have alluded"——

His own son—

—"as having fought manfully for the Stars and Stripes would rather blow his own father's brains out than haul down the honoured flag under which he has been born—the flag of his nation and of his fatherland. I do not believe there is a young Canadian in the army who does not honour his own flag as you honour yours, and they would be despised if they did not. If any member of the convention harbours the idea that in refusing reciprocity to British America they will undermine the loyal feelings of the people of those colonies, he is labouring under a delusion, and doing injustice to a people whose sentiment of loyalty is as indelible as your own."

Those were the sentiments expressed by the veteran Liberal statesman of Nova Scotia. These are the sentiments which now guide the Liberal-Conservative party of the Dominion. He was in favour of fair trade between Canada and the United States. So are we in favour of fair trade between Canada and the United States, but we are not in favour of any trade which would place the fiscal policy of this Dominion in the hands of the American people or any policy which would destroy the factories of this Dominion, any policy which would destroy the best interests of the agriculturists of this Dominion, and the interests of the coal miners and the fishermen. I know whereof I speak when I say that the poor farmers of this Dominion—not the bloated monopolists among the farmers but the poor farmers—as well as the poor fishermen and the poor miners and the labourers and artizans would suffer under unrestricted reciprocity with the United

States. We have a different country here from what they have on the other side of the line, and it requires great attention to induce our people to remain at home. Our people, under the cold climate and the disadvantages under which they labour, require words of encouragement and require some hope to be held out to them to remain at home. They do not want to be told, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said the other night practically: Thank God that the National Policy has been of advantage to the people who have been driven across the line, because there they have enjoyed prosperity and made homes for themselves and their families. Is that the way for a leading statesman to encourage our people to live at home? I say this question should be dropped out of Canadian politics. I think every sensible man, woman and child on either side of politics will agree that the system of continuously begging for unrestricted reciprocity or any other system of reciprocity should cease, as for twenty-six years past we have been knocking at the door of the United States and making advances from time to time, though not one single proposition for fair trade have we received from them up to the present time. I would say to my hon. friend the philosopher from Bothwell that he should call his dogs of political war off this question. It is useless for them to fight over the shadow of a policy which is held by the American eagle soaring in the heavens. It is just as useless for him to try to take the bone from the great American eagle, or to grasp its shadow which overshadows this Dominion, as to get fair reciprocity with the United States as long as they refuse to grant it to us; and, further, if the young roosters which crow on the other side would discontinue their discussion of a question over which they have no control, it would be better for all concerned. This question is absolutely under the control of the Americans and if that is so, on this side we are continuously telling our people that we cannot live without some kind of a reciprocity, that this country is going to the dogs without it, that it is impossible for us to live without it so long as this blue ruin howl is used by any political party, so long will our people be discouraged to remain amongst us, so long will the immigration agencies in Europe be encouraged to act against Canada by inducing people not to come to this country with all its ruin and devastation, but to go to a country, like the United States, where they will be able to make a living. I hold, with all patriotic Canadians in this Dominion, that any people who are frugal, industrious and honest, can make as good a living here as on the other side; and I say again that I hope the discussion of this fad will cease to occupy the attention of this House after this session of Parliament.

Mr. TUPPER. With the consent of the House I will ask permission to make a personal explanation in reference to the remarks that I made in this debate. The *Hansard* was perfectly correct in reporting me as quoting, in the speech I delivered the other day, from Lord Durham's Report. In the excitement of the moment I alluded to Lord Durham's Report as if I were quoting in the language of that report. I wish to say that I made a mistake, I was quoting from a book I held in my hand which refers to different passages of the report, but the language is not by Lord Durham, it is the language of C. J. Roe, who wrote a book entitled "Bonds of Disunion." In citing from the report I gave, of course, his own language, but it was the language of Mr. Roe based on Lord Durham's Report, and not the language of the report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 11.45 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 29th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No 45) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Fairbairn.)

Bill (No 43) to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey. (From the Senate.)—(Mr. Dewdney.)

Bill (No. 46) to make voting compulsory.—(Mr. Amyot.)

CONTROVERTED ELECTION—WELLAND.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the matter connected with the County of Welland has to be mentioned to-day.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Tisdale, (March 23rd) read.

Mr. GERMAN. Mr. Speaker, before this motion is put to the House, I would like, with the consent of the House, to shortly express my own reason for sitting here at present, as I am now doing. There is no doubt that portions of that resolution which has been read are, in the main, correct. There was an election trial held in Welland, and at that election trial the judges declared the seat vacant by reason of the corrupt act of an agent. On that judgment being delivered, the counsel for the respondent at that trial stated that he was satisfied with that decision, it being done with the belief, at any rate, that no further costs would be incurred in the action and that no further proceedings would be taken. I do not remember—and I do not think it is a fact—that there was any consent or undertaking that no appeal should be had from that decision. The petitioner then went on with the charges for disqualification for personal corruption. It was then found by the judges that a corrupt act had been committed by myself, and I was personally disqualified. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, and notice of appeal was given. That notice of appeal, Sir, was not, in any way, limited. It is not necessary, as I understand it, under the Controverted Elections Act to give notice of appeal at all, as the depositing of the money with the registrar of the court where the petition is filed

is a stay to all proceedings, and the seat is not vacant until that appeal is finally disposed of in the Supreme Court. However, in this case the notice of appeal was given, and not limited to any particular part or any particular portion of the judgments. Subsequently after the case was inscribed for hearing, a notice limiting the appeal certainly was given by solicitors for the appellant in the Supreme Court. That was done simply for this reason: That had the appeal not been limited it would have been necessary to have printed all the evidence taken at the trial, and in order to avoid the enormous cost of printing all the evidence that was taken at the trial, counsel thought it advisable to print just such evidence as bore on the matter of disqualification, as that was practically the only matter which we wished the Supreme Court to pass upon. That notice was given on the 9th of February. It speaks for itself, and it could not have been the notice primarily given, because the notice primarily given under the statute, if any notice is required, must be made within eight days after the judgment is rendered, and which eight days would have expired some time early in January. The matter came up, Sir, in the Supreme Court on an application made by counsel for appellant, which application the judges of the court did not seem desirous of entertaining. It was stated by counsel for myself that we were not claiming the seat, that the argument would only be as to the question of disqualification, and that in his mind no harm could occur because he possibly might have been labouring under the mistaken idea, as I think, that a writ could be issued. It was then stated by the judges of the Supreme Court, as I am instructed and believe, that the fact of our only appealing as to the disqualification made no difference; that I was the legal member for the County of Welland until that appeal was disposed of, and that the fact of limiting it to the question of disqualification made no difference. I have had, Sir, not a judgment it is true, but an expression of an opinion of the judges of the Supreme Court that I was the member for the County of Welland. I cannot understand on what reading of the statute the trial judges sent out a report to you, Mr. Speaker. They appear to have been under the impression that there was some ambiguity about the clause in the amendment of last session, but I myself can see none, and I cannot understand why that report was sent to the Speaker. However, Sir, I think that the fact of the report having been sent to the Speaker, strengthens the position which I take in this matter. A constituency, as I understand it, is either represented or it is unrepresented. If it is unrepresented, it is the right and the duty of the Speaker to at once issue a writ as soon as that is officially brought to his notice. If it is represented, then the representative has the right, and it is his duty, to take his seat on the floor of this House as the representative of the people. Now, Sir, it remains only to be settled and to be discovered if possible, whether that county is represented or not represented. Knowing that that report went to the Speaker, knowing the expression of opinion by the judges of the Supreme Court, seeing in the *Empire* newspaper a statement that I, with others whose cases were in the Court of Appeal, was entitled to take my seat, knowing that my name was on the division list in this House, knowing that I was recognized as the member for Welland by the members of the Government, because I was continuously getting any number of reports, particularly from the Department of Agriculture, to circulate through my county, knowing that I was recognized by the members of the Government and by the Speaker of this House, as the member for the County of Welland; I certainly believed, and I believe now that I have a legal right to a seat in this House. I can say more, Sir, that if I have not a legal right to sit here, I certainly am not interfering with the legal rights of any other gentleman to sit here. That is the simple statement. I came down here with the intention of taking my seat early in the session, but learning that the Supreme Court had adjourned from the Tuesday before Ash Wednesday until the following Monday, and believing that on the following Monday,—without having any suggestion that such would be the case—but believing that judgment would be given in this case on the following Monday, and desiring to avoid if possible any newspaper criticism or any adverse criticism of any kind, I thought it better not to take my seat pending the decision of the court, which would, in my opinion, be only for a few days. But when I found that the court had adjourned until the 4th April, then to give judgment, and at the urgent request of the electors of the County of Welland, and believing that I had a right to sit in this House, I came here and took my seat. That is the simple statement of the facts. I may be wrong in the law, but it is a legal question, and it seems to me to be one which ought not to be decided by a vote in this House at present. However, that is for the House to say. I may be wrong, and if I am, I am willing to abide by the decision of the majority, knowing full well as I do, that what I have done meets with the approval of the majority of the people of Welland, and knowing further, Sir, that the people of Welland who a year ago returned me by a majority of 477, are willing increase that majority on the first opportunity.

Mr. MASSON. After hearing the statement which has just been made to the House by the party interested, it seems to me that there is very little for this House to decide. The facts admitted by him alone show that so far as the seat for the riding of Welland is concerned, it has been declared vacant, and he has consented to that declaration. In face of that consent, it seems to me the height of folly to argue that he is entitled to be present in this House. Now, the gentleman in making this statement cavilled with the record on an immaterial point. He said that his counsel at that trial had consented to and accepted the decision of the judge. He did not remember personally consenting. The papers on the Table show that Mr. Cassel was his counsel; that Mr. Cassel, after the delivery of the judgment which declared the seat vacant, said: "I may say that I had discussed the matter with Mr. German while Your Lordships had retired, and we are perfectly satisfied with the correctness of your judgment." That is, not only were the counsel satisfied, but the client was satisfied; and he said: "There is no intention to appeal." Now, these are the plain words of the record, and I think it is trifling with that record to say that there was no consent or no expression of opinion that there would be no appeal. What follows? The counsel for the prosecution, Mr. Blackstock,

then said: "There is no reason to deal with any further charges, and I will confine myself to personal charges." Following that straight acceptance of the judgment is the straight declaration that the personal charges will be proceeded with.—no shirking of the record, no quibbling, but a straightforward statement. Further, I would call your attention particularly to what follows. Mr. Justice Rose said: "With reference to two charges which are before us, judgment is not asked in respect to them." There were two cases in which the evidence had been taken *pro* and *con*, and they were held in reserve for judgment if necessary; and the judge calls attention to the fact that it will be unnecessary in that state of affairs to consider these questions and deliver judgment on them. Mr. Blackstock, on behalf of the petitioner, says: "In view of the announcement of my learned friend, I do not ask for judgment on that." There is as clear an acceptance, as formal contract as can be made between man and man, in which the gentleman who is charged, declares by himself and his counsel, both being present in the court, that they accepted the judgment that the seat was vacated. Now, I will call attention to another little piece of quibbling, because I can call it by no other name, in which the gentleman has stated that there was no necessity of a notice of appeal, and no necessity of limiting. The gentleman was evidently speaking without the record. Had he read the 51st section of the Act in respect of Controverted Elections, he would have seen there that not only was the deposit necessary, but also the notice. The third sub-section of that section provides that the party appealing shall give the notice, and that he may if he desires limit the subject of such appeal to any special and defined question or questions. Now, the counsel said there should be no appeal. The case proceeded, and the disqualification followed. An appeal was lodged against the disqualification, and what was the form of the notice? We have it in the papers brought down, in the case presented at the Supreme Court, in the most emphatic language, and I will read this notice from beginning to end:

"*In the Supreme Court of Canada.*

"THE DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

"Election of a Member for the House of Commons of Canada for the Electoral District of the County of Welland, holden on the 26th day of February, 1891, and the 5th day of March, 1891.

"Dominion of Canada,
"Province of Ontario,
"*To Wit:*

"Between

"WILLIAM MANLY GERMAN,
Appellant,

and

"JESSE CALHOUN ROTHERY,
Respondent.

"*Notice of Setting Down Appeal and Limiting the same.*

"Take notice that the above-named William Manly German has appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada from the judgment and decision of the Honourable Mr. Justice Rose and the Honourable Mr. Justice MacMahon, the judges by whom the matter of the election petition above described was tried, and which judgment and decision was pronounced by the said learned judges on Saturday, the 19th day of December last.

"And further take notice that the record of the case upon such appeal has been transmitted to the Registrar of the said Supreme Court and set down for hearing by the said court, pursuant to the statute, at the sitting of the said court to be holden at Ottawa on Tuesday, the 16th day of February, 1892.

"And further take notice that the above named William Manly German, the party so appealing, hereby, pursuant to the statute in that behalf, limits the subject of the said appeal to so much of the judgment aforesaid as grants that portion of the prayer of the petition which relates to the personal charges against the present appellant, and finds and declares the present appellant (the respondent in the court below) guilty of personal corrupt practice at the said election, and the present appellant will, upon the hearing of the said appeal, contend that the said judgment, so far as it declares the present appellant guilty of any corrupt practice personally, should be reversed and set aside.

"Dated this 9th day of February, A.D. 1892.

"Yours, &c.,
(Sgd.) "A. B. AYLESWORTH.
"*Solicitor and agent for the said*
"*Appellant, William Manly German.*

"To Messrs. Meredith, Clarke, Bowes & Hilton,
"Solicitors for the Petitioner."

In the face of such a notice as that, limiting the appeal pursuant to the statute in that behalf, how can it be said that there is any question now whether that seat is vacant or not? It had been declared vacant; the respondent in the court below had consented to that decision, and in pursuance of it and in accordance with the agreement of his counsel, he limited the appeal. But we find that, in spite of that appeal, it is now claimed that he has a right to take his seat. But we go a step further in the case presented to the Supreme Court, as appears from the papers lying on the Table. It will be noticed that all the evidence in relation to the personal charges was omitted on appeal to the Supreme Court, and only those portions of the evidence that relate exclusively to the personal charges. I do not understand by what system of argument or reasoning or quibbling it can be urged that, because a man's name appears on the division roll, because he appears to have, by courtesy or otherwise, received papers from various departments of this House or Government, he is entitled to a seat in this House. There are many things which declare a seat vacant. There are a few in which, in very emphatic language, an election is declared void, and provision is made that a report shall be made to the Speaker, which is final, and which is immediately acted upon by the Speaker. There are, however, numerous other cases in which it is not so clearly defined. I would refer you to the authority on parliamentary procedure recognized in this House, page 180:

"A question arose in the session of 1887 as to the power of the House to order the issue of a writ when seats are vacated by a decision of a court. It was doubted whether such an order was necessary under the Canadian Election Act. Subsequently Mr. Speaker Anglin took occasion then to inform the House that, on looking into the question, he found that the English Controverted Election Act left the power in the House to order the immediate issue of the writ, on being informed of the vacancy through the decision of the court. The Canadian statute, on the other hand, made it the express duty of the Speaker to order the issue of the writ. It is now the practice for the Speaker to inform the House immediately that he has given the order for the issue of the writ for the new election, and in all cases not specified by the statute, the House has control over the issue of the writ, and may order the Speaker to issue his warrant."

This is really the crucial point in any technicalities that may arise here. The statute lays down that, on certain reports being presented to the Speaker, there being no appeal and so on, the Speaker forthwith issues his warrant. It does not provide for all cases, and it does not provide, unfortunately, for the Speaker acting in such a case as this, and the Speaker, I would say wisely, upon receiving the report it is now contended he should not have received, did not act upon it. But there is no

direct authority in the statute, if I read it aright, for the sending of this notice to the Speaker in this particular case. There was an appeal, a limited appeal. The trial judges knew not what that appeal was. There was no notice given to them. The notice was given to the other side of the case. The judges have before them as a fact that it has been appealed. What that appeal is they know not, but what that fact is we know by the papers on the Table of this House. It cannot be contended that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and given his explanation to the House did not know it. When the facts, plain to the view of the House, are before them, such as by laying the papers on the Table, it then is within the province of the House to deal with the matter, and I would refer to the Riel case in 1875, quoting from the same authority, page 196. We find that Riel was returned to Parliament during recess. We find that soon after the House met in 1875, Mr. Mackenzie laid on the Table the exemplification of the Judgment Roll of outlawry, and then moved :

" That it appears by the said record that Louis Riel, a member of this House, has been adjudged an outlaw for felony."

This motion having been agreed to, the writ was ordered to be issued. There is in principle an exact parallel between the two cases. There are certain facts which by law made that seat vacant, the same as in this case. The judges declared it vacant, and the respondent accepts that declaration, and declares that he has no intention to appeal. These facts being proved to this House, it is in their province clearly to pronounce upon them. There are no disputed facts. The gentleman himself did not deny them. He cavils over the form of notice, over the form of agreement, but here is the statement his counsel made in his own presence. I really do think that, after this statement of facts, there is really no room for assuming otherwise than that the seat is vacant. It has been declared so by report. That declaration has not been appealed against, and were the appellants in the Supreme Court to-morrow to be judged successful and the appeal allowed to its fullest extent, that would not fill the seat. It could not fill the seat. The seat has been declared vacant. The declaration has not been appealed against, and the seat is vacant to the knowledge of the person attempting to fill it. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House any longer on this question. The facts present a brutal argument, and beyond that I do not think it necessary to go. I do not think that any amount of sophistry or argument can alter the facts. They stand there unchallenged. They stand there in their nakedness, and it cannot in the face of the world for a moment be pretended that seat is not vacant. That being the case, the attention of the Speaker being called to it, the facts being brought before the House, the papers being laid on the Table, it rests with the House to order the writ to issue.

Mr. LAURIER. I have waited for some time expecting that perhaps the Minister of Justice would give his own opinion to the House upon this matter. However, as far as I have a personal opinion to express to the House upon this case, it seems to me to be one which involves matters of fact as well as of law. I do not pretend at all to review the argument which the hon. gentleman has delivered to-day, or the argument which was delivered some time ago by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), but, taking the facts which have been placed before the House to be accurate, the question would follow whether the conclusions which those gentlemen have arrived at are also accurate. There may be occasion to accept or to dispute these conclusions, but hon. gentlemen are aware that there are discrepancies in regard to matters of fact between the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and the gentleman who claims the seat for Welland (Mr. German). Under the circumstances, I would suggest to the leader of the House, the Minister of Justice, that we should follow the precedents which have been established when a seat of an hon. member has been impugned on previous occasions, and to refer the matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It seems to me to be impossible for any hon. member of this House to go over all the documents which have been brought down from the Supreme Court and other sources, but the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which has always been the instructor of the House in matters of this kind, should, I think, be requested to look into the facts and the law and report to the House upon them. I, therefore, move in amendment :

That all the words in the last paragraph after the word " facts " be struck out, and that it be resolved that the papers laid on the Table of the House be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I refrained from rising at the time my hon. friend says he was waiting for me to rise, because, although I had followed very closely the observations of the hon. gentleman who claims the seat, I did not understand that he varied any statement of fact which had been previously made and upon which this matter must be decided, and I was waiting until any hon. member of the House would challenge the legal principles laid down by my hon. friend who moved the resolution last Wednesday (Mr. Tisdale) and my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Masson) who supported that resolution this afternoon. It appears to me that there is an uncontested decision of a competent tribunal that the seat for Welland is vacant—uncontested, not only because it was acquiesced in by counsel in the presence of the respondent saying that no other result could have been arrived at, and also by the respondent stating that he was satisfied with the judgment and did not intend to appeal, but because he deliberately limited his appeal to the one question of his personal disqualification, as appears by the records before the House. That appears to me to establish that the court decided finally, without appeal, without contest, without the slightest protest from the gentleman who addressed us this afternoon, that he was not elected for the County of Welland. Now the case comes before the Supreme Court on the question of his personal disqualification. That gentleman has stated to us that the judges declared that he had a right to hold his seat in the meantime. Unless I am grossly misinformed, the judges gave no such decision.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He did not say a decision, but an intimation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am informed that the judges expressed no opinion on the argument, but that, when the matter was brought to the notice of the court and a hearing was sought to be

obtained on the appeal in advance of its usual course, or in advance of the printing being completed, this was urged by the counsel for the gentleman who addressed us this afternoon, in the course of the discussion which then took place before the Supreme Court. This is what, I am informed, occurred. The counsel for Mr. German was urging before the Supreme Court that further time should be given him for his printing. The court were of opinion at first that he should be allowed further time, because the question did not affect the seat, and a new writ might issue pending the appeal, but counsel for the petitioner pointed out that this was not so, and it was only on the solemn assurance given in open court, that Mr. German would not take his seat, that the Supreme Court allowed the indulgence which they did in regard to putting in the appeal book and the factum at a later time. I admit that any assurance given by Mr. German, whether before the court of first instance or before the Supreme Court here, as to what he would do, does not bind him if he has a right to his seat. I merely make these explanations to the House on my information in opposition to the statement which that gentlemen made, that anything which transpired before the Supreme Court here gave him any right to occupy his seat pending the appeal. I believe the hon. gentleman was not present when the argument took place before the court, and I understand from his statement this afternoon that he depended entirely upon the report in the newspapers for his information as to what took place before the Supreme Court. I am, therefore, not at all in a position to charge him, even if I wished to do so, with having wilfully misstated the facts to the House. I contend that that which he supposes took place before the Supreme Court of Canada should not influence the judgment of the House at this time, or at any other stage, because the information which I have, and which, I believe, is accurate and can be confirmed by the records of the court, if necessary, leads to a totally opposite view. Now, coming to the point that there is any question as to the decision of a competent tribunal that the seat is vacant and that Mr. German is not duly elected, we have to enquire, I think, why it is that a writ has not been issued. It has not been issued merely because the machinery of the law does not provide for this House getting the information before it as to what the decision was. In consequence of one phase of the case having been appealed from—not touching the validity of the election of Mr. German at all—in consequence of there being an appeal upon that phase of the case, the information had not reached this House until the records were brought down in response to a return asked for by my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) the other day. The House had not the information upon which to order a writ to issue. It seems to me that we possess that information now, and that, provided the facts are not disputed, provided there is no doubt in the minds of the House as to the questions of law involved, the duty of the House is to order the writ to issue. I do not think there can be any weight attached to the argument presented by Mr. German in the House this afternoon, that if he was occupying a seat here he was not interfering with the rights of any person else. Sir, it is interfering with the right of the electors of the County of Welland to have the seat unrepresented, if that case has reached a stage when a writ ought to issue. Precisely the same argument might be made by any person, who had never run an election at all, or been put in nomination, coming in and occupying the seat for the County of Welland, because it happened to be vacant and because a decision on one phase of the case had not been arrived at. Now, I may suggest to the House two or three considerations which seem to me to throw some light upon the question raised by my hon. friends from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and from Grey (Mr. Masson), and which seem to me to show that their conclusions are sound. In order to see how reasonable their argument is, and how reasonable their conclusion is, the House has only to consider this question: The Supreme Court has reserved judgment on the appeal by Mr. German, until about the 4th April, and let us ask ourselves what result may follow from that judgment. If the judgment goes against Mr. German, the sentence of disqualification remains, and the seat of course is vacant. But let us suppose that he succeeds in his appeal, all grounds then for his pretending to keep that seat, are gone. How, then, can he reasonably expect to occupy a seat in this House pending an appeal which, if decided in his favour, must remove him from this House altogether? Let us test the case from another point of view. Let us suppose, as might have been the case, that the returning officer had been made a party to this petition, that the petition had been presented against the sitting member and the returning officer, that the judgment of the court declared that the member had not been duly elected, and that Mr. German's counsel said that that was a reasonable conclusion to reach on the evidence, that he could expect no other result, and that he did not intend to assert an appeal, and that he asserted no appeal. But suppose that the returning officer had been condemned by the court for some misconduct and had asserted an appeal to the Supreme Court, precisely the same state of facts would have arisen. You, Mr. Speaker, would have had no report from the judges—for I am presenting the case on the supposition that the report which was sent to you, was sent by inadvertence, as it probably was—you and the House would have had no record showing there had been a decision, you would not have issued your warrant, and it would have remained for this House to send for the records and, finding that there was, as there is in this case, an undisputed judgment, that the sitting member was not duly elected, to have issued the writ for a new election, notwithstanding the fact that the returning officer had appealed from the judgment on some other branch of the case. I find now, however, that the result of my pausing to hear from my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has been to show me that he does controvert — and I presume from what he said, that his friends do controvert — the correctness of these views, at any rate they dispute the conclusion which I have arrived at, in common with my friends from Norfolk and from Grey. I think that the action which this House ought to take under the circumstances, is that which we have been accustomed to follow in times past in analogous cases—that it would be safer, better, and more dignified—and I am sure in this I will have the acquiescence of my hon. friends from Grey and Norfolk—to pass this motion to refer the

matter to the Committee of Privileges and Elections. The delay will not prejudice any important interests which may be involved, to any serious extent, it will be following a precedent I have always thought was the wisest to follow in dealing with questions as to the right of members to sit in this House, and it will certainly be the best way to arrive at a deliberate judgment upon a question in respect of which we are all more or less liable to be swayed by political feelings, provided we do not give to it the care and deliberation which is necessary to secure the best advice.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am pleased to see that the Minister of Justice has concurred in the recommendation of my hon. friend that this matter should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. While I would not like to say one word that would seem to countenance the right of any party to take a seat which he ought not to retain, I am very anxious that this House, in dealing with the question of the right of a member to sit here, should not act hastily, and should not undertake to deprive by resolution, such as is proposed to the House, the right of any party to remain here, however technical that right may be. It seems to me of the utmost consequence that a majority in Parliament ought not to undertake to exercise arbitrarily the right of declaring a seat vacant. Now, I understand in this case, that at least one of the judges of the Supreme Court did state that he thought this seat was not vacant, that so long as an appeal was pending it was not possible for a report to be made in accordance with the requirements of the statute, by the judges in the first instance, and that until such report was made, the House could not be seized with the facts until the Court of Appeals reported their conclusion to the House. It seems to me that where the law has provided a method of procedure and that procedure is adequate to meet the case, even though there should be some delay, the House should not, from a mere disposition to act precipitately, undertake to declare a seat vacant that has not already been made so in law. If any party undertakes to sit in Parliament without having a right to sit here, there is a provision that the seat may be attacked, and his rights to the seat may be ascertained provisionally, by a proceeding before a properly constituted legal tribunal; and so the House itself is never without a remedy to protect itself against anything like usurpation. There is one consideration for which it seems to me the law has some regard, and which the Minister of Justice, in the observations he has addressed to the House, has passed over. Mr. German's seat was attacked. The judges who tried the case in the first instance declared the seat vacant, and declared Mr. German disqualified from again being a candidate. It seems to me that where the law gives an appeal, and where the law has provided that there shall be no report during the pendancy of that appeal, even though it is special and limited, the law to some extent protects the rights which belong to a citizen to be a candidate, where he is not legally disqualified, and where it is the desire of the community he should be such. It may be that Mr. German will be the choice of the electors in case he is not disqualified, and the delay of a few days occupied in enquiring into the matter and arriving at a decision, after full investigation of the facts and of the law applicable to the case, is certainly a safer course than for the House to undertake to deal in a very hasty manner with so important a matter.

Mr. TISDALE. I shall occupy the time of the House only a few minutes, but I feel that under the circumstances I should say something. My sole object in bringing the matter before the House was the fulfilment of a duty which I felt I had to discharge when I became cognizant of the facts. I have no desire in this or in any other case to allow any matter I have brought forward to have the slightest semblance whatever of undue haste, or of not giving the party who is charged the utmost opportunity for full deliberation. I have, therefore, great pleasure in assenting to the proposition made by the leader of the House. I may say that I am glad to be able sometimes, as in this case, to concur with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in the opinion that when a political party has a large majority, whichever party it may be, they should proceed more cautiously and give greater consideration than if they were the weak party. I hold very strong opinions in regard to an attack made on the privileges of Parliament or the rights of members, and, therefore, any suggestions that could be made by my hon. friend opposite I should be glad to accede to at all times, if thereby there is any chance of throwing further light on the matter. I take but one exception to what the hon. member for Bothwell has said, and I cannot allow it to pass without calling attention to it. I do not think there is anything in the argument that where a seat is *de facto* vacant by decision of a court of law, and assented to by the gentleman who afterwards took his seat, any inference can be drawn that it was the intention of the law that under such circumstance he should do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say that.

Mr. TISDALE. I gathered that as an inference from what the hon. gentleman said. If the hon. gentleman did not say that, I accept his denial, because I would be sorry to have any such proposition passed by this House without challenging it. I wish to say here that the cause that led me to bring it up was the action of the hon. gentleman himself. Had he seen fit to exercise patience—and I say this simply because I feel a strong duty in this matter—had he, knowing all the facts, seen fit to have remained out of the House until this matter was settled, far from me would it have been to have made any motion in regard to it, because there would have been no breach of the privileges of Parliament. I shall be very glad to have this resolution referred to the Privileges and Elections Committee, because we shall then have a precedent established. If by any possibility it is proved that a gentleman can, under such circumstances, enter this House, then the election law should be amended in such a way as to render impossible a repetition of the act by any hon. gentleman on either side of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quite concur in what the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, said as to the impropriety, and it appears to me to be a very grave impropriety indeed, of a gentleman occupying a seat in this House under the circumstances detailed here, and when, even upon his own admission, he came here on the technicality he presented to us, and took his seat. At the same time, I cannot help thinking that we cannot, and

should not deal with this question here, but should refer it it to the committee specially charged with the guardianship of our privileges and the protection of the rights of members. I confess that I have very strong doubts, indeed, as to the correctness of the view put forward by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Masson)—I had not the honour to hear the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale)—as to whether or not the seat is now, as a matter of law, vacant. It is pure technical reasoning, no doubt, but after all these matters generally are technical, and I doubt very much—and I desire to speak on a matter in which all our privileges are concerned with all frankness—whether, until the Supreme Court deals with this question, there can be a judgment, or any report can be received by the Speaker of the House. The statute provides that the judges before whom the election case is tried shall, in case there is no appeal, and it is only in cases where there is no appeal, report to you, Sir, the result of the trial. If there is an appeal, inferentially there can be no such report made. Now, if no such report can be made on account of the appeal, how can this House become seized of the facts, and of the opinions arrived at by the judges until they are ripened into a judgment. There is this to be said, and I agree on this point with the hon. member for Bothwell, that the rights of members must also be always taken into account. The election was declared void on grounds stated by the judges, about which there is no dispute, but there is the possibility that the disqualification of a member may not have been properly arrived at, and he may be relieved of that disqualification, and it would certainly be a very hard case if that gentleman had not an opportunity of presenting himself when the writ is finally issued. So it is desirable that this House should not act too hastily, and that the case should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, by which, after it has been considered and enquired into with care and consideration, a report will be made that in future will enable us to act with precision on this subject. I agree also that the law should be amended, not in cases in which the question of disqualification is still in doubt, but, when it is admitted by a gentleman that he had not been properly elected, he should not be permitted to come and assist in the deliberations of this assembly.

Amendment agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to enter into any elaborate discussion or review of the financial statement made by the Minister of Finance. It is clear, I think, to the House, that the hon. gentleman, with the Government, and those who support him and them, have got back upon their old grounds. We have had in the speech of the Minister of Finance, the old music and the old instruments with scarcely any variations. The hon. gentleman has told the House, that the diminution of the deposits in the savings banks are no indication of the diminished prosperity of the country. When the amount in the Government savings banks increased it was an evidence of the increased wealth of the people, and when that amount has diminished it is no evidence of increased poverty or diminished wealth. When the crops of the agricultural population are good it is an indication of the wisdom and care of the Administration, and when the crops of the agriculturists are bad, it is the fault of Providence, and the Administration ought not in any degree to be held responsible. We are told from the Treasury benches, and by the gentlemen who support the ministry, that industries ought to be fostered. They are well fostered in the Province of New Brunswick; they ought to be fostered over the entire Dominion; and we are also told that our commercial relations with the United States have recently enjoyed the fostering care of the Administration. Now, Sir, we are having some new phases in the tactics of the Conservative leaders; we are having a new departure in parliamentary government; we are having new constitutional usages introduced and established, and I suppose before many years elapse, should the hon. gentlemen opposite continue to administer the Government, we will have a complete change in our parliamentary system. It used to be, and it is still in the United Kingdom, the practice under our system of parliamentary government, that the House of Commons, the body which represents the nation, is the most potent council to advise the Sovereign. It is that body which is supposed to exercise a paramount influence over every other institution in the State. But, Sir, this is no longer the case, so far as the Parliament of Canada is concerned. This Parliament is now supposed to be a mere registering body, to register the wishes of the Administration that may be expressed and acquiesced in, some time before final action is taken, if the Administration finds it convenient, or Parliament may be called upon to sanction, as a matter of form, what has already been finally determined. So far as the prerogatives of the Crown are concerned, we are having, in a large degree, a revival of the doctrine of high prerogative. We are having introduced into this country, in the practice of the Government those notions of prerogative that led to the great civil war in the time of Charles the First, and that were supposed to be altogether overthrown by the revolution of 1688. It is true, Sir, that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, are not claiming these extraordinary powers on behalf of the Sovereign or the Sovereign's representative, but they are claiming them on behalf of that viceroy who exercises authority over the sovereign, and so we are having a parliamentary committee known as the Cabinet or Administration, usurping all these powers that were at one time denied to the Sovereign; usurping them in the name of the Sovereign to be exercised by the Sovereign, always upon the advice of the Government whose advice the Sovereign is not at liberty to disregard. Here, this extraordinary power is actually in the hands of the Administration. It has been exercised by the Administration, and in a way that diminishes the usefulness of Parliament, and seriously affects the interest which the people take in the conduct of the Government of the country. There is nothing, in my opinion, of more importance in the maintenance of our parliamentary system, and in the protection of the community against serious abuses on the part

of those in authority, than the maintenance of a healthy public spirit in the community, and that cannot continue to exist when the Government acts without the sanction of the people's representatives; when they intimate to the representatives of the people in Parliament and to the electors at large, that they may give their mind a holiday, that the Government of the country is in safe hands, that their interests will be properly cared for, and so they need give themselves little or no trouble about the conduct of public affairs. I notice, Sir, that the "new colony," as it has been designated by the Conservative organs, who occupy seats on this side of the House supporting the Administration—I notice that the "new colony" praise the present state of things. They praise the delegation to Washington, not for what they accomplished, but for what they failed to accomplish. There has been a general expression of rejoicing, not because the Government succeeded in doing anything, but because the Government did nothing, and because those who went to Washington came back able to declare that they had not succeeded, and that they did not see before them any prospect of success. They had the wisdom to fail, and by failing to protect the farming population against these calamities, which if they had succeeded, would have inevitably followed from that success. This has been the declaration of nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken in support of the Administration. One hon. gentleman after another has arisen in the House and declared that reciprocity with the United States in the agricultural products of the two countries, would have resulted in a very serious calamity to the Canadian farmers, and so I have been at a loss to understand why these gentlemen should, under these circumstances, have gone to Washington at all. I am unable to understand why they should have gone there for the purpose of obtaining from the Government of the United States a declaration that they entirely agreed with the Minister of Finance—that they did not see how he was to raise revenue if he succeeded, and that he had better maintain the present condition of things. Why should not these hon. gentlemen who have recently come into Parliament, praise the Administration? They may say to the Government, and to some of the supporters of the Administration in Parliament, and some perhaps out of Parliament, that it is "Thou that hast made us, and not we ourselves, and we are the sheep of thy pasture." These hon. gentlemen sit here by the grace of the Administration, and by the favour of some hon. gentlemen who support the Administration; and there is no doubt that those potent influences which have brought so large a number of recruits to the other side, have proved of inestimable advantage to the hon. gentlemen who have recently obtained seats in this House. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken in support of the Minister of Finance on this subject find it very difficult to spell free trade and non-intercourse in one word. *Punch*, many years ago, represented Mr. Disraeli as a chameleon, on which the words free trade and protection were mixed up together. Now, the Canadian chameleon has not been a very active animal, and there is not much chance of convincing the community that the Government are in favour of reciprocity with our neighbours, and, at the same time opposed to putting the larger number of products, which may be interchanged between the two countries, upon a free list. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken are, no doubt, pleased, for another reason besides that of protecting the farmers against the calamity of having a free market in the United States. They can use their old speeches. Those speeches, Sir, are not in danger. The visit to Washington has not rendered them absolutely useless, and so far as we can judge from what has been said by the Finance Minister, they may serve a useful purpose to those hon. gentlemen for many sessions to come. At all events, they will, no doubt, serve them as long as the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches, continue to sit there. There is to be no further effort at negotiating a reciprocity treaty with our neighbours across the border. The march has taken place: the capital of the United States has been visited; the attempted negotiations have failed. The Government have convinced themselves, and their supporters, and they have convinced Mr. Blaine and General Foster, that there is no chance whatever of success; and so this whole business is ended, and the Government must remain where they are. They must retain the old policy, they must sing the old tunes, their friends must support the old leaders, and wave the old flag, and that is their business. They are confined within very narrow limits; their work of investigation and reflection is at an end; and all they have to do is to defend the fortress, retain the hon. gentlemen who support them, and use the old arms for the maintenance of the citadel. Well, Sir, I do not exactly see the matter in that light. Whatever may have been the intentions of the Government—and we can hardly suppose now that they were serious or that they ever expected to accomplish more than they did accomplish—it is pretty clear that their friends who followed and supported them, did not take the same comfortable view of the situation, as long as the negotiations were threatened, or were in progress. They felt some uneasiness. They were inclined to think that in some way or other, the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches had got off the old path, that they were deviating from that course to which the economic orthodoxy of that side of the House required that they should adhere, and that they were in danger of being lost: and they could never understand how it was that those gentlemen should stray so far away from home as to go to Washington to negotiate about a business, which, if it succeeded, would prove so detrimental to the interests of Canada. That was their position. They supposed that some sorceress had got possession of the Finance Minister—that some false Duessa, who had robed herself in garments that did not belong to her and appeared young and beautiful, proved, when stripped of these, to be a very offensive, old, deformed individual, like the false Duessa in the "Fairy Queen." Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, no doubt, when he started for Washington, played the part of the Red Cross Knight. He got to the White House, which was, his friends feared, a palace of enchantment; but somehow, by the interposition of some friendly fairy, the hon. gentleman was released from his delusions, and became clothed and in his right mind; and he returned without inflicting any serious injury on the people of Canada. That is, in their estimation, the hon. gentleman's position. I remember some years ago reading a play in which the hero, called, I think, Sir Pertinax McSycophant, was anxious to

grow suddenly rich, but was puzzled how to succeed unless he found some rich person who would be ready to marry him. So it appeared that he met an old, toothless, phthisicky, ricketty, rheumatic specimen of humanity whose affections he won in a fortnight, whom he married in a month and buried in a year; and then, with a large supply of money, a sorrowful countenance, and a light heart, he was enabled to begin life anew. Now, the hon. gentleman came back here, and I am sure it was a melancholy pleasure to him to tell how he failed. He was very much like Sir Pertinax: and not only did we see the melancholy pleasure with which—no doubt with a melancholy countenance, but with real pleasure at heart—he announced to the House the failure of the negotiations, but, Sir, the pleasure was not a melancholy one to the "new colony," nor to his older followers. It was perfectly clear from the loud cheers with which the announcement was received, that it was a matter of genuine rejoicing to them. It was a day of emancipation. They were once more free. They could once more, without any limitations or reservations, declare themselves supporters of the old policy to which they had adhered for so very long a time. Now, Sir, there is not only this feature of the discussion, but there is a larger one, if we look at the circumstances which gave rise to this visit to Washington. It is important, in order to understand the whole question, to notice how it began, as well as how it ended. There was a dissolution of Parliament, and this dissolution, we were informed, was for the purpose of obtaining popular sanction to the very serious business in which these gentlemen were about to engage. There was no popular sanction sought by the Government for the Franchise Act. There was no popular sanction sought when it was proposed to put the wards of the Government, the unenfranchised Indians of the country, upon the list of voters. There was no popular sanction required when it was proposed to undertake other constitutional changes of not less importance. Sir, Parliament is elected for a period of five years. The law provides for the continuance of Parliament during that period. The law has entrusted the Crown with the power of dissolution, under certain circumstances. What those circumstances are, is pretty well defined by the usages and practices of Parliament and the Crown, in the mother country. It is not a power that can be lightly used. It is a power, says Sir Robert Peel, "which never can be employed carelessly without blunting the instrument." It is of the first consequence that those usages and practices should be regarded by the Government, when advising the Crown, to dissolve Parliament. I am not going into a discussion of the question whether this was, and in what respect it was, an improper dissolution. I referred to the subject last year. I have no doubt whatever, that the Crown was badly advised, and that the prerogative of dissolution was abused, when that power was exercised in putting an end to the Parliament which preceded this. Honourable gentlemen want popular sanction for negotiations, the character of which was not disclosed. They asked the judgment of the country on a question which the country was not permitted to know and to understand, and they hoped that the people of this country would regard that as a serious declaration of principle. Now, let us look for a moment at what Parliament did in former years, and what it did without question, in putting upon the Statute-book what is called "the standing offer." There is a law which declared that the Government should at any time, under certain circumstances which are set out in the statute, enter into negotiations with the United States, and immediately put a large number of articles, indicated in the statute, upon the free list. This Government required popular sanction for what Parliament had authorized it to do. Does the Government require popular sanction for what has already, over and over again, received popular sanction? Most assuredly not: and it can be hardly said that the Administration were serious when they undertook to appeal to the country, and assigned as a reason for that appeal, that they required popular sanction for the step they were about to take. The hon. gentleman, the Minister of Finance, says that the Government are not responsible for the McKinley Bill. Well, I dissent from that view. We all remember here the discussion we had in 1886 when a large number of articles had been put upon the free list by the Congress of the United States, and we asked that they should be put upon the free list by the Parliament of Canada. They were natural products. They were such as a large number of our people had a special interest in, especially those who reside in the Maritime Provinces. A large trade was growing up in them. We were exporters of many of them, yet the Government, at the instance of some of their supporters, voted down the proposition to put these articles on the free list. The financial department of the Government was then in charge of Sir Leonard Tilley. Two years later the Government entered into negotiations with the Government of Washington about another matter, the treaty of 1888, relating to the fisheries. Sir Charles Tupper, who acted as Commissioner for Canada, came here. He was, I think, Minister of Finance at the time. He was, at all events, a member of the Government, and he pressed upon the Government the necessity of putting upon the free list these articles, that we had proposed should go on the free list two years before. He did so, on representations from Washington. The Government had declared against doing that particular act. The hon. gentleman who now leads the House had himself spoken against the proposition not two days before: but, at the instance of the Minister of Finance, the matter was pressed on the attention of the Government. They receded from the position they had taken, and put those articles on the free list. These articles remained there but for a single season, and were again put back on the list of dutiable articles, and then the McKinley Bill came into operation. Now, the Government for a series of years, acted upon these representations that had been made. What were they? Why, they had said again and again: If you permit us to pursue a courageous policy, we will bring the Congress of the United States to their knees, we will bring them to their senses: and Sir Charles Tupper, as a member of the Administration, pointed out again and again to this House, making a statement which was not accurate, but which was nevertheless made, that the mere threat of putting a duty upon American coal had the effect of inducing Congress to take the duty off Canadian coal. He gave that as an instance of the power Canada had, if she chose to exercise it, of completely altering the

fiscal policy of the United States. The Government pursued this system, talking loudly, talking very grandly, intimating what we had power to do, intimating the cowardly, the humiliating position we would be in if we failed to exercise our power, and to show the Congress of the United States our independence of them. All this tall talk, and these actions ultimately called attention, which was not before attracted, to the relations between Canada and the United States. They specially called the attention of the American Government to the matter, and the result was the McKinley Bill. The McKinley Bill, Sir, had its origin in the policy and in the language employed by the hon. gentlemen who sat on the Treasury benches, and in the newspapers supporting them, and the hon. gentlemen who voted with them and occupied seats behind them in this House. Well, on the eve of the last general election, these hon. gentlemen announced that they were about to negotiate a treaty with the United States. They were divided between their support of a treaty and their support of the National Policy. They were to leave here on the 4th of March, they were to reach Washington on the 6th, at a period when it would be known how great a victory they had achieved, and their hands would be strengthened, so that they could successfully carry on their negotiations with the neighbouring Republic. I think that the correspondence, to which I shall refer, shows that the representations then made were not such representations as ought to have been made to the people of this country; that they were representations made for the purpose of convincing those who were dissatisfied with the policy of protection, that they were about to receive relief at the hands of the Administration; that the relations between the United States and Canada had undergone change; that the Government had abandoned their fiscal policy of restriction, and that they were prepared to treat that policy as a mere means to an end. In fact, we were told again and again, at the last general election, that the policy of protection was not adopted as a policy good in itself but as a means to an end; that their policy, as the resolution of 1878 in fact declared, was simply a means of forcing the people of the United States to agree to freer trade relations, and to freer commercial intercourse, with the people of this country. Now let me call the attention of the House to the correspondence which took place between His Excellency and the Colonial Office, and the Government of this country and the British Embassy at Washington, for the purpose of promoting a better understanding in commercial matters between Canada and the neighbouring Republic. Before commencing to read quotations from this correspondence, let me say that, although the Government sent an embassy to Washington a little later than they had promised the people of this country that such a delegation or embassy would be sent, that delegation or embassy remained there for a remarkably short period of time; it did so because the Secretary of State complained that faith had not been kept with him, and these gentlemen were put on probation for misconduct before those negotiations could be renewed. On the 3rd November, 1890, the Colonial Office informed the Foreign Office that suggestions had been received from the Governor General by telegram, and that a reply to these suggestions should be telegraphed to the British Minister at Washington, if the Foreign Office approved of what the telegram contained. The words are:

"With instructions to consider in what way the wish of Canada to be included in any arrangement may best be made, and to telegraph home for consideration the terms of any convention or arrangement which he thinks could be obtained or is desirable."

This was done by the Foreign Office on the following day, and on the 6th November the Foreign Office informed the Colonial Office that they had received "the substance of a draft convention from Sir Julian Pauncefote that he had privately communicated to Mr. Blaine for an arrangement as to fishing questions and as to trade regulations between the United States and Newfoundland. I am to point out that Sir Julian Pauncefote defers replying to the enquiry addressed to him as to the best mode of including Canada in such an arrangement until he has discussed the draft with Mr. Blaine." On the 19th November, a protest is made by the Canadian Government against the Newfoundland treaty. On the 26th November, the Canadian Government was informed by Lord Knutsford that "Her Majesty's Government will delay the Newfoundland convention if Canadian negotiations can be entered upon at once on lines proposed by your Ministers so that both may proceed *pari passu*. Any reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States would, as previously, be framed so as not to place imports from this country at a disadvantage, and it is presumed that Canada would wish to retain control over her tariff with a view to possible extension of her trade with the colonies and England." There is a suggestion from the Colonial Office in consequence of a communication received from the Government of Canada with reference to the proposals of the Government which have not been laid before this House. What correspondence was there, that gave rise to this suggestion? How is it that that communication of the 19th November from the Government of Canada has not been laid before Parliament? The Governor General informs Lord Knutsford on the same day that "the Canadian Ministers are prepared to open negotiations immediately on the lines indicated in my telegram of the 19th." What were those lines indicated in the telegram of the 19th? Why is it that the contents of that telegram have not been laid before this House, and that the Government have not seen proper to communicate to Parliament the proposal which is necessary, to enable Parliament to form a judgment upon the conduct of the Administration? They go on to say: "Provided their representatives at Washington could be commissioners associated with the British Minister and empowered to negotiate directly instead of being merely delegates." That is the condition on which they proposed to undertake immediate negotiations. What were the lines indicated in that telegram, not a word of which has up to this hour been communicated to Parliament? We are required, on account of the statement of the hon. Minister, to exercise our judgment upon the conduct of the Administration, and the papers which are necessary to enable us to form a judgment upon the conduct of the Administration are not yet laid before Parliament. On the 28th November, 1890, Lord Stanley informs the British Minister at Washington that

"We are prepared to arrange for commercial relations with the United States being liberally extended and wish

that the United States may be so informed. This Government objects to sending delegates to Washington unofficially, as liable to give rise to misunderstanding, but is ready at once to open formal negotiations with the sanction of Her Majesty's Government."

They also say :

"They would negotiate immediately on the lines indicated in my telegram of the 19th if their representatives could be commissioners empowered to negotiate directly instead of merely delegates."

These are the words contained in the despatch of His Excellency upon this very important subject. On the 4th December, Lord Knutsford, in a communication to Lord Stanley, says :

"With reference to your despatch of the 19th of last month, Her Majesty's Government agree to the Minister at Washington being assisted by one or more Canadian plenipotentiaries, if the United States consent to negotiations."

On the 5th December, Lord Stanley telegraphs Lord Knutsford :

"May we now make definite official proposals through the British Minister to the United States Government."

That communication shows that up to that time no formal communication, or no proposal, had been made by the Government of Canada to the British Embassy at Washington with the view to its being communicated to the Government of the United States. Their communication which they proposed as a basis of negotiations on the subject of reciprocity, was with the Colonial Office. That is contained in the telegram of the 19th November, which has never been laid before Parliament, but the Colonial Office calls for caution—that they would not undertake to discriminate against British goods, and that they would not enter into such trade relations with the United States as would make it impossible for them to extend their relations with the mother country, or with other British possessions. On the 17th December, Sir Julian Pauncefote writes to Lord Stanley :

"I am informed by the Secretary of State (Mr. Blaine) that his Government could not respond to the suggestion of a formal commission until a basis of arrangement had been first reached. He expresses a strong desire to conclude a wide reciprocity treaty."

These were the words used in the despatch of the British Minister at Washington, that Mr. Blaine desired to conclude a wide treaty of reciprocity. He does not limit the Government to any specific kind of treaty except that it ought to be a treaty mutually beneficial and comprehensive in its provisions. Lord Stanley informs Lord Knutsford, on the 13th December, upon what terms the Government are prepared to negotiate. Now, the fact that that telegram of the 19th is suppressed, and this formal despatch of the 13th December is given, goes to show that the contents of the telegram did not correspond with the contents of the despatch. Let us know what were the Government's first impressions. What were the views, what were the proposals in contemplation as a basis for commercial arrangements with the United States, as suggested in this telegram of the 19th November? The House has a right to know what views the Government entertained on the subject at that time. Now, this despatch of the 13th December reads as follows :—

"I have the honour to send to your Lordship to-day a telegraphic message of which the following is the substance :"

That telegraphic message of the 13th is not here.

"With reference to my telegram of the 10th inst., this Government is desirous ... to propose a joint commission, such as that of 1871, with authority to deal without limitation and to prepare a treaty respecting the following subjects :—

"1. Renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries, and with the extensions deemed by the commission to be in the interest of Canada and the United States.

"2. Reconsideration of the treaty of 1888 with respect to the Atlantic fisheries, with the aim of securing the free admission into the United States markets of Canadian fishery products in return for facilities to be granted to the United States fishermen to buy bait and supplies and to tranship cargoes in Canada, all such privileges to be mutual.

"3. Protection of mackerel and other fisheries on the Atlantic Ocean and the inland waters also.

"4. Relaxation of the seaboard coasting laws of the two countries.

"5. Relaxation of the coasting laws of the two countries on the inland waters dividing Canada from the United States.

"6. Mutual salvage and saving of wrecked vessels.

"7. Arrangements for settling boundary between Canada and Alaska."

Now, these were the topics that were suggested in this communication of the 13th December as subjects for discussion in the Parliament of Canada and the Government of the United States. It will be observed that the Government proposed in this, the treaty of 1854 as the basis for negotiation between the two Governments on the subject of reciprocity. The Governments had again and again informed Parliament through a long series of years beginning in 1871, that it was not possible to secure a treaty of reciprocity with the United States upon the basis contained in this first proposition ; and why they should undertake to suggest as a basis for the negotiation that which they themselves stated never could be a basis for a successful treaty, I confess I am unable to understand, except upon the one hypothesis, that, however anxious the Government might be to succeed with regard to some of the other matters, they were merely anxious to allay public feeling, to postpone the public decision, until the elections were over ; and then if they failed, or if it became manifest that they did not desire to succeed in the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with our neighbours, no harm could come to them politically. That is the one inference which may be drawn, and it seems to me the only one that can be drawn, from the proposition, and from what subsequently happened with regard to it. I need not refer to the second proposition. I suppose the Government are anxious to accomplish that. I should have been sorry to have seen them successful with regard to some of the provisions of that treaty of 1888. I am willing that the Administration should go a long way in establishing freer trade relations, and making liberal commercial arrangements in all those matters referred to in the treaty of 1888 ; but I am not anxious, I am not willing, to see any government, or any party, sacrificing the sovereign rights of this country to the demands of our neighbours, and those sovereign rights were, in my opinion, to no inconsiderable degree sacrificed by the terms of the treaty of 1888, I need not refer to the protection of the mackerel, or to the relaxation of the laws relating to the coasting trade. I may say that the proposition relating to mutual salvage and the saving of wrecked vessels, which the Minister of War when Minister of Customs, fought with so much vigour and success for a long series of years,

he supported at Washington. I think I may congratulate the Minister of Militia on the progress which he has made in that particular, and that he is now prepared to support, as in the interests of humanity as well as in the interests of commerce, a policy which he has hitherto opposed with a great deal of vigour and with a great deal of success. Now, the next subject to which I shall refer is a statement made by a member of the Government. It is this :

"Mr. Blaine replied that to endeavour to obtain the appointment of the formal commission to arrive at the reciprocity would be useless, but that the United States Government was willing to discuss the question in private with Sir Julian Pauncefote and one or more delegates from Canada, and to consider every subject as to which there was a hope of agreement on the grounds of mutual interests ; if not to risk so grave a step until by private discussion he has satisfied himself that good ground existed for expecting an agreement by means of a commission. He added that he would be prepared to enter into private negotiations at any time after 4th March."

He added that he would be prepared to enter into these negotiations at any time after 4th March. This was the communication the Government received from Washington as to Mr. Blaine's intentions. Mr. Blaine informs Sir Julian Pauncefote :

"I had not a moment to give to the subject until after the adjournment of Congress in March, but after that date I would be willing to respond to your request, to have a full but private conference with the British Minister and one or more agents from Canada to go over every point of difference and consider every subject upon which a mutual interest can be founded. If an agreement is reached, all well ; if not, no official mention is to be made of the effort. Above all things it is important to avoid public reference to the matter. This the President will insist upon."

Now, this was the understanding in regard to these initial negotiations. Mr. Blaine said, when he received the proposition which the Government submitted : I am not prepared to enter into negotiations by the appointment of a formal Commission. Your proposition for reciprocity is vague and may be one exceedingly limited. I do not know how you propose to deal with the matter. I do not know what your proposals are. It may be a useless waste of time to undertake negotiations on such a basis : let us by private and informal intercourse, which is to be kept strictly secret, ascertain whether there is any reasonable prospect of arriving at an agreement before we appoint a Commission for the purpose of negotiation. That was his proposition. And why he wished to keep it secret is perfectly obvious. Such a proposition as the one contained in the topics for negotiations supplied by the Government is one which might arouse against it a very large section of the population of the United States, without bringing a single section to support the Administration that would entertain it. It was important to know more specifically what it was that Canada was willing to agree to have reciprocal trade in, and until that should be ascertained, it was most undesirable that the matter should be put before the people ; because the Government of the United States would be in this position : there would be a large number of interests prepared to attack the proposition, and no interests prepared to give it their support. That would be the necessary consequence of making public a proposition such as the Government of Canada submitted to the United States. That was not done. The Government did not keep secret these informal negotiations, on the contrary they published abroad that such negotiations were to be had, and of this Mr. Blaine complained, and he certainly complained with good reason. After that a member of the Government said :

"Sir John Macdonald's Government not long ago made a definite proposal to the Washington authorities for the settlement of all existing differences between the two countries, on the basis of the extension of trade between the two countries. It involves partial reciprocity, the enumerated articles to include generally a number of natural products. But the proposition discards any idea of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Moreover, these proposals were invited and suggested by the Washington authorities."

Did Mr. Blaine's suggestion—that if the subject of reciprocity was entertained it should be a wide proposal for reciprocity—warrant a statement of this sort ? In my opinion, it did not. I hold it to be a misrepresentation of Mr. Blaine's statement to say that it warrants the assertion made in the paragraph I have read. It is further said :

"The Commissioners from Canada and Great Britain start for Washington on the 4th March, the date of the opening of the new Congress."

The reason was not that a new Congress was to be opened at that date, but that the Secretary of State would have leisure in consequence of the termination of the old one. There is no statement made by Mr. Blaine that warrants the intimation that negotiations were to begin on the 4th of March, and that a delegation was to start on the 4th March. There is not a particle of the correspondence brought down that warrants a statement of this sort. Mr. Blaine says that before that time he will not have leisure. It is clear that the intention was that the fixing of the date for these negotiations was to be a matter for future arrangement. But that was not one acted upon, nor what was represented to the Canadian public. A Minister said :

"The result of the Canadian elections will be known on the 6th March, the day the Commissioners reach Washington. In order that the Commission may have no uncertain sound, Sir John A. Macdonald has decided to appeal to the country and ask for judgment on these proposals of his to the Washington authorities."

What were these proposals ? Was there anything definite, on which judgment could be passed ? No. It was necessary that negotiations should take place, that conclusions should be reached, that the public should know what those conclusions were before it would be possible for the public to form a judgment. It should not have been done before negotiations were begun. If the opinion of the country was required, it was required after negotiations were completed, and the terms agreed upon were known, and it was a mere pretense to dissolve Parliament, under the circumstances, for any such purpose as that set out in this statement. It is impossible it could be so. Sir John Macdonald shortly after this time issued an address himself. It was elaborate. It discussed the various issues that had been put before the people. It discussed the policy laid before the country by the party of which he was the head ; but there is not in the address from the beginning to the end a syllable with respect to those negotiations that were to take place at Washington. He said nothing in regard to them, and I suppose the reason he said nothing was the understanding with Mr. Blaine that these matters were not to be made subjects of public discussion. Nor was the fact of the discussion of this question in an informal way to be made public, unless they reached a conclusion

justifying the appointment of a Commission for the purpose of negotiating a formal treaty. When the statement became public, Mr. Baker, a member of Congress, addressed a letter to Mr. Blaine, calling Mr. Blaine's attention to what had been stated by the Government or the press of the Government, and asking him what foundation there was for these representations. Mr. Baker's letter is this:

"My Dear Mr. Blaine,—It is reported in the newspapers of Canada and along the northern border of my state, where my constituents are deeply interested in the subject, that negotiations are going on between this country and Great Britain, with a view to partial reciprocity with Canada, including natural products only and not manufactures; and it is stated that Sir Charles Tupper is on his way here as a commissioner to negotiate for such modifications of our tariff. I shall be very glad if you will enable me to answer my constituents.

"Very truly yours,
"CHAS. S. BAKER."

To this Mr. Blaine on the same date, the 29th January, 1891, addressed the following reply:—

"Dear Mr. Baker,—I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured that no such scheme for a reciprocity treaty with the Dominion, confined to natural products, will be entertained by this Government. We know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper's coming to Washington.

"Very truly, &c.,
"JAMES G. BLAINE."

Now, Sir, any one who has read the correspondence between the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office, between Lord Stanley and the Colonial Office, between Lord Stanley and the British ambassador at Washington, the minutes of Council, and the communication by the Government of Canada, will see that in every particular this letter of Mr. Blaine is true. There were no negotiations pending. He refused to agree to the appointment of a Commission, he refused to agree that there should be negotiations, until by informal and private conversation with the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches he had ascertained what their meaning was when they proposed a reciprocity treaty on the basis of that of 1854, modified as required by the changes that had taken place in both countries in that period of time. Mr. Blaine's view was clearly stated in this letter; and the Government, from the time that letter was written down to the time that they say they failed at Washington in these informal negotiations, knew precisely what kind of proposition the American Government were prepared to entertain. That that proposition must be as broad and as comprehensive as the Finance Minister has stated to this House, I do not believe. I think that a treaty of a very different character, without these restrictions which he suggested, can be negotiated. I think that he did his best to prevent any agreement that his party would be willing to accept. I have no doubt of that whatever, and I say, Sir, that under these circumstances it was of the first consequence that every memorandum, every letter, every communication, every report of matters that took place between the Canadian Government and the Government at Washington, and every report that was made to His Excellency here in reference to this visit to Washington, should have been laid before Parliament before the Minister of Finance undertook to discuss the subject at all. Now, there is in this letter of Mr. Blaine a specific declaration. He declares that no proposition looking to a treaty confined to natural products will be entertained, and the Government knew that before they left Ottawa for Washington. They promised to go to Washington while the general elections were pending, they left on this final visit of theirs when the bye-elections were pending, and so the Government have, by their action in the first instance and in the last, shown what in their opinion was the public feeling on the subject of reciprocity. Strongly, as they believed, the system of protection had taken hold upon the minds of the manufacturing classes; strongly as they felt themselves entrenched by their subserviency, shall I say, to that class; at all events let me say, by their devotion to it; they still felt that the agricultural population and the commercial classes of this country were interested in freer trade with the neighbouring Republic. It would not do when any number of bye-elections were pending, much less would it do when a general election was pending, to leave the public of this country to suppose that they were not prepared to entertain propositions looking to more liberal trade relations with the United States. On the 6th February last year the Minister of Justice spoke to the people of the city of Toronto, and he said in his speech amongst other things, those which I will now read:

"It will be proved to you when the time comes that in response to that Mr. Blaine, whatever his sentiments may be—and I am bound for the present to give him credit for candor—as the negotiations of Newfoundland would not suit the Dominion of Canada for a trade treaty between these two countries, he was willing to make a wide treaty for reciprocity and enter upon separate negotiations with her. That statement being made, we are bound to avail ourselves of that to extend our trade."

That the United States were willing to make a wide treaty of reciprocity, he knew. That statement was made by Mr. Blaine, and he says we are bound to avail ourselves of that to extend our trade. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the Government were bound to avail themselves of it, but the Government in the course which they adopted and in the proposition which they made, showed that they were not disposed to make a wide treaty of reciprocity. It was a treaty of a very different character; it was a treaty that would require to be characterized by other terms than as a wide treaty of reciprocity, which they expressed their readiness to negotiate: a treaty the character of which was such that they knew from the time that this proposition was submitted to the British Government to be communicated to Washington, that it would not be accepted. Again the Minister of Justice said:

"The next request from Mr. Blaine was that preparatory to negotiations being entered upon, the Canadian Government would propound a basis upon which the convention would eventually proceed. We did so in a document which has been published in the press offering to consider a renewal of the reciprocity of 1854, with such modifications as the circumstances of the two countries might call for."

Now, Sir, that is a statement which I have no doubt is fairly accurate. Mr. Blaine no doubt insisted upon preparatory negotiations before such a proposition was made, but that proposition when made was of so indefinite and of so vague a character that it prevented the appointment of the Commission until the Government of Canada made clear their meaning, until they explained to the Government of the United States how far they were prepared to go and what modifications they were prepared to propose. The Minister of Justice goes on to say:

"It is stated that having made that proposition to Mr. Blaine without any prospect of its being accepted, and

without any prospect of its being eventually entertained, Sir John Macdonald has sprung the elections on the people of Canada under the pretense of his going to entertain the negotiations while in reality the Cabinet at Washington will have none of it. Let me tell you that, so far from that being true, we had the proposition that was submitted to Mr. Blaine; that the answer that Mr. Blaine made to us was that he was willing to enter on a preliminary discussion to precede the more formal commission; he was willing to enter upon that discussion and to consider all points embraced in it, but would not be prepared to do so until after the 4th of March."

Now, Sir, the complaint which I make against that statement of the Minister of Justice is, that at the time it was made there was every reasonable ground for supposing that the criticism which he was answering, was a well-founded criticism. What does his critic say? That the Government had made the proposition to Mr. Blaine without any prospect of its being accepted. Now, did they not so make it? Had they any prospect that it would be accepted? Had not Mr. Blaine's refusal to appoint commissioners, his insistance on a preliminary discussion of this proposition, and his letter to Mr. Baker which had already appeared before this speech was delivered—had not all these things made it perfectly clear that the Government were not going to succeed, and that when they sought to persuade the electors of Canada to hold their judgment in suspense until the elections were over, and these negotiations had taken place, they were giving the people of Canada an assurance which they were not warranted in giving them; because there was not any ground whatever for hoping that the Government would succeed in the proposition which it had submitted at the time. The House will bear in mind that these negotiations, which the hon. Minister of Justice discussed so fully and freely in that speech, were negotiations that were to have been kept secret. Whether he felt that they had been already divulged by the Prime Minister and Sir Charles Tupper, and that he was not making matters any worse by further discussion, or not, I do not know; he has never given us any explanation on that point. How was it that the pledge of secrecy was broken, and that these statements, which were to be kept secret, and about which nothing was to be said if there was no success, were fully revealed from the very beginning? Well, Sir, after the elections were over and Parliament met here, the negotiations were made the subject of discussion in the debate on the Address, in which my hon. friend from South Oxford criticised the conduct of the Government in reference to these matters, and his criticism was answered by the Minister of Finance. In the course of his speech the hon. Minister of Finance said:

"Consequently, when there is an alternative, when the Minister of Justice makes a solemn statement in Toronto, when he gives official utterance, speaking as a Minister of the Crown, as to how these negotiations were commenced, and how they were carried on; and on the other hand, there is a letter sent by Mr. Blaine to a Mr. Baker saying some things, and not stating others, the hon. gentleman says: 'I believe Mr. Blaine and not the Minister.' I think, if my hon. friend will allow me to tell him so, it would be well for him to trust the Canadian people a little more, and even to trust the Canadian Ministers when they make grave statements on their responsibilities as Ministers of the Crown."

He further said:

"Is the hon. gentleman afraid of his case? Was he afraid that if he waited three or four days, until these papers came down, that he would not be able to make the speech he has just made, and so decided to forestall the Address and get his surmises spread throughout the country before they could have a chance of being confronted by documentary truth."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

The hon. member for South Oxford would not wait three or four days until those papers were brought down. Well, the House waited three or four months before some of the papers made their appearance, and when they were brought down many papers of the utmost importance to the proper elucidation of the subject were omitted, and to this hour the House is not in possession of them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him whether he did not complain that the telegram of the 19th of November had not been brought down? If so, that is a mistake, because I find it is in the book.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see, I think, there is just an extract from that telegram, but there is not a syllable referring to the propositions of the Government on this subject.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a reference to the telegram, according to the custom in all diplomatic communications, but there is not an extract, with the exception of half a dozen words.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). On page 75 I find an extract from the telegram of Lord Stanley of Preston to Lord Knutsford, dated 19th November, 1890, as follows:—

"Have received your telegram of 15th inst. My Government view with the utmost alarm proposed convention between Newfoundland and the United States.

"It affects fisheries interests of Canada as well as those of Newfoundland, and places fisheries and other products of Canada on different footing from those of Newfoundland in United States markets.

"Sanction of Newfoundland Treaty by Her Majesty's Government would materially aid United States policy by placing Canada at disadvantage with neighbouring colony of Newfoundland and producing discontent here.

"Dominion Government respectfully remonstrate in strongest terms against signature of proposed convention at Washington. I will telegraph text of Council Minute when received."

On the next page, I find this telegram:

"Canadian Ministers are prepared to open negotiations immediately, on lines indicated in my telegram of the 19th, provided their representatives at Washington can be commissioners associated with British Minister, and empowered to negotiate directly instead of being merely delegates."

Now, the extract from the telegram of the 19th does not allude at all to the negotiations. What I complain of is that that telegram contains proposals as the basis of negotiations, and the British Government in their answer say that they hope the negotiations will not "place imports from this country at a disadvantage, and it is presumed that Canada would wish to retain control over her tariff with a view to possible extension of her trade with the colonies and England." Now, when I take that statement as springing out of the receipt of this telegram, and the other allusion, it is clear that the telegram of the 19th November must have contained proposals relating to the basis of negotiations which are not in the extract published. Now, I have said this much with regard to the papers that are brought down, and the suggestions these papers contain are not fully disclosed. I wish now to discuss the subject of the recent negotiations and what I regard as constitutional usages with reference to the rights of Parliament in respect of papers and documents which have been the outcome of the intercourse between the United States and Canada. There are two things to consider, the rights of the Crown and the rights of Parliament. Now, with regard to the rights of the Crown, every one knows that under our constitutional system the Crown is

the organ of the Government for negotiation with foreign states. Every one knows that the intercourse between Canada and Great Britain and any foreign state is an intercourse had through the instrumentality of the Sovereign, and that every Minister or ambassador speaks in the name of the Sovereign in carrying on these negotiations. Now, the practice is that a record shall be kept and a report made to the Minister of Foreign Affairs as the organ of the Sovereign in this particular, of every transaction and of every discussion which has taken place between any representative of the Government of Great Britain or of Canada and any representative of a foreign state. Then, after such a discussion has taken place, if any parliamentary action is required or any discussion takes place in Parliament, it is the right of Parliament to have before it all these papers which the public interest will permit to be laid before it; and the practice is that if the important documents cannot be laid before Parliament, discussion on that subject shall be postponed. I venture to say that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches will not find one instance in a century where such a discussion has taken place in Parliament at the instance of the Minister, without all the papers being put before Parliament. Let me call the attention of the House to an important rule in this particular, and I will first read an extract or two from Mr. Todd's book on Parliamentary Government. Todd says at page 356 of Volume I:

"It is unquestionably of immense advantage to the country, that the diplomatic transactions and proceedings of the Government abroad should be freely communicated to Parliament, for thereby the foreign policy of the Crown ordinarily receives the approbation of Parliament, and is sustained by the strength of an enlightened public opinion. This in itself confers an additional weight to our policy and opinions abroad."

Then, at page 439, he further says:

"The rule which forbids any encroachment by Parliament upon the executive authority of the Crown has a further application, to which our attention must now be directed. It is imperative that Parliament shall be duly informed of everything that may be necessary to explain the policy and proceedings of Government in any part of the Empire, and the fullest information is communicated by Government to both Houses, from time to time, upon all matters of public concern. For it is in Parliament that authoritative statements are made or information given, by Ministers, upon public questions; and no action in Parliament should be based on declarations of policy made elsewhere."

Now it is as much the right of Parliament to know what has passed between any Minister of the Crown and any foreign Government or official, as it is the right of the Crown to know what has passed. This Parliament has a superintending power over the Cabinet. It exercises a supreme authority over the policy and conduct of the Administration. It is entitled to form a judgment upon all proceedings of every department of the Government; and to enable it to discharge that duty intelligently and in the public interest, and not to take a leap in the dark, not to depend wholly upon a statement made by a Minister of the Crown in the House, it is the unquestioned right of Parliament, before it is called upon to discuss any matter of public importance, to have all the papers relating to that subject laid before it for the purpose of enabling it to form an accurate and unbiassed judgment. Let me give to the House a few instances from the practice of the Imperial Parliament, which go to sustain the general proposition I have just stated. I am not stating merely a proposition relating to a rule of procedure in the House. I am stating a constitutional principle which enables the House to exercise an effective and an intelligent control over the conduct of every officer of the State, and over the conduct of the members of the Administration combined. I am asserting here, in the interests of parliamentary government, the maintenance of a principle, which it is necessary to maintain, to enable the House to discharge its duty in this particular. I am not asking that the House shall undertake the work of the Administration. I am not asking that it shall exercise a meddlesome interference over any Minister in the discharge of his duties in his department, but I am maintaining that the House, as the supreme council of the nation, has supreme authority in advising the Crown on all matters of great public importance, and has a right to overrule every other council of the State in its views; and I am stating what is absolutely necessary to enable it to discharge a duty, which, under the constitution, it is called upon to discharge and which it has a right to discharge. Now let me give you a few instances. I say this, that there is not an instance in which the Government ever initiated a discussion and withheld the papers, in the history of the English Parliament, as far as I know. There are instances where private members have insisted upon discussing a question before all the papers could be brought down, or when it was in the interests of the State that some of the papers should be held back; but when the Government have not laid all the papers on the Table of the House, the House has insisted upon the postponement of the discussion. But for a Minister of the Crown to initiate a discussion upon an important question of public policy, and to inform the House that he will give it no information except what he chooses to give in his speech, is an unprecedented, a most unconstitutional and improper course to pursue, one that would make it, if acted on generally, quite impossible for the House to discharge those high functions it is called upon to discharge as a council of the State.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I shall now refer to a few cases which I think will go to establish the general proposition which I laid down, and which I think is supported by the two citations I made from Mr. Todd's very excellent work on Parliamentary Government in England. The first is a short conversation which took place in the House of Lords between certain noble lords on the subject of the aid that had been given by the Government towards the maintenance of the Colonial Government in the Fiji Islands. Viscount Canterbury moved for copies or extracts of any other correspondence or documents explaining the present position of the colony of Fiji. It was stated by him that up to that time there had been only three papers laid before Parliament, and that the necessary information for the consideration of the condition of the colony was not before the House. Lord Kimberley, who had been Colonial Secretary, but whose party was not in office at that time, said the reason assigned for the delay in the preparation of the documents was the pressure of work in the Colonial Office. It would

seem from his statement that application for these documents had been made under a former Administration. Lord Carnarvon said "this only showed the inconvenience of being obliged to speak on a subject without having all the information necessary to render their statements quite accurate." The discussion was a mere incidental discussion as to the importance and necessity of having the documents before the House for the further discussion at a later period, but Lord Carnarvon pointed out that some of the opinions expressed were inaccurate, and that their inaccuracy was due to a lack of the proper information, which went to show the importance of having the information in the hands of members before the subject was made a matter of serious discussion. The next case to which I will refer is a motion which was made for the Berlin memorandum in 1876. That motion was made in the House of Lords by Lord Campbell, in reply to whom Lord Derby, who was then the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, said:

"I hope I shall not be charged with disrespect to this House or discourtesy to any member of it, if I do not in my turn take the opportunity of explaining and justifying in detail the policy which we have pursued."

Further on in the same speech, Lord Derby said:

"There is another reason why a full discussion is not at present possible—it would require as a preliminary, that the papers relating to what is past should be before your Lordships, and that your Lordships should have had time to consider them. The production of these papers, which has often been promised, has been unavoidably delayed; but they shall be laid before Parliament during the present session and in time for a full discussion of them, if such discussion be thought desirable. But to lay them at the present moment on the Table would be premature and inconvenient; and moreover, they could only be produced in a very fragmentary form."

There were two reasons assigned for not proceeding with the discussion to which the papers related. The one was that the House had not all the papers and correspondence in its possession which would enable it to discuss the matter intelligently, and the second was that, these papers being largely correspondence with foreign Governments, the Administration were not in a position to lay them before Parliament. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that this discussion, incidental and brief as it was, was not initiated by the Administration but by private members of the House, who asked for the papers in order that a full discussion should be had; and that it was stated that these papers were essential to a discussion of the matter; that the Minister admitted that, and also that the duty devolved upon him to bring down these papers. Then, in another case that took place in the same year, 1876, Mr. Bruce, who was subsequently a member of the Administration, and who was at that time a prominent member of the House, asked Mr. Disraeli, who was the leader of the House of Commons at the time, "Whether he can fix a day for the discussion of the motion upon the affairs of Bosnia and Herzigovina." This motion had reference to the contemplated acquisition of these two provinces, which had previously been part of the Turkish Empire, by the Empire of Austria, and these papers were asked for in order to have an intelligent discussion on that subject. In reply to Mr. Bruce, Mr. Disraeli said:

"I quite recognize that my hon. friend has a *locus standi* in this question in the notice he has previously given; and assuming as a matter of course that there will be a discussion on the subject even if there may not be one which involves the opinion of the House by a formal motion, I should, under those circumstances, recognize the claim of my hon. friend and endeavour to meet his convenience. But until the papers are on the Table, I think I should hardly do justice to the feelings of the House if I made any arrangements for the discussion of a question of such an important character by a private member.

The reason given for not fixing a day for the discussion of the question was that the papers had not yet been brought down. Upon the motion that the papers on the Eastern question should be laid on the Table of the House, Mr. Disraeli said:

"All those papers are public records of the feelings, policy and views of the different countries, and can always be produced; but in course of negotiations of this kind, there are confidential communications made by foreign powers, and it is very often highly necessary for the vindication of our course, and as illustrative of our policy that those documents should be published; but the House will see at once that the ancient custom which has always been observed, of consulting foreign powers before confidential communications on their part are laid before Parliament, is a very proper and very wise one. The House will feel that otherwise there would be an end to all confidential intercourse with any foreign power. When we are told that all the Government has to do is to consult the House of Commons, and not under any circumstances to consult those who are our allies, the only consequence of such a policy would be that all the papers we could lay on the Table would be documents which the House would soon find were wanting in light and information on many points of the most interesting character."

Here Mr. Disraeli points out in the first place that a full presentation of the papers may be necessary to a full consideration of the conduct of the Government and to a justification of the views of the Government on an important matter of international concern. But he also points out that before these papers can be laid upon the Table, some of which were of a confidential character, the consent of the foreign Government, with whom that communication was had, should be obtained; because if a Government were to assume, without such consent, the right to lay papers, under all circumstances, before the House of Commons, a Government would be extremely cautious as to what its public documents would contain. It might be driven to carry on, by private and unofficial communication, through private or unofficial channels, that highly confidential correspondence that is, under present practice, found in the papers of a public character. Now, in so far as any correspondence of this kind may be immature, as the question has not yet been finally disposed of, the Government may find it in the public interest to withhold these papers. But the Government that does so must also find it in the public interest, so far as it is concerned, to take care not to initiate a discusssion upon the subject. When they ask the House to consider their conduct, and to pass it in review, commenting upon or approving of the course they have taken, they are bound to put the House in possession of all these documents, and all that information which is necessary to enable the House to form a proper judgment. Now, what I complain of in this case is that the Minister of Finance introduced into his speech a discussion of communications of an informal character that had taken place with the Government at Washington, a correspondence which was of the highest importance to the people of this country. The hon. Minister has made a statement to the House; he has told us what passed in a very imperfect manner, but he has withheld from the House all those papers, all the memoranda, all the notes, or protocols, if any were kept, of the communications that were had, and he gives us no opportunity, except

in so far as his speech gives it, of forming an opinion for ourselves. I say that it is treating the House in a highly improper manner, it is treating it with the greatest possible indignity. The Administration sit on these benches and hold their official position with the sanction of this House. Their continuance in office is due to the goodwill and confidence of the House, but that confidence should be a rational confidence, and not a superstition. They deny to the House an opportunity of coming to a rational conclusion when they withhold from us that information which is necessary to enable the House to judge properly for itself. Let me mention another case. When Sir Austin Layard, in 1853, proposed to discuss the invasion of Turkey by Russia, and moved for the papers, Lord Palmerston stated on that occasion that it would be highly inconvenient to lay those papers before Parliament, and as the papers could not be laid before Parliament, it would be very improper to call upon the House to discuss the subject: that the House, before that discussion took place, ought to be in possession of all the facts, and that it would not be in the public interest to carry on such a discussion in the absence of the necessary material by which a proper conclusion upon the subject could be reached. This was the statement made on that occasion by one of the first parliamentarians of the country, by one who was as conversant with the constitutional rights of Parliament and with the constitutional rights of the Administration, as any man who has, in our day, sat in the English House of Commons. Sir, I do not know that I could quote to the House a higher authority than the one to which I have just referred. Lord Palmerston held the office of Foreign Secretary in the United Kingdom for nearly half a century. At a later period, in 1878, during the Russo-Turkish War, the Eastern Question was again discussed, and the Earl of Granville on that occasion moved for certain papers and public documents, and I will read a sentence or two from a very brief speech he made on that occasion, and the answer that was given by Lord Beaconsfield:

"EARL GRANVILLE—I am quite sure Her Majesty would not desire that a matter of such great importance should be considered without the fullest information having been afforded to the House."

And again:

"I should be glad to know when those papers will be in the hands of members of this House? I also wish to know whether the correspondence will include, besides the correspondence between this country and Russia, the correspondence with the other powers?

"LORD BEACONSFIELD—They will not be limited to the correspondence between this country and Russia, but will contain papers relating to the proposition of the Congress by Austria."

Lord Beaconsfield proposed that Monday week should be a day for the consideration of this message.

"EARL GRANVILLE—I think that will depend entirely on the papers which, I understand from the noble Earl, will not be confined to the papers between this country and Russia; but will include also those between this country and Austria. I think we have a right to know the views of all the great Powers with regard to whether there should be a conference or not.

"LORD BEACONSFIELD—I shall not fix the day for the discussion till Monday."

Now, these papers were to come down immediately, and it was not until after the papers were in the hands of the House that the Government proposed to fix a day for the consideration of the subject to which the papers alluded. Is that the way in which the House was treated on this occasion? Not at all. Here the Administration informed the House last year, it informed the country again and again that there was to be an unofficial discussion on the subject of reciprocity with the Government of the United States. That unofficial discussion has taken place. The correspondence, the papers that the Government submitted—which I will undertake to show must, in the nature of things, be very important—have not yet been brought down. Sir, the Minister in his speech, if he wished the House to consider this subject, ought to have stated when these papers would have been brought down, when the House would be put in full possession of everything that was in the possession of the Administration; and after he had put the House in full possession of these papers and this correspondence, he might then have asked the House to fix a day, or have proposed himself a time when the subject should be taken into consideration. But to propose a discussion on the subject, to undertake to tell the House what the Government thought, what certain members of the Government said to the Government at Washington, and to declare that the subject now is put at rest forever, is to treat the House, I say, with the greatest possible indignity. The hon. Minister has not dealt fairly and frankly with the House; he has not given to the House that consideration to which it is entitled, when he withheld the papers and proposed himself to remain the master of the situation. Sir, I need not cite any further authorities than those which I have already cited. They are sufficient to illustrate the principle which I laid down before we rose at six o'clock, which was confirmed by Mr. Todd, and which is abundantly supported by these authorities. I say that the rule is clear, that it is a highly improper proceeding for Ministers to initiate a discussion in Parliament upon a subject, and at the same time to withhold papers relating to that subject, from Parliament. Let me say again, there is a difference in this respect between a Minister and a private member. If a private member, in face of the fact that the House has not been put in possession of the papers, and against the remonstrance of the Administration, insists upon a discussion, he may express his opinion upon the subject. But the House is not bound to go on with the discussion. It is, however, altogether different with a Minister of the Crown. The information is in his possession, and he must act upon the well-settled principle that the House is never ready for discussion until the Government are ready to lay before the House the papers which are necessary to enable it to come to an intelligent conclusion. The House ought to be in possession of all the information of which the Government are possessed; it ought to have the same opportunity to form its judgment which the Government has, because the members of the Government for all these purposes do not in any respect differ so far as their rights are concerned from any other members of Parliament. It is the right of every hon. member, before he is called upon to vote or to discuss a question of this sort, to have in his possession the material which will enable him to form a proper judgment upon the subject. Sir, I have already alluded to the fact that the Minister of Finance, and I may now say also the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, exhibited

no little pleasure in referring to the circumstance that they had failed. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the failure would be satisfactory to the business men of the country; the question was disposed of, in fact it was now put out of the purview of practical politics, and the country might have some rest. Let me, having said this much with respect to the constitutional question that has been raised by the course which the Minister of Finance has pursued, say a word or two with respect to the negotiations as they are disclosed to the House in the speech which the hon. Minister addressed to it. He said that reciprocity on the lines offered by Mr. Blaine would necessitate discrimination against the importations and products of the mother country. I am not here going to contest that proposition. I shall be better prepared to discuss it when I have at my disposal the same material the Minister himself has. But I wish to call attention to this fact, that the Government have long proposed, and this Parliament has long sanctioned, a policy of discrimination against the United Kingdom. The taxes on the products of the United Kingdom are discriminatory. The Government do not place the industries of the mother country upon the same footing as those of some other countries. Let me remind the Government of this fact that, when the products of one country are free and we tax the products of another country, it is not necessary that those products should be of the same kind in order that the taxes should be discriminatory, in favour of one country as against the other. Does not the hon. gentleman know that when he imports tea and coffee free, that when he exempts them from taxation altogether, he obliges other imports to bear larger taxes or on such of them as are the subject of taxation? Does he not know that he is discriminating against the United Kingdom and in favour of the countries where tea and coffee are produced? Can there be any doubt on that subject? Does he not know that he seriously affects, by the amount of free importations the imports of the country which are subject to taxation? Has not Spain over and over again complained that Spanish wines are subjected to a higher tax than the wines of France, and is it any reply that the wines produced in Spain are of a different character from those produced in France? There is discrimination. The whole policy of taxation is policy based on the self interest of the Government that imposes it, and it can only be justified on the ground that it is in the interest of the people in whose behalf it is imposed. There is not a country in the world, so far as I know, that places all countries on an exact footing of equality. The products of some are admitted without taxation, and the products of some are highly taxed. And the fact that they are different does not alter or change the principle; the fact that one commodity is taxed and the other is free makes the tax discriminatory as much as if we received the articles from exactly the same countries. In another respect it is discriminatory. Take, for instance, woollen products. Sir Francis Hincks years ago showed that the tax on woollen products of England were higher than the tax on similar products of the United States. We tax certain articles according to weight, and specifically, and also *ad valorem*, and when taken together the tax on horse blankets is very much higher than the tax on broadcloth, in proportion to their value. So it is in regard to some other articles. The whole system of taxation is unequal, and as Sir Francis Hincks showed the few blankets imported from the United States paid in proportion to their value a far lower rate of taxation than corresponding articles from the United Kingdom, because they belonged to a different class. But the whole system of specific taxes will make it discriminatory and such as exists at this moment, and it is against the products of the United Kingdom. The Minister of Finance said there could not be a treaty of reciprocity with the United States on the part of Canada unless it was a discriminatory tariff against Great Britain. What evidence does the hon. gentleman submit to us? Recently the Americans made a treaty with the West Indies. It is not discriminatory. They had concluded a treaty which the hon. gentleman succeeded in defeating, with Newfoundland. That was not discriminatory. I am not prepared to admit that any treaty which does not discriminate against Great Britain cannot be made with the United States. I am satisfied that the negotiations, if carried on by hon. gentlemen who were anxious for a treaty, instead of hon. gentlemen who in all their speeches have pronounced themselves against a treaty, whose supporters in this House since the financial speech was made by the Minister of Finance, have, without an exception, spoken against a treaty of reciprocity, show the spirit by which the party of hon. gentlemen opposite are actuated, and the spirit in which those hon. gentlemen journeyed to Washington for the purpose of carrying on those negotiations with the United States would have resulted differently. I think a fair treaty is a possibility. I think that we have before us up to this time no evidence that this subject was fully, exhaustively and adequately considered by hon. gentlemen opposite in their intercourse with Mr. Blaine. Let me say this, that some preparation for the proper discussion of this subject is necessary, some consideration of the facts, some careful analysis of the trade between the two countries, some estimate of the possibility of an increase in consequence of the change which the Government proposes. One of the statements made by the hon. gentlemen was that Mr. Blaine said that a treaty of reciprocity confined to natural products could not have in it any of the elements of mutuality in reciprocity. What evidence is there of that? What answer did the hon. gentlemen make to that statement? What document or memorandum did they prepare when they went to propose a treaty of reciprocity in natural products; what argument did they advance for the purpose of upholding that proposition? How is it, that this is not before Parliament before this question was made a subject of discussion? When I look at our Trade and Navigation Returns I find that there have been imported from the United States into Canada last year $24,000,000 worth of products that were not subject to taxation at all. How much do we send to the United States free from taxation at this moment? How much of that $24,000,000 worth are natural products, and what would be the volume of trade between the two countries under a system of free trade in natural products? If the hon. gentlemen went to Washington to make a proposition to the Government of the United States, and they proposed to confine reciprocity to natural products, I suppose they went there prepared to show that that propo-

sition was a fair one to the United States. The hon. gentleman told us that Mr. Blaine said it was unfair, but the hon. gentleman did not give to the House a single statement to show that he contended the contrary. He does not lay before the House any memorandum of facts by which the offer is justified and by which an attempt is made to show that it is a fair and proper offer. Now, Sir, it seems to me that the Government ought to have come to the House prepared to submit to the House all the data by which they had fortified themselves, before they set out on their journey to the southern capital. Why is it not in our possession? Why do not the Government give us an opportunity of seeing how far they acted earnestly and in good faith, or how far they sacrificed the interests of the agricultural and labouring population of this country to a few persons engaged in manufacturing, whose confidence the Government have so unremittingly enjoyed? It seems to me that it is clear that the House has not been properly dealt with in this matter, and that the course taken by the Government is not usual and is not constitutional. I believe that the House is entitled to full information, and that everything that the Government had in their possession by which they undertook to sustain the propositions which they made to the Government of the United States, and the answers which they received from the Government of the United States should have been at this moment in our hands, and until they were prepared to put these papers in our hands they ought to have abstained from initiating any discussion upon this subject. Sir, I have stated already that I know a number of gentlemen in this House, some of whom are here for the first time, some, after an interval of absence from the House, who refer to the result of these bye-elections as an evidence that the country supports the policy which the Government have pursued. But, Sir, what is that policy? Is it the policy that the Government intended to pursue, or that they sought to persuade the country that they intended to pursue, when they set out on this journey to Washington, or is it the old National Policy, and when a member of the Government told this House, that no greater disaster could befall this country than to permit the free importation of foreign products of the United States, and that reciprocity in natural products would be a calamity; and when that calamity was one of the things which the Government by these negotiations, if they were in earnest, intended to inflict on the country? Was it protection or reciprocity upon which the recent elections turned; which was it that these gentlemen supported? Did they support the Government in undertaking to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, or did they support the Government in opposing negotiations and undertaking to secure the defeat of that treaty? What were the views that these hon. gentlemen were elected to uphold in this House? Now, Sir, I have said that there were potent influences other than those of the popularity of the measures of the Administration which were not without their effect in the elections which have taken place. Let me read a letter which has recently appeared in some of the newspapers. This letter is addressed from St. Mary's by a Mr. Ingram, of St. Thomas, to a gentleman in that city. It says:

"DEAR SIR,—Your telegram to hand this afternoon and am glad to hear from you. Things were quite dull until to-night, and mayhap to-morrow it may be all O.K. Hold yourself in readiness at any time. I will write you when to come if O.K.; if not, I will write you 'no good.' Mr. R. Ber. is not here yet; keep patient.

"Yours in haste,
"W. H. INGRAM."

I suppose most hon. gentlemen will understand the significance of a communication of that sort, and that it means a good deal, I have no doubt. I draw my inferences, and every hon. gentleman in the House can do the same thing. But, Sir, I am of the opinion that the protective policy of the Administration enjoys, to-day, in no degree, a greater measure of public confidence or a greater degree of popularity than it did when the general elections took place in March last.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), at the conclusion of his very interesting address, endeavoured to console himself and the gentlemen who sit beside him, by indicating that he had made a discovery which would explain to this House and to the country the reason why every candidate, with hardly an exception, who has faced the electorate under his banner, has met with defeat during the last six months. He has endeavoured to describe that in a letter from which he draws an inference, which he did not pause to explain to the House—I will not say which he could not explain to the House, because the hon. gentleman is ingenious enough to explain anything—but from which he must have drawn, if he gathered comfort from it at all, an inference which certainly does not appear on the face of the document as he read it to the House. If the hon. gentleman desires to discuss election literature, if he has any anxiety at all to discuss before this House the letters which were sent into the different electorates of the country, and to different electors of the country, encouraging them, in spite of all demonstration to the contrary, to keep up their heart for the good cause which he helped to lead: he does not need to cite a letter addressed to my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) or to anybody else——

An hon. MEMBER. It was his brother.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A brother, perhaps.

Mr. LANDERKIN. One near and dear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He does not need to quote any letters to gentlemen who are near and dear to any member on this side of the House, and he may save himself the trouble of producing correspondence which requires any inference to be drawn. If the hon. gentleman will just turn to the file of letters which are now published, and which bear the names of his own co-conspirators, I might almost call them, and especially that portion of the literature which bears the name of one Preston, he and the members of this House will be saved the necessity of drawing any inference whatever as to the methods by which campaigns are fought and won in this country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Read the letter, please.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman inform me that he has not read the letter to which I have referred, signed by Preston?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then the hon. gentleman has not read the papers during the last month or two, as the hon. gentleman's conduct in this

House very often indicates he ought to do. Now, Mr. Speaker, one thing which struck me more than any other in the very admirable and interesting address which we have just heard was the pains which the hon. gentleman took to impress upon the House and the country the uncertainty, the vagueness and the inconsistency of the Government policy as it had been expounded from time to time. The hon. gentleman began in that line, he went on in that line, he concluded in that line. He asked us not one question, but a shower of questions as to what our policy was and what we had done since a member of the Government declared that even reciprocity in natural products would not be of advantage to Canada—what we had done at this time, what we had done at that time, what was the policy the country was supposed to have sustained even in the recent bye-elections. I could not help, Mr. Speaker, asking myself, amidst all this shower of questions and parade of words, what the hon. gentleman's own policy is. The hon. gentleman seeks to act in concert with a party which favours unrestricted reciprocity, and has put that forward in every campaign in which it has engaged: yet, what is there in the hon. gentleman's speech from beginning to end, during the hours he has entertained us this evening, which indicates what his own opinion is on that question? The hon. gentleman's friends in time past have taken great credit to him from the fact that he has never committed himself on that question. They have asserted as a reason why he should have the greatest portion of the confidence of the country—that limited portion of the confidence of the country which can be divided up amongst the members of the Opposition—that, however grossly many of them have gone astray, he has always been too wise to commit himself on this question. The hon. gentleman has given us new evidence this evening of his ability to entertain the House for hours at a time in discussing the question of unrestricted reciprocity, without ever committing himself to an opinion upon it at all. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has dealt with a great many subjects this evening, as to only a few of which I shall detain the House by making any reference. The hon. gentleman has delighted us with a review not only of ancient history, but, to some extent, of fable. Even when he came to touch the question of reciprocity, which we supposed was the one before the House, the hon. gentleman was not satisfied merely to begin at the beginning, but he went back to early traditions, and not till after the clock struck six did he venture to begin a discussion of the practical questions before the House. He had learned allusions to the reign of Charles I, and from Charles I he came gradually and slowly down until the clock stood at a quarter to six, and then he began to discuss the last dissolution of this Parliament. Now, I do not intend to begin with Charles I. I do not intend to do more than make a passing reference to the question of the dissolution—in the first place, because it is a bygone question, and in the second place, because we heard the hon. gentleman last session deal as profoundly and as carefully with the arguments which can be addressed to the House on that question, as I suppose any member is able to do. He endeavoured by the hour to persuade the House last session that the dissolution ought not to have taken place; but we did not reply to him, for the very obvious reason that the dissolution had taken place. The hon. gentleman, or at least his party, stood very much in the position of the prisoner who had been imprisoned, as he thought, contrary to law, and who, having committed some infraction of prison discipline, had been flogged. Seeking next day legal advice as to his rights as an Englishman, he was comforted for a moment on being told, by his legal adviser, that "they could not do it;" but the next instant the failure of the comfort flashed upon him when he reflected that they really had done it. The hon. gentleman argued that the House could not be dissolved and his party ought not to have been beaten, but in reality the House had been dissolved and his party had been beaten, and there was not much use in making any more fuss about it. But, let me say this as to the right to dissolve, and as to the propriety of the circumstances under which that dissolution took place. If we are to credit the statements made by the Opposition at that time and for years previously, there never was an occasion on which a dissolution could be so easily justified. It is not, as the hon. gentleman intimated this evening, that we justify ourselves on the ground that we wished to get the ratification of the country for reciprocity arrangements: but it was, in the first place, for this that we advised a dissolution: We were about to enter on negotiations for what? The chief executive officer of the country with which we were going to negotiate, had declared in advance that there might be a wide reciprocity treaty. It was obvious, therefore, that the commissioners who would go from this country to negotiate for a wide reciprocity with the United States would go with the dearest interests of this country in their hands; and, Sir, it was all important, when they went to meet the negotiators of that other country, that the latter should not be in a position to say to us: "We will not make a treaty with you, because you are a Government whose term is about to expire; the treaty we might make with you would be one with regard to which we should have to take the risks of assent and ratification by an expiring Parliament." The commissioners going with such important interests in their hands, would be weak as clay in the hands of the other negotiators if they had to come back to meet a Parliament which had only a few weeks of existence left to it. But if the position taken by the Opposition is correct, our justification is tenfold stronger. We had been informed, in an indirect way it may be, that negotiations would not be unacceptable to the United States, that a wide reciprocity treaty was in contemplation; and, Sir, the late leader of the Liberal-Conservative party did a patriotic act and an act of justice to the country when, after all the years of discussion that had taken place as to whether reciprocity should be restricted or unrestricted seeing that the time was about to come for negotiators to go to Washington, he said to the country: Choose the men who are to negotiate for you; settle once for all the policy upon which this wide reciprocity is to be negotiated. If you want restricted reciprocity, such as we think the country can afford to give, such as we think will be consistent with our position and trade relations, return us to power and we will go to Washington and pursue these negotiations. But if, on the other hand, you want a treaty of unrestricted reci-

procity accompanied by discrimination against Great Britain and followed by, as we think, evils which would be a menace to precious interests in Canada, now is the time to select your negotiators. Before that time, every member of this House and every candidate who stood upon the hustings had been challenged by the declaration that the people of the country, from one end to the other, were anxious to throw off the yoke of the National Policy, and declare for the freest possible trade relations with the United States. The members of this House, and especially the Government, were told that their tenure of office solely depended upon the term of Parliament, and that the moment the country got an opportunity to speak they would demand a different set of negotiators. We gave the country the choice. Yet when the choice did not fall upon these gentlemen but upon the chieftain who had led the Liberal-Conservative party with success for so many years, they declared the greatest outrage we committed was that dissolution which thus gave the people the choice of their policy. When I said that the hon. gentleman not only went into ancient history but into the region of fable, I was referring to the history of the negotiations which have taken place within the last five or six years, and to which the hon. gentleman's imagination, it may be, or at any rate his bias, have given a peculiar turn. He endeavoured to interweave romance with that history in such a way as to present, when his task was ingeniously done, as he alone could do it, an absolutely different narrative from that which the true history presents to this House. These fables are not presented once or twice to this House, but on every occasion when these matters come up. They are published in every issue of the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, they are put before the public on every platform, until it becomes an absolute article of belief of hon. gentlemen opposite that their romances are true. Why, one of the statements most current in this country is the statement the hon. gentleman repeated to-night—of the total inaccuracy of which, I am sure, after the number of times which he has heard it repeated by his own friends on the other side, and seen it in the press and heard it on the platform, he was unconscious—that is that some time ago I declared in this House that shrubs, plants and small fruits, though put upon the free list by the United States, must not be put on the free list of this country, and the statement has been made everywhere, and repeated with as much unction as if it were true, that I declared to the House it would be treason to put shrubs and fruits and plants on the free list.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island who says "hear, hear," is the one who has been most ready to make that statement. I have seen it reported from his lips a dozen times, and I am sure he believes it, although the hon. gentleman has heard me refresh his memory by an appeal to the record more than once in the House, and I now do so again for the last time. What we were discussing was whether we were bound to put them on the free list by the mere fact of the United States having put them on the free list. Hon. gentlemen opposite were pressing, with great earnestness and force, that we were bound, in consequence of the wording of the statutory offer, to do so, and what we contended was, not that it was treason, in the ordinary sense of the term, to make these articles free, but that it was treason to the House to act upon the interpretation that we were bound to put them on the free list, because that was not the interpretation we had given the House when the Statute had been passed. But, a few days after came communications from Washington, in which it was intimated not that we were bound to put these articles on the free list, because the proposition so earnestly pressed on the other side was never adopted at Washington at all or thought worthy of argument, but the representations were: "we supposed if we put them on the free list, you would do so also," and we acted on that assumption. Then what we would not yield, as a Government, in answer to the dictation of any country, we at once yielded on their statement that they assumed our offer to them was an invitation, and that they had acted in pursuance of it, expecting their action to be reciprocated. The hon. gentleman went on with his little fable a step further, and he declared to us that then followed the McKinley Bill. Well, the hon. gentleman must have realized that it was a tax upon the credulity of the House to assume that because we put these fruits and shrubs on the free list, and then taxed them a year afterwards, the McKinley Bill was the result. So he went on to elaborate the fable a little further, and declared it was by thus bringing the attention of Congress to the subject, and by our threats that we would bring Congress to its knees, the McKinley Bill was adopted. And the hon. gentleman, having made his fable thus a little more plausible, in appearance at any rate, went on boldly to charge the Government with being thus indirectly responsible for that enactment in the United States. The hon. gentleman knows probably that the McKinley Bill was introduced in Congress, advocated and sustained there as not being a measure of hostility adopted against Canada, but purely a domestic arrangement in the interests of the people of the United States: but he knows that it received its most efficacious support and strongest argument in the House of Representatives by quotations from the speeches, letters and resolutions of hon. gentlemen who sit in this House on your left, Mr. Speaker, who proved that such an act would be a most effective measure of protection to the farmers of the United States, because it would greatly injure the farmers of Canada. Under that state of facts, of which I am sure the hon. gentleman must be well informed, I can only suppose that the attack was made upon us of being thus indirectly the authors of the McKinley Bill in order to screen the Opposition from the indignation which this country has felt for some time past at the gentlemen who consciously or unconsciously were really the authors and promoters of that measure, and indicated the way in which it could be framed to injure the interests of the country. Another little fable that has again appeared, and which we used to hear last session, was about that famous interview in April by Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Finance and myself, when we went to Washington in the month of April. We have heard that described as a three minute interview. We were told we had just an opportunity to alight at the residence of the Secretary of State and be dismissed. And the hon. gentleman went on to embellish the story a little further this afternoon by the

extraordinary statement which surpasses in ingenuity anything yet devised on that side of the House, that we had been repulsed because faith had not been kept by this Government with the United States and that we had been put on a period of probation for misconduct—I am quoting the hon. gentleman's own words. Now, the statement that we were repulsed because of any breach of faith on our part or that we were placed on a period of probation for misconduct is just as absolutely false as the assertion to which I have already alluded in reference to the interview. It is hardly worth while to state to the House now what that interview was. It was an interview in which the greatest courtesy was shown to us and the greatest regret was expressed, not that we had to be repulsed for want of good faith or that we were put on a period of probation for misconduct, but that the time fixed for that interview proved to be inconvenient to the President of the United States. That forms part of the records which are before the House and before the public, and yet the statement is to go to the country, interwoven with the other remarks of the hon. gentleman, that we were repulsed on account of want of good faith on our part and because we had to be put on a period of probation for misconduct. Let me come at once to the assertion of the hon. gentleman, that we committed any breach of faith in this matter. I emphatically deny that any member of the Government, and particularly the honoured leader who is no longer with us, was guilty of any breach of faith. I shall ask the House to dwell with me, for a short time, on what the hon. gentleman alleges is a breach of faith. The hon. gentleman did me the honour to quote from some statements which I had made to a large audience in the city of Toronto shortly before the last election. He was good enough to say that the statements I made were correct in fact except as to my statement that we had received an intimation from Washington that negotiations would be had with us. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. My statements were perfectly correct. It may be asserted that Sir Charles Tupper admitted that the initiative came from Canada and not from the United States. That may be correct or may be a matter of opinion, but we have before us the fact that the first step taken was that, in pursuance of our right as representing the Dominion of Canada, we requested Her Majesty's Government to ask that we should be included in any arrangement that might be made between the United States and Her Majesty's Government in regard to Newfoundland and the answer of Mr. Blaine was that, while he was not willing that Canada should be included in the treaty with Newfoundland, he was willing to conclude a wide reciprocity treaty with Canada. We had a perfect right, based upon that information, to intimate to Her Majesty's Government that, anxious as we were to increase our trade in any direction, we were willing to negotiate with Mr. Blaine, I was therefore perfectly correct in stating that the initiative for the renewal of negotiations in reference to reciprocity actually came from the United States. The hon. gentleman went further, and said that I disclosed at Toronto what the negotiations were, but he was good enough to endeavour to temper the criticism by saying that I might be able to plead that Sir John Macdonald and other members of the Government had already broken confidence. I do not intend to avail myself of any such excuse, but it is a fact, I think, that before I explained this to the people of Toronto, the proposals had been published in the *Canada Gazette*, and, whatever anyone may say in the way of humour, I think it can hardly be said to be secret matter after it has been published there. However that may be, the fact had been already published in the leading newspapers of the country and it was well understood by every one who heard me there before I went into the discussion. But neither I nor any member of the Government nor the High Commissioner can be charged with any wilful breach of faith in regard to these negotiations, and the House will understand that, when I state briefly what the history of those negotiations was. When the dissolution took place, this is what we had before us, without any indication whatever, either on the face of this paper or any other paper, that there was anything private, secret or confidential about it. In answer to the request that we should submit to Mr. Blaine a basis of proposals on which negotiations might afterwards be conducted, we had presented that basis which is set forth in a despatch from His Excellency to Lord Knutsford dated the 13th December, 1890, which the hon. gentleman has read, and the reply to that, which we had no reason to believe was confidential, dated the 2nd January, 1891, from Lord Knutsford to Lord Stanley of Preston, was as follows:—

"Minister at Washington has communicated to the United States Secretary of State the substance of your telegram of 13th December. Mr. Blaine replied that to endeavour to obtain the appointment of the formal commission to arrive at the reciprocity treaty would be useless, but that the United States Government was willing to discuss the question in private with Sir Julian Pauncefote, and one or more delegates from Canada, and to consider every subject as to which there was hope of agreement, on the ground of mutual interests; if not, and to risk so grave a step until by private discussion he has satisfied himself that good ground existed for expecting an agreement by means of a commission. He added that he would be prepared to enter into private negotiations at any time after 4th March."

That is to be found at page 78 Sessional Paper No. 38 of last session. That was the telegram in the hands of the executive of this country, and that gave no indication that while the proceedings of the conference were to be private the fact that the conference would take place was to be private. We had been told that Mr. Blaine was ready to meet us at any time after the 4th March, and we announced that to the country in perfect good faith. The elections took place shortly before that date, and it was not until the receipt of a letter from Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote, dated the 1st April, long after the elections were over, that we were astonished to find that Mr. Blaine complained to Sir Julian Pauncefote that a breach of faith had been committed. It is true that Mr. Blaine had stipulated for a discussion of the question in private, and we fully understood that what would take place at that conference would be private. I believe that this is the case in regard to every occasion of that kind. The negotiations are private, and the delegates or plenipotentiaries agree before concluding their negotiations what part of them shall be given to the public, but we had no reason to suppose that the fact that the conference was to take place, was to be private any more than the fact that the negotiations of 1878 would take place was kept pri-

vate when it was published in London and in this country before the conference sat at all. The letter of Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote dated 1st April, contained the first intimation of complaint on the part of the Washington Government that faith had not been kept, and that secrecy had not been observed. I include in my explanation the High Commissioner likewise, who had no other source of information than the despatches in our hands. Sir, when, with surprise and some feeling of annoyance, during the first week in April, we read Mr. Blaine's complaint dated the 1st April, we immediately set ourselves to work to see what ground there was for an assertion on his part that faith had not been kept with him, and that privacy had not been observed. It became my duty to make some enquiries into the matter, and I have among my papers a note written to me by the late Premier with which he enclosed to me all the papers in order that I might make a review of them for the purpose of seeing upon what ground such complaint could possibly be made, and he added an observation in the language which I just made to the House:

"You will observe that while we understood that the proceedings of the conference were to be kept private, there was not one word of intimation to us that the fact of a conference going to be held, was to be kept private."

Well, Sir, it has transpired that through an unfortunate mistake in the transmission of the telegram which I read to the House, from Lord Knutsford, a few moments ago, there was a stipulation which was not communicated to us, and it was not until a few days before the close of the last session of Parliament that we obtained the real text of that telegram and saw that a mistake had occurred, which mistake led most improperly to the imputation of bad faith being made against this Government—most improperly and at the same time not unreasonably, in view of the stipulations that were made. It transpired afterwards, on reading that letter of Mr. Blaine of the 1st of April, that there had been a stipulation that even the fact of negotiations being on foot or a meeting being appointed, was to be kept private. Now, if the House will take the trouble to look at that telegram on page 78 they will observe one place at which the composition of the message seems to halt. I will just read a few words before it:

"The United States Government was willing to discuss the question in private with Sir Julian Pauncefote and one or more delegates from Canada, and to consider every subject as to which there was hope of agreeing on the ground of mutual interests; if not, and to risk so grave a step——"

And so on. There is a halt in the composition which we naturally supposed was merely due to the error, perhaps, of a single word in the transmission of the telegram; but it transpired afterwards that these important words were omitted:

"If no agreements are found possible, the attempt should not be mentioned officially, and all public reference to the subject should be avoided. At a further interview Mr. Blaine stated that President Harrison strongly objected to the commission on the ground that it would provoke agitation throughout the United States, and declined to run so grave a risk, &c."

The words which I have just cited, and which were embodied in that telegram, were never communicated to this Government in the life-time of Sir John A. Macdonald, and it was only in the month of September last, that we discovered upon what ground it was that bad faith had been imputed to us on the part of Mr. Blaine. I may say that the enquiries which were set on foot with regard to that telegram disclosed the fact that the blunder occurred somewhere between the despatch of the message from Downing street and its receipt by His Excellency here, and that His Excellency did not hear until about the time that I mentioned, what the text of the telegram was, but supposed, as every one of us supposed, that the telegram, as given in the sessional papers, was the telegram actually sent from Downing street, as it was the telegram upon which we acted. The matter has been explained to the Government of the United States, and that Government is not small enough or despicable enough to undertake to repulse the representatives of this country, invited as they practically were by Mr. Blaine's intimation about negotiating a wide reciprocity treaty, on the ground that we had broken faith with him, when what did occur was entirely the result of a mistake. But the bad faith of that imputation is specially shown by the fact that it was after the publication had been made in the newspapers and on the platform by Sir John A. Macdonald, by Sir Charles Tupper, by myself at Toronto, by my colleagues everywhere else—it was after all that, that Mr. Blaine invited us to meet him on the 6th April, the date which he subsequently had to change on account of the engagements of the President. We might have expected that, after that fact had been expanded on the records which are published as part of the sessional papers of this House, the House would have heard nothing of the fable that we were repulsed and given but a three minutes interview, because we had broken faith with the Government of the United States, and required to be sent down on a period of probation for misconduct. Sir, if Mr. Blaine had been under the impression that we had wilfully broken faith with him and required to be put on a period of probation for misconduct, it is not very likely he would have fixed a date for our interview, or that subsequently he would have, with many apologies, explained to us his regret that the interview could not take place at the time appointed—at the time, to use his own words in one of these despatches, that "we had fixed for the interview." Now, the hon. gentleman further endeavoured to put a gloss, it seemed to me, upon the record, by quoting to the House with great emphasis a letter which Mr. Blaine wrote to Mr. Baker at that period. That letter did duty last session in an endeavour to persuade this House and the country that all we had said upon the subject of negotiations at Washington, was untrue, that there was a letter from Mr. Blaine to Congressman Baker declaring that there were no negotiations on foot for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty in 1854. In strictness, Mr. Blaine's letter to Mr. Baker was correct. The negotiations were not proceeding, but a day had been fixed when they would begin. In strictness again, the letter was literally correct, because the negotiations were not for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, but for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 with extensions and modifications such as might suit the altered circumstances of the two countries, and including a large number of other questions as well. Mr. Blaine was perfectly right and perfectly within his duty in giving to Mr. Baker a short and decisive answer to his enquiry, and his answer was literally correct,

and still was not in the least degree inconsistent with the fact that we had made proposals to him about which he intended to have negotiations in the future, as he eventually had. Now, then, the hon. gentleman told the House, during one of those periods when he was endeavouring to show that our policy was altogether too vague to satisfy the country, or too vague to become a basis for the confidence of the country—that the proposals made in December, 1890, were altogether too vague, and that the Ministers who went to Washington must have been exceedingly silly if they supposed that on such a basis there was any chance of making a reciprocity arrangement. Why, Sir, how could we suppose it to be too vague when three different dates were afterwards fixed by the Administration of the United States for a conference to take place with regard to those very proposals? They were too vague, says my hon. friend from Bothwell, to be the basis of any rational negotiations; but they were not too vague for Mr. Blaine to tell us that he would meet us to discuss them on 6th April, that he would meet us any time after the 4th March, that he would meet us on 12th October, and finally that he would meet us on 10th February, when he actually did meet us, and had negotiations, notwithstanding the vagueness of the proposals, which negotiations extended over six or seven days. The hon. gentleman declared that we went there for the purpose, of securing a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with such modifications and extensions as the altered circumstances of the country might require, and then he read Mr. Blaine's letter to Mr. Baker, in which he said: "You are quite authorized in denying that a treaty for natural products only will be renewed, and he asked how we could expect to succeed in our mission. Again I call the attention of the House to the fact that this is the way the record is closed from time to time, and this is the way in which information is given to the public. The letter from Mr. Blaine to Mr. Baker intimated that the reciprocity treaty of 1854 would not be renewed. Nor did we expect it would be; but we thought it might be renewed with modifications and extensions which have been pointed out from time to time in both countries as having arisen in consequence of the changed circumstances of trade, changed treaty obligations and changed means of communication. The hon. gentleman declared to us, and he was cheered by his followers when he made the statement that it was a significant fact that we promised to go to Washington when the general elections were on and that we went there when the bye-elections were on. The hon. gentleman has put the car a little before the horse. The general elections came on because we were under engagement to go to Washington and wished to give and opportunity to the country to pronounce on the policy on which the negotiations should take place; and so far is it from it being a fact that we went there because the bye-elections were on, this is the fact, that Mr. Blaine was willing to appoint an earlier day, and we might have gone before the bye-elections had begun, but we intimated to him that in consequence of the engagements then pressing on Ministers, it would be most inconvenient for us to go before 10th February. My colleagues therefore were able to participate with some effect in the bye-elections which had come off; and we were able not to telegraph from Washington the news to the bye-elections, that negotiations were going on very satisfactorily, and that the electors had better vote for us because we were able to give them reciprocity, but to receive there the glad news that the hands of every man who was striving for the welfare of Canada and British connection were being strengthened by the electors. The hon. gentleman made an extraordinary paraphrase of the mission of the Ministers, to-night. The hon. gentleman speaks of the new colony, which is the facetious phrase he adopts as applicable to the new members of the House. That is a colony which I hope will increase. It was not so much our colonization efforts which disheartened him as the exodus which has taken place from his own side of the House. The hon. gentleman declared that the new colony in this House looked on with the greatest dismay at my friend the Minister of Finance going to Washington. They looked upon him, he said, as being seduced by some sorceress, and he described the way in which my hon. friend went to that palace of enchantment, the White House at Washington. If the House will take the trouble to compare the hon. gentleman's interesting periods in that part of his speech with the expressions which came from his press at the time we went to Washington, hon. members will see that there has been a change. We were not accused then of being influenced by a sorceress, but every effort to make the mission a failure was put forward with diligence and vigour by the hon. gentleman's press, and by the speeches which his friends delivered. He will see in that stage of our history a unique phase, for it was the first time, at all events, in a British country, when a political party endeavoured to traduce the Ministers who went to represent their people and to secure interests for them from a foreign country. But there is no difficulty in accounting for this change of tone. We have every reason to suppose that those who endeavoured to make our mission a failure, and who asserted, even in the press at Washington under our eyes, that we had come there, not for the purpose of entering into honest negotiations with the United States, but for the mere purpose of humbugging the Secretary of State and making political capital out of our mission, imagined their influence was so great that they could for a moment disturb the harmony of the negotiations entered upon. But their minds have changed now that they find that some practical results have been arrived at on this mission, when they heard how we were received and how the mission resulted, they sneer at the palace of enchantment at Washington. The hon. gentleman in another passage of his speech, which I shall have to refer to in a few moments, spoke at very great length about the want of papers. The hon. gentleman cited a great many precedents from the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of showing us that time and again the absence of papers was made a reason for not going on with a discussion. The hon. gentleman might have saved himself the labour, because we would have admitted at the outset that in every Parliament the absence of papers is made a reason, time and again, for refusing to go on with a discussion. How often does it occur here, as in a great many cases he read from the Imperial records, that on a motion for papers the House is urged into a discussion of a question of policy, and Ministers rise and decline, in the absence of papers, to discuss the question of policy

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

which they may involve, and inform the House that hon. members will be able to arrive at a better judgment on the question when the papers are laid on the Table. That is every day practice. The hon. gentleman read a number of instances in which Ministers protested against discussion going on under these circumstances. He has not read to us one instance of a Minister being interrupted in his statement to the House of what had transpired on an objection, either by way of order or by way of complaint, of any violation of constitutional usage, on the ground that we heard put forward the other night, and again this afternoon, that the House, forsooth, ought not to be informed as to what went forward elsewhere unless we brought the information down in writing and had in the meantime communicated it to His Excellency the Governor General. I challenge him now, and I challenge all his friends before this debate closes, to quote me an instance from the records of the Imperial Parliament where a member ever charged a Minister with impropriety for giving information to the House, and desired that he should keep it back until it had been communicated to Her Majesty and sent by Her to the House. Our position on that question is just what I stated it to be the other night. It is our duty to give the House any information in our possession, and we shall do that whether that information may in the meantime have been communicated to any one else or not. Why, the results of negotiations that take place in the mother country — and they occasionally are conducted by Ministers — are reported to the House by a Minister standing in his place and making a statement of facts, and sometimes, and I have heard of notable cases in modern history, the results of a mission have not been given to the House before they have been proclaimed from the house tops even, by the Minister on his return from his mission. Let me say to the hon. gentleman, further, that with respect to the whole body of precedents which he quoted, whether applicable or not, or whether in the least degree in line with his objections or not, we have satisfied the requirements of every one of them, because we have brought down every shred of the correspondence, so far as I know. But, the hon. gentleman was not putting the real proposition to the House, for the proposition which he stated the other evening, and which, I suppose, his argument was intended to enforce, was not that we had kept back correspondence, because, he could not assert that, but his proposition was: That a Minister should never make a statement to the House as to what has transpired, until he puts it in writing, sends it somewhere else and gets it sent back here to be laid on the Table. All that I say on that subject is, that in the first place, every particle of the correspondence has been brought down, and that as regards any record or memorandum that may have been made as to our interviews, we are just as free to make a statement to the House as to what transpired during our mission to Washington, as if we had never put the matter in writing at all. The hon. gentleman is seeking to avail himself of a most ingenious excuse for claiming to be at a disadvantage in this debate, but it is an excuse which he will find will in no way avail him if other papers should eventually be brought down on this question. Let me call the attention of the House, before I leave this subject, to the way in which this matter about the papers came up originally. Although the House has been for 30 days in session, we have never yet been asked for the papers, except on one occasion. On that occasion, when we were expecting to be interrogated and requested to make a statement to the House as to what transpired at Washington, I was asked by the hon. the leader of the Opposition something about the correspondence and something with regard to its secrecy, and I stated that we had received the full assent of the Washington Government to everything being stated that had transpired. The hon. the leader of the Opposition asked if that were in writing, and I said it was. He asked if it would be brought down and I said it would be. I brought down not only that paper, but as I have said before, all the correspondence bearing on the subject, and everything that could in the remotest way come within the region of the instances and cases and precedents which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) cited to the House this afternoon. I suppose it will not be necessary that I should detain the House, even for a few moments to discuss what the hon. gentleman dwelt upon in the last few moments of his speech, with regard to discrimination. The hon. gentleman was as ingenious as usual and as dexterous as usual, but it seemed to me, that he was only playing with words, when he declared that because we decided to import tea and coffee free in this country, we were discriminating against the country that produced brandy, because we did not import that free also. That was the hon. gentleman's argument. Now, there may be something ingenious and something sound in it, but if there is anything in it, it is simply a play upon words. There may be discrimination between the products of different countries, but he knew perfectly well from the statement which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance made, that the discrimination which is demanded by the United States is something more serious and actual than that, and that it means that the same tariff shall not apply to the same articles if coming from two countries; but that the articles which shall be free to the one shall be taxed, and taxed to an enormous rate if coming from another. That is the kind of practical discrimination which we are talking about, and refinements about Spanish wine as compared with tea and coffee are altogether outside of the question. The hon. gentleman declared that after all he could not believe that discrimination against Great Britain would be enforced by the United States, because they did not enforce it with regard to the West Indies. Any one who looks at that matter will see the total difference of situation and of products as between the West Indies and this country. The West Indies produce what the United States requires and require the products of the United States. It would be utterly unnecessary for the West Indies to discriminate against Great Britain, because on a level tariff even the articles of manufacture which the United States can send them would take possession of their markets. As regards Newfoundland the hon. gentleman's argument was at fault, because the great complaint we had to make against the Newfoundland convention was that it did discriminate against a portion of the British Empire—the Dominion of Canada. It was because we made that appear

to Her Majesty's Government that Her Majesty's Government declined to ratify that convention. If the hon. gentleman wishes to persuade this House or any intelligent portion of our people, that we may be able to get reciprocity without discrimination, because the West Indies got it, and because Newfoundland did not get it without discrimination, he has to answer the deliberate statement of his financial leader who declared to the country that his party were prepared to discriminate : not in the fanciful sense of comparing tea and coffee with Spanish wine, but in the actual sense of raising the tariff high on English goods and allowing American goods in free. If I am not very much mistaken the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) went a step further, and said that it would be absurd to expect that we could get reciprocity on any other terms ; and if my memory does not again deceive me, the same hon. gentleman made a statement very much to the same effect when he spoke the other night in this House in reply to the Minister of Finance. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has endeavoured to meet, as other gentlemen on that side of the House have done, the statement of the Minister of Finance, that the adoption of the American tariff and discrimination against all other countries than the United States, were the only terms on which we could get reciprocity with the United States. He has met that statement with the remark that he does not believe it. It is the shortest and simplest way to satisfy his own conscience and that of his friends. They cannot meet it by a word of reason. They could not during the election contests deny that these measures were inevitable, at any rate as regards discrimination, and they cannot now argue away the necessity for the equalization of our tariff to the American tariff, any better than they could argue away discrimination then. Here is what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us the other evening, and when we read it let us contrast it with the argument of the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that he does not believe that these terms would be imposed and that if commissioners went from the other side of the House to Washington they could do a great deal better. Here is what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said in the House :

"Allow me to tell the hon. gentleman "——

Was he speaking to the hon. member for Bothwell or to whom ?

"Allow me to tell the hon. gentleman that reciprocity, in the very nature of the case, must involve—not discrimination, as he puts it artfully, for the purpose of exciting prejudice against it : but every genuine reciprocity treaty involves this : If a country is going to give you special privileges, you must give that country special privileges in return. It is of the very essence of reciprocity. It would be monstrous for the hon. gentleman or his colleagues to expect that the United States or any other country would enter into a reciprocity treaty on any other terms."

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who now says "hear, hear," seeks to put that on record alongside of his statement, that perhaps discrimination would not be required in the case of Canada, because it was not required in the case of the West Indies, where there was no discrimination at all, and where the terms which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) sought to reconcile this country to, were never imposed. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is willing to swallow that pill now, forgetting that a few moments ago he wanted us to accept a story about getting reciprocity on the same terms as the West Indies and Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said in this debate about the way in which the announcement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was received, as to the conclusion which had been come to with regard to these reciprocity negotiations. We are told, Sir, that that announcement was received with cheers, especially from what the hon. member calls the new colony in the House. Why, Sir, every person who listened to that speech knows that the statement which was cheered was the announcement that we would not accept reciprocity on such terms as were offered. The hon. Minister of Finance had made a statement to the House, that we had not succeeded in arranging for enlarged trade relations with the United States, and the House was silent ; but when he went on to tell the House the price at which we might obtain them, and that we had rejected them at that price, there was a cheer in this House as there was a cheerful feeling throughout the country. But, Sir, I can remember very well, for it was not more than twelve months ago, when this House rang with cheers from the other side, including the little colony that has gone into exile, when the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared that the fact that we had reduced our sugar duties showed that we were not independent of the United States, but had to submit to the dictation of that country. I can remember very well, also, when the Blaine-Baker letter was read to this House, and when the hon. gentleman, who professes even to-night to be so much in favour of a reciprocity treaty in natural products if it only could be got, went into raptures when at the close of that letter Mr. Blaine declared that the reciprocity treaty of 1854 could not be renewed, and that no negotiations could be had with regard to natural products alone. I remember many occasions when this House was told in grave accents night after night by these hon. gentlemen, that this Government could not get reciprocity from the United States, and when the roof shook with applause from the Opposition. And yet we are told that the members on this side of the House are not to cheer when they find that their representatives refuse to accept reciprocity on terms which would be not only degrading, but ruinous to every interest in this country. There is another fable which we owe to the ingenuity of my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who spoke during the first night's debate, when his party was under great stress of weather. I never admired his ingenuity more than I did then, when he arose and endeavoured to extricate his party from their confusion by an ingenious—I was going to say misrepresentation, but an ingenious gloss which he cast over the whole debate when he presented to the House as a brand new idea, that what the Minister of Finance had done was to go to Washington and ask Mr. Blaine for some suggestions as to how he might govern this country. We were delighted with the ingenuity which the hon. gentleman evinced ; but we have not admired so much the persistency with which his statement has been gravely repeated to the House since. The hon. gentleman's sense of

humour was excited at the curious position of his own party on that occasion ; but the statement has been repeated since by hon. gentlemen who really thought he was in earnest. By this time they have even got the Finance Minister down on his knees, representing him as having gone to Washington and gone down on his knees to Mr. Blaine to ask for a hint as how to devise a fiscal policy for Canada. And this is the way they represent what has transpired at every negotiation which has taken place, I suppose, since the world began : one side making a proposition, and when the other side declines it, that side being asked to make a counter proposition. The Minister of Finance, in what Mr. Blaine calls a free and frank discussion, after that gentleman had declined our original proposition, was asked to make a proposition which, from his knowledge of the conditions of the country, he thought would be acceptable to Canada ; and because my colleague did that, which has been done in every negotiation that has taken place since the world began, my hon. friend is accused of trying to get a hint from Mr. Blaine for a fiscal policy for Canada. I am sure that my hon. friend from South Brant will acquit me of supposing that he intended that story to go down with the intelligent people of this country. One word more as to the allusion of the hon. member for Bothwell to the new colony. The hon. gentlemen declared that they were in great glee, because the old speeches would do again, and the old songs could still be sung. Sir, the reason for the speeches we have heard from the other side of the House, delivered with more than usual vehemence and ill-feeling—an ill-feeling which is exhibited by the hon. member's flat declaration that he answers everything that the Minister of Finance said by not believing him—the reason is that the little colony at the left of the Speaker is not able to sing the old songs again. The old speeches will not go down any longer; and when the hon. gentlemen opposite make their appearance before the country again, they are very likely to be asked, not what is the policy of the Government in the string of questions which my hon. friend from Bothwell put to us to-night, but what policy have you got to take the place of that which has gone to wreck and ruin under your eyes within the last few months ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the House, who has just resumed his seat after speaking for over an hour, closed with almost the same question with which he opened his speech. He was asked by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) what the policy of the Government was with reference to the trade relations between this country and the United States. The hon. gentleman did not deign to tell us what that policy was, but he replied in the Irishman's way by asking, what is the policy of the Opposition ? The hon. gentleman started with that proposition and he closed with it ; and from the satisfaction with which his own countenance beamed, and the manner in which his remarks were received by his followers, he evidently considered that when he asked the question, the question was closed. Sir, I think the people of this country will not be satisfied, now that there has been a most lamentable failure in the apparent attempt of the Government to negotiate a treaty—whether their attempt was an honest or dishonest one, and on that I have my own opinion and a very strong one—the people of this country will not be satisfied with asking the Opposition, what is your policy, but they will ask the Government what is theirs. The financial condition of the country is sufficiently serious to justify us in asking the leader of the House not to trifle with it by asking his opponents for a policy to guide him, but by telling the country what his policy is. I was somewhat surprised at one statement which the hon. gentleman made to-night, because its historical accuracy I totally deny. He took the position that the convention negotiated between Newfoundland and the United States, which this Government succeeded in preventing the ratification of, provided for discrimination against Canada and in favour of the United States. Sir, I hold that convention in my hand ; it is in the official papers before the hon. gentleman ; I have read it time and again, and I challenge him or any hon. gentleman sitting beside him or behind him to place his finger on one paragraph which the ingenuity of man could construe into discrimination against Canada. There is not a word in the convention, from beginning to end, which justifies the hon. gentleman's statement, and I hold in my hand here, if it was necessary to give further proof, a speech delivered the other day by an hon. gentleman, a member of the Newfoundland Government, in which, reading the treaty from end to end he asked : Where is the charge which has been insidiously circulated throughout Canada that the convention negotiated with the United States originally discriminated against Canada ? It does not exist. The Hon. Mr. Harvey has stated so. I have read the convention time and again to see how this rumour could be justified, and I have no hesitation in giving my opinion that there is nothing in the treaty, from beginning to end, which could justify such an assertion. The hon. gentleman dwelt for a long time to-night with the historical part of the speech of my hon. friend from Bothwell.

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, with reference to the convention, what was the proposed duty upon flour going into Newfoundland and the revenue tariff on flour from other countries ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Newfoundland statute, which prescribed the duty to come into force, after the convention became a treaty, prescribed a duty of 25 cents per barrel on flour and $1.50 upon pork.

Mr. TUPPER. What was the duty on flour coming from other countries into Newfoundland ? What was the proposed duty, according to the draft convention, on flour coming from the United States at the time the draft treaty was submitted ?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am reading from the draft treaty :

"When this convention shall come into operation and during the continuance thereof, the duties to be levied and collected upon the following enumerated merchandise imported into the colony of Newfoundland from the United States shall not exceed the following amounts, viz., flour, 25 cents per barrel."

Mr. TUPPER. And the general duty was 30 cents.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I take the speech of Mr. Harvey.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If hon. gentlemen are prepared to accept the *ipse dixit* of the Minister of Marine against the law——

Mr. FOSTER. Take their tariff and read it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to accept the Minister of Marine's *ipse dixit* against the Newfoundland tariff, as I read it, and as it was purported, at any rate, to be read by Mr. Harvey, I have nothing to say. He stated in his speech that he had telegraphed to Newfoundland for a *verbatim* copy of the tariff, and that copy he read to the Board of Trade in Halifax, and he gave, according to the report of his speech which I have in my hand and which appeared in the *Morning Chronicle* the day following, 25 cents as the tariff enacted by the Newfoundland legislature, and the same is put in the convention between them and the United States.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will not object to my correcting him on a very important subject, and the correction is quite consistent with the statement Mr. Harvey has lately made. I simply wish to state this, as a matter with which I am pretty familiar, that, speaking of the draft convention and of the tariff of Newfoundland and the subject of discrimination, one must look, not at the speech made in the last few months, but in the year the draft treaty was negotiated and a revenue tariff existed, and when the Canadian Government interfered on behalf of Canada. And I state positively, after looking into both the revenue tariff and the draft treaty of that time, and having studied the question carefully, that when the revenue tariff of Newfoundland imposed a treaty on flour coming from various countries of the world of 30 cents a barrel, the proposal of Mr. Bond in the draft treaty with Mr. Blaine was that the duty upon the flour from the United States to Newfoundland should be 25 cents instead of 30 cents. That statement has not been contradicted by Mr. Harvey in his recent speech nor has one ever contradicted it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has darkened counsel with words, and I will show him the convention, the terms of which provide explicitly that 25 cents per barrel shall be charged on flour.

Mr. BOWELL. From the States.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The convention is applicable to the States alone, but the point is, does that convention prescribe in any of its parts that there shall be discrimination against any other country?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly it does.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say not. I say that the legislation enacted in Newfoundland for the purpose of carrying out that convention declared that: "When the proposed convention between this colony and the United States shall come into operation and during the continuance thereof, the duties to be levied and collected upon the following enumerated merchandise imported into the colony of Newfoundland shall not exceed the following amounts, viz.:—Flour, 25 cents per barrel." So that the legislation which Newfoundland enacted to carry out the convention prescribed that when that convention became a treaty, 25 cents duty should be the only duty imposed, and therefore there was no discrimination at all. That matter, I submit, is beyond any reasonable doubt. I say that when the leader of the House challenged the speech delivered by the hon. member for Bothwell, he devoted three-fourths of his remarks to the introductory or historical part of my hon. friend's address. That historical part was leading up to the proposition he wished to submit to the House as a constitutional proposition. And what was it? It was that when a Minister of the Crown initiated a discussion upon negotiations which had taken place between Ministers of the Crown and a foreign country, he was bound to submit to the House all the papers, protocols and facts connected with them. How does the hon. gentleman meet that proposition? Does he wish the House to understand, and this is a matter of importance, that while there were protocols and offers made and reduced to writing with reference to the questions of wrecking, and fisheries, and Alaska boundaries, and every other matter then and there discussed, there was none reduced to writing and no offer made to or by the United States with reference to reciprocity? Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell this House and this country that, going as a representative of the Crown to Washington, a quasi-accredited ambassador or diplomatist, authorized by His Excellency to speak in the name of the Queen, he discussed the matter during four or five days and made no report in writing to His Excellency? Will the hon. gentleman tell the people and the House that there is no official document in writing giving an account of what transpired between himself and colleagues on the one side and Mr. Blaine and General Foster on the other? I challenge the hon. gentleman to make the assertion. They have brought down the other papers. We find that the offers made by this Government to the United States with respect to each of the subjects I have mentioned were reduced to writing, as they ought to be, so that there would be no misunderstanding on the one part or the other. The hon. gentleman wishes his followers and this House to believe that there does not exist any official record of his mission to Washington or the offers made *pro* or *con* on the subject or any memo. of their own. The unassailable proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell is this, that the Ministry having challenged a discussion upon that question, were bound by constitutional usage to lay before the House the facts, so that a discussion might take place. The hon. gentleman says he gave no reasons why he did not believe the statements of the Minister of Finance. When we get the facts as they are, as we believe them to be, in writing, when the constitutional usage is complied with, when Parliament is supplied with the information it ought to have and that some day or other it must have, then we will be able to tell whether the frail memory of the Minister of Finance is correct or not. We are not imputing turpitude to the hon. Minister, and when we say he misrepresented what took place, we simply say that he is like other men, a frail man; and, when we remember what occurred on a previous occasion, we find that serious differences of opinion occurred between Canada and the United States Government as to what actually did take place. Therefore we say that what the hon. gentleman started out to prove he did prove, and that it remains unassailed, and that the hon. gentleman opposite, notwithstanding the applause with which his followers greeted him, has failed to show one instance in British history where ambas-

sadors went to a foreign country to negotiate a treaty and asked Parliament to discuss their action without laying before Parliament an official record of what they did. The hon. gentleman waxed somewhat warm in regard to an implied imputation that he had not, on a former occasion, accurately represented the attitude of the governments of the two countries to one another. The hon. gentleman told the electors at a public meeting in Perth, held on the 18th November, 1891, that Canada had not approached the United States, but that the initiation of this matter came from the United States Government. He said:

"The statement the Canadian Government began the negotiations was not altogether true, because the first intimation came early in the year from Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Minister at Washington, that he was willing to make a reciprocity arrangement with Canada. (Mr. Foster—'Hear, hear, hear.') That was the first thing which intimated to the Government of Canada that such proposals would be acceptable to the United States. They wanted no further invitation, but immediately forwarded their proposals to Washington."

Sir, is that correct; is that historical truth; is that a fair representation of what took place between these two countries? The matter is not perhaps of the grave importance that it promised at one time to be, because Mr. Blaine, after an apology had been made by Canada's representative, expressed himself as willing to pass it over, but we have first Mr. Blaine's statement to Sir Julian Pauncefote of 1st April, in which reference is made to the statements of Sir Charles Tupper and the late Sir John Macdonald, and Mr. Blaine says to Sir Julian Pauncefote:

"In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with the proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us, and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference as explained in my Minute, I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, both stated before public assemblies that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State.

"I detail these facts, because I deem it important, since the matter has been for some weeks open to public remarks, to have it settled that the conference was not "initiated" by me, but on the contrary, that the private arrangement of which I spoke was but a modification of your proposal and in no sense an original suggestion from the Government of the United States."

And, if there is any possibility of doubt remaining, we have Sir Charles Tupper going as the representative of Canada to Washington, and addressing an official communication to Mr. Blaine, in which he uses the following language with respect to that statement:

"I told Mr. Blaine that I wished, in the outset, to recognize the accuracy of the statement contained in his letter to Sir Julian Pauncefote, which I had seen in reference to the initiation of the negotiations regarding reciprocal trade arrangements between the two countries."

Mr. Blaine says that in no sense did any initiation of the negotiations come from the United States Government, and Sir Charles Tupper says that he acknowledges the accuracy of that statement. The hon. gentleman had made statements on more than one platform directly at variance with that fact, and to-night he tries to escape from the unfortunate position in which he has placed himself and the country by saying there was some mistake in the wording of a despatch and that they had not the actual words of the despatch before them at the time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said nothing of the kind in the speech I made at Perth.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said some words had been omitted from the despatch, and he had not seen those words. The hon. gentleman knows that, in the despatch on which he says he acted, it was stated three times that the discussion to which he went was to be a private discussion and not an official one. Therefore the hon. gentleman could not have understood, if he read the despatch with the excised words out, that he was to make this matter public which it was understood was to be kept private between the governments of the two countries. Faith had been broken between the representatives of this Government and the Government of the United States, and the hon. gentleman occupied a most humiliating position when he had to go to Washington and, through the mouth of Sir Charles Tupper, make an apology for the statement which had been published. But the Government had gained a temporary triumph, and they had to do anything they could to get out of the scrape. The hon. gentleman says it is a small matter, but, as he has introduced it, I will refer to it again, and that is in reference to the proposal to admit certain articles free of duty under what is called the statutory offer. The hon. gentleman says that the action of the Government was perfectly consistent in the matter. It is within the recollection of every hon. member who was then in the House, that a proposition was made on this side to meet the offer of the United States Government, and that, as the United States had selected certain articles which were to be admitted free of duty, we were bound to reciprocate. The hon. gentleman not only repudiated that with indignation, but he used language, which I think, he afterwards was ashamed of. When he was twitted with that language afterwards, he attempted to explain it away, but there it is in the *Hansard*, and what is that language? He says:

"I can only say, if the Crown, having discretion, uses it in that way, it would use it to betray the interests of the people of Canada."

That is, that to permit one or more of the articles referred to in the statutory offer free into Canada when the United States admit them free into that country, if the Crown used it in that way, it would use it to betray the interests of Canada. Not a week after that—an hon. gentleman says only two days after—the Government, at the dictation of Sir Charles Tupper, receded from their lofty position and exercised the discretion he, a few days before, had said it would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada to exercise. The hon. gentleman tried to evade that by stating that a forced construction had been put upon his language, but the words are there and anyone can read them for himself. I suppose he thought our memories were defective, or that we could not look up the book again. Now, Sir, I do not propose to follow the discussion on the lines which it has followed for the last hour or two, any further. Speaking for myself, I would have been well satisfied to have left the discussion of the question where it was after the hon. Minister of Finance had spoken, and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had replied, but when I reflected upon the importance of the statements which he made respecting reciprocity and the chances of our ever obtaining a reciprocity treaty with the United States, the importance to

my own province in particular, and to the provinces known as the three Maritime Provinces, I felt I was in duty bound to present to the House the condition in which those provinces stand, and I promise the House that I will not occupy a moment's time longer than is absolutely necessary to submit a few facts which I think it is desirable the country should know with respect to the condition of these provinces. The Minister of Finance took credit to himself that the condition of the country was reasonably prosperous. He intimated to us that the exports were $92,500,000, that this was an increase of $8,000,000 beyond the average exports of Canada, I think he said, since Confederation, and $10,000,000 over the year 1889. Although the hon. gentleman did not say so in so many words, he challenged the admiration of his followers, and challenged their applause by intimating that in some way or another the Government should receive credit for this large export. For my part I fail to understand why the Government should be entitled to any credit whatever for Canada's exports. The hon. gentleman, I know, poses as a medicine man, pretending that he can bring about good crops or bad crops, just as he pleases. The time was when he repudiated the suggestion that a Minister could be a fly on the wheel: he thought that legislation could be enacted to make a country prosperous, and he asks that credit be given to the Government for that condition of affairs. Sir, I rejoice as well as he does over the magnificent harvest of last year. It was a godsend to Canada from one end to the other. I rejoice that in the province from which I come, we had a magnificent harvest, it saved us from a great deal of misery. I believe the harvest in the North-West was one of the greatest they ever had before, and it put a large amount of money in the pockets of the farmers. But, Sir, I deny—it is not necessary to deny it, everybody knows it—that the Government can in any sense be entitled to the least degree of credit for that. The hon. gentleman might beat his political tom-tom over every wheat-field in Canada, and he might get his lieutenant the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to curse my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) by all his gods, and the grain would grow just the same as ever, and the fisheries would yield up their fruits, and so would the mines. The hon. gentleman is absolutely powerless in the matter. He told us in years gone by that the increase of deposits in the savings banks indicated the prosperity of the country; but now that the savings banks deposits have decreased, I think some $3,000,000 last year, and $3,000,000 the year before, the hon. gentleman intimates that the fact must not be taken in any way as an evidence that prosperity is decreasing. Well, Sir, I never thought that the deposits in the savings banks afforded any indication of the prosperity of the country, but I do think the withdrawal of those deposits cannot be accounted for entirely in the manner the hon. gentleman suggests. I think in some places that the people have withdrawn from the savings banks the moneys they had deposited there in order to use them for their daily wants. But I would not press the argument arising from the deposits in the savings bank as any evidence of the prosperity of the country, nor *vice versa*. Sir, the hon. gentleman stated that there was another evidence of prosperity, he quoted statistics with reference to railways, he quoted the increase in the mileage of railways and the quantity of produce they had carried, the increase tonnage they had carried and the passengers they had carried, and he intimated that that was a capital test of the prosperity of the country. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Landerkin) interjected a remark and asked him if those railways were under the management of the Government, and he was treated, I thought rather rudely by the Minister of Finance, who retorted that that question was an evidence of sapience of the hon. gentleman from Grey. I thought the question was very aptly put, I thought the question evidenced a strong appreciation of the facts by the hon. gentleman from Grey, because he wanted to show that these railways for the administration of which the Government were responsible, did not share in the increased tonnage carried, or the increased number of passengers carried, or the increased profits, and therefore that the Government were responsible, for all the other railways were making money and those that were specially under the control of the Government were losing it, and therefore the Government were responsible for the loss. Sir, what is the fact? We discussed it last night. In the history of Canada there never has been a showing one-half so bad as the hon. gentlemen make out with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. Why, Sir, there is this fact with reference to the Intercolonial Railway—because when you corner these hon. gentlemen with regard to the commercial condition of Canada and the exports and imports of Canada, they say: Oh, there is that vast interprovincial trade of which we have no record. There is this fact with respect to the Intercolonial Railway, that it is the only large railway in Canada which is strictly interprovincial. If the traffic on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the traffic on the Grand Trunk Railway have increased, it is very largely due to the fact that those two great railways have connections with the country to the south of us, whereas this Intercolonial Railway is entirely an interprovincial road, and depends for its business on interprovincial traffic. If that traffic increases, then the profits of the Intercolonial increase, and if that traffic is at a standstill or decreases, the returns suffer accordingly. Now, Sir, when we see that for seven months ending on the 29th February last, the deficit on the road reached $645,000, I say that the showing is not only appalling in itself and not only an indication of crass and gross mismanagement and extravagance, but it indicates more than that, it indicates what the hon. member for East Grey intended to indicate by his question, not only that the Government were responsible for this huge, this appalling deficit, but that the interprovincial traffic on this road decreased instead of increasing, and the profits have decreased accordingly. That is a serious aspect of the case. One hon. gentleman, a member of the Government, had the pluck, after an examination of that road, to recommend an enormous cutting down in the expenditure and the discharge of a large portion of the staff. When he tried to carry out his recommendation he was taken by the throat, and the matter has gone from that date to this without change. Through the extravagant management of the Government, the deficit is rolling up month after month, and year after year. We had the statement made by the Minister of Railways, only the other day, that up to this

moment, he has made no recommendation to Council whatever with respect to the discharge of the surplus number of men, some five or six hundred, it was said, upon that road. Now, the hon. gentleman went further to indicate the prosperity of this country. He said that the tonnage of sea-going and inland vessels had risen from 11,646,812 tons in 1879 to 18,803,648 tons in 1891. Sir, that is a very satisfactory statement, so far as it goes, on its face, but let us analyze these figures a little and see if they are so satisfactory as they appear *primâ facie*. As a matter of fact, in 1879 the grand total of sea-going vessels inward and outward, arriving and departing from Canada, was 6,684,384 tons, and of that number 1,928,531 were Canadian. In 1891, twelve years afterwards, although the grand total of shipping had increased from 6,684,000 to 10,695,000 tons, the Canadian tonnage, so far from increasing in the same ratio, has actually decreased from 1,928,000 to 1,791,000 tons. If our exports had been larger than before, the fact remains, according to our Trade and Navigation Returns, that the Canadian trade is largely passing from Canadian bottoms to foreign bottoms, and that a percentage larger than in 1879 is carried in foreign bottoms and a smaller percentage in Canadian vessels. These facts cannot be ignored, and I certainly will not ignore them, coming as I do from the Maritime Provinces, because, knowing the terrible, sad and lamentable condition of trade there, I have to look around for the cause, and I find one of the effects here. Following out a little more these shipping figures, what will you find? That the tonnage of Canada has decreased at an alarming rate. In 1873 we had 1,073,718 tons of shipping; in 1877, 1,310,015, or an increase of 236,297 tons. The Marine Department has always valued that tonnage at $30 per ton, and that will give an increase between 1873 and 1877 of $7,088,910. From 1877 to 1887 which was the last return brought down, for the Marine Department has ceased to publish the figures for more recent years, the tonnage declined to 1,130,247 tons, or a decrease of 179,768 tons, of the value of $5,393,040. If that loss had been distributed over Canada, it would not have been felt so greatly, but on the lakes and in Ontario Canadian shipping has not decreased but increased, and the loss entirely fell on the three Maritimes Provinces and the Province of Quebec. The Maritime Provinces, which gained from 1873 to 1877, have lost, during the last named period, shipping to the value of $4,500,000. If we come now to the ships built in Canada, we find that in 1877 the tonnage was 118,985, which at $45 per ton, the estimated value of new vessels, would give a total of $5,354,325. In 1887 that had fallen to 22,516, of the value of $1,113,220, showing a loss of $4,241,000; and I may add that three-fourths of that loss fell on the Maritime Provinces. While I am willing to join in the congratulations which the Minister of Finance offers to the House and the country on the increase of the carrying trade of Canada, I am bound to point out that that trade is being more largely carried each year in Norwegian and British ships, and that our shipping industry has been depleted and destroyed so that it is hardly worth talking about. I have been one of those who have dwelt on the continuous exodus that has taken place from all the Maritime Provinces; I have stated that the people have fled from the provinces as if from a plague, and it has been charged against me by hon. gentlemen opposite that my statements were exaggerated and were not true. We have now the record before us, which shows that we never stated one-half of the true extent of the exodus. There is no part of Canada which has suffered so much as the Maritime Provinces during the last 10 years from the exodus. I wish to place a few figures before the House in order that hon. members may understand why some of us from the Maritime Provinces are downhearted, why we so strongly advocate some change in our fiscal policy, which will lift us from the lamentable condition we are in to-day. Take New Brunswick for instance; the natural increase should have been 65,000 for the last ten years. How many did she increase? Thirty-seven souls. So New Brunswick lost 65,000, who were driven from her shores, including the flower of her population. They have gone abroad, not to the North-West, because if they had done so Canada would yet have the benefit of them. They have mostly gone across the line to enrich our rivals to the south. Take Nova Scotia; the natural increase should have been 88,111. The actual increase was 9,920, or a loss to that province of 78,000. Take Prince Edward Island. The natural increase should have been 21,777. The actual increase was 191, or a loss, in ten years, of 21,580.

Mr. FOSTER. What is your percentage of natural increase?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Two per cent per year, which will be accepted as a very fair percentage, and as being one rather under than over the mark. I have not referred to the immigrants, because there is no appreciable immigration to the Maritime Provinces. There may have arrived some hundreds or perhaps some thousands, but I place them aside and I take a natural increase of only 2 per cent per annum, and even then the calculation shows a loss to the Maritime Provinces in the last 10 years of 164,882. Parallel that if you can in any country possessing half the advantages of Canada as regards climate and resources. What is the fault? It does not lie in the people. A more thrifty, saving, and hardworking people I have never met in the world. They have inexhaustible resources in the sea, the mines, the forests and agricultural lands; and why then have these people, enjoying advantages unsurpassed by any people in the world, fled from our shores as from a plague? A remedy must be found. It is very well for hon. members from the North-West, and I envy their position in this particular, to speak of the increase of population there, which, although it is far below what was anticipated, is an increase to talk about; but in the Maritime Provinces we have a depreciation in land values, shipping values and loss of population. This has not been our normal condition. Between 1871 and 1881 we had, not as large an increase as we desired, but there was increase of which we were not ashamed, while from 1881 up to 1891, the period that the gentlemen opposite have been in power, the period during which their National Policy has had full fling, the period during which they have fleeced the people to the full extent, we have lost 164,882 of our people. It will not do for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that the condition of affairs which is prevalent all over the world, of the rural population

fleeing to the cities, is the cause of it: because I am willing to take the cities in the Maritime Provinces alone, and I am sorry to say that the results are nearly as bad there. Take St. John, Halifax and Charlottetown, the chief cities in the Maritime Provinces, and what do we find there? The great city of St. John, lying at the mouth of a great river, a city that it was prophesied when Confederation was being brought about, was going to be the Liverpool of America, started in 1881 with a population of 52,996, and its population has declined since then by 3,392. Could anything be more lamentable than that? The great city of Halifax which in 1881 had a population of 67,917 only increased 3,504 in the ten years, and the population of the city of Charlottetown, 11,451 in 1881, is reduced to-day to 11,373. The three cities taken together have exactly the same population in 1891 that they had in 1881. In other words the entire natural increase of the three cities of the Maritime Provinces for ten years have left these cities and gone abroad to a foreign land. While these cities of the three Maritime Provinces have lost 26,000 souls, the entire Maritime Provinces have lost 164,882. Hon. gentlemen may be surprised at the persistency with which those who come from these provinces press very anxiously for more extended trade relations with the United States, but, Sir, that surprise would cease to exist if hon. gentlemen looked at the Trade and Navigation Returns, and examined where the exports and products of these Maritime Provinces found their chief markets. It is a gratifying fact that our exports to Great Britain as a whole have increased, but does that apply to the Maritime Provinces? No. The great province of Ontario which exports so much cheese and such a great quantity of live cattle, finds its best market in Great Britain for these articles, and hon. gentlemen opposite point the farmers of the whole Dominion to Great Britain as their only market. Let us examine for a moment what the trade returns show with respect to the market of the Maritime Provinces. Take the Province of Nova Scotia, the products of which are more varied than perhaps those of any other province. She has the largest fisheries of any province of the Dominion, she has inexhaustible coal mines, she has gold mines, she has great quantities of agricultural lands, she grows immense quantities of apples, and she has some manufacturers; and where do her exports go? Out of the total exports of Nova Scotia, amounting to $9,765,000, Great Britain takes $2,269,000; the United States take $3,463,000; the Spanish West Indies, $1,249,000; the British West Indies, $1,593,000, Newfoundland, $604,644, and other countries $583,000. If hon. gentlemen would do me the favour of following those dry but interesting figures for a moment they will see to what they will lead. Take the Province of New Brunswick. That province exports $7,182,000 worth per year. Where does it go? $3,000,000 of it goes to Great Britain, the exports to which consists entirely of deals and deal ends; $3,648,000 go to the United States and $508,000 to other countries. With the exception therefore of $508,000, every article that goes from the province of New Brunswick finds its natural and only market in the United States with the exception of deals and deal ends. If there was a part of this Dominion of Canada that would benefit and whose condition absolutely demands broader and freer trade relations with the United States, that province is New Brunswick. What is the use of pointing the people of New Brunswick to the market of England for their produce, when they send nothing there except as I said deals and deal ends. Everything else they have to export goes to the United States; and if you do not enlarge the market there and knock down the barriers which prohibit the people from trading there, commercial atrophy will continue to exist as I regret to say it does exist in that province. Take the Province of Prince Edward Island from which I come. We find that out of $1,349,000 worth of exports, the United States take $933,035, while Great Britain takes $160,000, the British West Indies and Guiana take $77,000, Newfoundland $136,330 and other countries $41,000. Of the total exports from the Maritime Provinces which amount to $18,296,000, Great Britain takes $5,458,000, the United States $8,843,000 and other countries all told take less than $4,000,000. Very nearly 50 per cent of the exports of the Maritime Provinces are sent to the United States market, and the next best market after Great Britain which they have are the markets of Newfoundland and the West Indies. My remarks are made almost entirely from a Maritime Province standpoint, and I trust I will be excused for that. I want to ask, how do the Maritime Provinces stand continentally? We have the McKinley tariff, almost a prohibitory tariff, between us and the United States; we have the British West Indies, and what have we done to open up a market there for our people? There is a limited market it is true, but a pretty good market for Nova Scotia products in the West Indies, and the only return cargoes that we possibly could have brought from that country in exchange for the surplus products sent there, was West India sugar. The hon. Minister of Finance took care by his policy to prevent us importing West India sugar. The West India sugar which we could import was sugar over 14 Dutch standard, and the hon. gentleman placed his duty upon that and prevented us from importing it, and to that extent restricted our trade with the West Indies. We know that the West India Islands have negotiated a treaty with the United States, and I fear very much that the trend of the trade hereafter will be from the West Indies to the United States, and that we will hereafter find the West India markets closed against the articles which we formerly sold there. How is it with regard to the Spanish West Indies, to which Nova Scotia sent one and a quarter millions of its products last year? Why, Sir, the House knows that a treaty has been negotiated between the Spanish West Indies and the United States which discriminates against Canada, and that on and after the 1st day of July next the ports of these countries will be practically closed to Nova Scotia and to the rest of the Maritime Provinces. And now, Sir, to make matters still worse, our own sister colony of Newfoundland, which offered a very large market for the surplus products of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, is discriminating against our products too. What do we find? We find in answer to a question which I put the other day, that owing to our conduct—because I cannot excuse our own Government in this regard—our sister colony of Newfoundland is discriminating against us to a very serious extent. In the year

1885, this House, improperly as I conceive, passed a law taxing Newfoundland cod-fish and other products. That law, in some illegal way which I have not yet been able to master, was not put into force. I want to ask the Government, before this debate closes, how it was that the tariff we then enacted against Newfoundland was never exacted. I do not say that the tariff was just; but the Government did not impose those duties until December last. The law provided that a proclamation could be issued under certain circumstances; exempting Newfoundland products from those duties. No such proclamation was ever issued, but the Government seemed to take the matter into their own hands and admitted the products of Newfoundland free for a number of years, while at the same time they were leading the people of Canada to believe that the duties were being exacted. What was the consequence? The hon. Minister of Militia was kind enough to hand to me to-day a copy of a circular which was issued from the Customs Department at Ottawa in the month of December last, instructing the customs officials throughout the Dominion to exact against Newfoundland the import duties prescribed by the statute. When we passed our statute, taxing her products, Newfoundland passed a law of retaliation, declaring that *quoad* those countries which taxed her products a discriminating duty should be levied in Newfoundland. The result is that as we, on and after December last have exacted the duties against Newfoundland products, the discriminating tariff of Newfoundland comes automatically into force, and this country is now being discriminated against in regard to flour, pork, butter and other articles for which we have hitherto found a ready market in that colony. Sir, I took the trouble to make up from the Trade and Navigation Returns, a short statement showing how large that market was, not alone for the Maritime Provinces, but for the Dominion generally. I find that in 1891 we exported to that country articles to the value of one and a-half million dollars, of which there were 99,438 barrels of flour of the value of $468,000. Owing to our conduct in taxing Newfoundland products, in addition to the ordinary duty of 30 cents on flour, there will be 75 cents a barrel of discrimination added. What chance have we therefore, as against the United States, in retaining the trade of that country in the face of this discriminating duty against us? Unless some method can be discovered by which the unfortunate and unhappy conditions existing between this country and Newfoundland can be changed, and amicable relations established, the trade between the two countries will be destroyed. And, Sir, I do not hold the Government harmless in this regard. I know, from having read the Newfoundland newspapers and the debates in the Newfoundland legislature, that we are not blameless in this matter. There are two sides to the question. When the Newfoundland people found themselves impelled and compelled to pass what is known as the Bait Act, it was stated in this House that the British Government assented to that Act only on the condition that it should not be applied against Canada, and it was not applied against Canada. But it was found, as they said at any rate in Newfoundland——

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will not ask us to disbelieve their official statements. They found that all their efforts to prevent the sale of bait to the French fishermen of St. Pierre were thwarted, because as they alleged Canadian fishermen carried bait and sold it to the French.

Mr. TUPPER. Do you believe that?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have the statements of men whom I have known the larger part of my life, and whom I believe to be incapable of telling an untruth. I have known Sir William Whiteway a number of years, and I believe him to be an honest and straightforward man. I have known Mr. Harvey for twelve or fifteen years, and I believe him to be incapable of making a false statement. I have the statements of these men in the public papers that when France granted an additional bounty in 1885 or 1886 of 12 or 13 shillings to the local fishermen for every quintal of cod-fish they caught, the Newfoundland fisheries were in danger of being entirely destroyed, as those of Nova Scotia would have been also, unless some means were found of putting our fishermen and the Newfoundland fishermen upon an even footing with the bounty-fed St. Pierre fishermen. The Newfoundland Government sought to do that by the provision they adopted preventing the St. Pierre fishermen getting bait. That was evaded by the Canadian and Newfoundland fishermen selling the bait to the French fishermen contrary to law. The Newfoundland Government punished their own people, confiscating their vessels, and imprisoning those who had broken the law; and if I am to believe Mr. Harvey's statement, they applied to the Canadian Government, asking it to take measures to suppress this illegal trade, and to prevent their fishermen from supplying bait to the St. Pierre fishermen.

Mr. TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman deny that our fishermen had a perfect right to sell bait from the Magdalen Islands to the St. Pierre fishermen, irrespective of the Newfoundland laws?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not deny that. I am trying to point out that when the French Republic increased the bounty on cod-fish, changing from a tonnage bounty on ships to a quintal bounty on the fish, it was found that the Newfoundland fishermen could not compete against the bounty-fed fishermen of St. Pierre, and that in self-defence they had to pass the Bait Act to prevent the French fishermen getting fresh bait; and it was found that that Act was useless because Canadian fishermen sold the French fishermen the bait, and the Newfoundland Government, in obedience to the promise they had made to the Imperial Government, had not up to that time enforced the Bait Act against Canadian fishermen. But when they found that Canadian fishermen were selling bait to the St. Pierre fishermen and thus destroying the effect of the Act, they passed a new Bait Act against Canada to prevent Canadians buying bait.

Mr. TUPPER. That has always been the custom. It is legitimate trade.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) And it is because Canadians sold the bait they passed the second Act to prevent our getting it at all. I only mention these facts to show that this matter has two sides, and that although Newfoundland has been accused of breach of faith towards this Dominion, and although *prima*

facie it is a breach of faith, still they have a very great deal to say in palliation, if not in justification, of their conduct. I go further and say, from what has appeared in the Newfoundland press and legislature, statements have been made which this Government have to answer. They are to this effect: that the Government sent down, two or three years ago, Senator Howland, an accredited agent from this colony, to treat with Newfoundland, and he gave assurances in the name of Canada that steps would be taken by Canada to prevent our fishermen from selling bait to St. Pierre. Those statements have been made openly and so far without contradiction. Further it has been stated by Newfoundland Ministers that Sir Charles Tupper himself, when approached on the subject, promised that steps would be taken by the Canadian Government to prevent Newfoundland fishermen being ruined in the manner I have described, although he withdrew afterwards the promise he made. It is on those statements the Newfoundland Bait Act was passed, and now we find these two kindred colonies engaged in a war of retaliation, and unless some modus is discovered by which the ill-feeling now existing can be done away with, and these retaliatory tariffs on the part of Canada on the one side and Newfoundland on the other entirely abolished, the trade between Newfoundland and the Maritime Provinces which is assuming such large dimensions will be entirely destroyed. What condition do the Maritime Provinces stand in to-day? They stand in this position: They have to face the prospect of losing the West India trade, the almost certain prospect of losing the trade of Havana and the Spanish West Indies, the loss of the Newfoundland trade, and the McKinley tariff between us and the United States. In the face of the fact that heretofore over 50 per cent of the total exports of all the Maritime Provinces have been sent to the United States, the hon. gentleman told us that we must change our mode of farming and make cheese and send home fat cattle to England. The hon. gentleman knows we have tried that time and again. I remember a few years ago when the people of Prince Edward Island invested their capital to the extent of £34,000 or £35,000 sterling in the purchase of a large iron ship which we put on the route between the Island and England in the hope of opening a trade. We shipped our cattle for one or two years. We tried to ship our sheep and other products, and I am sorry to say, after it had been tried a year or two, it was not found profitable, and the enterprise was entirely given up. It is no use denying the fact that our natural trade and market lies in the United States. It may not be so to the same extent with the great Province of Ontario. England is her great market for many products, but the country to the south is her market for many other products. With regard to the Maritime Provinces, however, the future is a dark one indeed if we are to be excluded from the British and Spanish West Indies and cut off from Newfoundland and the United States. We have England for our market, but what are we to send to her from Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? New Brunswick sends her nothing but deals and deal ends. Every article taken from the mines of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and from the sea, except lobsters, goes to the United States, where it finds a good market, and our object should be not to glory and cheer as hon. gentlemen did when the Finance Minister announced that the door was closed and there was no hope of negotiating a treaty with the United States, but to bend our energies to see if we cannot discover a modus by which the difficulties existing between the two countries can be amicably and satisfactorily arranged. The Finance Minister showed he was well satisfied indeed to be able to announce that the door was closed. He was pleased and joyful when he announced that the exports of Canada had increased, but the great pæan of congratulation which he offered to his followers was this, that the door was closed hereafter against any trade with the United States, that there was no hope of reciprocity, unrestricted or otherwise, and that hereafter we were to treat with England and England alone. It was seen well where the hearts of his followers were. The cheering which greeted his statement with respect to the exports was moderate, but when he announced that hereafter we had better not discuss the question of reciprocity, the enthusiasm of his followers knew no bounds. The Minister of Railways sat behind him smiling and laughing, not ashamed to be proud that the negotiations, whether honest or dishonest I will not for the moment say, with the United States proved to be absolutely a failure. Hereafter, said the hon. gentleman, our farmers must change their mode of farming, as they must look, not to the markets to the south of us, but across the seas, and hon. gentlemen opposite cheered him to the echo. They pretended during the elections in my part of the country that they were as strongly in favour of reciprocity as we were, not in natural products alone, but in manufactured goods, almost to the extent of unrestricted reciprocity: but in this House I have heard, not one but a dozen, rise, one after another, and find fault with reciprocity, not only in manufactures or manufactured products, but in natural products as well. Hon. gentlemen opposite said: What are you going to do if you have reciprocity in beef, or pork, or other natural products? You will be ruined: thus showing that these gentlemen were opposed even to reciprocity in natural products, following out the statement, evidently an official one, made by the late President of the Council, when he declared that the greatest calamity to Canada would be the renewal of that reciprocity treaty of 1854. When the hon. gentleman went to the United States the other day to negotiate a treaty, what kind of a treaty did he attempt to negotiate? He had it stated to him time and again, his late leader had told him, that there was no possible hope of a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854. He says he went there to discuss the question of unrestricted reciprocity. Well, he was a beautiful commissioner to go on that errand. He had denounced the scheme of unrestricted reciprocity with a virulence that could not be excelled or even equalled by any of his supporters. He had denounced it as a fad, as an impossible policy, as a nebulous theory, as a ruinous policy to Canada, as a grave peril to British connection. The hon. gentleman had hurled all these epithets against this policy, and yet he says he went to Washington to propose to Mr. Blaine to adopt a policy which would be ruinous to British interests, a policy which was a fad and an unclean thing. What did Mr. Blaine say? He said: You were either

dishonest before you came here or you are dishonest now. The hon. gentleman was not a *persona grata* at Washington. He could not be. He had done his little best to magnify the difficulties between Great Britain and the United States when he was Minister of Marine. He had denounced in the strongest language he could muster the only basis upon which he could hope to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and then he went to Washington, and he comes back and says he could not get a treaty from dear Mr. Blaine, that dear Mr. Blaine could not see how he was going to raise a revenue if the treaty were agreed to, and dear Mr. Foster could not see it himself. Why, he knew he was deliberately misrepresenting the proposal of unrestricted reciprocity when he went there, and he did it with malice prepense. He knew, when he stated to Mr. Blaine that the question of raising the revenue was an insuperable difficulty, that, as has been explained time and again on this side of the House, the adoption of that policy did not mean a sudden and immediate abolition of duties on manufactured goods, that it did not mean the abolition of duties in a day or a month or a year, but that it must perforce be a gradual abolition, and that, being a gradual abolition, it would right itself after the first or the second or the third year, that though there might be a loss, not of one half nor of one third of the revenue, but of some portion of the revenue during that time, still it would right itself. From a political standpoint, the hon. gentleman was dishonest in going there and was dishonest in stating to Mr. Blaine that the question of revenue was an insuperable difficulty, and that he saw no way out of it. I can only say that he occupied the most humiliating position that any accredited ambassador ever occupied in the British Empire. He went there after denouncing a policy as disloyal and pretended that he wanted to carry out that policy. He was either dishonest in opposing that policy before he went, or he was dishonest in advocating it in Washington. He can take either horn of the dilemma which he likes. I cannot see where the difficulty arises in negotiating a fair and honest reciprocity, if men who are honestly and sincerely desirous of negotiating it go there. Does any one suppose that Mr. Blaine is not willing to treat with us on a fair basis? We know that the reciprocity treaty of 1854 cannot be renewed. We know that the only duties imposed by Canada, during the existence of that treaty between 1854 and 1866, on manufactured goods, amounted to from 12 to 14 per cent, while now they have risen to between 30 and 40 per cent. Does any one suppose that our natural products alone could be the basis of an interchange between us and the United States? The thing is ridiculous. If we are honest and sincere in the desire to renew our trade relations with the United States we must give and take. We must certainly include manufactures in any such treaty, as everybody is aware except the hon. gentleman, though I believe he wilfully misrepresents the policy of unrestricted reciprocity when he stated that the revenue we would lose offered an insuperable obstacle to its adoption. This result can be attained by those whose hearts are in the business. We do not talk in regard to this matter without some knowledge of the views of the gentlemen across the line. Their conversations have not been limited to those which they have had with hon. gentlemen who have gone to Washington. We have the opinions expressed by their statesmen in Congress, we have their opinions expressed in the press, and many of us have had the privilege of conversing with many of their leading men.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I suppose, by the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite, that is considered a crime, and that those hon. gentlemen would not discuss any of these questions with leading men in the United States if they met them. I have discussed these questions with them, and I have not found one of them who is not amenable to reason. I have found a disposition on their part to negotiate with us on fair and honest lines. I have not found that any of those objections that the Finance Minister considers insuperable have come from them. They certainly did not come from Mr. Blaine, but they were suggested by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues with the desire to damn this policy in this country and to make it impossible to be carried out. In fact, the hon. gentleman was not there in the interests of the people of Canada, but he was there in the interests of his masters, the manufacturers. He durst not attempt to negotiate a treaty which was contrary to their interests, but he might have stated to Mr. Blaine: We are representing, primarily, the manufacturing industries, we will subordinate to them, as we have in Canada, the farming, the mining and the fishing industries, and if we cannot negotiate a treaty in favour of the manufacturing interests, we cannot negotiate one at all. If he had done that, no doubt he would have failed, as he has done, in negotiating a treaty, but he would have saved his consistency, and he would have saved us the humiliating spectacle that Canada has presented of Ministers going to Washington in March and coming back after a few minutes' interview, and going again in October, and coming back with their thumbs in their mouths and saying that no treaty could be negotiated with the United States. I say that the spectacle presented is the most humiliating that could be exhibited in this or any other colony. I warn this House that there never has been an act of the Government of Canada so calculated to promote disloyal sentiments in this country as the step which the hon. gentleman has taken. If he satisfies the people of this country that his statement is true, if he convinces the people of the Maritime Provinces that the door is closed, and that while they retain their political autonomy they need never hope again to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States by which their products can go into that country, he will have done more to generate and promote an annexation sentiment in this country than anything which has ever before taken place. But, Sir, I thank God that, in my belief, at least, his statement is not true. I believe that this dishonest negotiation which was gone through with, was understood by Mr. Blaine as well as it is understood by people in this House. Sir, the record of the hon. gentleman and his party was known in Washington before he ever left Ottawa. It was known that he did not intend to negotiate a treaty upon a basis that would be accepted by the Washington Government, and that he had proclaimed the fact from his place in this House time

and time again. It was known that he held power by virtue of a compact with the manufacturers, that he was to protect their interests, that those interests must be paramount, and that no treaty could be negotiated with a man holding that position. Sir, we do not hold that the door is closed. We have good reason to know better, not only from the official statements made in Congress, not only from the articles in the newspapers, not only from the constant flow of our people back and forth from the United States, but by conversations which we, individually, have had—and I speak for myself, which I, individually, have had—with a large number of leading statesmen of the United States, all which facts cause me to believe that it is quite possible for an honest man, who goes there with a sincere desire to promote a fair treaty, to negotiate one in a very short time. Sir, we will have to give as well as to take; there must be justice done to both sides. It has been said that the discrimination which now exists, which you have kept on your Statute-book as against Great Britain, may be increased. It may be so, perhaps it must be so; in my humble judgment it will be so. But is that going to prevent a treaty when you are convinced—and convinced you must be, if you study the Trade and Navigation Returns—that it would be a great and over-weening advantage to Canada to have an open market for all her surplus products there? Is the fact that you are going to discriminate more against Great Britan than you do now, going to stop you from negotiating altogether? Are we to legislate in the interest of Canada or in the interest of the British exporter? Whose interests are going to be paramount if they clash? For my part I have long since made up my mind that when they clash my vote will go for Canada. Sir, when I look at the position which we continentally hold to-day—and I speak more from a maritime standpoint than from any other at the moment—when I see that we are excluded from Newfoundland, excluded from the Spanish West Indies, and practically excluded from the British West Indies——

Mr. FOSTER. Excluded from neither of the two latter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Practically we are going to be excluded from the West Indies, because trade will follow with the treaty between the British West Indies and the United States, and if the trade is of any value they will get it and not us. I cannot predict a very brilliant future for my native land when I reflect upon these things.

Mr. FOSTER. Because you do not see it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I can see, and I wish my constituents could see, how the Minister of Railways laughs and sneers at these statements, which cannot be serious to him but which I tell him are pretty serious facts to three or four hundred thousand people who live down by the sea. They toil from morning till night, they spend sparingly, they are people of great thrift, and they deserve a better fate than the hon. gentleman has awarded them. I do not think if they saw the ridicule that the hon. gentleman is prepared at all times to throw upon any proposition which has for its object the opening of better markets for them, he would feel as much flattered as he does at the present moment. Sir, it is a serious matter for those people; I will not say it means life or death, but I do say it means the difference between prosperity and adversity. The figures for the last ten years show that there has been no increase at all in the material wealth of those Maritime Provinces, and so far from the population increasing we have been unable to hold even the annual increase by 160,000 in the ten years, and if that goes on for the next ten years I ask where will we be? Sir, I know that hon. gentlemen have only one answer to give to our arguments, and it is the effective answer that the bye-elections show that the people are in favour of the present policy. That may be true so far as Ontario is concerned, it is not true so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned. The elections in the Maritime Provinces tell a different tale, whether you take the Halifax election, or the King's election, or the Digby election, or the Queen's election, or any other: they show that the people are becoming alive to their interests, and that in the near future they will strike a blow as strong as they can, by their votes, in favour of as broad and free trade relations with the United States as is consistent with the honour and dignity of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. I had hoped that we had arrived at a period when my hon. friends on the Opposition side would be convinced that there was no use in pursuing the policy they have so long pursued: but after hearing the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) it would seem that they are still determined to fight under the old flag of unrestricted reciprocity, although that old flag has been scouted from one end of the country to the other.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says "no." My hon. friend may sit there in coming sessions, and that colony about which my hon. friend from Bothwell was so humorous, may have grown still larger: the sheep of which he spoke may have swelled by fifty or one hundred per cent, and those goats that have gone to the barrenness prepared for them by the policy of the hon. gentlemen, may be still larger. And yet we hear this cry of unrestricted reciprocity, and that cry, even when there was behind it a certain amount of belief, a certain evidence of faith, was not either a very successful, nor, in my opinion, a very respectable one. And now when it is absolutely a falsetto cry, when we hear it from those benches—because hon. gentlemen must say something and have been able to invent nothing else—that cry has passed into the category of ridiculous clap-trap, and I was sorry to see so much time occupied here to-night in re-echoing the doleful sounds we have so often heard from my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) was preceded by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I sympathize with some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell. Neither this assembly nor any other human institution can be expected to reach or even approach the ideal. When speaking of public opinion in Canada he might say the same of England, he might say the same of any country where constitutional government prevails; you might say public opinion is not all it ought to be; but if you compare public opinion in England to-day with what it was fifty years ago, not to go back to the time of Charles II, not to go back to the revolutions, you

will find that the state of public opinion in England is intelligent, it is ever ready to grasp all great questions, and it is in advance of what it was at any other time. I say a man familiar with the history of Canada must know that although public opinion, and the organs of public opinion, and this great instrument of public opinion that we have here, may not be all that they should be, yet the organs of public opinion are abler, public opinion itself is more enlightened, and this great representative of public opinion is, by the confession and evidence of all persons competent to give an opinion, in advance of what it was 20 or 30 years ago, and I might stop at a still later period. But the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has complained about public opinion, and of this Parliament taking a course that he believed was inimical to a healthy public opinion, and why? Because of the very political sins that hon. gentlemen have been accustomed to fall into. I grant that, according to publicists and thinkers, the English Parliament and this Parliament do not approach the ideal of what the great council of the nation should be. Is all the responsibility with one side or the other? Suppose a member of the Conservative party—the hon. member points with a ghostly finger towards some one on this side—may happen to take that course which ought to be taken by every member of this House at times. Remember he is one of the council of the nation: remember that we are here to take counsel, that it is not our business to come here and range ourselves merely in hostile camps and have political jousts. That is not the ideal of a Parliament. The ideal of Parliament is that men should come together and give counsel. What will happen? We have seen it happen here at different times. If a member of the Conservative party happens to rise and differ in the least from his own party, differ in some small detail, as men of both parties ought to do from their parties, what will be done by hon. gentlemen opposite? Will they approach the question subsequently in the same large spirit? No. They will try and twist that act to a party advantage, and seek from a particular and small occurrence to draw a general conclusion and make a sweeping effect. I wish to deal very briefly with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He commenced his speech by resorting with great cleverness to a style of advocacy that those who have practised in criminal courts are familiar with. I do not think he was very ingenuous. He tried to prove that the reverse of a statement that was made from this side was the true state of the case. But what are the facts in regard to discrimination by Newfoundland? When we got that treaty the Newfounland tariff was 30 cents per barrel on flour, and the treaty allows 25 cents for United States flour. The protest of the Government was based on that fact, and the Act which the hon. gentleman confounded with this one only came into existence twelve months afterwards. I say for an hon. gentleman sitting within two chairs of a philosophic statesman who takes so large views of things in general as does the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), it was hardly a creditable proceeding on the part of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). But hon. gentlemen around him cheered, and however grossly at variance with the facts the statement might be, hon. gentlemen opposite would cheer. I will be very brief in dealing with the hon. gentleman's argument as to what the Minister of Finance did in giving us the information that was in his bosom as one of the Ministers who went to Washington. There can be no doubt whatever that it is a well established rule that when diplomatic negotiations take place and protocols come into existence, if a Minister intends to refer to those, and the transactions are completed, they should be laid on the Table of Parliament. But if you take the most extreme cases, and if you examine the authorities you will find this: That this position is never surrendered by any Government under constitutional procedure, that it rests with their sense of responsibility to the country as to whether or not they will at any given time lay the papers on the Table. Of course, they are responsible. But in the present case you had really no diplomatists in Washington to arrange a treaty. What you had were three Ministers going down to Washington at the invitation—and I will come to the dispute on that in a minute, and pass rapidly from it too—of a member of a foreign government to have an informal, a *quasi* private discussion as to what might be done in the way of reciprocal trade. As I understand it, because I am not in the confidence of the Government in this matter, in regard to the subjects that were definitely arranged, and in regard to which we have definite information, we have the papers laid on the Table: and in regard to these communications which passed between the Ministers and Mr. Blaine and General Foster, what have we? We have what has again and again been done in the British Parliament, we have one of those Ministers, the very best means of affording information to Parliament that could be obtained, rising in his place and stating what took place between them and Mr. Blaine. The matter is somewhat different from a Minister giving information to Parliament about what took place between a diplomatist and the representative of a foreign state, that diplomatist not being in Parliament. What we had was one of the Ministers who engaged in these conversations with Mr. Blaine giving the House a statement of what took place, and I ask hon. members what better means could Parliament have of being made acquainted with what took place? The question of what a Minister is bound to do in regard to information in his possession came up in 1863 in the British Parliament. It was about very important transactions, it was a case where, if ever, the papers ought to have been laid on the Table, once you grant the argument of the hon. member for Bothwell. But, Sir, when Lord John Manners, and Mr. Pope Hennessey protested against the Government referring to the communications that they had had without laying these communications on the Table, what does Lord Palmerston say:

"It is altogether a new doctrine to me that a Minister making a statement from information which has come to his knowledge, is bound to lay on the Table of the House the document from which that information is derived. I admit no such principle. It is perfectly true that when a Minister reads a paper he is bound to lay it on the Table."

If the hon. Minister of Finance had come here and read extracts from so-called protocols, there would be ground for complaining that they were not laid on the Table. But there could have been no protocols, and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) used the word, as he used many other words, in a

way that would make the genius of English literature stare and gasp. If the hon. Minister of Finance read from some documents, there would be good ground for complaining that they were not laid on the Table: but the reason why it is necessary to lay documents on the Table when extracts are read from them, is because Parliament should be face to face with the source of the information that is given to it. In this case, we have the very men here, between whom and Mr. Blaine the conversation had taken place, and you cannot doubt the accuracy of the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance unless you resort to the extraordinary parliamentary politeness that belongs at times to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and which I am afraid the hon. and learned member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) fell into to-night, and unless you are going to say to a Minister of the Crown who stands in his place with the eyes of the country and the eyes of Parliament upon him, and whose position could not be maintained if he would palter with the truth, that you do not believe him; unless you are going to doubt the word of the Minister of Finance, and put his position and responsibilty aside, in the face of the fact that if he misrepresented what took place, detection and exposure must inevitably and speedily follow. I say that that sort of thing is not treated properly by speaking satirically of it as politeness, but that it should be denounced with every invective a man is capable of, because it is a degrading thing to this House to hear such remarks as we heard to-night from the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I shall not refer to the point made by the member for Queen's in reference to what the Minister of Justice said at Perth, and for this reason: There is no use whatever in trying to put down the slanders or the misrepresentations of certain people. You know, Sir, that Mr. Pope, in one of his admirable poems, speaks of a certain insect that has an uncontrollable instinct, but an instinct necessary for its own existence, to spin cobwebs. These cobwebs are very unsightly, and so the poet says, speaking of the slanderer:

> "Destroy his fib or sophistry, in vain,
> The creature's at its dirty work again."

I confess to you, Sir, that I was not surprised that my hon. friend spoke once more about the monstrosity of the Minister of Finance talking about the prosperity of the country. It is a dreadful thing that the Minister of Finance, in the face of what we see to-day in Canada, should stand up here and speak of the prosperity of the country. It is a monstrous thing that he should dwell on the increase in the mileage of our railways; perfectly monstrous that he should dwell on the increase in the tonnage of our ships: perfectly monstrous that he should say one word about the vast increase of our exports or that he should refer to the evidences of our prosperity. It was superfluous, and if the hon. gentleman will excuse me for saying so, it was a superfluity of naughtiness, if I may borrow a word from Paul, because the country had proclaimed the conviction of its prosperity so strong by reducing hon. gentlemen opposite to the miserable account of empty benches that they now make up, that it was perfectly unnecessary for the Minister of Finance to dwell upon the prosperity of the country. We know that when my hon. friends opposite went from place to place, and sent forth their wailings and draped themselves, so to speak, as political mutes, and went to the funeral of something, you may guess what it was, but it was not our funeral anyway—the country rejected them. We know that the people whose votes they needed, and whose votes they wanted, and whose votes they courted with tears and wailings, declared in answer to their entreaties: "Gentlemen, really in these constituencies the accommodation in the lunatic asylums is greatly limited, and begone as quickly as you can." I am much concerned for my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I have been a dabbler in constitutional law and things of that sort myself, but I have never went, of course, as deep as that hon. gentleman. In fact, I should be sorry to go so deep as he. One of the Lake poets tells a brother poet that if he does not get up from his books he will grow double; and to be too studious is no doubt attended with some inconvenience, and to be too learned is not always a happy thing. I confess that I feel for my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when I see him with something sitting heavily on his mind, rising discontentedly from that seat to which in its infinite mercy an all-wise Providence has allotted him, and looking fundamentally uneasy. I always sympathize with him in such a position. He has had too much learning, he is uneasy in his mind until he gets off his constitutional expression of profound principles, and I come and I sit here like a Paul at the feet of Gamaliel, to learn from him his superior wisdom, and I watch and watch, but he takes such a long time to get around the corners before he gets to the subject——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That you are fundamentally affected.

Mr. DAVIN. No, not so profoundly as that. I cannot pay my hon. friend that compliment; but I find it hard to get at his point. At last, as I sat here to-day and tried to make out what my hon. friend was at, though I had a pen in hand and was taking notes, I could not discover what it was. Then I asked myself what he was like, and I thought he was like an aged hen in a state of metaphysical dubitation as to whether she would lay an egg or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And you sympathized with the hen.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, there can be no question, in my opinion, as to the prosperity of the country. I will not take time at this late hour to go into comparisons; but I have been visiting some of the constituencies. I was up in South Perth, which used to be represented by Mr. Trow, whom personally—and I told him so—I am sorry not to see here, though on other grounds I did not wish him to be elected——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Explain that metaphysical distinction.

Mr. DAVIN. I went into the Township of Blanchard, and afterwards when I met Mr. Trow, I think at St. Mary's, I asked the people: How on earth can these men say that this country is not prosperous, when in this very township there is not a farm house which has not the rank of a villa or a mansion, on which $500 or $600 or possibly $1,000 has been spent in ornamentation? Yet these poor farmers, who are ground to earth, bled livid or pallid—I believe bled white is the language of the member for South Oxford—in that very

township gave I think 52 more votes for the Conservative candidate than they had done in the previous election.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many times did you speak there?

Mr. DAVIN. Twice. Now, it is the same everywhere; and I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that if they want to see their party grow smaller and smaller they will continue the course which they have pursued for some years past: but if they want to make an Opposition which will be powerful and effective, they will change their tactics. Now, the prosperity of this country is a fact, notwithstanding the hon. member for South Oxford. I am sorry for that hon. member, although mercy is for the merciful. I doubt very much if there is much mercy in the hon. gentleman's composition. I doubt very much if he would have any pity for political opponents if their ranks were reduced as the ranks of his friends are: and he is one of the causes of that reduction. He is the embodiment of this cry against the prosperity of the country, and the embodiment of the disloyalty in the cry of unrestricted reciprocity which was so apparent in the last part of the speech of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). Why, the hon. gentleman is so discounted by that policy to-day that if his party could they would get rid of him: but they cannot do it. The country does not want him. The most they could do in the recent bye-elections was to keep him off the platform. What is the career of that hon. gentleman? He has gone about the country barking at its prosperity, barking at the Conservative party and the National Policy. He had a kind of political rabies which made him, so to speak, bite the Conservative party. Indeed, the event reminds me of Goldsmith's ballad on the mad dog. You know that the mad dog bit a man, and the neighbours were all very anxious about the man, fearing that he would take hydrophobia and die. All the anxiety was directed to the man and none to the dog, but the event showed how much it was misdirected, because Goldsmith tells us that the man recovered from the bite—it was the dog that died. Now, I am obliged to the hon. member for Queen's, for admitting that we had a good harvest in the North-West. That shows that hon. gentlemen opposite are making progress. But he asks what credit have the Government for it?

Mr. LANDERKIN. They ploughed it all.

Mr. DAVIN. I grant you that the Government did not plough and the Government did not sow: but if the Conservative Government, the Government of Sir John Macdonald, of which this Government is the continuation, had not built the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the hon. member for South Oxford would not have them, as the hon. member for Bothwell and their late leader, Mr. Blake, would not have them, where would be that magnificent harvest of which the hon. gentleman now admits the existence? If he admits the existence of that harvest, what does it mean? Do the millions which come in for that harvest confine themselves to the North-West? Is it not the nature of money to spread itself as a river or a lake, and touch all shores of the community? And yet the hon. gentleman asks what credit have the Government for it? I will tell him who has the credit.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is Mr. Dewdney who has the credit: he is the Government of the North-West.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about that. I like my hon. friend so much that I am always sorry when I cannot agree with him, and the consequence is that his remarks doom me to perpetual regret. Now, Sir, I will not waste time in dealing with the decrease in the savings banks deposits. That has been dealt with fully in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance, so that the answer to the hon. member for Queen's on that subject is in the *Hansard*. With regard to shipping, I want to point out that the hon. gentleman must have been consciously disingenuous in what he said in regard to the decrease of tonnage of vessels built in Canada. He tried to make out that that, too, was an evidence of diminished prosperity: yet the hon. gentleman must have known that within recent years the fashion has gone from timber ships to iron ships built on the Clyde: he must have known that large ships are registered in England why? In order that they may escape municipal taxation. And yet the hon. gentleman, knowing that, spoke as if he were speaking not in a Parliament like this, but before a jury, in which case when the trial was over and had or had not got his verdict there would be no more about it. If in parliament when he can be answered he talks in that way, what would he say on the hustings? Again he spoke about the census. Well, I am not going to take up the time of the House about that, but I see the eyes of my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) fixed on me, and a smile that is childlike and bland lighting up his countenance. I will ask his attention therefore for a moment to a few remarks I will make about the census and the exodus, and as he is great on comparisons of figures I will call his attention to this comparison. May I point out to the hon. gentleman that he is actually not reasoning when he takes a set of figures for one year, say 1877, and compares it with a set for 1887. The true comparison would be the figures which we might have shown, had hon. gentlemen opposite continued in office since 1878, as compared with those we can show to-day. That would be the real comparison, showing the state of the country, had the Mackenzie Administration continued in office to-day as compared with what it really is under the Conservative regime. Had hon. gentlemen opposite remained in power what would have happened? We should have had a Pacific Railway extending probably 200 miles west of Winnipeg. East of Winnipeg we should have had the water stretches: we should have no North-West whatever, and the credit of Canada would not be what it is to-day. Now, take the census. Does anybody suppose we have anything to do with limiting or increasing the population? Does anybody suppose that the exodus would not take place whatever government was in power?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is better informed because he knows very well that the natural cause of that exodus is the restless enterprising spirit of a progressive community such as ours. As to saying that the cause is to be attributed in any way to the quality of the Government, that shows a very bad state of perceptive powers, unless

we had a state of things such as existed prior to 1878 when everybody was shrowded in gloom and no attempt made to develop our manufactures. But I say this, that with the country in a normal condition we have to account for the exodus by the enterprising spirit of restless educated young men who will go across the line and elswhere too. Neither will I deal with what the hon. gentleman said about sugar, because after all that has been sufficiently dealt with. I want to refer once again to the negotiations at Washington and to what the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) said concerning them. He described the Ministers, especially the Minister of Finance, as going down to Washington dishonestly, with the view of putting obstacles in the way of reciprocity, and he went on to say that the Minister was greatly to be blamed because he showed difficulties on the Canadian side in the way of a proposed treaty under discussion. But the hon. gentleman evidently fails to see that showing there was a difficulty on the Canadian side would be no evidence of a disinclination on the part of the Finance Minister to have a treaty. If he had shown difficulties on the American side, that would show he was disinclined to make a treaty. Can any one who knows anything of our Conservative and Reform politicians doubt that every enlightened man in this country would be ready to make a treaty with the United States which would be useful to Canada? Nobody doubts for one moment that we would be ready to enter into a treaty on the line of the Act of 1854 modified by present conditions, and nobody doubts that such a treaty could be made if the Americans were willing to meet us half way or even a quarter. But, as the Minister of Finance says, the history of our negotiations shows that to our proposals there are no counter proposals, and that when the hand was stretched out by Canada, no hand was stretched out to meet us. In fact, the conversations between the Finance Minister and Mr. Blaine reveal what might have been known from inference and from the political situation in the States, the character of the party to which Mr. Blaine belongs, and Mr. Blaine's own character, and that is that it would be impossible to get a commercial treaty with the United States unless on terms this country would never submit to. I was sorry to hear the closing remarks of the hon. member from Queen's. He talked in a vein of humiliation we have too often heard from that side of the House, but which the country has declared they will have none of. He said nothing could more tend to disloyalty than to have it go forth that it is difficult or impossible to make a treaty with the United States. What would that mean? It would mean that 5,000,000 of Canadians doubt their power to lay the foundation here of a great nation and are looking humbly, pitiably, to the United States? Can you imagine anything more contemptible? If that is the position of Canada the sooner we go cap in hand to Washington the better and say, as it is impossible for us to do anything without your permission, as you are masters of the situation, let us make the best arrangement we can for annexation. That is what the language of the hon. member means, if it means anything. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country by their votes in the past elections have expressed their opinion. When I heard him talk about St. John and about the effect of our commercial legislation on New Brunswick, I could not help thinking that there is but one man from New Brunswick in this House. Are the people of New Brunswick all crazy that they will support a Government which is destroying their vitality and bleeding them white? Are the people of Canada, belonging to the most enlightened races, with education diffused so thoroughly amongst them, so utterly lost to their own interests that they will vote for the men who will destroy their prosperity? The thing carries absurdity on its face. It should be denounced. I denounce it this night. It is a pity to have the time of this House taken up, as it is and has been, by pounding at a cry that is entirely played out, and waving a banner that the people will have nothing to do with. There is a member on that side of the House whom I greatly honour. He is a man of chivalrous soul—I mean the leader—and, if he is going to stick to this cry, he will be in the position of Cadot, the hero of a poem written by Mr. Louis Fréchette, "*Le drapeau fantôme.*" Cadot was with France when Canada was ceded to England. He still waved his white flag over his little fort. A number of English soldiers summoned him to surrender, and he refused. They were called away. Twenty years passed by and still the flag floats idly on its swaying mast, although it has no longer a meaning, and the unhappy man's chivalry is all wasted and astray. I say there is not a man on that side fighting for unrestricted reciprocity who is not fighting under a phantom banner which every sensible man can see has no longer any meaning. The Opposition commenced by taking a depraved line. First they took unrestricted reciprocity. Now they are driven down to commercial union, and afterwards we will find themselves driven to annexation, and then that colony will no doubt have swelled very large, and where will the party find itself? It may have disappeared altogether. But anyway unrestricted reciprocity is no longer a serious cry, and I would fain hope that even this session hon. gentlemen would review the situation and give us clear, reasonable, logical criticism—criticism that, though it might come from hostile ranks, would yet add to the efficiency of that great council of the nation for the excellence and effectiveness of which my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is so anxious.

Mr. WATSON. If the House has not been entertained by facts and figures from my hon. friend who has just sat down, it has no doubt been treated to an amusing address. I might have expected from the remarks he addressed to us 24 hours ago, that he would have given us some information on questions affecting the people of the North-West, but we have been told of an animal that changes its colour, and I know of no man who changes himself so rapidly as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). We have heard him denouncing a Government of incompetents, a cabinet of antiques, and last night we heard him denouncing the Government for keeping up the duty on binding twine, and claiming that, according to the National Policy, when combinations were formed, it was the duty of the Government to reduce the duty. I expected to-night that, when he had an opportunity of dealing with a larger field, he would have dealt with different questions, and would have pointed out the advantages which a

change of policy would be to the country, and in particular to his constituents. We have heard a good deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about loyalty and discriminating against Great Britain, but on examining the Trade and Navigation Returns, we find that the present Administration is discriminating against Great Britain. We find that the amount of duty they levy on dutiable goods from Great Britain is 29 per cent and on dutiable and free goods 22½ per cent, while on goods from the United States which are dutiable they levy 25½ per cent and on dutiable and free 14⅛ per cent, so that they are discriminating against Great Britain in the proportion of 14⅛ per cent to 22½ per cent. The Minister of Finance says he went to Washington and applied for a renewal of the treaty of 1854 in natural products. Other hon. gentlemen on the other side say that the farmer would be injured by the renewal of that treaty. The Minister of Finance was told, as we have told him time and again, that a treaty on that ground alone could not be obtained. We go further than that, and say we should ask for free trade in manufactured goods as well as in natural products, and I say that, as far as the North-West is concerned, we would be much more benefited by free trade in manufactured products than in natural products. We have no fear of free trade in natural products and we wish to have free trade in manufactured goods. The experience of the North-West is that the farmers there have to pay, if not the whole 35 per cent, at least 30 per cent, on the agricultural implements they use on the farm. The member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke of the language used by the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in reference to annexation, when he said that no language could be used by any member more calculated to encourage annexation than the language of the Minister of Finance. I agree with the member from Prince Edward Island, and I will give the member for Assiniboia some evidence given by a gentleman for whom he had great respect, in years gone by. Before the reciprocity treaty of 1854, there was just such a sentiment as there is to-day in favour of annexation, and we know that at present the first lieutenant of the Conservative party in Ontario, Mr. Sol. White, is an advocate of annexation. Previous to 1854, some of the best men of Canada, some who hold the highest positions to-day were in favour of annexation. No less a person than the Premier of this Dominion was in favour of annexation in 1849, and other gentlemen who have occupied prominent positions in the Conservative ranks since that date, signed that annexation manifesto. Now, let us ask what occurred to allay that feeling of annexation. We find that just such a reciprocity treaty as we wish to make with the United States reconciled the people of this country to their condition. They were not satisfied in 1849 when the Hon. Mr. Abbott, the Hon. D. L. Macpherson, and other prominent men signed the annexation manifesto. Sir John A. Macdonald, in referring to the Treaty of 1854, used the following words :—

"It would be impossible to express in figures, with any approach to accuracy, the extent to which the facilities of commercial intercourse, created by the reciprocity treaty, have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this province; and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities.

"Nor is the subject entirely devoid of political significance.

"Under the beneficent operations of the system of self-government which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada, in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the reciprocity treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbours in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitation for organic changes has ceased—all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the province has wholly disappeared."

So you see that Sir John A. Macdonald felt that reciprocal trade with the United States, under the treaty of 1854, was the main cause in allaying the feeling in favour of annexation that existed previous to that date. I am satisfied that nothing that can be done by this Government to allay any feeling that exists in Canada to-day in favour of political union, will have a better effect than the renewal of that treaty on a broader basis, which we know the Americans are willing to extend to us. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke of the election in South Perth, probably because the Conservative candidate was successful in that county. I happened to be in that county, and I took pains to look up the census to ascertain how the county stood with regard to population. I will take the township of Blanchard, which is pictured to this House as a township where the farmers are apparently prosperous. I find that in that township in 1881, there was a population of 3,244 ; in 1891 it was 2,900 or an actual loss of 344. If you take 2 per cent as the natural rate of increase—and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me after seeing those healthy, robust people that the increase ought to be 2 per cent, as the men in that township are not like the hon. gentleman himself, most of them are married men—if you add 2 per cent annually to 3,244, it would make 648. So you see the loss in population suffered by Blanchard township in ten years is 992, to say nothing about the immigrants that came from other countries. Now, sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite have made a comparison between the eastern provinces and the eastern counties lying along the border line in the United States. But while the Americans may have lost in their counties along the boundary line, we have also lost in the eastern portions of the province of Ontario. But I say that so far as we are concerned, we are satisfied that we have a better country on our side of the line, and the people ought to be more prosperous and ought to remain at home. But if people leave the Eastern States, where do they go? They go to the Western States. Unfortunately for us in Canada, although our population is increasing in the North-West, it is not increasing as rapidly as it should ; there are thousands of young Canadians who leave Eastern Canada to go to the United States, but it is not for want of room or accommodation in our Canadian North-West. I think the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will agree with me that we have better natural facilities in Manitoba and the North-West than they have in Minnesota or Dakota, and still hundreds of thousands of our young Canadians prefer to go to the Western States. I think that the National Policy has a great deal to do with it, if it is not the sole cause. Hon. gentlemen opposite have also disallowed our railway legislation. For years those hon. gentlemen would not allow us to build a railway with our own money. Under this National Policy a young man going to

the North-West has to pay $240 a year more to buy the necessaries which he requires to purchase on a prairie farm, than he would have to pay south of the line. Now, that is quite an inducement to a young man, and it is one of the great reasons why immigrants go to the United States instead of coming to Canada. We have been told in this debate that Great Britain is our market. Now, I contend that when we are discussing the tariff there are some articles we may leave out altogether when you are making a comparison as to where our natural market is. So far as beef and breadstuffs are concerned, both Canada and the United States export those articles to Great Britain, and the British market regulates the price of those articles. But outside of those two articles, where do we find the bulk of our products go? Why they go to the United States, that is our natural market. Take horses, for example. Since Confederation we have shipped 316,000 horses, of which 305,000 went to the United States and only 5,478 to Great Britain. Why is this? Because we do not raise the kind of horses they want in Great Britain, and if we did raise them, and if we had Imperial Federation, and Great Britain discriminated in favour of her colonies, the whole British market would not consume the horses we have to export annually. A couple of years ago we exported to the United States some 16,000 horses, and we find from the trade returns of Great Britain that last year the total imports of horses into that country only amounted to 13,000. Therefore, if we had the British market to ourselves they would not require all our surplus horses for years. We have been forcing these horses into the United States under a 20 per cent tariff, while we had free trade with Great Britain. Now the United States impose a specific duty of $30, and our best horses are still climbing that high tariff wall, although we have free trade with Great Britain, showing that the United States is our natural market for horses. Now, I will come to the egg question, which, although some people look upon it as a small industry, still is a very important one to many of our farmers. The farmers of Canada know well that their eggs, as a rule, will pay their grocery bills, and that is a very important item for them. Until 1889 we shipped 12,000,000 dozens of eggs yearly to the United States, and we did not ship any to Great Britain. Since the McKinley Bill imposed a duty of five cents a dozen on our eggs, it is true that some of our eggs have gone to Great Britain, but the egg dealers without exception give evidence against the British market for our eggs. the American market still remains our natural market for this article, and we still ship more eggs to the United States, even paying 5 cents a duty per dozen, than we do to Great Britain. I have heard it stated that the price of eggs was no lower on account of the McKinley tariff, that the lowest average price last season was 10 cents per dozen. I think the lowest price under the McKinley tariff has been 10 cents. That does not, however, prove anything. The lowest average price paid for eggs in Michigan was 14 cents per dozen, while 10 cents was the lowest average price in Canada. One cent per dozen would place them on the market, and this shows a loss of three cents per dozen because we have not the American market. Of sheep, we shipped in 1889 244,000 to the United States, and 47,000 to Great Britain, the duty being 75 cents for lambs and $1.50 for sheep. Of wool, we shipped to the United States 1,000,000 lbs., and none to Great Britain, the duty being 12 cents per lb. It may be said that we cannot control the McKinley Act, but I am satisfied that if proper representations are made to the Americans we can secure a large measure of reciprocity with the United States, not only to the benefit of the people of Canada but those of the United States as well. But there are certain matters over which we possess control, and there are certain articles from which we can remove the duty. By taking off the duty on binding twine we can save our farmers $450,000 annually and only lose $6,000 of revenue. Take coal oil: we use 15,000,000 gallons, 5,000,000 gallons being imported. The duty paid on the imported oil, which is of the value of $498,279, is $365,131. On the total of 15,000,000 gallons there is three times that amount of duty, or on the 10,000,000 gallons of oil we refine in Canada under a strong combination that controls the output, these men put in their pockets on account of that tax on oil $730,000 a year. It can be shown that only one-third of the taxes collected on any article goes into the public treasury, and that two-thirds find their way into the pockets of the manufacturers, refiners or combinations. Accordingly, as the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said last night, not to-night, the Government should interfere and reduce the duties. Coal oil is consumed almost entirely by the farmers and labouring classes, because in towns and cities the electric light is largely used: and, therefore, these 15,000,000 gallons of oil are used almost entirely by farmers and labourers. We were told a year ago that the duty did not increase the price, and during the elections of that time, at the last general election, we were told that everything was cheaper in 1891 than in 1878. That proves nothing. What we desire to know is what the prices would be if the duties were removed. When the duties were lowered on sugar, the people found that the Conservative party had deceived them before the elections, because when the duty was reduced on sugar the people got it cheaper. I claim that we can wipe the duty entirely off sugar and be better off for doing so. I shall be asked what about the refiners. I would provide not only for them but for the people employed in their establishments, and even then we should be better off than we are to-day. It is estimated that we consume annually 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar. All our sugar is over 14 Dutch standard and it is subjected to $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per lb. duty. We have practically shut off all trade with Jamaica on account of this duty. The Americans admit all sugar under 16 Dutch standard free and sugars over 16 Dutch at $\frac{1}{2}$ a cent per lb., and we therefore impose $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent more and do not admit as high grades free. So all our sugar has to be refined before it can be sold to the consumer, for all under No. 14 is unfit for human food. I say we pay $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent more per lb. for sugar than do the Americans. Take 200,000,000 lbs. at $\frac{5}{16}$ of a cent per lb. and you have $600,000. I believe that between 500 and 600 people are employed by the sugar refineries, and I would pursue the policy of superannuating them, giving each $500 per year during natural life. 600 men at $500 would take $300,000. Then about 12 men own these refineries. You could not expect

to satisfy them with a small amount, but suppose they each received $25,000 a year, that would make $300,000, or a total expense of $600,000 to provide liberally to all employed in the sugar industry. 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar at $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent represents $1,600,000. So by wiping out the sugar refineries and by pensioning the owners and the employés at a total cost of $600,000 yearly, we would have sugar as cheap as it is to-day and $1,000,000 annually placed in the treasury. Or, if sugar were made free, the people would obtain it at a much cheaper rate than they do to-day. The hon. gentleman referred to the prosperity of railways and it is desirable that these matters should be discussed. Railways have been prosperous in Canada and are prosperous to-day, because they enjoy free trade and they are about the only enterprises that do enjoy free trade. On the other hand, take Canadian shipping. On the great lakes our shipping has not free trade and what is the result? Only 5 per cent of the lake trade is carried in Canadian bottoms. No better proof of the advantage that could be afforded by reciprocity can be adduced than that which would follow free trade in shipping. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) mentioned that there were good crops and he wondered what the people would do without the Conservative party. One would imagine that they controlled everything, and that they alone would give subsidies to railways, to harbours and other public works. It must, however, be remembered that it is the public money that is expended, and if a Liberal Government were in power the country would undoubtedly possess as many miles of railway as there are to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We might not have six miles built to a saw-mill.

Mr. BOWELL. Because you would not have a saw-mill to which to build a railway.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman suggested that more miles of railway have been built in Manitoba than would have been the case if a Liberal Government were in power. But the Liberal Government never restricted railway building, and I am well aware how the people of the North-West suffered for years on account of the railway policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman spoke of public opinion, and public opinion had left the Opposition in reduced circumstances so far as numbers were concerned. I have no doubt that before this Parliament is ended that hon. gentlemen will find that the Opposition is a pretty lively corpse. A year ago the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was not quite as solid a supporter of the Government as he is to-day.

Mr. DAVIN. Just as solid.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think so. I think that the hon. gentleman delivered a speech in this House that rather reflected on the Government which is now in power.

Mr. DAVIN. On immigration.

Mr. WATSON. The speech that he delivered was a general condemnation of the Premier down to the humblest member of the party. There may be reasons for his change. The hon. gentleman as he stated did stump in the county of South Perth, and he claimed to be an Independent there and to be one of the men who was sufficiently independent when owning and controlling a paper in Regina to criticise the action of the Government. We have heard him state repeatedly in this House that he did not control that paper, but we find by the Public Accounts that there are probably certain reasons why he should be a supporter of the Government of the day. In South Perth he boasted of controlling that paper, but in the House of Commons I think I heard him deny it. However I felt satisfied that if the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) did not criticise the Government, his constituents knowing that he did control it would not have sent him to represent them in Parliament. We know that he had to pledge himself to the people. He told us last night that he had to pledge himself that he would declare in the House that the tax on binding twine should be removed, and I have no doubt that he had to pledge himself also to vote for taking the duty off agricultural implements.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. WATSON. If not his next neighbour did. I know the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had to pledge himself on the temperance question; he had to make several pledges to the electors, and that being the case I do not think that he has treated his people well when he comes here to-night and eulogizes the Government and their policy. I do hope that the Government have not done as the Minister of Finance has stated, and have given up all hopes of having a reciprocity treaty with the United States. So far as I am concerned I would like to see free trade with the world and direct taxation. Some hon. gentlemen whistled across the House, and I feel satisfied that if we had direct taxation hon. gentlemen opposite would not have so much money to squander as they have to-day. Their policy is a system of legalized robbery in taking a man's money out of his pocket when he does not know it. If I have $100 in my pocket, and a highway robber puts a pistol to my head and says: I want $50, I will probably give it to him if I think the gun is loaded, but if I can get that man arrested he will be placed in gaol; whereas the highway robbery practised by the manufacturers or combines is protected by legislation. They take our money and they give us no more in return for it than does the highway robber. I can easily understand that the Minister of Finance did not want a reciprocity treaty with the United States, for if he got it he would not know what to do with it, and I also believe that hon. gentlemen opposite would not know how to run elections if they had free trade, because they require to have the manufacturers' subscriptions at their back. I do not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite have been honest in attempting to get reciprocity with the United States, for I am of opinion that unrestricted reciprocity could be secured if proper representations were made to the neighbouring Republic. I am satisfied that the people of the States want a great many articles that we produce, that we want a great deal that they produce, and that mutual reciprocity would be advantageous to both. While we have a high tariff Minister of Finance on the Canadian side and a high tariff McKinley on the American side, we cannot expect to reduce the tariff wall. I do hope that the Government will not stand by the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that he had no hope for reciprocity.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. Yes, we will.

Mr. WATSON. I believe that the hon. gentleman from South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) will, but I noticed last night that he did not repeat his speech of a year ago on the binding twine question. Not a man on the other side of the House defended the exactions of the Government in exacting taxes from the people for binding twine.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. It was not worth while.

Mr. WATSON. Probably they have had an intimation that the Government will take the duty off twine, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman from South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) along with others was tied up last night by a piece of binding twine and was not allowed to speak. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin,) spoke about the lunatic asylums in some constituencies being filled up, but I felt satisfied after hearing the speech of the hon. member to-night that the lunatic asylums in his part of the country must have been filled up, and that there was no more room there. Without further occupying the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will now take my seat.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I beg to move the ajournment of the debate.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the House, that both last week and again to-night, an arrangement was made with the leader of the Opposition that we should finish the debate at a reasonable hour to-night. I do not see the leader of the Opposition here, but I have no doubt that such information was given to me after consultation with his colleagues. Therefore I think that the hon. gentleman had better go on and make his speech.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There are two or three of us to speak on this side yet and we ought to be allowed a fair opportunity. If the House does not wish to adjourn we will have to go on.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was the understanding that there should not be any more discussion, or that we should go into Supply?

Mr. FOSTER. That we should close at an early hour to-night.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We can discuss the items on Supply. When any motion is made to go into Supply the whole matter can be brought up again.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, if you wish to bring it up.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That will be in accordance with the arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangement was simply that this debate on what is called the Budget would close to-night at a reasonable hour.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that the Minister of Finance informed the leader of the Opposition, at the same time, that nobody on that side would speak.

Mr. FOSTER. I think not. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong in his information.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. gentleman remembers that he told me that the debate would close to-night when we consented to an early adjournment the other night.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I know that the Minister did arrange with the leader of the Opposition that the debate should close at this sitting, but I understood that the Minister stated that no one else on the opposite side would speak on this subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman had better finish his speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman can make his speech at any time on going into Supply.

Mr. McMILLAN. If I shall be allowed to speak on going into Supply I would rather speak at another time.

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

(In the Committee.)

Kingston Penitentiary..... $162,753 49

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that there is an increase of $13,339. Will the hon. gentleman say how this increase has taken place?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are several statutory increases, $1,060 for keepers and $2,300 for guards. But the principal item is $15,000 for an isolated female prison and a new criminal lunatic asylum. But for that there would be a decrease in the estimate. The report which has been laid on the Table of the House shows a very regrettable state of affairs as regards the lunatic asylum. It is the only asylum for criminal lunatics in the Dominion, and it is simply a large ward in the building occupied for divers other purposes, among others for a flour mill. There is a great want of exercise and employment; of outdoor exercise there is none. I think it is desirable above all that a lunatic asylum should be provided. It can be constructed on the penitentiary property. If funds were available, I should like very much to erect a prison for female convicts, who are likewise congregated in that penitentiary from all parts of the country. The accommodation for them is only in the basement of the building, which is somewhat damp and gloomy, and not at all the kind of place for convicts of that description.

Mr. FLINT. I would ask the Government if they contemplate carrying out any of the suggestions made by the Inspector of Penitentiaries in regard to the establishment of a prison for young criminals. I was very much impressed by the arguments of the inspector, and I was heartily in sympathy with his views.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not propose to take a vote for that service, but I am entirely of the opinion the inspector has expressed, and it is incumbent upon Parliament to make some provision for that. I propose to frame a scheme for an institution of that kind, and have it ready for next session, and ask for a vote for it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the decrease in the maintenance due to a decrease in the number of convicts?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; it is a reduction in the ordinary expenses. I do not think the number of convicts is less or likely to be less.

Committee rose and reported the resolution.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the High Commissioner for Canada.—Mr. Foster.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 30th March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE ELLIOTT.

Mr. LISTER. Understanding that objection would be taken to the petition which was presented the other day from Thomas S. Hobbs and others, praying that justice may be done with reference to certain judgments rendered by County Court Judge Elliott under the Electoral Franchise Act, and in relation to certain acts of partizanship alleged by them to have been committed by the said Judge Elliott, I beg to present another petition praying that the matter may be dealt with in conformity with law and justice. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Edgar, that the petition of Thomas S. Hobbs and others be now received and read.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think that this is not a question of urgency that would justify the House in passing this motion; however, it is for the House to say.

Mr. LISTER. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is a question of urgency. It is unfair to Judge Elliott that these charges should stand upon the Table of the House uninvestigated, if they are to be investigated at all. On Tuesday last, I think it was, a petition was presented making certain charges against this judge, and to-day in the regular course that petition would be received and read. But an intimation was received by me that the petition was informal, for the reason that it contained no names upon the page containing the prayer. I, therefore, present to-day another petition, in order that as little time as possible may be lost, and I think, in the interest of Judge Elliott and in the interest of the whole community, that these proceedings should be carrried on as rapidly as possible. I think the new petition which I present to-day should stand, as far as this House is concerned, in the position of the old one, and that it should now be read, and a copy of it forwarded to the judge for his answer. A charge against a judge is, of course, a matter of very grave importance, and the authorities lay it down that it should be proceeded with without any delay, because it is a matter affecting the dignity and honour of the judiciary of the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman claims this to be at all a matter of privilege.

Mr. LISTER. No.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Then that disposes of the question of urgency, which is about the only question. All the business on the Paper is urgent; but besides that, the only ground put forward for the claim of urgency is that the matter is urgent to Judge Elliott. The House has other important business to attend to which is equally urgent to other public functionaries, and I am afraid that Judge Elliott will have to wait his turn. I agree with the hon. gentleman that this is a matter of very grave importance, inasmuch as it affects the position of a judge, but that is no reason why the rules of Parliament should be dispensed with. On the contrary, I think it is most desirable that the rules of the House should be observed.

Mr. LISTER. I move, seconded by Mr. Edgar:

That the petition of Thomas S. Hobbs and others be printed, and a copy thereof be at once sent to Mr. Elliott, Judge of the County of Middlesex.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion seems to me to be in the same position as the other. The petition has not yet been received.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of this motion—I cannot conceive of any other—is to prevent an examination of the petition for the purpose of seeing whether it conforms to the rules of the House. A petition was presented which it was found did not conform to the rules of the House, and on that ground it was asked that the rules be dispensed with. I think it is equally desirable that this petition should be found to be formal.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not see why the printing of the petition should not go on.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It has not been received by the House.

Mr. EDGAR. It has not been received, and, therefore, it is not in that sense before the House, but it has been presented by an hon. member, and certainly the House, if it desires to expedite the business, could order the petition to be printed.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is another objection to this motion which I did not mention at the moment, because I thought the one I mentioned was sufficient. This is a motion for the printing of a paper, and the ordinary course is to move that it be referred to the Printing Committee and be dealt with by that committee. This is an additional objection to the one I have already stated.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that you should reserve your judgment on this point, because I think there are precedents to the contrary. At all events, this is a petition against a judge, and the law is for this Parliament as well as for others; and if the objection is taken, there is nothing to be done but to follow the rules of the House.

Mr. LISTER. In the two or three cases which have come before this House since 1867, the usual practice has been to move that the papers be printed and copies forwarded to the gentleman against whom the accusation is made.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It seems to me that we should not print and send to a person accused a petition which has not been received. For that reason I think it important that the rules should be observed.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. CAMERON moved for leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Co.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not been furnished by the examiner with a statement that this Bill can be presented, and I would require that from the Bill examiner before it can be introduced, it being a private Bill.

Mr. GUILLET moved :

That the petition presented to-day on behalf of the Cobourg and Northumberland Pacific Railway Co. be read and received.

He said : It is urgent that the petition should be received to-day, as the time expires on Friday.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to know whether this is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not, strictly speaking, in order if objection is taken. The only ground I think on which the House would receive the motion is that the time is about to expire.

Mr. EDGAR. As a motion which I had the honour of seconding has been ruled out of order, I must take the point of order in this case.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further papers respecting the Fisheries on the Pacific Coast, including the separate arrangement proposed to be entered into by Newfoundland with the United States, and also the enforcement by the Government of Newfoundland against Canadian vessels of the Newfoundland Bait Act.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 30th March, 1892.

I.C.R.—ARRANGEMENT WITH C.P.R.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, What was the amount paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Intercolonial Railway, for the year ending 29th February, 1892, on tickets collected on the Canadian Pacific Railway betwen Halifax and St. John ? What was paid for the same year, for car mileage between Halifax and St. John, by the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. HAGGART. The Canadian Pacific Railway extends no farther east than St. John, and therefore nothing could be paid on tickets collected on that railway between Halifax and St. John. With regard to the second part of the enquiry, the amount for car mileage between Halifax and St. John paid by the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the year ending 29th February, 1892, was $22,371.28, and the amount received for the same time from the Canadian Pacific Railway for the use of cars running on that railway was $13,037.

ACTIVE MILITIA.

Mr. HUGHES moved for :

Return showing :—1. The corps of the Active Militia of Canada that have been drilled (*a*) annually : (*b*) biennially, and (*c*) triennially, in the period 1889-1891 inclusive. 2. The number of qualified combatant officers in each corps. 3. The number of provisionally appointed officers in each corps, specifying those whose period for qualification has expired. 4. The name, length of service and age of each commanding officer upwards of sixty years of age. 5. The actual strength of, and number of enlistments in, during the year 1891, each of the permanent corps, located in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick.

He said : In bringing this motion before the House, I do so at the request of a large number of militia officers of Canada. I have received letters from almost every province of the Dominion containing suggestions with regard to the force, and these suggestions I shall briefly endeavour to put before the House. I may say I have no intention whatever of finding fault with the past management of the Militia Department. The former Minister of Militia and his predecessors found themselves, on taking office, fettered, in a certain sense, by the condition in which they found the department when they returned to office in 1879. The policy of the late Minister in encouraging the force, in developing rifle shooting, and in encouraging the militia in every way consistent with the amount of money at his disposal, would preclude my casting any reflections on the department on his account. More than that, the conduct of the late Minister during the campaign of 1885, will for all time merit for him the approval of the people. The present Minister of Militia is an old personal friend of mine, he is new in the office, and therefore I can have no object in making any reflections on him. I had the pleasure of drilling under the present Minister of Militia nearly a quarter of a century ago, and I know from past experience he is in every sense a thorough militiaman. Nor have I any desire to reflect on the departmental and staff officers throughout the Dominion. I simply wish to take the case as it is and present the ideas of militia officers, with the sole object of improving the force in any way we can, with the same expenditure, or a greater expenditure if necessary. A slight review of the force may not be out of place. In 1866, the old rifle companies were reorganized and battalions formed throughout the Dominion. These corps were drilled during 1867, 1868, and 1869, and up to 1875 in brigade camps. Then we had the whole force annually drilled, and it was one of which any young country might be proud. Unfortunately for the militia force, the Reform party came into power in 1874, and their policy at once began to show itself. The aim then, and it was successfully carried out, seemed to be to do away with the rural battalions, limit the city and town companies, and establish a small standing army. When the Conservative party returned to power in 1879, they found the force almost entirely demoralized, the old military schools closed up, and the force in a very weak condition. The second part of the motion asks for a return of the qualified officers in the force. In the old days of the military schools, we found the militia force well officered by well qualified men. There was scarcely a company which had not all the commissioned officers qualified, and many of the non-com. and even privates. The cause of this is to be found in the schools. Now, in presenting a view adverse to the present system, I do not wish to be understood as saying that our present military schools have not done some good, but I do say that the same expenditure of money might have resulted much more advantageously to the force. We find in them that the basis is rank and not knowledge. I shall just illustrate this by taking two brothers, possessed of equal knowledge and proficiency and

equal in every respect. One happens to be provisional captain, knowing just as little about drill as does the other, who happens to be a sergeant. These two go to school. What do we find? We find the one who wears the sergeant's uniform is relegated to the sergeant's mess and drills with the sergeants, while his brother, who wears an officer's uniform, messes with the officers and is given double pay and allowances compared with the non-com. We find in the school they wear their different uniforms, their mess is different, and their lodging is different. One has all the luxuries of an officer, and the other has to put up with the skilly and other discomforts of the private soldier. But the greatest possible objection to the whole is that, on leaving the school, the non-com. has to leave, no matter what his proficiency may be, with his non-com. certificate, while his brother may acquire a commissioned officer's certificate. Under the old system, one which a great many militia officers maintain should be again revived, the basis was not rank but military proficiency. Whether a man was a provisional captain or a sergeant, all entered the school on an equal footing. A non-com. officer wore the same uniform as a militia lieutenant-colonel. In other words, they were treated as cadets, all aiming to acquire certificates. We found in those days that all men were taught alike, they all had to pass the same examination, and certificates were issued on the basis of military knowledge and not of rank. Their uniforms were the same. There was no full dress regulation in force then. I have a number of letters from military men in the different districts stating that they have been unable to afford the money for the purchase of full dress uniforms which are now required for young men coming from these schools. We all remember that, in the old days, we would see thousands of volunteers in brigade camps, and scarcely a full dress uniform amongst the officers, and yet those men were as competent to face the music and go to the front as those who can afford to buy full dress uniforms. I am not saying anything against those who can afford to buy them, but I think those who cannot should not be placed in the position they are. We had some excellent men who marched through the trenches at Batoche wearing white kid gloves, and we had others who marched through those same trenches in their shirt sleeves, and those who were in their shirt sleeves were no less able to perform their duty than those who wore kid gloves. Under the old system a man might apply to enter the military school at any time, and, by applying to his commanding officer and the commander of his district, might obtain an entrance. Under the present system, there is great difficulty for the young men to enter at the time when these military schools are being held, which are the very times when they are required to be busy on their farms. In short under the present system, it is almost impossible for these men to get there at the times which are suitable for them. Under the old system, a student at a military school might board in any part of the city or town where it was held, but under the present régime the officers and the non-commissioned officers attending these schools are obliged to board in the barracks and to undergo all the discipline of the institution. The system of boarding out allows a much larger number to attend the schools than can now attend them. One of the chief excuses offered by those in charge of the schools at present is that they can only take a certain number at a certain time, and when the number of applicants exceeds the amount of accommodation, they have to wait until others pass out of the school, thus preventing entirely their attendance. Under the old system, a man at the completion of his term was allowed $50, and in the old days he wa allowed $100, being $50 extra for a first class certificate, but now there is no such allowance. I had the privilege of attending the school under the old 29th Regiment, but I have seen men who have never attended a school who were quite as successful in carrying out their duties as men who passed through the schools, having passed before what we called in the old days the Volunteer Boards. Many of those are in the force to-day and are ornaments to it. At that time they were examined according to their proficiency in the field, but that is not carried on now to the same extent. Then an impetus was given to young men to study military business at home, but now no such impetus is given to a man to develop his military drill. We find that the number of officers who pass these schools is year by year becoming limited, and at the present time, looking over the militia list, I think it will be found that not one-third of our officers are qualified to command an ordinary company. In the old days, there was scarcely a company that had not every officer qualified, besides a large number of non-commissioned officers. I was drilled in the ranks under Colonel Bowell, the present Minister of Militia, but I held a military school certificate, and I remember others did also. There is another matter to which I desire to call attention, and that is as to the manner in which the camps are conducted at the present time. Formerly, the corps were drilled annually, but, since the annual drills have been done away with, and a small standing army has been built up, the result has not been so good. It is true that there has been an attempt to return, to a certain extent, to the old system of annual drilling, but they leave out the rural corps, and some of them are not drilled more than once in two years, and sometimes once in three years. What kind of force can be kept up when the men are not taken away for drill more than once in three years? They go home after their brigade drill, and their muskets are put away, and according to the ordinary death rate, many of the volunteers must pass away into another land before they are called upon for the next drill. The burdens that are thrown on the officers, of taking out the rural corps once in two or three years, are enormous. Only those who have to keep up a rural corps know the expense and trouble which it involves to keep that corps up under this system. I have seen brigade camps, and others have seen them also, in which the commanding officers were standing around unable to drill their own battalions, and drill sergeants were sent to instruct them in their duties. Another thing is that we find too much interference in the interior affairs of the battalion by the officers in command of the camps. It is not uncommon to see in brigade orders that certain battalions are to parade at such and such an hour in the morning for squad drill, and I have seen strong young farmers called out there and given balance steps and extension drill for the

good of their health. That is the way in which the money voted by Parliament is thrown away. They take up a large portion of their time in teaching them squad drill, which may be all right in regard to the regular army, but for the volunteer force you require very little of that. The man who can change his feet, form fours, and shoot is quite competent enough in that respect. We find very little battalion drill under the present régime in camp, and it is not uncommon to find a battalion returning from camp without having had one brigade drill. If such is to continue it would be as well to adopt the old system and have drill at headquarters, or better still, disband the whole force and save the money. In these brigade camps there should certainly be some battalion drill every day, and there should be a large amount of brigade drill as well, and there should be no interference by the officers commanding the camps with the interior affairs of the different corps. I would like to know where the dignity of an officer is who takes a battalion out to attend the brigade camp, and has one of these instructors drill not only the colonel but every commissioned officer in the whole corps. I have often wondered where the dignity of the officers of the force was who would tolerate any such interference, or who had not pride enough to adopt some system that would allow their officers to become qualified. There is another point to which I will refer. If we are to have a force at all, then I maintain that force should be ready to march to the front at any time on 24 hours' notice; if we are ever to have any want for a volunteer force in this country, that want will come up suddenly. In the rebellion of 1885, the need sprang up very suddenly, and we were fortunately able to send a sufficient force to the front. But in case of trouble with the United States or with any other foreign Government, we have instances on record to show us that it will be absolutely necessary that we should be able to place a very large body of drilled men in the field on a moment's notice. I believe that if the present system were continued many years more the force would become so degenerated that we would not be able to put more than fifty or sixty thousand men in the field in case of necessity; but under a proper system with the same amount of money we could easily turn out three or four hundred thousand men, on a day's notice, ready to march to the front. Many of the corps at the present time have officers in command who have been in command ever since 1867. Now, there is no objection whatever to an officer retaining command, provided he is young and active, and fit for all the duties he has to perform. Many of the older officers finding themselves unfit to assume the fatigues of an active campaign, have retired, and we find that nearly all the city corps change their commanding officers every few years. We further find, unfortunately, that many of the rural corps, although the officers in command may have been good men in their day, are yet but fairly good men. Still a great many of them have officers who take command, not for the good of the force, but for the honour of the position and the benefits that accrue to them. There is a section in the Regulations and Orders of Canada requiring officers, when they reach a certain age, to be placed on the retired list. I regret that that regulation has been a dead letter, and has not been enforced in Canada at all. Now, there is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House, and that is in relation to the permanent corps. Either these permanent corps are intended to be a standing army, or they are intended to give instruction as military schools. Now, if they are to be the nucleus of a standing army, I think the voice of the country will be against the policy of building up a standing army in the Dominion of Canada. If we review the history of nations we will find that when standing armies have been brought face to face with militia corps, the militia corps have invariably been the winners; in other words, the militia force has invariably proven itself to be superior to standing armies in the field. Now, if permanent corps are to be the nucleus or the rallying point of military schools, then it is proper for us to enquire into the cost of these schools. I find in last year's official report that the sum of nearly half a million dollars was expended on these permanent schools, and only 402 certificates were granted; in other words, each certificate cost the country about $1,200 during the past year. On turning to the amount paid for drill pay and camp allowances for the militia corps, we find that the sum of a little over a quarter of a million was expended for a force of 40,000, whereas the sum of nearly half a million was expended for these permanent schools. I wish again to point out that it is not my intention nor my wish to make any attack on these permanent schools. The officers commanding them, I believe, are efficient and good men; but what I do say is this, that the same money might be so employed as to give the country a vastly improved system and much better results. For instance, if we were to return to the old system of issuing certificates on the basis of military knowledge, instead of military rank, we would have a much larger number of young men attending these schools. At the present time, the attendance is limited to a very few men, because they have to sleep in the barracks, but if we returned to the old system we could easily have 150 to 200 men in the school. The number in the school of the 29th Regiment when I passed was 215 men, and not one of them—I make the statement guardedly—who had attended school for two months but was fully capable of taking his place in any force—the equal of any officer or man now in the permanent corps. Under the old system which was in vogue in Canada in former years, we would always have the schools filled with able young men who would train not to put in an easy time or an idle hour, as many of the men do at present, but for the purpose of acquiring knowledge and fitting themselves for real service. I have spoken with a great many military men in this country about returning to the old system, and I find only four objections urged against it. One is that it would be a loss of dignity on the part of these provisionally appointed officers to stand in the ranks and drill with non-commissioned officers. Well, I maintain that in a country like this we have no business to recognize rank without merit, where all are students. As Bobby Burns has said:

> "The rank is but the guinea's stamp.
> The man's the gold for a' that."

As I have pointed out, if the officer commanding is a provisional officer and the other is a sergeant, where can there be any loss of dignity in standing side by side and drilling with each other?

The basis of these schools should be knowledge. These very same officers who would scorn to drill in a military school beside non-commissioned officers seem to suffer no indignity in going into camp where a drill sergeant goes around among them and teaches them their duties. Another objection is that sergeants might hold the same commissions as their officers. Thus they say you might have a sergeant holding a first-class certificate, whereas the captain or lieutenant might have only a second-class or provisional certificate. But if the private knows more than the captain it is the business of the captain to go and get a better certificate. In the old days, we are told that these men passed for the money and not for the love of the force. These men might have had no intention whatever of remaining in the volunteer force: but they have in many instances allied themselves after a time with the force, and are to-day the best officers in it. Another objection is that the men under the old system were not trained in mess room etiquette. Now, it may be very necessary to a military education to know how to hold one's knife and fork, to know how to handle a napkin, but I do not know that it is an essential part of such an education, or that it is so important that an ordinary Canadian with ordinary brains could not learn that branch in ten or fifteen minutes. These are the only objections I have ever heard against returning to the old system. Sir, I do not wish to take up the time of the House any further on this subject. I have endeavoured briefly to point out what I consider the drawbacks of the present system, and the superiorities of the old system, which many militia officers believe should be again adopted in this country. I believe that it would be best for the country to resort once more to the old plan. But of one thing I am satisfied, and that is, that the militia force of this country, particularly the rural battalions, are determined to have annual drill. The militia officers who have for years kept up these corps, to a great extent, at their own expense, are determined to make their voice heard in favour of having annual drill for the militia corps. I believe that all thinking men are in favour of it, and I trust that the Government will take such steps as will enable these corps to have annual drills, so that we may again have a large volunteer force of which the country may be justly proud.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am very happy to be able to say that my experience, which is probably as long as that of most hon. members, differs very materially from that of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and I cannot agree with him in one or two statements he has made, especially when he lays down a proposition that the force as at present constituted has degenerated, or is in any other way inferior to what it was under the old system. Speaking for the portion of the force with which I am acquainted, I have no hesitation in saying that the active militia in the country never was in so good a condition as it is to-day, either as regards the quality of the men or the efficiency and standing of the officers. I quite admit that the present system of instruction is an expensive one; I quite admit it might be made of very much more general use for the same outlay; but at the same time it must be remembered, when we compare it with the system that existed to which the hon. gentleman has referred, that these schools of instruction were carried on by a line regiment, which set an example and afforded the most complete instruction. When the line regiments left this country we had for a short time the system of schools which then existed, before the establishment of the present system was secured, and when this system was inaugurated there was a very great falling off in the quality of the officers and in the value of the instruction given. I have no hesitation in saying, so far as my knowledge of the force goes, that the statement made with respect to the small proportion of qualified officers is very far from being correct. I know in our district there is not a regiment in which there is not a very much larger proportion of qualified officers than is required, and which does not contain within itself all the necessary elements of instruction, both as regards discipline and drill. In the camps I have attended there have not been those abuses to which the hon. gentleman has called attention, and there has not been that waste of time which he has mentioned. Such is not my experience, and if these abuses prevailed in other districts, attention should be called to it, and it should be corrected by the proper authorities. I admit there is a drawback with respect to the expense necessarily incurred by the officers who attend the present school of instruction, but at the same time the practical results are exceedingly satisfactory, because, as I stated, we have a better class of officers for the force to-day than, so far as my knowledge goes, we ever possessed before. Under the old system, in which the hon. gentleman seems to see so much to commend, it is well known that a large number of young men went to those schools for the purpose of passing a portion of an idle winter, and obtaining the grant given, and they never had the slightest intention of entering the force or took the least interest in it and a more useless lot of men than were those who passed through those schools does not exist anywhere, so far as I know. No one now goes to the school of instruction unless he has a commission. We know we are going to obtain the full benefit for the service of the instruction given, for, as I have said, a man cannot go there until he has obtained a commission, and these men possess the necessary equipment to qualify them for the discharge of their duties. It was a standing complaint, as every one is aware, under our old system, that the equipment of the officers was exceedingly unsatisfactory. Of course a man may fight as well in his shirt sleeves as in a uniform—I am prepared to admit that; but at the same time it is desirable that officers who have to retain the respect and confidence of their men, should attend to these things which one might almost call the decencies and amenities required in every other branch of life, and especially where the discipline of an army has to be maintained. Our officers now come to their camps in a condition very superior to that which was formerly the case, and in the best rural corps, at all events those with which I am acquainted, the officers have these qualifications, which, although not essential, are exceedingly desirable and without which the discipline and efficiency of the force cannot be maintained. There is one point on which I heartily agree with the hon. gentleman, and that is the absolute necessity, for the due efficiency of the force, of the annual drill, and that is an expenditure which will be popular in the country and be well supported in

this House. If the Government will ask Parliament to make the necessary grant for the purpose, there will be hardly a dissentient voice raised. A proof of the popularity of the force is this: take the worst conducted regiment in Canada, and let the Minister attempt to cut it down or do away with it, and there will be such an outcry that he will be compelled, as he has often been compelled, to allow arrangements to prevail which, under other circumstances, would not be allowed. That is the best evidence of the popularity of the force. Moreover, the expenditure necessary for the force passes directly from the pockets of the people into the pockets of the men. That is, in my opinion, the great essential. It must be remembered that the corps of instruction should be regarded and treated by the department, not as forming the nucleus of a standing army, but simply as schools of instruction. It must be remembered that we have in this country no regular troops, and any one who knows what the condition of the force was at its first formation, especially in many of the rural corps, must be perfectly well aware that one of the things to be considered was that many of the people had never seen a soldier or had any idea as to how he should look. When the regular regiments were in this country we had always a type and pattern set for our men to work up to, and our men took the full benefit of it. When the regular troops left, the position was very altered, and in the schools then established we had no example and pattern and rule of discipline, which was most essential to be learned by all who go through a course of instruction. When a man goes to a school simply to learn drill his time his wasted, for he needs that general knowledge of military matters which is essential, and in these schools of instruction these advantages can be procured, without which it would not be possible for the force to maintain its discipline. My own experience entirely differs from that of the hon. gentleman. I say that our officers so far as I have knowledge of them, are thoroughly efficient as regards drill and discipline, and if the hon. gentleman from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) comes to the camp at Niagara in the second military district, next June, I think he will very materially change his opinion as to what the quality of the rural battalions is: at any rate, in the western part of Ontario. I join with him most heartily in impressing upon the Government the great necessity of increasing the grant for the active force so as to enable the whole force to be drilled every year. That is the main thing that we have to consider now, and when that is accomplished we will find many other things to which attention should be paid. Let us take one thing at a time, and I would recommend my friends to press that one thing upon the attention of the Government. The main thing now is that we should have annual drill, which, really considering the amount we spend at present, would be very little additional cost to the country. I contend that there is not a force in the whole world maintained at as cheap a rate as the active militia force of Canada. I say that it is a force suited to the requirements and conditions of the country, and I say that in point of economy it leaves nothing to be desired. Twenty-five cents per head per annum of the whole population is the actual cost of our active force, including all the excrescences that are planted upon it, and counting the military college, which I look upon as of less value to the force in proportion to the expenditure than anything else. We really get no good from the college, never have got any good from it, and from present appearances we are not likely to derive any benefit from it. That college should be brought more in harmony with the needs of the force. It is an admirable school, no doubt, and if I had a son I would send him to it, but it is not an institution which is of any particular benefit to the force.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It trains officers for the active militia.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not know a dozen men in the active force at present who were educated at the military college. I wish we could get them, but unfortunately we cannot. I have suggested a means by which the military college might be brought into harmony with the active force, but I was told that nothing could be done because it would interfere with the examinations. If that is the case, then it is merely an educational institution for the benefit of the public, and if so, it ought not to be charged to the active militia. The great thing for the Government to do now, is to give us an annual drill, and that accomplished, it will lead the way in the first place to a great many reductions in the expenditure which might then be permitted. It would relieve officers from a great deal of trouble and expense, and it would give to us what we really require: a force which, in twenty-four hours at any time, according to the idea of the hon. gentleman, could be available. Some hon. gentlemen talk about the difficulty of getting out our force. How long did it take in 1885, to put a rural battalion in the field? The battalion I had the honour to command was brought from the extremities of two large counties in 48 hours, without any previous notice except the rumour in the newspapers. I am very well satisfied and pleased with the condition of the force. I have the greatest possible confidence in its efficiency, and in the means by which it could be increased at very little cost. I look upon the economical side of it as a most important matter, because, of course in this growing country with the enormous expenditure which is required to be met in the shape of interest on debt and public improvements, we cannot afford to spend a very large sum on a military force, but the country can afford to spend what it does now, and what is necessary to make our militia really and thoroughly efficient. To that point we should direct our attention at present, and that point is one which I would most earnestly press upon the Minister of Militia and upon the Government of this country.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, another objection which I have to the military college at Kingston, is that it is really a school of emigration and nothing else. Our best young men go there, get a thorough education, become perfect civil or military engineers, and then immediately leave the country. It is not only a great expense, but it is also a cause of loss of population, and I think we should find some way else of utilizing the money expended on it. I will not follow the remarks of my colleagues who have spoken upon the question of camps, nor of the necessity of the schools, but I want to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that the schools have actually become an embarrassment to the militia. We cannot get certificates for our young officers without their attend-

ing the schools, and our best officers are those who have employment in commercial houses, banks and so on, and they cannot leave that employment the number of days necessary to go to the schools to get qualified. The consequence is that those who deserve certificates, and who would obtain certificates from boards of examiners, cannot obtain them, and we are deprived of their services. Let the Government keep their schools if they wish, for my part I will not object, but I would like the regulations which prevent our officers obtaining certificates otherwise than by the schools, to be repealed. I have listened very attentively to what the hon. member from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has said, in his comparison of the old and new systems, and I entirely agree with him that the old system was by far the more preferable. We obtained as many officers as we wanted under the old system, and they were perfectly qualified for the service. I beg the hon. Minister to amend the regulations in such a way that boards of examiners be given us so as to qualify those of our new officers who wish to join the force and are able to do it conveniently. I will give the Minister an example. When we went to the North-West we had a very regular service there for three months, and the greater part of my officers and men who went there were perfectly qualified. After all, what is the main thing required for the service? It is that a man knows how to drill and knows something of the internal economy of the force, and nothing else. It is not necessary that he should know the names of every part of a gun, and every part of a rifle and a cartridge, and so on. It is not necessary that he should know the scientific names of everything he touches in the armoury, but the great thing for a soldier is to be able to take a gun and shoot well, to know how to drill in company, battalion, or brigade, and to know exactly what to do in camp when he receives his orders. I think that is all we require. The object of the militia force is to have a force ready to help the civil authorities when required. We want every facility given to our officers to receive certificates when they have got sufficient knowledge for that, and I hope the hon. Minister will see the wisdom of this suggestion. In my own corps I have about 10 or 12 officers waiting until they are enabled to be examined and get their certificates to permanently join the 9th Battalion. As I have already said, I do not object to the schools, especially to the infantry schools, but I want military boards of examiners to grant certificates to those who are ready to join the force and who cannot afford to lose time to go to the schools. These schools are not open during the months of July and August. Those two months are generally the months during which the students at the universities might go and qualify themselves; but then the schools are closed. It appears as if the militia is created and maintained for these schools, and not the schools for the militia. Another most extraordinary thing is that a man may have obtained a certificate in 1863 or 1864 or 1865, and, if he has not joined the ranks for a certain number of years, his certificate is annulled. That does not help the militia. When a man has learned once how to handle his rifle, how to form fours, and how to turn on his feet, he remembers these things all his life; and if there should be two or three changes of words in the command, they are easily learned in half an hour's study. Therefore I do not see why the old certificates should not remain good. I may mention one case: that of a man who holds two first-class certificates, and who had the best notes ever given in the school; yet he cannot join the force to-day without renewing his certificate. I hope the Minister, who has a practical knowledge of the wants of the militia, will give his attention to this matter and help us.

Mr. DENISON. I wish to endorse a great deal that has been said by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), particularly in reference to the old system. I advocated the old system once or twice in this House, and I did so because I saw that the officers of the Canadian militia were not qualifying themselves as they ought to do. It is only necessary for us, as pointed out by him, to look over the list of officers to find that a large proportion of them have never taken the trouble to qualify, or for private reasons have not been able to qualify. There is no doubt that some of the best officers in the force are the busiest men in civil life; and their time is so fully occupied that they cannot put in a course in the schools just at the time prescribed for them. I understand that some of the schools arrange to take classes during the summer months, while others do not. There is no doubt that a great many more officers would qualify if the classes were arranged to suit the officers rather than the schools. The point raised by the last speaker, as to the chances which these schools should give to young men to qualify, is a strong one. If the opportunity were afforded to any Canadian who wishes, to go to these schools, putting on his cadet uniform and taking his course, he would acquire, so far as I can see, the same knowledge as those officers who now go through the schools, and at very much less cost to himself, and I fancy at a great deal less cost to the country. The old system, under which men went in for two or three months, passed the examination and received their $50, was probably the cheapest system that could possibly be adopted. Under the present system, the officers receive $1 a day and take a three months' course; that makes $90 which the country pays them. Under the proposed change, officers going there could be supplied with the cadet uniform, which I believe costs five or six dollars; they would board where they choose, either with their own people or with some of their friends; they would put in six or seven hours' drill a day, and at the end of three months they would receive their certificates, if up to standard; and all it would cost the country would be $50 instead of $90. There is no reason why the system advocated by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), which I have myself advocated in this House, should not be adopted again and grafted upon the present system. I do not say that the present schools should be done away with; I would be very sorry to see that; but there is no reason why the one system should not be grafted on to the other. There is no reason why officers should not be allowed to put on their full dress and mess jackets and attend these schools for three months, and get their certificates; while others, who are not able to spend so much time and money, should be allowed to put on a cadet uniform and attend the schools and put in their course. There is no reason why a certificate granted in that way should not be equally good with the certificate given now.

If the two systems were adopted, the men would be drilling under the same officers and receiving the same instructions; the only difference would be that some would board at home, and others would sleep in the barracks. As I have pointed out before, a good many men in the country would be very glad to give their sons a three months' course in these schools; and even though they did not immediately join the force, yet, if occasion should require, their services would be available to the country. That, I consider, would be a great gain. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has said that none of these men would go into the force. I am quite sure he is mistaken in that, because our experience of the old system was different. Many young men who went to those schools acquired a knowledge of and a taste for military service, and went into the force. I know districts where military cadets who graduated in those schools organized companies that would not otherwise have been organized. I am sure that other members of this House will testify to the same effect. As to the remarks made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) about the difficulty of his officers qualifying, it does appear to me that those officers who accompanied him to the North-West and put in three months of active service there, with lots of drilling, ought to be as well qualified for active duty in the field as men who attended one of the schools for three months. The knowledge acquired in the schools is supposed to fit them for service; and if those men drilled three months in the field, doing the active duties required of them in our service, surely they ought to be as well qualified at the end of that time as men who went through the schools and had a theoretical knowledge rather than a practical one. Now, the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) asks whether we are to have a standing army or not? For my part, I am opposed to a standing army, for this reason, that all history tells us that where the people of a country do the fighting they are successful, but where a standing army is established, and perhaps, after that mercenary troops are engaged, there will not be the same advantage or success as where people fight for their own homes and firesides. Therefore, I think it should be the policy of Canada to encourage our people to drill, and in every way possible to inspire them with a military spirit; and then if danger arises they will be able to defend their homes and firesides. Before I sit down I wish to say a word with reference to the drilling of the militia. Ever since I have been in this House, session after session, I have pressed on the attention of the Government until I am tired of doing it, the desirability of drilling all the militia of Canada, and doing it every year. At present but a portion of them are drilled. It is really not fair-play to the majority of the rural battalions to put them on a par with the city battalions in one respect, and then to throw them in the shade by providing for them only biennial drills. The city battalions have advantages the rural battalions have not. They have their drill sheds, they are compact, they can drill at night without any great cost, while the rural battalions have not that opportunity, the men being scattered, and therefore require, if anything, their annual drill much more than do the city battalions. I would like to press upon the Government again the necessity and desirability of having all the militia of Canada drilled this year. It will not cost a large sum. I am sure that the economical Minister we have at our head now will do it without making it a burden on the country, and I would again press upon the Government the desirability of drilling all the men.

Mr. BOWELL. There can be no possible objection to laying before the House the information sought for in this resolution. I frankly confess that I am fully in accord with a good many of the suggestions made by the mover of this motion, and by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison). There may be reasons, and those of a monetary character, which may prevent carrying out to the fullest extent the suggestions they have made with reference to drilling the whole militia, but that there should be some system adopted by which officers occupying the position such as the officers of the 9th Battalion, referred to by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), should be enabled to obtain their certificates without leaving their homes and attending the schools for two or three months, I have no doubt; and it shall be my aim if I am spared to preside over this department for any length of time, to devise some economical system by which officers in the different corps of the Dominion may obtain certificates qualifying them for permanent appointments on the staff. I am also in accord, to a certain extent, with the remarks of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) on what he terms the old system. Probably I am prejudiced somewhat, because in my more active days in connection with the force that system prevailed, and I should scarcely like to say that the officers of that day are not qualified to serve under the gallant colonel, who spoke a few moments ago, from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). I recognize this fact, however, while not agreeing with the hon. member for North Victoria in the democratic sentiments he has uttered, at least not to the full extent, that in all military organizations there must be something like discipline; and that unless there is discipline and that most rigidly enforced, I do not believe any force can be effective, particularly when called upon to perform the duties for which they have banded themselves together. In the hon. gentleman's self is an illustration of the remarks he made, that if the private knows more than the officer the officer should "get out" and the private take his place. I fully recognize the fact that the hon. gentleman, when I had the pleasure of drilling him some quarter of a century ago, gave evidence of the qualities of a good soldier who would ultimately rise to the top of the ladder, and who will not, whenever his services may be required, be found wanting either in courage, skill or intellect, or in the performance of his duties. At that time I was considered the master, but just now the private is the master of the Minister of Militia, and it is for him and those who support him in this House, if they can control the majority, to dictate what shall be done, not only by the head of the Government, but by the head of the department. However, I think a moment's reflection will show my hon. friend that, as long as the present system prevails, the discipline under present regulations must be continued. I do not know, however, that it should be incumbent upon every officer to furnish a uniform in accordance with the rank he holds, I mean while he is at the school. That entails upon

him an expense which, I think, by some regulation, might be dispensed with. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), that at these schools of instruction we should revert to a certain extent to the old system, by having one common uniform during drill, might be adopted, and thus avoid the difficulties which have presented themselves to many of the officers. I was rather surprised to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for North Victoria with reference to the drill performed at the camp. I may, however, say that I am in accord with him in the view he has expressed that there is no particular object or necessity for asking the young men, particularly those from the rural sections, to appear early in the morning in order to obtain what might be termed healthful exercises in extension drill; but how he ever is to get his men under control or teach them their drill properly without beginning with what is termed squad drill, is something I have not yet learned. Perhaps my hon. friend may be able to give me a practical hint which may be of benefit in the future. I shall be glad to avail myself of any suggestions from those who have had practical experience in comparing volunteer corps. I have long been of opinion, whatever may be said of city battalions, that the battalions composed of farmers' sons, after a very few weeks' drill in camp or in the drill shed at home, constitute the best possible force we can have. The suggestions which have been thrown out, and which I will not elaborate just now, shall have my best attention, and anything I can do to make the force more effective, consistent with the means at the disposal of the department and with the revenue of the country, hon. gentlemen may rest assured will be done. All it requires is money to drill the whole force, and if Parliament and the Finance Minister can see their way clear to ask Parliament to grant $100,000 or $200,000 in addition to that which is already asked for, $275,000, we should be enabled to place the whole force under camp during the present year. Whether the revenue of the country would justify that expenditure I am not at this moment prepared to say. I will say, however, before sitting down, that I shall devote some attention to the management, and not only the management, but the system which prevails at present in the military schools, and also in connection with the staff connected with the whole force, and if I can see my way to suggest to my colleagues any means by which efficiency can be maintained and expenditure reduced, it shall be my duty to do so.

Mr. HUGHES. In reply to some remarks which have been made, it affords me a great deal of pleasure to learn that gentlemen of the experience and standing of the member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), and the Minister of Militia, and the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) expressed views which are nearly in accord with my own. I said I did not desire the abolition of the permanent corps, but a reduction of its numbers to a minimum and the employment of young men of our force instead of those who are simply on the permanent list, with a view to getting a living out of the country. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said we formerly had the line regiments to model ourselves upon. I think our experience of the line regiments is that, while they are well drilled, I do not know that they are in all respects to be taken as models, and I would rather take our own volunteers into the field than any line regiment that I have ever seen, and I have had the honour and pleasure of seeing and drilling with several of them. I thank the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) for his kind invitation to me to attend the Niagara camp, but, while I have no doubt the volunteers there are in every respect quite capable, still I believe that the corps to which I have the honour to belong is not second to any corps that is drilled at Niagara. We have sent more men to the Wimbledon teams than any rural corps in the Dominion of Canada, and I look in vain for one man who has been sent from the corps which the hon. member for Muskoka commands. In reference to the question of discipline to which the hon. the Minister of Militia has referred, he knows as well as I do that there are two kinds of discipline, the silken glove discipline and the rusty iron discipline. An officer in a city corps told me that some of those officers who have recently passed the schools, came to him and asked him: "What is the punishment for men who are inattentive in the ranks?" The whole of that system seems to be of that kind. My system would be just as strict in regard to discipline, but more intellectual, and not have so much of the drill sergeant or the martinet. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) says that his corps was in the North-West for three months. Well, at the rate of 12 days' drill every year, it would take an ordinary battalion eight years to equal the three months actual drill which that corps had in the North-West. I think we should drop those non-essentials such as extension motions, and deal with what is essential, and that is to obtain a rough and ready efficient volunteer corps at a moment's notice.

Motion agreed to.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

Mr. FREMONT (Translation) moved for:

Statement showing: 1. The number and location of the several experimental farms; 2. The amounts expended on each of them since the date of its establishment; 3. The name of each and every employé of each farm, and a statement of the salary and of any other emoluments received from the Government by each of them.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the object I have in offering the motion which is now in your hands is to call the attention of this honourable House to what I believe to be an injustice towards that portion of the population of Canada which speaks the French language. The end proposed by the Parliament of Canada when the creation of experimental farms was decided upon, was to further the interests of agriculture in the whole Dominion of Canada, without any discrimination of race. I regret to have to say, Mr. Speaker, that if I am not mistaken in the information which I have, this end has not been attained. No experimental farm has been established in that part of the country where French is spoken. I know that the farm which was established for the Province of Ontario, a few miles from here, was also intended for the Province of Quebec, but I must say that as far as the latter province, or the French-speaking portion of the population, is concerned, the institution does

not fulfil the object of its creation. The superior officers of this farm are all of English origin; but there would not be very much harm in this if these officers spoke French. However, they know English only, and cannot give the French farmers the information required by them when applied to. Then I must say that from two standpoints the population has been unjustly treated by the Department of Agriculture in regard to this. First, as to patronage, all the superior officers, I believe, or at least the great majority of them, are persons of English origin, who do not know the French language. They consequently cannot render the French population the services that it has a right to expect from them. Now, these employés are all installed, at large cost to the country, like little princes, like lieutenant governors —

Mr. BECHARD. Like pashas.

Mr. FREMONT, and do not at all render the services expected from them. The result is that when French-speaking farmers apply to them, the answer has often long to be waited for. If my information is correct, there is not even a French-speaking secretary on the Ottawa Experimental Farm; so that the French correspondence is put aside, and only receives any attention when the English correspondence is disposed of. In the second place, when comes the question of distributing the documents which are printed, the English reports are published first and only several months later are the French reports prepared and distributed to the public. Consequently, from all points of view, is the French-speaking population found in this respect on a footing of inferiority by comparison with that portion of the population which speaks the English language. When samples are distributed by the experimental farm, the circulars which accompany them are invariably in the English language, so that in that also is the French population discriminated against. It is with a view of drawing the attention of the Government to these facts, that I offer the present motion. I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the return which will he put before the House, will give us the fullest information, so that we may know exactly the state of things in this matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no objection to bringing down all the papers asked for by the hon. gentleman. I regret that the Minister of Agriculture is not present to reply more fully to the remarks made by the hon. member with respect to the deficiency to which the hon. gentleman has referred as to the use of the French language and the representation of the nationality for which he speaks on the staff of these farms. I am sure that this is a defect which will before long find a remedy. It is perfectly evident that the reports in regard to samples sent out from these farms should be sent out in the language understood by the people to whom they are addressed.

Motion agreed to.

VOTERS' LIST REVISION.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Return showing the cost of the revision of the voters' list in the years 1886, 1889 and 1891, in each electoral division, and the total cost of the three revisions throughout the Dominion.

He said: I have thought it was desirable to ask for this information, that it would be of some value to the members to know the total cost of the Electoral Franchise Act since its introduction.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Copies of all proclamations, reports to or Orders in Council, correspondence or other documents under which the products of Canada and Newfoundland have been exchanged free of duty since the year 1885.

He said: My object in moving this is that, in looking over the matter, I was unable to discover the manner in which Newfoundland products have been admitted into the Dominion. I find in the Customs Act of 1886 this provision:

"Fish and other products of the fisheries shall be chargeable with, and there shall be collected thereon, the rates of duty set forth and described in schedule B to this Act, and set opposite to each of them respectively: provided, that the whole or part of the duties imposed by this section may be remitted as respects either the United States or the Island of Newfoundland, or both, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the Governments of the United States and the Island of Newfoundland, or either of them, have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada, in reduction or repeal of the duties in force in the said countries respectively."

I was unable, after searching in the *Gazette* and I thought I made a pretty exhaustive search—or in the Orders in Council which have been published and collected in book form, to find any proclamation, or any Order in Council made subsequently to the passage of this law, which authorized the importation of these products into Canada without duty. The law is clear and distinct, so far as it goes. The duty is to be exacted, the duty is specified, and the proviso sets out clearly the circumstances under which the duties can be remitted. My object, therefore, is to obtain copies of these proclamations, or reports, or Order in Councils, or other authorities under this statute, or under any other statute, if there is any other one, or any other order upon which the Customs officers permit these goods to be introduced.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the motion is of sufficient consequence to have been answered by some hon. member on the Treasury benches. My hon. friend has called the attention of the House to the fact that there is a certain provision of the Customs Act which requires a duty to be imposed on fish imported from Newfoundland. He has pointed out the provisions of that Act, and upon what conditions those duties were to be removed, and he has called the attention of the Government to the fact that those conditions so far have not been complied with, and yet the duty has not been collected. If the Government feel that Parliament has made a mistake in imposing those duties, the Government should have come down and opposed their repeal. The duty of the Administration is not to commit breaches of the law and disregard the law, but to administer it; and that has not been done. I suppose that if a Minister has taken it upon himself to give instructions that the duty shall not be collected, and in consequence of his order officers of the department have so acted, the hon. gentleman has made himself liable for the loss the country has sustained in consequence of the failure to collect the duties. It appears to me that it is important that the Minister of Customs, or the

Minister who has taken action in this matter and given instruction that those duties should not be collected, but that the law should be disregarded, should offer some explanation to the House, and some indication or justification of the course which has been taken.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know what question the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) thought should be answered; but if it was the point on which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) had some doubt, as to where the proclamation or Order in Council could be found, I can only say that I am under the impression that there is none. If there is such, of course it will be brought down in answer to the motion. I am very glad indeed to find that an hon. gentleman, occupying so prominent a position as does the hon. gentleman, concurs with us in the view we took of our obligation to collect the duty on Newfoundland fish, an obligation which our friends in Newfoundland have never been able to appreciate, and they even say it was wantonly imposed for the purpose of injuring their trade.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The duties have not been collected.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am under the impression they have been.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Although the law imposes the duties, the Department of Customs has apparently given instructions in consequence of which they have not been collected.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Is the hon. gentleman under the impression that they have never been collected?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the Minister of Justice will turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns, page 383, he will find: "Free goods—the fisheries. Special from Newfoundland, fish, cod, halibut, herring, and all the articles enumerated." These are entered as free goods and no duty charged. The duties may not have been imposed on the ground of the dissatisfaction of the people of Newfoundland, but that is not the point taken by us. The point taken by us is that in 1885 the Government asked Parliament to assent to the imposition of certain duties on Newfoundland products. Many hon. members thought the Government's policy was wrong, that they were adopting an erroneous course, that they were going backward. The Government persisted, and they carried their intentions into law. Their proposition became the law of the land. There was no official, nor any person, no matter how high in the Government employ, who has authority to put the law in defiance. It was a law enacted by Parliament at the request of the Government themselves, and special powers were taken in the Act that these duties might be remitted under certain circumstances. These circumstances have never occurred. But it is evident that some person has given instructions for the admission of these goods duty free. I can understand that for the future Parliament need not go through the farce of passing a law. After this Act was passed in 1885, it was re-enacted in 1890. Parliament was not then informed that these goods were being surreptitiously imported contrary to law and without a proclamation having been issued. Parliament was not then informed that the Government had chosen to override the law and usurp the power which Parliament alone possesses, and although the leader of the Government attempts to pass this over as an unimportant matter because the Newfoundland people complained of the imposition of the duty, I think it is a very serious matter. If the Government can set this law at defiance, they can set aside any other law. I can understand their coming to Parliament and saying: We made a mistake, we never should have passed this Act, and we now desire to have it repealed; and no doubt Parliament would have repealed it. While the law stands on the Statute-book, to tell me it can be violated by an individual member of the Government, or by an officer of any department, and that he has the right to admit goods contrary to the law, is to make a most extraordinary proposition. I asked a question the other day as to the reimposition of these duties, or rather as to whether the law was now being carried out, and further, as to whether a proclamation had been issued, and I was informed that no such proclamation had been issued, and the present Minister kindly sent to me a circular issued by the Customs Department giving, by order of the Assistant Commissioner, directions to the Customs officers on and after 2nd December last to exact these duties. So it is a matter of departmental regulation. The Customs Department has taken power to thus act contrary to the law. No report was ever made to Council advising the issue of a proclamation according to the statute, nor was any such proclamation issued. If this can be done with regard to Newfoundland, it can also be done as regards the United States and England, and the authority of Parliament can be set at defiance. I have discharged my duty in bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and I shall be somewhat surprised if Parliament does not express itself pretty forcibly in regard to this subject.

Mr. LAURIER. It is evident that the law has been disregarded. The Government really stand in the position of confessed sinners, I do not know whether they are penitent sinners: but evidently they acknowledge by their silence that the charge made by my hon. friend is true, that the law has been violated. My hon. friend who is now Minister of Militia, and who was at one time Minister of Customs, has the reputation of being a very good administrator, and even something better than a good administrator, of being a severe one, and a Minister who stood firmly by the letter of the law. But in regard to this matter it appears that the department was run by some one else than himself. The law was disregarded. Where is the authority that has been exercised? It is evident that the duty has not been collected on fish coming from Newfoundland. Where is the authority? It is said there is no authority for the action of the department. Then the Minister of Customs, through his officers, has ignored the law in not enforcing the duties and provisions of the Act. If that is so, there has certainly been a gross dereliction of duty on the part of the Minister who presides over the department, and in former times—I do not know how it has been in regard to the administration of his present department—the

hon. gentleman has been very jealous of the good name of his administration and has never allowed charges to be made against him without at once rising, if he had any defence to offer. On the present occasion he has not one word to say, and he hereby acknowledges that the charge made by my hon. friend is a true one, and therefore we have nothing to do, if the hon. gentleman declines to speak on the subject, but to enforce the penalty to which he has made himself liable, and sue him in a court of law in order to collect from him the duties which he has neglected to collect from the fishermen.

Mr. BOWELL. I will beat you on the execution.

Mr. LAURIER. I think not. If the hon. gentleman has failed to collect these duties, he will be amenable to the courts of law, and since he has failed to find his tongue on the present occasion, he must find it somewhere else.

Mr. BOWELL. Surely the hon. gentleman will not ask me to discuss a question of so great importance without having the papers before me.

Mr. MULOCK. When the motion was made, I understood the leader of the Government to question the action of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that there had been no remission of duties. Is he satisfied now there has been a remission of duties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I never questioned that at all. I understood the hon. gentleman denied that any duties had ever been collected.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the gravamen of the charge was that there had been remissions of duties for a number of years without authority of law. That I understood to be the point made by the hon. member for Queen's.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The blue-books show it.

Mr. MULOCK. What answer has the Government to make to this charge? It is certainly a matter of very great concern, and it is due to the House and the country that the Government should offer an explanation. If they are not able to do so to-day, the debate may be adjourned for an explanation to be given at a subsequent sitting. I am not prepared to discuss this question one way or the other until the Government offer an explanation. It is stated that for some reason, unknown to the country, and illegal in itself, the Government removed duties which were by law collectable. Has the Government the power to enforce or not enforce the Customs Act at its will? We are now face to face with the whole question of responsible government. Parliament passes an Act which says that certain taxes shall be levied, and that certain funds shall belong to the people of Canada, and the Government, we are told, has chosen to ignore this Act of Parliament and to over-ride the rights of the people. I do not say whether such has occurred or not, but the charge is made and the Government acquiesces in that charge by their silence, and offer no explanation. We are face to face, therefore, with a grave question. Has Parliament ceased to enjoy its rights? The ex-Minister of Customs does not consider it worthy of an explanation. He smiles at the suggestion that it is a grave question. Well, if so, certainly the parliamentary institutions of Canada are broken down. There is an entire failure of responsible government if the Government can cause its officers to disregard the law which has been passed by Parliament, and which has received the sanction of the two Houses and of His Excellency, the representative of Her Majesty. If the facts are as alleged here, I think that the discussion should be adjourned until the Government is prepared to offer an explanation to the House. Nothing less than that will satisfy the requirements of the case, and nothing else than that ought to be expected. The Government ought not, for one moment, to allow a grave question like this to pass in silence without offering such explanations as they can in regard to it. I hope they will not continue to treat the matter in this cavalier-like style, but that they will treat the House with proper respect, and offer such explanations as the circumstances of the case admit of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I agree with my hon. friend beside me, that if the Government have no explanation to offer to the serious statement made by the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) it is a matter which deserves a little consideration at our hands. As far as I understand the case it is this: Parliament passes an Act by which certain duties are regulated; I believe, also, that power is given to the Government by issuing a proclamation to suspend the operation of this Act, but I understand that that proclamation was never issued. I understand that no steps were taken to suspend the operation of the Act, but that nevertheless for a period of four or five years no attention was paid to the Act of Parliament which this House passed. Well, Sir, all I can say, if they did do that, is, that they have in the first place wholly and entirely neglected their duty, and they have, in the second place, committed a very grave breach of the law, as no doubt the Minister of Justice perfectly knows. Even if it be an accidental or careless omission, it was a very grave omission to be committed by the officers of the Government, for which they ought to be held responsible.

Motion agreed to.

ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. FORBES moved for:

Copies of all petitions, correspondence, letters, telegrams and memoranda received since 1887, asking for or referring to the subsidizing of the Annapolis and Atlantic Railway Company or a line of railway from Liverpool and Shelburne to Annapolis, passing through Caledonia.

He said: In making this motion, I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to press upon the Government the necessity of considering this railroad and of completing the further subsidizing of the line, by granting a subsidy to cover the balance of the line. The road is about 105 miles in length and has been subsidized for 75 miles, so that there is a subsidy for about 30 miles remaining due. The construction of this road has been agitated for some years. In 1887, large numbers of petitions were presented to this House asking for a subsidy in aid of this line, and a charter was granted by this Parliament and by the Provincial Legislature of Nova Scotia, and under the latter charter on the application of the company a subsidy has there been granted. The company are now desirous of having

a subsidy granted by this Government necessary for the completion of this line, in order that they may approach the Nova Scotia Government and ask that the local subsidy shall be utilized. They are entitled to the local subsidy as soon as they are able to show their ability to construct the line, either with or without the assistance of the Dominion Government. This railway will pass from the towns of Shelburne and Liverpool down to Caledonia and thence to Annapolis. It passes through the finest territory in these counties, right through timber limits of hard and soft woods and along the very best water systems in these counties. It is proposed that capitalists will build upon the watersheds and upon the streams flowing from the lake, industries of a considerable extent if they had the means of getting their products to the nearest market or to the seaboard. The timber limits along the line are of considerable extent, and the mines in the vicinity are being opened up. The County of Queen's stands to-day second to one only in the Province of Nova Scotia for the output of gold, and the supplies necessary for the mines will form a considerable traffic over that line. I know that these matters have been pressed before this upon the attention of the Government, and in 1890 the late Minister of Railways (Sir John Macdonald) brought down a series of resolutions to subsidize railways, amongst which was the following :—

"For 75 miles of the railway from Shelburne, in the County of Shelburne, and from Liverpool, in the County of Queen's, to Annapolis, in the Province of Nova Scotia, to be so contracted for as to secure the construction to both Shelburne and Liverpool, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $240,000."

When the motion came up later on, the then hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Lovitt) referred to the fact that this was only for a subsidy of 75 miles, and the present Minister of Justice replied to him as follows :—

"This is designed to give them railway communication with Annapolis, and in that way they can reach Liverpool, in the County of Queen's, which has a very fair harbour. Shelburne, which has a magnificent harbour, and Annapolis, from which steamers ply to the United States and to the adjacent Province of New Brunswick. I know that the western part of Shelburne naturally desires railway connection, not in this direction, but in the direction of Yarmouth, but that will be a matter for consideration hereafter. I know it is important to that part of the county which trades with Yarmouth, and sends its exports there, but, while that is so, it cannot be expected that one line can accommodate the whole of Shelburne County, nor is that aimed at. The county will receive connection with the general railway system of the province by the branch which it is intended to extend from Caledonia to the harbour of Shelburne."

Mr. Blake, who was then in the House, said :

"I have no doubt that that portion of Nova Scotia to which this resolution refers, in common with certain other portions which have received assistance at various late sessions, has been very much neglected, and its progress retarded for the want of railway communication. I think it is deeply to be regretted in the interest of the whole Province of Nova Scotia that what I must call the profligate railway expenditure which has taken place in other parts of that province should have resulted in a failure to meet the real wants of the province."

Now, there is no doubt that all parties, irrespective of politics, are pledged to the granting of this subsidy to the whole line to Annapolis, and I desire to impress upon the Government the absolute necessity there is for their at once taking the matter in hand. As the old subsidy is about to expire some time during the coming summer, probably when this House has risen, I trust that the Government will not only revive it, but that they will grant a new subsidy for the balance of the road. Further, I may remark that the present Government has been pledged to this subsidy. The hon. Minister of Justice, speaking at Liverpool, in the County of Queen's, on 18th February, 1891, just previous to the last election, made what the people of the county consider to be a definite promise, as quoted by the organ of the party in that county, as follows :—

"Sir John Thompson then spoke for over an hour, and claimed the attention of his audience by the earnest manner in which he set forth the views of the Government on the reciprocity question, the fisheries and railway matters in Queen's—as to which latter subject he clearly explained why the subsidy for the whole length of the line was not included in last year's Estimates. Two things he certainly made plain to every man present: 1st, That the Dominion Government had selected the line for construction, viz., that from Liverpool to Annapolis, and from Shelburne to Annapolis—notwithstanding the influence brought to bear upon the Government in favour of the Midland scheme; and 2nd, That the Government granted $240,000 towards the construction of this line, and that the balance of subsidy required would have been voted at this winter session had not Parliament been dissolved."

The other organ of the party in the county took this portion of the speech as a positive and distinct promise, by remarking :

"Now, if the Dominion Government will fulfil its pledges and grant the balance of subsidy this session we are certain to get the road, as it is understood that Mr. Hervey will at once commence operations."

Now, I am not going to say that this promise, made previous to the elections, was for the purpose of influencing the electors, because I have always advised the people to accept it as a definite promise from the Government; and inasmuch as the people accepted it as the policy of the Government on that question and felt that they were entitled to the subsidy as a matter of right, they were not led away by any insidious influences such as might have been expected from these remarks. Had the whole subsidy been granted at that time I believe the line would, to-day, be in operation, as the condition of the financial markets at the time was such that if the company were able to show their strength, the necessary capital could have been raised. However, I desire to impress on the Government the absolute necessity of granting this subsidy during the present session. I am informed by one of the corporators who is now present in the city, that he is negotiating with capitalists who are ready to put money into the enterprise for the surveys and all the expenses preliminary to the more costly work of construction. The Counties of Shelburne, Annapolis and Queen's are, I am proud to say, deserving of the best consideration of the Government of Canada; and on this occasion it would ill-become me not to press, with every lever which I possibly can use, for the granting of this subsidy. If this railway is built, Shelburne and Queen's on one side will be placed in communication with Annapolis, from which their products can find their way to the markets of the United States, and from the other side we shall have communication with the other markets of the world; and we will look to the Government to see that steamers will call at the different ports in order that the products of those counties shall find their way to the most desirable markets.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As the hon. member has referred to what he supposed to be a promise of mine prior to the general elections of 1891, I may just say a word or two in explanation. I did not

hear or read, until the hon. gentleman read it in his place, the statement which I was supposed to have made at Liverpool, and which he says is published in our organs in the county. I am not aware at this moment what papers he refers to.

Mr. FORBES. The Liverpool *Times*.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have seen statements which were supposed to represent what I said on that occasion published elsewhere, which I certainly did not recognize as an attempt at a truthful record of what I said. I had the pleasure of addressing a number of the hon. gentleman's constituents, with my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and in the very courteous reception which persons who address assemblages in that county always receive, I had the honour of being presented, alongside of my colleague, with an address from some of the inhabitants of Liverpool, in which the necessity of the railway was very prominently referred to. In my reply I touched on the railway question, only for the purpose of assuring the people of that county that, situated as I was then, I was not in a position to make them any promise with regard to the railway at all. I preceded my observations with that very distinct statement, and I called attention to the fact that we were there on the eve of a general election, and that nothing would be hailed with greater pleasure by the hon. gentleman's supporters than the opportunity to make a statement to the effect that I was endeavouring, for the purposes of the electoral campaign, to hold out a promise of that kind to the electors of the county, which I was visiting solely in connection with the business of the election. But I proceeded to call attention to the fact that it was unnecessary for me to make any statement of my position or views on the question, as they would find them expressed in the *Hansard* of the previous session. I then repeated from memory as closely as I could what had taken place in this House, and what the hon. gentleman has read this afternoon, namely, the observations which I had made during the preceding session. I then went on to state that in all probability a grant would have been made for the remainder of the line if a session had taken place instead of a dissolution, and there I let the matter rest, going on to make some general remarks on the policy of the Government and that of the Opposition on railway questions. There is no ground for saying that I went to Liverpool to make a promise, for in point of fact I made none. The hon. gentleman is right in stating, to the extent that *Hansard* supports him, that the Government were pledged to give a subsidy for the remainder of the line to Annapolis. That is to say, we indicated to this House clearly, in bringing down the subsidy for the line from Shelburne and Liverpool in the direction of Annapolis, that our intention was not to stop there, but to reach its terminal point on the Bay of Fundy, which is Annapolis. The hon. gentleman has informed the House that the subsidy is about expiring, and it will be a matter for consideration whether a renewal of that subsidy can be granted. The hon. gentleman is of opinion that if the whole subsidy had been granted, in the session of 1890, the road by this time would have been under construction. In that respect, he has been misinformed, or I have been. I have been very much disappointed at the absolute want of any attempt at progress on the part of the company which we expected would take up and proceed with the construction of this road: and the information has reached me that the excuse put forward for the delay is not that we did not give the subsidy to carry the road all the way to Annapolis, but the excuse is that we had included the Queen's portion of the road and thereby hampered the operations of the company by insisting upon the construction to Liverpool when, according to the opinion of those connected with the enterprise, the success of the enterprise would not be at all promoted by going there. That is not the view I entertained, but it is the view put forward by the company as a reason why they were not able to go on with the enterprise.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 6) to amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act of 1888.—(Mr. Flint.)

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EMPLOYÉS.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Mr. McMullen for:

Return giving the names and addresses of all parties employed by the Government, on or in connection with Government railways in the Dominion, stating the nature of work engaged in, the salary paid per month or year, and the gross amount paid each employé during the year ending the 31st December, A. D. 1891.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for South Grey, some days ago, moved a resolution, of which I had given notice, for a return of names and addresses of parties employed by the Government in connection with Government railways. My reason for moving that resolution when I did was possibly to reach the important expenditure connected with the Intercolonial Railway. We know well that road has been running very seriously in arrears, so far as the difference between its earnings and its expenditure is concerned. We know that the year before last the loss over working expenses was something like $350,000. Last year it was something over $650,000, and during the present year we have had intimations given to the House that the loss is about $100,000 a month, or over, which will amount to at least a million at the end of the year. Now that we have this condition of things, it is undoubtedly the duty of members of this House to enquire into the entire working and organization of the Intercolonial Railway. On looking over the Auditor General's report of the amounts paid, I was rather struck with the enormous staff of officials we keep in connection with this line. My impression is it is high time that some change should be made. It would be better to make a present of this road to the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway, with the understanding that it shall be operated on scheduled rates not in excess of what is charged by either of those two lines at present, for the country is not only paying interest, over $2,000,000 a year, on the amount of money expended on the road, but $1,000,000 besides as net loss on its working, making in all $3,000,000 a year actual loss. It will, therefore, be admitted that we cannot too soon seriously consider what we should do in the

face of this enormous loss. Now, I see that the staff of officials employed in the head office in Moncton in connection with the operation of the line were paid $121,979.28 last year. This includes, of course, those engaged at the station there, as well as those engaged on other portions of the line. I notice we have a general freight agent at $2,400 a year, a general passenger agent at $2,400 a year, an eastern passenger agent at $1,800 a year. These are four passenger agents in connection with a road that is losing $1,000,000 a year. Then take the storage department. We are paying a man to take care of the stores bought for the use of the line $1,900 a year--simply for receiving the stores and delivering them as required. Then we have no less than four travelling auditors who are receiving very large salaries annually. Then we have on the whole line 175 stations. Taking the number of men who have been paid during the year as employés, including station masters, baggage agents and road men, we have an average of eleven and one-fifth men, or 1,995 men altogether. We have paid for advertising $17,596, and for printing during the summer of last year $45,429.38. Looking into some of the items for advertising, I notice we have paid the Moncton *Times* $1,045. We have paid in Montreal for advertising the schedule time of the running trains and other matter, although Montreal is a point at which the road does not touch, and which it does not reach within 100 or 150 miles, $2,017.60. In Quebec we have paid $1,506.91, and in St. John $2,251.55. The Hamilton *Spectator*, a sheet published at the top of Lake Ontario, got $335. The entire expenditure in connection with the road has been $3,662,341.94 and the receipts $2,977,395.38, leaving a net loss during the past year of $684,946.56. I notice that we have paid in Toronto for advertising alone $2,599, and of that the Toronto *Empire* has received $1,885. Then a large amount has been paid for printing. All this shows very clearly that the manner in which this road is being run is in the interests of the party on the Treasury benches, and that patronage of all kinds is given out in such a way as they think will do most good. In order to enable us to get at the bottom of the expenditure in connection with this line, and to see if some system cannot be adopted whereby the expenditure can be very largely reduced, I put the notice on the Paper of the motion which was made some few days ago. If we do not make an attempt to get rid of unnecessary expenditure in connection with the operation of this road, it will go on and will grow worse. I believe there is nothing to prevent this road being run on a true commercial basis, and to make it a paying line, but so long as it is operated in the interests of certain miners in Nova Scotia, who get their coal carried at a very low rate—I believe the tonnage rate is less than the actual cost of drawing the coal—as long as that is done, the people of this country are simply paying to keep in operation a road which is a drain on them, and is simply keeping up a coal trade between Montreal and Quebec and New Glasgow. I do not think this should be continued. If it is, the people should understand how and why the Intercolonial Railway is operated. In order to reach the proper condition of things, I make this motion, and I hope we will have the entire list of the officials, the work they are doing, and the money they draw laid before us, so that the country may know why it is asked to continue this enormous expenditure.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not intend to discuss the management of the Intercolonial Railway at the present time, or to enter into any of the questions which the hon. gentleman has brought before the House on a simple motion to bring down the papers. I made enquiries in reference to this matter, and the chief of the department told me it would be almost impossible to furnish all the information asked for in regard to railways alone during this session, and that the estimated cost would be over $2,000. I think the motion which was made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) and the return in answer to it, will furnish all the information necessary for the full discussion of the subject the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman takes the responsibility of refusing this motion, I do not suppose my hon. friend will press it any further, but it is a sad comment upon the administration of the Intercolonial Railway if it is impossible for the Government to bring down a list of the employés on the railway without the expenditure referred to by the hon. gentleman and within the compass of one session.

Mr. HAGGART. The motion asks for a great deal more than that.

Mr. LAURIER. The motion asks for the number of the employés, the labour they perform, and the salary they receive. Of course the motion may be longer in words, but I understand the three things demanded are those, and it seems to me that, if it takes two or three months to obtain that information, there must be an army in the employ of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HAGGART. All I can say is that I sent the question to Mr. Schreiber, the head of that department, and I received as an answer the statement that it would take nearly the whole session to make the return and that it would cost $2,000.

Mr. LAURIER. All the more reason to have it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not understand what motion of mine is referred to by the hon. gentleman which he said would cover this. I moved for Reports to Council and Orders in Council in reference to the removal of employés and appointments and a reduction in the number of the employés. Is that the motion to which the hon. gentleman alludes?

Mr. HAGGART. No; I was referring to a scheduled motion which you made the other day.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That motion had no reference to this question.

Mr. HAGGART. Then an order has been made on the motion of the hon. gentleman in the Public Accounts Committee for the pay rolls, and that will be submitted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I never asked for the pay rolls. There is no order that I have obtained from the House which embraces the subject-matter of my hon. friend's motion at all. The motion I made, and which the House was kind enough to grant, was in regard to the proposed reduction in the number of employés on the road. It is a matter of public notoriety that the late act-

ing Minister of Railways, when he returned from his inspection of that road, determined that there should be a large reduction in the number of the employés. I moved for the correspondence in regard to that. The hon. gentleman told me there was no report and no Order in Council on the subject, and on that statement the motion was withdrawn, but there was no motion made by me in this House asking for the information which my hon. friend seeks. It is all very well to say that the pay rolls will be brought down, but that will not supply the information the hon. gentleman seeks. We are aware that the officials at Moncton who have to employ these men know that so many men are employed in the carshops, so many in the workshops, so many as conductors, so many as baggagemen, and so on. They can be grouped together very easily and there can be no practical difficulty in giving the information asked for if the chief engineer or the chief manager desire to give it, but it is known that the chief manager, Pottinger, does not, because he has had in his employment hundreds of men whom the Minister has decided to be unnecessary, and he thinks it is not desirable that the information should be given, but it is information which the Minister can get in a very short space of time. There is no use saying that this involves an immense deal of labour. To put down each man's name and to say that he was employed by day labour or anything of that kind, would involve labour, but that is not asked for. The idea is to have the different classes of men, the pay they get, and the work they do, so that we may know whether a man is being fairly paid for the character of work he does.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all accounts, claims and certificates presented and transmitted (from 1st July, 1885, to this day) to the Dominion Government, by each of the judges of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec, in his capacity as such for all travelling expenses and hotel expenses, in any place other than that in which such judge had orders to reside, or did in fact reside, either for sitting or for acting therein, or for holding therein (in such capacity) any court in civil, criminal or other matters; together with a detailed statement of the several sums paid in conformity with such accounts, claims and certificates. —(Mr. Flint.)

Return of all correspondence, telegrams or other documents between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government or the Government of Newfoundland, or between any member or representative of either of such Governments, respecting the admission of Newfoundland into the Dominion of Canada; including all correspondence or telegrams to and from the High Commissioner on the subject; and all Reports to and Minutes of Council thereon.

And also copy of any terms or offers which may have been submitted to the Government of Newfoundland or any member thereof, with respect to the admission of that Island into the Dominion.—(Mr. Davies, P.E.I.)

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Tisdale).

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Corby.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 45) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Fairbairn.)

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EMPLOYÉS.

House resumed debate on motion of Mr. McMullen (p. 692).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the motion submitted by my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is one of very great consequence, and I do not think the objection raised by the Minister of Railways is an objection that ought to prevail with this House. There are, no doubt, many persons employed on the Intercolonial Railway, and so far as it is possible to judge from the information before us, there is a very much larger number than is required in the public interest, and this fact has been to some extent confirmed by the statement of the Minister, which shows that the apprehension prevailing in the public mind in regard to the management of this road is not without foundation. It is of importance that this House should obtain this information and enquire into the administration of that particular branch of the public service. We exercise, to a considerable extent, if we are active in the discharge of our duties, supervision over the efficiency of the administration of the various public departments. The Public Accounts show that the cost of management over earnings on this road is about $1,000,000 a year, perhaps in excess of that amount. That is a very serious condition of things, and it is of some importance to the country that that condition should be remedied. If the cost of managing the Intercolonial is to be so largely in excess of the earnings, then it may be of some importance in the public mind to determine whether that road is to be kept in operation by the Government at this very large charge on the public treasury. Even if the cost of securing the return were as great as the Minister represents, and I think he must be mistaken in regard to the amount, the House might even economise by incurring the expenditure, if, as a result, there could be a reduction in the actual deficit in the management of the road as exhibited in the Public Accounts. What is the return asked for? The number of persons engaged on the road, the amount of salaries they receive, the work in which they are engaged; and surely, supposing the number was several thousands, it ought not to employ a man more than a few days to prepare such a return. If these parties were classified, and it was stated that there were so many of this class receiving so much salary, and so many of another class, the work would be still further shortened, and the return might be of such a character as to suggest, not only to the department, but to the House, some means of effecting an improvement in the condition of affairs that has prevailed. It may be that the construction of the short line across the State of Maine, the expenditure of a large sum of money by the people of Canada in a foreign country, and the construction of a

road as a rival to the road owned by the Canadian public may have seriously crippled the usefulness and advantage of maintaining this road for all time to come. But, surely, if the amount of work has largely diminished on the road, and if the earnings on the road are not increasing, the cost of management ought not to increase in so large a degree as it has done during the past few years. There was, as some hon. gentleman said, a deficit under the administration some years ago, when the road was first put into operation. It was not expected that from the beginning the road would earn as large an amount as it has since earned; but I doubt if there was a deficit if the Public Accounts had been made up during Mr. Mackenzie's Administration in the way they are prepared at the present time. The construction account had been closed, and all the charges incurred on behalf of the road were placed against the current expenses. That is not so now. I suppose this deficit of $600,000 or $700,000 in six months will not be charged against running expenses but against capital account, so that the capital account which formerly amounted to $35,000,000 had now reached $50,000,000. It is clear the management of the Intercolonial is in the highest degree unsatisfactory. Whether the hon. gentleman who is now in charge will have courage and vigour to correct the abuses that have arisen in connection with the road and repair the mischief done, remains to be seen; but whether he succeeds or fails, it does not relieve the House from the duty that devolves upon it, and the first step necessary to enable the House to consider the subject is the preliminary one suggested by the motion of my hon. friend. It is of the utmost importance that the House obtain this information, and hon. members will then be in a better position to decide as to what shall be the next step taken.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The House will have many opportunities this session to consider the management of the Intercolonial Railway, but I think most members will agree with me that this is the most inconvenient time that could be adopted for that discussion. Something has been said about the ease with which this return could be prepared. I think what has been said on this subject justifies the opposition of the Minister of Railways to granting this return. The leader of the Opposition, for example, has said that if the return is to occupy the time and incur the expense which the Minister of Railways has indicated, there must be a little army of men employed on the railway. That is undoubtedly correct. In a railway from 1,000 to 1,200 miles long there are necessarily employed, even under the most economical management, upwards of 4,000 men. What the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has said, and what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said too, as to the utility of this return, convinces me that what is really desired by the mover of the resolution, at any rate what is desired by these gentlemen who have spoken in support of it, is not so extensive and expensive a return as that which this resolution contemplates. What these gentlemen have said is, that with a view to a proper discussion of the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and with a view to ascertain whether the number of men employed in the various places is not greater than it might be, it is desired that the House should know how many men are employed at the different occupations on the road. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution will remember that his return will comprise a great deal more detail than that, and it is that detail, as I understand it, which incurs the expense and delay. I make this observation with a view to ask the hon. gentleman whether he will not consider what has been advanced from his own side of the House, withdraw the present motion, and substitute one for it which will give the information which his friends have stated would be desirable. There would be no objection, and there would not be any very great expense to get a return indicating the number of men employed at the different occupations on the road. But, when the hon. gentleman asks us to give the names and addresses, and the different kinds of work at which each man was employed, he will see that it comprises not only a little army of men permanently employed on the railway, but likewise every man who may have been engaged at temporary work on that railway. For instance, in the winter season, during heavy snow storms, men are put on temporarily, and even as regards them it would be necessary to ascertain their names and addresses and the different kind of employment at which they may have been engaged. The hon. gentleman will perceive that when you come to detail the work of each individual you will require to search the records of the department and to ascertain when "A. B." has been engaged in snow-shovelling, or track-laying, or tearing up decayed sleepers, or cleaning out the ditches, and in that way it involves a separate enquiry as to the particular work at which each of these men has been engaged. The hon. gentleman I think will be convinced that to do that requires more time than will enable the return to be brought down in time for any practical discussion on the Intercolonial Railway this session. We have no desire at all to keep from the House any part of the information which will help it to an intelligent judgment as to the management of the Intercolonial Railway. We are as anxious as any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House that the railway should be economically conducted, and I should say that we from the Maritime Provinces, who are so much interested in its management, desire above all things that that management should be satisfactory to the House and to the country. We think that the deficit, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated, is not due to the mismanagement of the road and the employment of large numbers of men who are unnecessary. It may be, however, that owing to a partial decrease of business, arising from the competition of rival lines, there are men employed whose services can profitably be dispensed with. If so, I am sure that my colleague the Minister of Railways will act properly and decisively with regard to that question, and he will find no obstruction from his colleagues in that regard. I think it will likewise be found that instead of the comparison being unfavourable to recent management, instead of its being shown as the hon. gentleman thinks, that if the accounts were kept as they were during a former Government it would be found there would be no deficit under a former Government but a large deficit under the present Government; I think it will rather be found that if the

accounts were kept as they were formerly kept and sums charged to capital account which are now charged to income, the deficit would be far less than it appears to be on the accounts of the department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The capital account is closed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think not.

Mr. MILLS. It was closed in Mr. Mackenzie's day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am informed he proposed to do that but abandoned it. However that may be, we can discuss it at another time. My recommendation is that the hon. gentleman withdraw the present motion and substitute on another occasion a motion for the different classes of workmen employed on the road, and I fancy that return will not cause much expense.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to curtail the expenses connected with the preparation of this return, and I have no desire to throw an enormous amount of work on the Minister or on the department, but I have grave doubts in my mind that the House can possess itself with the necessary information to intelligently criticize the Intercolonial Railway without the return I have asked for. I am willing to accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, if he will allow this motion to go with the understanding that the information he indicates is to be furnished in it. If afterwards we find that the information is not sufficient to thoroughly investigate the operations of the whole line, we will of necessity have to ask the House for an order for further information.

Motion negatived.

FEE ON CANNED LOBSTERS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the absence of Mr. Tupper, I beg to move that the House do resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution :—

1. That it is expedient to impose a fee of — dollars for each license granted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to can, preserve or cure lobsters, or keep them alive out of close season in ponds or other places.

2. That it is expedient to impose a fee, at the rate of two cents for each case containing four dozen one-pound cans of lobsters, and one cent for each case containing two dozen one-pound cans of lobsters, to be paid by the packer to the person directed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to mark, label or stamp such case.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That on Thursdays, for the remainder of the session, Government Orders have precedence after Questions put by Members."

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to offer to this motion. It is an early stage of the session at which to make such a motion, but still I think the light state of the business paper justifies it. As the hon. gentleman, I suppose, takes this step with the view of expediting the business of the session, the House will be glad to be informed as to when they may expect the introduction of a Bill which may prove to be a very serious one, that is, the Redistribution Bill.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The resolution is moved, as the hon. gentleman has stated, with the view of expediting business, and also in view of the fact that at the present session the volume of business in the hands of private members appears to be less than usual. Every day that has been open to private business we have had the whole Order Paper passed and Government business reached ; and we thought therefore, although it is somewhat earlier than usual, that we might with advantage to the whole House ask for an additional day for Government business. I am not in a position to state this evening when the Bill to which the hon. gentleman refers will be brought down, but I will give him that information as soon as I possibly can.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very unsatisfactory statement. We know right well that it is of the first importance, in the progress of the Estimates, that the legislation promised by the Government should be in the hands of the members of the House. I have on more than one occasion pointed out that in England nearly all the legislation that the Government propose in a session of seven months is put into the hands of the House during the first three weeks of the session. It is the right of members to have an opportunity to consider with care the legislation which the Government propose. It is their right also to have an opportunity of communicating with their constituents upon the various measures which the Government present to Parliament. Now, we are at that period of the session when at least one-third of it has gone by, and yet the most important measure which the Government have proposed to the House this session is not before us. We know that under our constitutional system the ancient practice was that Parliament did not grant supplies or subsidies until they knew whether the Crown intended to redress the grievances of the people. What were formerly called the grievances of the people are now embraced in the Speech from the Throne brought down at the beginning of every session. Here are the men who are the committee of Parliament, the men who are not merely the counsel of the Crown but who enjoy the confidence of the House, who have promised important legislation, and who are taking a day that belongs to private members for the purpose of hastening the granting of supplies when the legislation which they have promised is not yet before us. I think it is the duty of Parliament to exercise that precaution which the House of Commons in England has always exercised, and to see that the measures of redress which the Crown proposes are before Parliament before they undertake to any great extent to carry forward the supplies. That is the rule, and it ought not to be disregarded. I can assure hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that if they have time to spare, they had better devote it to getting ready the measures which they intend to submit to us, because it is necessary that they should be in our hands if the business of the House is to be facilitated.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

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

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on the Budget. My reason for speaking on the subject is that it has been stated frequently during the present session that the farmers of this country, especially those of the Province of Ontario, by their votes at the bye-elections, expressed themselves as favourable to the retention of the National Policy. I cannot agree with this statement. I have been through a considerable portion of the western part of the Province of Ontario, and I am thoroughly convinced, notwithstanding all that has been said, that the farmers of that part of the province are as anxious as it is possible for them to be that we should have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. The hon. Finance Minister has stated:

"This matter is now settled in point of clearness and definiteness. I for my own part regret that it is settled as it is, and I am glad it is settled."

I do not believe that this question is settled in the manner in which the Minister of Finance has led the House to believe. I would just like to ask if the Ministers in going to Washington went with a well-defined scheme—if they went prepared to state exactly how far they were prepared to go? According to the statement that we have received, they declared that they were willing to treat on the lines of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, modified to suit the changed and altered conditions of the country. I would like to ask how far the changed and altered conditions of the country would warrant the Government in going in the direction of unrestricted reciprocity? I believe, Sir, that the conditions of the country to-day would warrant the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity; I further believe that the people of this country are just as anxious for unrestricted reciprocity as they ever were; and I was not the least astonished to hear the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance that the delegation to Washington had entirely failed. We had been told that everything had been done that tongue or pen could do in order to make the trip of the commissioners to Washington of no effect, in order to place the United States Government in such a position that they would not give us unrestricted reciprocity. Let me ask if it was either the tongue or the pen of any member of the Opposition that put the language into the mouth of the Minister of Finance which he told us he used when he went to Washington? Was it either the tongue or pen of any man that urged him to ask Secretary Blaine if he could propound a system by which the Government of Canada would be able to raise revenue under unrestricted reciprocity? Certainly the Government knew before they went to Washington what position the Government of the United States had taken. But we have been told also that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, our manufacturing industries would be shut up. We have been told that our iron furnaces, our coal pits, our cotton factories, would be shut down, and in fact there would be a stoppage to almost everything in the Dominion. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he considered the statement he was making. Take the iron industries. Up to 1878 they had no protection. True, that industry then was not making satisfactory progress, but has the progress been much more rapid since the imposition of the duty, although that industry is now fostered to an extent to which few have been in any country. Why, there is a duty at present of $4 a ton on pig iron and a bounty of $2 a ton; and when we take into consideration the fact that the increased product from 1878 to last year is only 10,000 tons and the amount of money spent to secure that something like $155,000 annually, going into the hands of the iron manufacturers of this country, we may well ask whether we are not paying too dear for our whistle. I would ask whether the Government has taken into consideration what the manufactured product of pig iron is really worth? I see by a statement to-day in a British return that the value of pig iron in the British market from 1885 to 1889 was £2 5s. 7d. or a little under $11, yet we are paying $6 duty in Canada on every ton of pig iron manufactured, and the output has only increased 10,000 tons since that duty was imposed. This surely must indicate that the iron industry will not thrive here unless we have a more extended market. Then take the cotton factories. Down to the time the National Policy was inaugurated, we had one factory, the Hudon Manufacturing Company, which was fairly successful, but since the National Policy that company has gone to the wall. Nay, further, if I am not mistaken, all our cotton manufacturing industries have been acquired by English capitalists, and I would ask who those English manufacturers, who have bought our factories in Canada, should be protected against? Are they to be protected against themselves? Are they to be protected against the goods they manufacture in the old country and send to Canada? And if those gentlemen can manufacture upon a paying scale in the old country, why can they not compete here just as well? The raw material has to be purchased and brought into Canada, and it has to be purchased and brought into the old country. I hold that if millowners can manufacture successfully in Great Britain, they ought to be able to manufacture just as successfully in Canada, unless there is a condition of things here such as at one time existed in the British Islands when the English manufacturers were not employing the most improved machinery and the very latest methods. At one period the silk manufacturers of England were almost driven out of the market by the silk manufacturers of France; and when an investigation took place it was found that their machinery was not of the most improved sort, so that they had to throw aside the old machinery and get in the best that could be found before they could compete successfully with their neighbours. I believe that such is the condition of things in Canada in some of our manufacturing industries at least, and that the same remedy would bring about a similar result. Then we are told that the farmers of Ontario would be reduced to the condition of those of the Eastern States, had we unrestricted reciprocity and a large amount of grain and animals allowed to come into Canada. We have no fear of that. In Ontario, with the most fertile land on the continent of America, with a more fertile soil than can be found in any state of the Union, we have no fear of competition. Nay, further, what we want is to get the markets of the United States. We were told also by the hon. member for Inverness, and I was very much amused at his statement, that the exodus from this country had its foundation from 1854 to 1866, when the old

Reciprocity Treaty was in force. At that time, he said, there was great intercourse between the two countries, and our people went over to the United States and remained there, and he told us that from 1861 to 1864 40,000 Canadians enlisted into the American army. But the hon. gentleman forgot that from 1881 until 1889, 80,000 annually went out of Canada into the United States, so that the exodus which he admitted in several years together only amounted to 40,000, was only one-half the exodus of a single year under the National Policy. I want to call attention to some of the statements of the Finance Minister. He tells us now that we are debarred from the great markets of the United States, and that the only thing left for the Government to do is to give us adequate protection against competition in products of the Western States. Let me give a few quotations to show whether or not the National Policy is really protecting the Canadian farmer. In the *Empire* on the 23rd of this month, I find the following prices quoted for fall wheat, spring wheat, barley and oats in Buffalo and Toronto respectively: Fall wheat, in Buffalo, 94c.; in Toronto, 84c. to 85c., or a difference of 9c. in favour of Buffalo. Spring wheat, in Buffalo, 92c. in Toronto, 82c. to 86c., or 7c. in favour of Toronto. Barley, in Buffalo, 86c. This was a special despatch to the *Empire* in which it was stated that some 6,000 bushels of barley had been sold in Buffalo at 86c. which would make, according to the despatch, some 50c. in Canada, or a difference of 36c. in favour of Buffalo. Oats, 34c. per bushel in Buffalo and 31c. per bushel in Toronto. Now, that is certainly something to be protected against. I would ask how far this protection affects the Canadian farmer? I made a little calculation on the subject. Suppose a farmer had 10 acres devoted to fall wheat, spring wheat, barley and oats each. According to the average rate of those grains in Ontario in 1891, the yield was of fall wheat 29 bushels, spring wheat 21 bushels, barley 29 bushels, and oats 40 bushels per acre. Take 10 acres of each of these, and how much more money would the American farmer get for his 40 acres than the Canadian farmer? We find that the American farmer in Buffalo would take home $164 more than the Canadian farmer selling his produce in Toronto, and yet this is a fair comparison, both of these cities being equally near the seaboard and equally near the frontier. One reason why we do not get the same price in Canada as they do in the United States is that we have a Millers' Association in the Province of Ontario that meets from time to time and discusses the question as to the supply of wheat to the different mills. There are over 160 millers who have joined that association. They have a central buyer who buys almost the whole, and consequently we have no competition in our own markets. I will repeat a statement which I have made in the House before, because, as we are informed, there is a colony of young members in this House, and I want to show them that we have not been able to hold the markets of Canada as well as we did before the National Policy was imposed. In 1881, two years after the introduction of the National Policy, wheat in Montreal was at $1.33, while in New York it was $1.11, or 22 cents lower in the United States than in Canada. The National Policy was then fairly commencing. When it had been in operation up to 1886, wheat had fallen 24 cents in New York while it had fallen 48 cents in Canada, showing conclusively that the National Policy has not enabled the farmers of Canada to hold their markets in the same position as before the National Policy was imposed. Then we have been told that, if we had reciprocity, American corn would come into this country: and that in 1878, before the introduction of the National Policy, while our horses in Ontario were feeding on American corn, our oats were left in the barns and were only worth 10 or 15 cents a bushel, and that the same thing would take place again if we had reciprocity. I was sorry to hear this statement from a gentleman who has experience in Canadian affairs, I mean the member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). If he had examined the records, he would have found that the price of oats in Canada was higher in 1878 by 7 or 8 cents a bushel. If he will examine the *Mail*, which at that time was the organ of the Conservative party, he will find that, in December, 1878 the price of oats was 7 cents higher in Toronto than it was in Chicago, and if he will come to 1881, two years after the National Policy was imposed, he will find that oats in the United States were 1 cent higher than they were in Canada. There was also a report handed in 1882 from a Commission which was appointed to report upon the influence of the National Policy on the agricultural interests of Canada. I have that report at home in a blue book, and I consulted it before I came down here. I find that in 1877 oats were 11¼ cts. higher in Chicago than in Toronto, and that was two years before the National Policy was imposed, and in 1881, two years after it was imposed, the price was within 1¾ cents in Chicago of what it was in Toronto—another proof that the National Policy has not helped us. Let me say that in 1877-8 corn to the extent of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 bushels entered into Canada and were consumed, while in 1881-2 only about 2,000,000 bushels were brought into the country and consumed—a clear proof that the statements which have been made are not borne out. We have been also told some things in regard to cattle. There was a report made by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the statement was made that there had been $10 or $15 advantage for Canadians over the Americans in taking their cattle into the British market. I have some experience in that matter. I have shipped large quantities of horned cattle to the English market, and I had a son 28 years of age who went to the old country and was going to stay there for a considerable time to look after this matter. I told him to make a careful comparison of the sales of the American and Canadian stock, and to let me know the condition of affairs. He attended the sales at the different markets on the banks of the Clyde and he informed me that he believed from $1.50 to $2 was all the advantage the Americans gained at the season he was there, but that a little earlier there would be more advantage. There is another circumstance that bears this out. A gentleman named Bickerdyke, who is largely engaged in the cattle trade in Montreal, came to Ontario and bought about 7,000 head of cattle. Did he ship them from Montreal? No. The larger number were shipped to Boston and sent from Boston to the British market. It was found better to send the cattle to Boston and take the cheap ocean freights from Boston to the old country and forego the advantage of the transhipment, because, while

they were paying from Boston only 25 or 30 shillings freight, we in Canada had to pay from 65 to 70 shillings. Then we have been told that the condition of the railways of Canada is another sign of prosperity. Our railways are prosperous, and I am happy to know they are. I want to see every industry in the country thoroughly prosperous. But I would enquire what is the great cause of the prosperity of the Canadian railways, especially the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway? Why, Sir, it is the measure of reciprocity in railway traffic that they enjoy with the United States that makes them so prosperous. Let me state also that the farmers of this country are feeling a little of the prosperity of those railways. Last winter a good many hon. gentlemen in this House told us how cheap the western farmer could get his products to the seaboard, as compared with the farmer in the Province of Ontario. A gentleman from Toronto who is largely engaged in the cattle trade, published a letter over his own signature, showing that a carload of cattle was taken from Chicago to the seaboard, a distance of 1,000 miles, for the sum of $50. Last summer I took six or seven carloads from Seaforth, a distance of only 350 miles, and it cost me $54 per car. I think the Government had better turn their attention towards getting the farmers of this country cheap railway rates, and to give us that meed of justice that we believe we are entitled to on account of the large sums of money we have spent in assisting to build these railways. Now, we have been told that it is impossible for the United States to become the market for our produce, and that Great Britain is our natural market. We find that in 1891 the imports from Britain to this country amounted to $42,047,526. We are also told that if we were to have reciprocity with the United States, we should have to discriminate against Great Britain. I hold that the present tariff does discriminate against Great Britain. There is more than one way of discriminating against Great Britain. On this $42,047,526 of imports from Great Britain into Canada, a duty was collected of $9,114,271. The imports from the United States last year were $53,685,650, or $11,500,000 more than the imports from Great Britain; yet we find that the duty collected on the imports from the United States was only $7,734,513; or the duty upon all goods coming from Great Britain is 21½ per cent, while upon those coming from the United States it is only 14½ per cent. Then, in respect to free goods, we find that the imports from the United States amounted to $23,895,225, while from Britain they amounted only to $10,599,866. Now, I hold this is a plain discrimination against Great Britain; in fact it is possible for this country, by means of its tariff, to impose a protection tariff against one country, and allow goods to come in free of duty from another country, just as the Government wish to favour one country more than another, or to lay a heavier burden upon one country than upon another. Then we were told that if the flour and wheat of the United States were to be brought into Canada and turned into flour, it would completely swamp our farmers. But I find that the United States took last year 1,090,000 bushels of wheat from Canada, while Great Britain took 1,006,000. I am not aware whether our wheat that went to the United States paid a duty; I have not got the Trade and Navigation Return of the United States, but surely there is not the least danger of the United States swamping us in our own markets with their wheat and flour, or putting us in a position that we cannot keep our own market. I do not believe that what has been said is correct on that point. I find that a statement has been made upon the floor of this House which will do more to keep settlers from coming into Canada than anything else that has ever been said in this House. Let me read from his speech delivered here a few days ago:

"But the day is fast approaching when it will become the duty of the Canadian Government to protect our farmers against horses from the western prairies. On almost any article of farm produce our Canadian farmers cannot compete with the cheap products of the western prairie farms of the United States. There the farmer, when he goes on to his land, finds it already cleared; there is no necessity of fencing it; as a rule, his house is very cheap; and he is not obliged to indulge in the luxury of expensive buildings. In the older provinces of the Dominion, the farmer has in the first instance to clear the land, which, with stumpage and stoning, occupies several years of severe labour. I am free to say that the fences and buildings on almost any Ontario or Quebec farms represent fully the value of any western prairie farm. Further, Sir, in the western states the farmers are not subject to the long winters that we are here. On the average, our farmers have to provide for feeding their stock, six or seven months every year, and it is utterly impossible for them to raise pork or cattle, or animals of any kind, in Canada, to compete with the cheap products of the western states."

Sir, the author of that language is the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), that was the gentleman who made this statement. Now, I hold that no statement so injurious ever passed the lips of any Reformer in this House, to go abroad to a foreign country. I am a Canadian farmer, and I do not believe this statement to be correct. I, for one, have a little experience of what can be done in the United States. I have relations living there, we interchange communications regularly, and I believe we are as successful as they are on the western prairies. I believe that in the Province of Ontario we have more comfortable homes, and we are in a better position than are the farmers of the United States, and give us free trade with the rest of the world, and we can compete with the farmers of the United States or any other country. I have no fear of competition from any other country. Now, just to show what benefit our farmers would derive from having free markets in the United States, I have picked out a few articles from the Trade and Navigation Returns, with the amount we export of those articles and the duty that is paid under the McKinley Bill. Remember that I am dealing entirely with the Province of Ontario, I speak for that province alone, as I have no experience with the Maritime Provinces nor with our great North-West. Let me take the article of horses. We sent to the United States 9,957 horses, and we paid a duty of $298,710 to get those horses into the United States before the McKinley Bill, because most of them went in during the three months from July to October before the Bill took effect. Of lambs we sent to the United States 244,996. We were told by the hon. member for North Victoria that just as soon as the McKinley Bill took effect lambs went up in the United States. Let me state that the McKinley Bill affected lambs very little. The old tariff imposed a duty of 20 per cent upon sheep and lambs, under which a lamb worth $4 going into the United States paid 80 cents, while, under the McKinley Bill, a lamb worth $4

only pays 75 cents, so that the McKinley Bill does not injure our export trade in lambs. To get those lambs into the United States we paid a duty of $183,747. I will read a table of a number of other articles that we exported in 1889 and 1890:

Articles.		1889.	1890.	Duty, 1891.
				$
Poultry	lbs.	110,793	53,510	9,000
" and game	"	51,732	24,070	7,700
Eggs	doz.	14,011,017	7,354,235	367,711
Beans	bush.	302,826	321,829	128,731
Barley	"	9,934,510	4,751,953	1,425,585
Potatoes	"	716,668	3,326,546	831,636
Hay	tons	82,308	50,070	200,280
Wool	lbs.	1,011,457	1,107,560	132,907

When we take these ten articles we find that the duties charged on them in the United States amounted in 1891 to $3,586,000, and although we would not benefit to the full amount, yet when we consider that it would raise the prices of what we sell at home as well as what we send to that country, we would be benefited to even a greater extent. While we sent only 1,000,000 lbs. of wool to the United States there were over 5,000,000 lbs. raised in Canada, according to the report of the Bureau of Ontario Statistics. Those 5,000,000 lbs. would be increased in price also, and $600,000 duty on those entering the United States would be removed. These items would foot up to the sum of $3,586,000. The duties on farm products amount to $1,793,000, which comes out of the pockets of the farmers of Canada. Let me refer to two or three items in order to show the large sums taken out of the pockets of the ratepayers, and which go into the pockets of the combines and manufacturers. This is one of the greatest injuries we sustain from a protective system, namely, that very large sums are taken out of the pockets of the people and pass into the hands of the combines. Take sugar, for example. Over 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar are consumed annually by the Canadian people, or equal to 44 lbs. per head. The duty paid amounts to $1,600,000. The duty in the United States is ½ a cent per pound while we charge $\frac{2}{10}$ of a cent, and accordingly we are called upon to pay $600,000 more for that quantity than are the people of the United States. Take binding twine. Only 198,007 lbs. were imported into Canada last year, but it required over 14,000,000 lbs. to tie the Canadian crop last year, because it was a very large one and required an immense quantity of twine. While $6,192 went into the treasury, no less than $424,000 passed into the pockets of the cordage companies. If those companies increase the cost of binding twine 3 or 4 cents per pound a still further burden will be placed on the farmer. Of coal oil we imported, in 1889, 5,071,386 gallons, and we manufactured over 9,000,000 gallons. That was the means of placing $710,993 in the pockets of the oil refiners, while only $365,145 went into the treasury. If we take the duty amounting to $1,600,000 on sugar, scarcely any of which goes into the treasury at present, and if we take the items of coal oil and binding twine, we shall find that no less than $2,744,993 are taken out of the pockets of the people and placed in the

pockets of combines and manufacturers on those three articles alone. Yet we are told that it would be injurious to the farmer to have those burdens removed. Let us take the crops of last year and make a little calculation in regard to them. We raised of barley over 16,000,000 bushels, of oats 75,000,000 bushels, of wheat over 32,000,000 bushels. Take half of this as needed for home consumption and half as exported. Comparing the prices obtained with the prices prevailing in the United States we find on oats a difference of 3 cents during last year, on wheat 5 cents, and on barley 15 cents per bushel. Taking 3 cents per bushel on 37,500,000 bushels of oats, there was a difference of $1,025,000, 5 cents per bushel on 16,000,000 bushels of wheat will give $800,000 and 15 cents per bushel on 8,000,000 bushels of barley will give $1,200,000. On those three articles alone, comparing the prices in the Ontario market and in the markets of the United States, our farmers sustained a loss of $3,000,000 which they would have secured if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Yet we are told that we have a better market in England than we can obtain in the United States for our barley, that may be in the future, it is not in the present. I have a statement for 1891 which shows that the price of barley in the United States was 16½ cents higher than in Ontario, and I have another statement which shows that large quantities of barley which were sent to the English market last year were sold only after considerable trouble, and I was told only the other day by a grain dealer that losses had occurred on barley sent to the old country. Canadian barley suitable for shipment to England was sold at 46 cents per bushel, provided it was average in quantity, and from my experience we cannot fill the bill. We have been told that we cannot succeed with the Americans even as regards farming or manufacturing products. The Government take the most inconsistent position on this question I ever knew. We were told during the recent elections, and it was stated in West Huron by an hon. gentleman who is now on the Treasury benches, that members of the Government had gone to Washington to frame a reciprocity treaty, and, further, that the duty on binding twine and agricultural implements would be taken off. As hon. gentlemen opposite have not entered into a reciprocity treaty, they might give the people a measure of redress by removing the duty on binding twine, from which a very small sum goes into the public treasury. We have been told that the Toronto market is worth more than the whole market of the United States. We grant, Sir, that the Toronto market, or the market of any city as large as Toronto, is a great boon to the farmers of the Province of Ontario; but give us unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and we will have the Detroit market which is situated right upon our borders. While Toronto has a population of 180,000, with the same limits as in 1881, we find that Detroit has a population of 205,699. Give us unrestricted reciprocity and at least three-fourths of the market in Detroit would be served from Canada. Buffalo, another city lying on our very borders, and in the line of our commerce to the east, with a population of 254,450, would be supplied with a large amount of our products. Here are two cities that would bring to us a market of something like three-quarters of a million of people. Let us take the

city of New York, with a population of 1,513,000, and we would send a very large amount of our products to that city. If it is a great benefit to have a market in Toronto, the next greatest benefit that can be conferred upon the farmers of the Province of Ontario is to give them access to the markets of the United States for their surplus products. Rochester, is another city within a short distance of the frontier, and it has a population of 138,328; Boston has a population of 446,000, those cities being nearly equal to the population of the Province of Ontario, and with free access to their markets we could supply them. Let me give some figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns with respect to our agricultural products. The total of our exports from Canada amount to $85,757,744 worth, and our agricultural product exports amount to $13,666,858 worth. Of this Britain takes $5,254,028 worth, and the United States $7,291,246 worth. Although we have a tariff against all our articles going to the United States and a free market in Britain, only $2,000,000 worth more of agricultural products go to the British markets than go to the markets of the United States. In manufactured goods we export $6,296,249, and where do these exports find a market? To Great Britain we ship $2,823,491 worth of manufactured goods, and to the United States $3,006,423 worth, so that the United States takes some $200,000 worth more of our manufactured goods than Great Britain; but when we come to the Province of Ontario, let us see where do our agricultural products go. The total of our exports from Ontario amount to $25,721,000; Britain takes $5,073,305, while the United States takes $20,028,706, or the United States takes $4 worth from Ontario for every $1 that goes to Britain. If we go back to the year before the McKinley Bill took effect, we find that the United States took $6.50 for every $1 that Britain took. In agricultural products we send from Ontario $6,801,181. Britain takes $1,261,492, while the United States takes $5,389,492. Now, we have been told that when we lost the United States markets we would find markets elsewhere. Both the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told the people of Halifax during the general election, that it was now their duty to find us foreign markets to compensate us for those we lost in the States, and they pointed to the markets of China, Japan, Australia, the West Indies and England. Why, Sir, we have had the English market all along and we prize it highly, and while we wish for unrestricted reciprocity, we still wish to retain that market, but the only other country mentioned by the hon. gentleman opposite which takes agricultural products from Ontario was the British West Indies, and they take only $32,813 worth, while not one cent of agricultural products went to any of these other countries which they told us would supply us with a market. When we send such large amount of our products to the United States and such comparatively small quantities to the British markets, is it to be wondered that the people of Ontario wish to retain the markets of the United States? I say that the United States market is the best market we can possibly have. I might also mention that we sent 14,000,000 dozen eggs out of Canada in 1889, and mostly all of them went to the United States, whereas we only sent in 1890 6,656,000, showing that the market for eggs has fallen off to a great extent. There were 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 dozen eggs less exported last summer than the summer before, and this means an immense loss to the Canadian farmer. We have been told time and time again that the Government is not to blame with respect to the McKinley Bill. I would like to review this matter for a little and ask how it was when this discussion took place in 1888, with respect to removing the duty from trees, shrubs, fruits and small seeds in accordance with the tariff legislation with the United States, there was such pressure brought to bear at the time upon the Canadian Government? It was because the Mills's Bill was brought before Congress, and that a Bill of almost complete non-intercourse between the States and Canada if it had become the law of the land. When the British Minister at Washington found that this Bill was before Congress he sent a communication to the Colonial Office in England, and that communication was forwarded to the Canadian Government. The Government at Ottawa changed their policy and reciprocated at once when this matter was brought under their notice. The first intimation we had of it here was when the Hon. Peter Mitchell from his place in the House asked the then Premier if any communication had been received with respect to the duties not being removed from these articles on our tariff Statutes. A considerable discussion followed, but the Premier stated emphatically that the Canadian Government would not reciprocate; but in a few days Sir Charles Tupper came down and he told us that after he had discussed the question with the Canadian Government they passed an Order in Council the night before to reciprocate, and that the Order in Council closed with this language:

"And the Canadian Government await further legislation from the American Government in the same direction."

Now, Sir, this was done under pressure from the American Government and also under pressure from the Colonial Secretary pressure both from Washington and from England. The journals of the United States at that time took this question up and discussed it very warmly, saying that the Government of Canada was not acting in good faith with the Government of the United States. We had been told that it was not obligatory on the Canadian Government to reciprocate in this tariff legislation; but we have the following utterances of Sir Charles Tupper on that question:

"But I may say that the moment the Mills's Bill was introduced into the Congress of the United States, long before the discussion arose in this House, I had the Deputy Minister engaged in making a comprehensive statement in reference to this question, in order that I might bring it to the notice of my colleagues as I was bound to do, because I found that by an oversight on my part, caused no doubt by the various duties imposed upon me, the action of the United States Congress had been lost sight of."

Here is Sir Charles Tupper's acknowledgment that it was the duty of Canada to reciprocate with the Government of the United States. Now, Sir, we find that the Canadian Government, most certainly under pressure, did remit those duties. It was only when the attention of the British Government had been called to those taxes, and when a despatch had come from the Colonial Secretary, that the Canadian Government consented to remove the duties from the articles from which the duties

had been removed in the United States five years before. Now, we have been told that Canada is prosperous, that the farmers of Ontario are prosperous, and we have had many signs of that prosperity laid before us. But, Sir, there is one test of the prosperity or adversity of the inhabitants of any country, that is, whether or not they are relieving themselves of the burdens imposed on their property, or whether those burdens are becoming heavier and more grievous to bear. Now, Sir, I have a statement here showing that the chattel mortgages upon the farmers of the Province of Ontario, on the 1st of January, 1890, numbered 8,877, and amounted to $2,647,558; but on the 31st of December, 1890, they had increased to 10,529 in number and $3,218,291 in amount, an increase in one year of 1,652 chattel mortgages covering $570,733 of an increase. Now, we may be asked whether the farmers are the only class in the Province of Ontario who have suffered from the late depression. Let the mortgages which rest upon the whole community tell whether the other classes are prosperous. I find that the chattel mortgages in the whole Province of Ontario on the 1st of January, 1890, numbered 16,214 and amounted to $7,491,908, and that on the 31st of December in the same year they had gone up to 17,859 in number and $8,949,443 in amount, or an increase of 1,645 mortgages in number and no less than $1,458,535 in amount during that one year. If that shows that the people of the Province of Ontario are in a prosperous condition, I do not know what the record of people in adversity could possibly be. Now, we have been told that population is not a true measure of the prosperity of the country; but I hold that it is, especially in a young country. And let me say here that I have been astonished to hear hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches and their supporters comparing the population of Great Britain with the population of Canada. Why, Sir, Great Britain is a country with a large surplus population, which emigrated to all countries in the civilized world to the number of 250,000 annually from 1885 to 1889. Yet they compare that country with a young country like Canada, whose only real want in order to become prosperous is a large increase in her population. The cost of the machinery of Government in this country at the present time, with its population of only 5,000,000, is sufficient to govern a country with a population of 20,000,000 or 30,000,000, and it is more than was the cost of governing the United States when that country had a population of that size. In the State of Minnesota, which cannot compare with Manitoba, there was a gain from 1888 to 1890 of 520,000, while in Manitoba there was a gain of only 92,182. In Dakota, which we have heard described in this House and before the Agricultural Committee as a land of storms and blizzards, a perfect desert and wilderness, what is the condition of the population? During the last 10 years South Dakota, which is considered to be far inferior to Manitoba, gained in population 230,540, and North Dakota 145,810, while the fertile Province of Manitoba, with which none of these American states can compare, only gained 92,182, and our North-West only 42,039. Then, let us see what was the increase in population in the great Territory of Washington, which lies adjacent to British Columbia, and this recalls to my mind a statement made in the report of the Minister of Agriculture

a few years ago that 10,000 people who had come from the old country and gone to Manitoba and the North-West, where they did not find things as they had been represented to them, went on to British Columbia, and when the Government agent followed them there, he found that they had gone to Washington Territory—10,000 in one single year. That territory gained in population from 1880 to 1890, 274,274, while British Columbia only gained 43,303. Now, Sir, let me attempt to give a statement of some of the causes which have led to this condition of things. We have had a great many causes assigned for the failure of the country to increase in population. I will give you one cause, stated by Senator Hansbrough of Dakota, who has just arrived in Washington. When he arrived there, he made some interesting statements about the effect of the McKinley tariff, among which was the following:

"Why do the Dakotans like the McKinley Bill? Because it gives them such decided advantage by affording a higher price for home products. Take the single item of barley. Just across the imaginary line that separates Dakota and Canada the farmers of that country get only 25 or 30 cents a bushel net for their barley, because they have to pay a duty of 30 cents a bushel when they bring it on our side to market. Our farmers sell at 50 and 60 cents a bushel, having no duty to pay. It's the same with potatoes. Our wools, too, have been in brisk demand at good prices. Three years ago there were 30,000 sheep in North Dakota. Now there are 230,000. Our farmers are increasing the output of wool in Dakota, because they get 12 cents per pound more than the farmers of the North-West and Manitoba."

There is one of the reasons given by a United States Senator why people leave Canada. I came across a report of a speech delivered by Sir Francis Hincks after he returned to Canada and became Finance Minister. In 1870, when making his Budget speech, he said that the debt per head of the people of the United States amounted to $60 while that of the people of Canada per head only amounted to $22.50. The taxation in the United States amounted to $9.25 per head, and in Canada to $3.25 per head; and he seemed to point to this, that should the taxation of this country ever become heavier than that of our neighbours, we might expect an exodus. Another eminent statesman, who held a high position in the ranks of the Conservative party, Sir Alexander Galt, made a similar statement, namely, that should the day arrive when Canada would be heavier taxed than the United States, we would commence to loose population. This prediction by these two gentlemen has been fulfilled to the letter. We have been told that the trade of Canada has been increased to a considerable extent. Well, I chanced to take up the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1873 and 1874, and I find that the gross trade of Canada in those years compared with that of the succeeding years, as follows:—

1873	$217,801,203
1874	217,565,510
1882	221,556,703
1883	230,339,826
1890	218,607,390
1891	218,384,934

In all a gain of nearly $1,000,000, only $800,000 over the trade of Canada in 1874. This shows that Canada is not in that prosperous condition hon. gentlemen opposite would lead us to believe it is. When we go back to 1878 and look at the gross trade of Canada with Great Britain and the United States, what tale does it tell? Does

it show that Great Britain is a country Canada has to look to more than any other for a market for her goods? We find that in 1878 we traded with Great Britain, exports and imports, to the amount of $83,327,719 and with the United States to the amount only of $73,876,437. But when we come to 1891, we find that while our trade with Great Britain had increased to $91,328,384 our trade with the United States had increased to $94,824,352; or while it increased with Great Britain $7,955,655, it increased with the United States $20,947,915, and remember this was during the period of the National Policy. What, then, would have been the extension of our trade if the National Policy had not been established? I have had letter after letter within the last few days, every one of them stating that Canada's only salvation is to have reciprocity with the United States. There is a belief all through western Ontario that the Government did not deal fairly with them. The people feel that the Government went to Washington only that they might be able to come back and say to the farmers: We went to Washington, we attempted to get reciprocity, but the Government of the United States would have none of it. Last year the Minister of Justice told us that he had hopes there was a good ground that a fair reciprocity treaty should be entered into between Canada and the United States. This year we are told that the United States will not give reciprocity unless Canada becomes annexed to them. Against this, however, we have the statement of the President, in his last message to Congress, that they did not want any more territory, as they had all they required, but that what they wanted was extended trade relations with every government on the continent of America. I believe, from the nature of the McKinley Bill, that that is what the United States wants. If our Government knew anything, they knew before they went to Washington that the Government of the United States would not give reciprocity in natural products alone. They twitted us with not having a policy, but have the Government a policy? Have they lain down a well-defined policy as to what their views on reciprocity are? If there was a policy ever laid down by them, it was when Sir John Macdonald, in 1880, stated that if we could not get a reciprocity of trade with the United States, we would get a reciprocity of tariffs, and he added that the Government of the United States would not give another reciprocity treaty under the old lines of 1854. I have a statement here of a number of articles included in the treaty proposed by the late Hon. George Brown, when he went to Washington in 1874, but which afterwards fell through. Great Britain we have been told would not be willing that Canada should discriminate against her: but I find there is in this treaty a large number of articles in which she would be discriminated against, and yet the Government of Great Britain then expressed willingness that such a treaty should be entered into. It was then proposed that the United States and Canada should interchange the following articles free of duty:—

Agricultural implements, of all kinds, axles, of all kinds; boots and shoes, of leather; boot and shoemaking machines; buffalo robes, dressed and trimmed; cotton grain bags; cotton denims; cotton jeans, unbleached; cotton drillings, unbleached; cotton plaids; cotton ticking; cottonades, unbleached; cabinet ware or furniture, or parts thereof; carriages, carts, waggons and other wheeled vehicles or sleighs, or parts thereof; fire engines, or parts thereof; felt coverings for boilers; gutta percha belting and tubing; iron—bar, hoop, pig, puddled, rod, sheet or scrap; iron nails, spikes, bolts, tacks, brads or springs; iron castings; India rubber belting and tubing; locomotives for railways, or parts thereof; lead, sheet or pig; leather, sole or upper; leather, harness or saddlery; mill or factory or steamboat fixed engines, and machines or parts thereof; manufactures of marble, stone, slate or granite; manufactures of wood solely, or of wood nailed, bound, hinged or locked with metal materials; mangles, washing machines, wringing machines, drying machines, or parts thereof; printing paper for newspapers; paper making machines, or parts thereof; printing type, presses and folders, paper cutters, ruling machines, page numbering machines and stereotyping and electrotyping apparatus, or parts thereof; refrigerators, or parts thereof; railroad cars, carriages and trucks, or parts thereof; satinets of wool and cotton; steam engines, or parts thereof; steel wrought or cast, and steel plates and rails; tin tubes and piping; tweeds, of wool solely; water wheel machines and apparatus, or parts thereof.

The Government at that time was willing that the treaty should be entered into, the Government of Great Britain had given their consent to it, and the Hon. George Brown had nearly succeeded in negotiating the treaty. They were willing that that treaty should be entered into, and if the British Government were willing and the Government of Canada were willing, certainly they must have seen a way to raise the revenue. Our Government did not go down to Washington with a well-matured scheme to submit to the Government of the United States, telling them how far they were prepared to go, but on the contrary they raised all the objections they could; nay, further, they asked Mr. Blaine if he would show them how to raise a revenue. Can any one imagine anything more humiliating for Canada? I have heard that at the time of the National Policy those gentlemen had to send to Washington for a man to come here and help them to get up that National Policy, and now it appears to the world that our Government is so imbecile that they cannot get up a policy of their own. I say they have done more to discredit Canada in the eyes of the world than was ever done by either the tongue or the pen of the Opposition, though those gentlemen used to say that the Opposition, by tongue and pen, had done as much as possible to frustrate the attempts to obtain reciprocity. From their action the world would imagine that Canada is in a lost condition when she cannot raise a revenue. Speaking as a farmer, I, for one, have no fear of that, and I am prepared to accept unrestricted reciprocity and let the amount which the late Premier of Canada said would have to be imposed on every family, that is $15, be imposed. It would be a blessed day when that took the place of the present system. If every man in this country knew the extent to which he is robbed the country would rise at once and go in for direct taxation. But, through the mis-statements made by the Government and their supporters, a great many of the people have been led to believe what they said. We will be told that the people of Ontario still believe in them, and that, by their votes at the bye-elections, they have said that the Government are right and the Opposition are wrong. No such sentiment goes through western Ontario. I know western Ontario thoroughly, and, during those bye-elections, we found a horde of men in each constituency whom no one knew. They went to the hotels and they did not register their names. They

were afraid to be known. They never went to a public meeting or addressed a public audience, but they went out after sunset and went away the next morning. If the agent of the Government there was organizing them, it was evident that he had no confidence in them, for he did not put the boodle into their hands, but, after one of them had visited a house, another was required to be sent there the night before the election. I know that in West Huron a man went to the house of a respectable farmer and offered him $100 in money if he and his two sons would vote for Mr. Patterson. Another man went into the house of another farmer the night before the election and asked, had he any cattle for sale? No, he had no cattle for sale. Had he any sheep for sale? No, he had no sheep. Then he said that was not his business, but he was out canvassing and he could not say any more in the presence of a third individual. The farmer felt so indignant that he threatened to kick the man off the premises if he did not go. That is what carried those ridings. It was not the vote of the respectable electors that returned these gentlemen. I believe that some of the individuals who were there must be under the pay of this Government because they have no visible means of support, and yet we have found them there, going out in the cool of the evening and not showing themselves during the day. Yet hon. gentlemen tell us that this is the free and unbiassed voice of the farmers of Ontario who have recorded their votes against reciprocity. I say there is no such sentiment in Ontario, and I claim to know that province as well as any hon. member, because, for five years past, I have been going amongst the farmers at the Farmers' Institutes, and, though that question is never brought up at those meetings, I have found their views in private interviews, and I say that the feeling is growing stronger and stronger in favour of reciprocity with the United States, and the hon. gentleman will find that out when the people of western Ontario get an opportunity to show them. Many voters were led astray when they had the statement that the Government were going to Washington to get reciprocity, and in West Huron they understood that it was to be unrestricted reciprocity. They were deceived, but they will not be deceived again. I hope the Government will see their way to make some change, and will find some means of giving us the relief we have asked.

Mr. SPROULE. At this late stage in the debate and after the developments which have taken place, not only last winter but also since in elections, it would seem to be a pity to waste time over a discussion of a subject which has accomplished so much for our friends opposite. One is surprised to hear so much said in defence of a policy which may be called one of the dead issues of the country, though it has been presented to us by the eloquence of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) and his followers, a policy which has accomplished nothing for them except the decimation of their ranks until now they have a very much smaller number in the House than they had when they first propounded this policy. The hon. member, who is leaving the chamber I see, says there is no such sentiment in favour of the National Policy in western Ontario as is represented by the supporters of the Government. In saying that, the hon gentleman must discredit his own educating powers because he has been one of the strongest advocates of unrestricted reciprocity, one of the most uncompromising opponents of the National Policy, and has spent a considerable portion of last summer and fall in educating the people of western Ontario on this subject; but the result was that in every constituency in which he had the honour to speak, the election went against him and his party. Either the people must discredit the leader and the party, or else the educating ability of those who addressed them must be very poor. It reminds me of the story which was told of an incident which happened when the first engine was driven through the Rocky Mountains over the Union Pacific Railway. Buffalo bull standing on the heights watching the inroads being made by the white man in his territory, came down from the mountain and placed himself on the track in front of the engine, to fight and to once and for all time stop the inroads on his territory; with head down, tail erect, and back bowed, he made the charge. The engineer who was driving the train had hold of the lever of the engine, and looking at the indignant animal in an amused way, said: "Well, old boy, I admire your pluck, but I think very little of your judgment." We cannot help but admire their pluck, but I think very little of your judgment. certainly the country must think very little of their judgment after the reception their policy has met with by the verdict of the country. Now, for several years past we have had from the same gentlemen the cry throughout the country that the policy of the Conservative party was not the one the country required, but that unrestricted reciprocity was what Canada needed to cure her commercial and political ills. These men have endeavoured to influence the people upon every platform and every hustings in the country, they have held numerous meetings during the campaign of 1891, and during the bye-elections of this summer, which almost amounted to a general election; they have scattered thousands of pamphlets and fly sheets throughout the country, and have asked the electorate to pronounce upon their policy, and what is the result? The result is that every bye-election has gone against them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What about Prescott?

Mr. SPROULE. It must be a great source of consolation to those hon. gentlemen to hold a constituency by some 40 or 50 votes which they carried a year ago by some 400. If they can find consolation in that election, I am sure we are willing to let them enjoy it. They have taken every possible means to educate the people, not only by their speeches, but by the facts and figures, so called, which they have scattered among the electorate of the country. I have one pamphlet here before me that I got from a friend belonging to a constituency in the west. The cover was labelled "With the Compliments of Mr. Campbell, M.P.," and the pamplet was entitled "Facts and Figures for the Electors," and was intended to convince them that the National Policy was a great curse to the nation, and that unrestricted reciprocity was the blessing the people needed. After looking over this pamphlet I thought to myself it was well they labelled it "Facts and Figures." It reminded me of the condition of things in ancient times when Art was so crude that when a picture

was made the artist put the name under for fear it might be mistaken for something else, for instance when a boy drew a picture of a horse, underneath he wrote "This is a horse," for fear some one would take it for a cow or some other animal. If this pamphlet had not been labelled "Facts and Figures," I am sure the reader would have come to the conclusion that it contained nothing but fiction. Now everything between the two covers of this book is written to convince the people that the National Policy is a national curse, and that unrestricted reciprocity is the need of Canada to-day. It tells the people that ever since the Conservative party came into power in 1878 the National Policy has been ruining the country, until the burthens of the people have become so great that they can no longer be borne, and the country is growing constantly weaker and more powerless. At the end of the pamphlet they turn round and indicate a remedy, and what is the remedy? The remedy is the Butterworth Bill. We have often stated that they went to the United States for a policy, and you can find no better evidence of the truth of that statement than is afforded by this pamphlet. They tell the people of Canada that the Butterworth Bill runs upon the same lines as unrestricted reciprocity, and that is the remedy for Canada's commercial and political ills. It is most amusing and interesting to look at our present situation, as it is described in that pamphlet, because they tell the people what they are suffering from, they tell them what they want and they tell them that they have found a remedy. They finish up this pamphlet in a very amusing way. It is said that among them is a poet, and he comes from the Province of Ontario, I take it must be so, because we find some of his handiwork in this pamphlet. I will read you a few lines:

"Once to every man and nation comes a moment to decide;
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side:
Some great cause God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand and the sheep upon the right;
And the choice goes by favour, twixt the darkness and the light,
Hast thou chosen? O! my people, of this great and happy land,
Looking to the future, in whose party thou shall stand?"

Now, they ask the country to make the division upon the lines they indicated, the country has made the division, and where do they turn up? On the left hand of the Speaker; hence it is unnecessary for me to ask them to which class of animals they belong. But what more do I find? In examining this pamphlet that is said to contain nothing but facts and figures and the great remedy, the great panacea, for Canada's commercial and political ills, on the very next page I find an advertisement of Hamlin's Wizard Oil, which is said to cure rheumatism, neuralgia, headache, catarrh, deafness, toothache and a hundred other diseases. These are the facts and figures given to the farmers of Ontario to cure their physical ills, I suppose. Now, we know what Hamlin's Wizard Oil is, we know that it is only a quack remedy, and by the same parity of reasoning I think the people of Canada will come to the conclusion that the remedy given in this pamphlet to cure Canada's political and commercial ills, is just about as reliable as Hamlin's Wizard Oil, and is just as likely to cure their commercial and political ills as the oil is likely to cure their physical ills. Well, the Canadian farmers have taken them at their word, they have judged them and sent them to the left hand of the Speaker, and they have sent the Conservative party back to the right hand of the Speaker. Now, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat told us that in western Ontario there is no such prosperity as is said in this House to exist, and he has told us that the trade of Canada has fallen off between 1878 and 1891, and therefore that is evidence that the country wants some change. Now, if the hon. gentleman had only looked a little further into his figures he would have seen that from the time the Reform party came into power in 1874 up to the time they left power, the trade of Canada greatly decreased. In 1873 when the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald left power the export trade of Canada was $89,351,928. Then the Mackenzie Government came into power and when they left our export trade had fallen to $71,491,255. The total import trade of Canada in 1873 was $128,011,281, and in 1879 it had fallen to $81,964,427. In 1878 our import trade was $93,081,787, whereas in 1873 it was $128,011,281, showing that the export and the import trade of Canada went downwards constantly during the time that the Mackenzie Government was in power, and since 1878 it has been gradually coming up until it has reached its present great proportions. At the present time our total import and export trade amounts to $218,000,000, about the same as it was in 1873, when Sir John A. Macdonald and party left office. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat drew a comparison between the condition of things in Manitoba and the condition of things in Southern Dakota, and he told the people why it was that Southern Dakota had settled so much more rapidly than Manitoba. He drew a comparison to the effect that the farmers of Dakota would get 25 cents a bushel more for their potatoes, and 30 cents a bushel more for their barley than they could get in Manitoba, and therefore that they are more favourably situated than our farmers. I have here a paper printed in Southern Dakota, the very section of country about which he was speaking. It is headed *The Star*, Aberdeen, South Dakota, Wednesday, March 23rd, 1892. This is what it says about the condition of the people in that country:

"The signs of prosperity among our farmers are showing up grandly—in the columns of our Republican exchanges. Nearly all of them are publishing 'boom editions' to advertise the country, while their columns are overloaded with foreclosure notices. The St. Lawrence (Hand County) *Journal* publishes a big supplement to accommodate the foreclosure notices. The Faulk County *Record* has been enlarged until it is the largest weekly newspaper in the state, and it prints almost absolutely nothing on the home side except mortgage foreclosure notices. In one township in that county five school houses are closed. The mortgage companies have no children to educate. The Leola (McPherson County) *Blade* last week published a full page supplement, the entire home side of the *Blade* being filled with mortgage sales. This is what a big crow has done for South Dakota."

Then they go on and talk about another part of the country:

"The *News* calls the efforts of the *Star* to show the people the real condition of affairs in the state by publishing the number of mortgage foreclosured 'calamity politics,' and says 'it sets up a howl—a wail, that would perhaps be pitiable if there were any one to weep besides the holders of the mortgages on these vacant farms, for in nearly

every instance when a mortgage is foreclosed it is because the mortgagor has abandoned the land and in most instances left the country.' Our esteemed contemporary proves too much. Why have these men left? This is the garden spot of the world; and the *News* claims settlers are leaving at the rate of 5,000 a year."

Where are they going? Over to Canada, over to that god-forsaken country where they get 25 cents a bushel less for their potatoes than they sell for in the United States, and where they get 30 cents a bushel less for their barley. They are leaving Dakota at the rate of 5,000 a year and coming over to Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Now, I think when the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), attempts to prove that the farmers from Southern Dakota are in a better condition than the farmers of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, he had better take his proof from some other source than the one from which he took it to-night. The hon. member says that the chattel mortgages in Canada indicated the condition of the farmers, and he gave a comparison between the number that existed in the summer and the number that existed late in the fall of the same season. No man has a better opportunity of ascertaining the condition of the farmer than has the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), because, I understand, he is an inspector for a loan company. I ask him to look at the reports of his own company for last fall, the previous fall, and two or three years before that. What does the report say? That the payments on mortgages are satisfactory, that the company has had very little trouble in collecting money, that the payments were better than at any time in the history of the company for a great many years. This, indeed, has been the report year after year, not only of the company which the hon. gentleman represents, but of the different loan companies in Toronto, the Canada Permanent, the Western, and any of the companies loaning money to the Canadian farmers, particularly in Ontario, every one without exception last fall stated that the payments were better than before, that there were very few payments behind, that there were very few foreclosures, and that the companies had very little trouble in obtaining their money. The hon. gentleman went on to ask, where did the agricultural products of Canada go? He said our natural market is in the United States and not England, and he gave a few lines from the farm to show that the farmer's market is in the United States, and not in England. Take his friend, Mr. Awrey. The hon. gentleman was very unfair during the late elections because, in making a comparison between the value of the English market and the value of the United States market for the Canadian farmer, he took a few lines in which the Canadian farmers would be benefited by the Canadian market, but he very conveniently omitted several important lines on which much larger prices are paid in England, and which shows it to be the only good market the farmer possesses. I have before me a comparative statement of the products of the farm sent to the two markets, and that was what the hon. member for Huron professed to give when he stated that we sent to Great Britain of agricultural products to the value of $5,000,000 and to the United States to the value of $70,000,000. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his figures, they are not to be found in the Trade and Navigation Returns, and unless he culled them from a very obscure source, or invented them, I cannot understand where he obtained them. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that agricultural products of Canada in the following lines—and these lines may be fairly said to include all the lines which the Canadian farmer has to sell:—Cattle, sheep, mutton, swine, pork, bacon and hams, beef, lard, tallow, butter, cheese, poultry, beans, eggs, wheat, barley, oats, pease, potatoes, oatmeal, apples, rye, vegetables, vegetables canned, horses, hay, hides, wool, bran, seeds, straw, flourmeal, flax, meats canned, hemp, tobacco leaf, fruit canned, were sent last year to Great Britain to the value of $21,067,424. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) gave the value as $5,000,000. What was the value of similar products sent from this country to the United States last year? Only $12,823,000. Surely the market which returned us $21,000,000 is a more profitable one than the market which brought us back $12,000,000. These figures show unmistakably that our most important market is England. When Mr. Awrey made up the statement, which was quoted by the hon. member for Huron, he took only these items: horses, sheep, poultry, barley, beans, hay, malt, potatoes, eggs, hides, wool, flax, rye, hemp, tobacco leaf, canned fruit; and these, he said, were the products of the Canadian farmer which he had to export. These are, however, only a few of the lines which we export with benefit. In these lines to which I have just referred, as compiled by Awrey, we exported to the United States the value of $11,897,562 and to England only $716,094, and by that course of reasoning Mr. Awrey endeavoured to convince the Canadian farmers that the American market is the natural market for the Canadian farmers and that it can be secured by adopting a system of unrestricted reciprocity. It is a most unfair line of reasoning, and cannot be maintained. The hon. member for Huron talked about some of the lines in which the Canadian farmer would be benefited if we had unrestricted reciprocity. He referred to binding twine, and said a great injustice was done because binding twine was not admitted here free. But I was told, and I believe it to be correct, that the price of binding twine is fixed in New York both for the United States and Canada. Unrestricted reciprocity, therefore, would not leave us better off than we are to-day, because our farmers could not obtain it for less than the American farmers. But a comparison of the prices last season in the United States and Canada shows that it is sold quite as cheap in Canada as in the United States. In my section it was retailed at 10½ cents per pound, and it could be bought in packages of 25 lbs. or 100 lbs., or any quantity. A farmer in Dakota writes me that the twine they constantly use there cost 13½ and 14 cents for the past season. Surely, then, it would not be beneficial to the Canadian farmer if we obtained American binding twine free of duty when it can be bought here for 10½ cents as against 12, 13 and 14 cents in the United States. The member for Huron has informed the House that a great boon would be conferred on our farmers if we got the American market for our horses. For the last 10 years the American horse market has been growing worse and worse. Ten years ago we sent 43,000 horses to the United States, as compared with 17,000 the year before the McKinley tariff came into operation. The fact is the Americans are raising more horses than they want, and

electricity and traction power are taking the place of horses to the detriment of the horse trade. We have been told that there is no demand for Canadian horses here, and it is not worth while raising them. Let me read the following extract from a newspaper which will be a sufficient argument to this :

"BRUSSELS HORSE FAIR.

"BRUSSELS, ONT., March 3rd.—The Brussels monthly horse fair, held to-day, was the most successful one ever held. The town was packed with farmers and the marketable horses of all grades were very plentiful. Some fine specimens in heavy draught were offered. One team was sold for $300. The medium class, general purpose, brought from $100 to $150 each, and roadsters about $120 up. Nearly all that were for sale changed hands. There were twenty buyers present. The next fair will be on the 31st of March."

We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the horse trade is entirely done in the Province of Ontario, because we have not unrestricted reciprocity, but that extract which I have read does not show that after all we have such a bad market for our horses. I do not intend to say much about lambs, because the price of lambs is about the same as it was before, and the McKinley Bill did not affect it at all. The hon. member from Huron (Mr. McMillan) said that we now discriminate against the mother country, and that discrimination could not be an objection to unrestricted reciprocity. He attempted to prove his statement by saying that we brought in more free goods from the United States than we did from England. It is plain to any sensible man in the House that it is not discriminating against the mother country when we bring in the same line of goods from both countries under the same rate of tariff. The hon. gentleman also told us that cattle were shipped from Boston last year, which were bought in Canada, and, therefore, that we do not enjoy such an exceptional advantage in the British market over the Americans, by reason of the privilege of sending our cattle into England without being scheduled. It is a fact well known to every one who has taken any interest in the matter, that the Canadian farmers must suffer very materially if our cattle were placed on the same footing in the English markets as are the American cattle. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) stated that he himself is engaged in the cattle trade, and that when his son went over to England with shipments last year, he told him to enquire the difference between the price of the United States cattle and the Canadian cattle in the old country market, and that his son reported that there was a difference of $1.50 to $2 a head. The hon. gentleman is speaking of the prime fat cattle sent from the United States and the same class from Canada, but that is not the class of cattle which we would suffer most on account of, if Canada was scheduled in England. We would suffer most in the exportation of our stockers. We sent to England the year before last 123,000 head of cattle and out of this number 90,000 were stockers, animals which were not fit to be killed or put into the market as beef, but which were sold to the English and Scotch farmers to be fattened by them. The United States exporters are obliged to kill their cattle when they land in England, and when we put prime fat cattle on the English market it does not make very much difference, because they could be killed on the day they land as well as any other time. The advantage which we possess over the Americans is that we can keep our cattle longer in England before disposing of them. For instance, if a shipper of Canadian cattle struck a bad market in England he could keep them until there was a good market and higher prices, and he would receive the benefit, while the American cattle would have to be killed and disposed of within the time limit fixed by the British Government. It is in the line of stockers, which are sent to England in large numbers, that we derive the greatest benefit, from the fact of our not being scheduled. The United States cannot ship their stockers to the English market, because the Scotch and English farmers cannot buy them as they do our stockers, and put them out on grass and fatten them. That is where the Canadians reap the advantage, and this means about $10 to $12 a head. The member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) told us the other night that unrestricted reciprocity would not necessarily compel us to be scheduled in England; he said that we could have quarantine regulations around Canada the same as we have to-day. Let me point out to him how his argument is entirely wrong in this respect. There are 36 states in the American union and in only three of them has pleuro-pneumonia ever been known to exist, but notwithstanding that the entire United States is scheduled in the English market. They have quarantine laws around every state in the Union, and although pleuro-pneumonia has only been known to exist in three states, yet each of the 36 states is scheduled, and so would Canada be scheduled also if we had free trade with the United States and the Americans were allowed to send their cattle in here free. I believe that the cattle trade would be effectually destroyed if we had unrestricted reciprocity. I do not think that it is necessary for me to reply to the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, because the pronounced verdict of the people of Canada has been such as not only to convince this House, but to convince every reasonable man in this country, that the policy of the Opposition is not the policy the country wants. Hon. gentlemen opposite advocated at one time commercial union, and the people pronounced against that; and then they advocated unrestricted reciprocity, against which the people of the country also pronounced themselves. They tell us that the National Policy is a failure, but the fact that the people of the country want it and vote for it is the best argument to refute that statement. Why was the National Policy first brought into existence? It was to protect the markets of Canada for the Canadian people, and to raise a revenue. Has it been a failure in raising a revenue? No. Has it been a failure in keeping the Canadian market for the Canadian people? No; because we find that the year before the National Policy was introduced we imported 7,387,000 bushels of corn for home consumption, and the next year we imported only 2,700,000 bushels, showing that the National Policy made a market for over 5,000,000 bushels of corn for the Canadian farmers. The year before the National Policy, we imported oats to the extent of 2,162,000 bushels and the year after the National Policy we imported only 77,000 bushels, showing that over 2,000,000 bushels of oats were required from the Canadian farmers to supply our own people, more than was required before the National Policy was in force. Whatever benefit the farmers received from that was because of the

operation of the National Policy. The year before the National Policy was introduced we imported 5,636,000 bushels of wheat, and the year after it was introduced we imported only 147,500 bushels, showing that the National Policy gave the Canadian farmers a home market of over 5,000,000 bushels for their wheat. I think that is the best argument to refute the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite that the National Policy does not give a home market to the Canadian farmer. Now let us take another important line in which the Canadian farmer is interested, and I will give the House the following figures in connection with it :—

1890.

MEATS IMPORTED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

	Lbs.
Bacon, hams, shoulders and sides	4,353,653
Beef, salted, in brls	6,445,105
Mutton	246,363
Pork, barrelled, &c	17,185,794
dried or smoked, &c	1,062,854
Other meats, fresh or salted	485,652
Total	29,779,421
1891	15,372,212
Kept out by tariff	14,407,209

We raised the duty on meats to 3 cents a pound, except upon mess pork, and the first year of the operation of that duty we find that we imported only 15,372,212 lbs., showing that there were kept out by the tariff 14,407,000 lbs., which had to be supplied by the Canadian farmers instead of by the United States. We did not raise the duty to 3 cents upon mess pork and I would like to draw the attention of the Government to that particular item, because it is a most important one and one on which I think we should raise the duty to-day to 3 cents per pound, the same as other meats. The line of pork upon which the duty was not raised sufficiently high is the kind we find coming into this country yet. Before the duty was raised we brought in 17,000,000 lbs. of mess pork in barrels, and the year after the duty was raised we brought in 11,000,000 lbs., showing that the duty was not sufficiently high to keep it out, and to enable the Canadian farmers to supply it to the Canadian people, instead of the Americans sending it in here. But the other lines, bacon, hams, shoulders and sides, were kept out nearly entirely. Beef, salt and fresh, was kept out nearly entirely. They had the Canadian market to the extent of 14,000,000 lbs. in one year, and if we had raised the duty to 3 cents a pound all around, it would have given us that market and 7,000,000 lbs. more. I have a letter here written by Hately Bros., of Chicago, to one of their operators in this country in this line, and it proves what we have heard throughout the country. This letter says :

"Market very dull, but feeling somewhat firmer. Unless you intend shipping this pork we advise taking a fair profit, as we believe it will ultimately sell at a very low price. The consumptive demand for mess pork has fallen off to almost nothing. Contract pork is not moving at all. Old pork is moving slowly at a discount of about $2 per barrel. We believe in higher prices generally for provisions, and should not be surprised to see May pork sell again at $10.50 or possibly $11, but ultimately we believe it will take extremely low prices, say $7 to $8 per barrel, to force our large stocks into consumption."

Now, if the duty had been raised to 3 cents per pound or $6 a barrel, to that extent this cheap pork from the western states would be kept out, and the Canadian farmer would have his own market for pork. We are told that the National Policy has done no good. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) tells us that whatever it has done for the country, it has done nothing for the Canadian farmer. I would like to ask when his friends ever attempted to do anything for the Canadian farmer. When the Mackenzie Government was in power there was a duty of 15 per cent on manufactured goods, but there was no duty on the products of the Canadian farmer. The Mackenzie Government increased this duty on manufactured goods to 17½ per cent, but left the Canadian farmer out of consideration altogether. The only party that ever endeavoured to do anything for the Canadian farmer was the Conservative party when it came into power in 1878. When the Conservative Government found that the Americans were competing against the Canadian farmer in his own market and keeping him out of their market, they put a duty on wheat, pork, cattle, horses and almost every other product of the farm which came from the western states into Canada. A few lines were left out, and I think we ought to have a duty put on those lines to about the same extent as the Americans have imposed duties upon them. On horses we ought to put about $30 a head, because at the present time there are thousands of horses coming into Canada from the western states and taking the Manitoba market which ought to be kept for our own farmers. The Americans are bringing in their horses at a low price, because they are very cheap in Dakota and the other western states, valuing them at $30 or $40 a head and paying 20 per cent on them, which amounts to almost no duty at all ; and in addition to those which they bring in through the customs, I am told that they smuggle in many others. Again, we ought to have a duty of 5 cents a dozen on eggs, as I believe the reason eggs are so low in price in the Canadian market at present is that during the last few months large consignments of American eggs have been brought into Montreal and Toronto and lowered the prices. We should shut out from our market these American eggs by imposing a duty of 5 cents a dozen upon them, and then we would be treating our neighbours just in the way in which they are treating us. The first party that ever attempted to do anything for the Canadian farmers was the Conservative party. It was that party that gained for them the reciprocity treaty of 1854, whatever benefit it may have been to them. It was that Government that gave them the National Policy, the only protection they ever had. The Conservative Government legislates for every nationality, class and creed ; it does not set class against class ; and the voice of the country is with us, as is evidenced by the fact that in almost every election which has taken place since the general election a supporter of the Government has been sent to this House. If we had a general election to-day, and the Opposition maintained their present policy which they have advocated for the last few years, it is almost safe to say that they would be wiped out of existence. After every general election they have either changed their leader or their policy. In 1878 they were defeated, and they changed their leader ; in 1882 they were defeated, and they changed their policy ; in 1887 they began to introduce commercial union, but they failed to carry the country, and their leader left them in disgust ; in the late general election they were defeated again on their scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, and I believe that they will

shortly change both their leader and their policy. I believe that in a few months, unrestricted reciprocity will be forgotten as completely as those who have been laid in the graveyards of the country, and then perhaps they will apply for another policy to their old friend at 114 Broadway, where they got their present policy. But to-day their old leader and their old policy have both failed; and if they appealed to the country to-day I think they would be without a representation in this House. They are always telling the Canadian people what they are going to do in the future. They are always living in the future instead of the active present; and when that future comes it brings no more consolation for them than they have had in previous elections. If they do not change their whole policy, if they do not seek for a more patriotic and loyal one, if they do not try to get better men into their ranks, instead of increasing influence and force, they will find their party growing smaller and more insignificant, until at last they will scarcely be known by the name of a party in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) who has just sat down spoke about the possibility of our cattle being scheduled in England if our policy was in vogue. There is a feeling that if some hon. gentleman had raised the question in the House while the hon. gentleman was speaking, he would have been scheduled, because, at one time, we had not a quorum. I like that speech of his; I think I like it better every time I hear it. I have heard it several times. I was able to stand it, although there were only three of his friends who were willing to stand it to-night. He has collected a good many facts, and I wonder that his friends would not stay with myself and my leader, and the other hon. gentlemen who are here, to have listened to that speech, once more at least. That speech may be calculated to do a great deal of good in the country; but it does not seem to take a great hold of his friends in the House. That is about all the criticism that I will do myself the honour to make upon that able speech. I think I will allow that to go down to history without further observation. Speaking of the policy of the Liberal party and of the leader of the Liberal party, if there was ever a time in the history of the Reform party when I was proud of my leader I am proud of my leader to-night. I am not only sanguine about my leader, but am sanguine about his policy. I believe it is a policy which will prevail in the country and I believe when it does the exodus will cease and those who love and desire the welfare of Canada will see a rebound given to her institutions which every lover of Canada would like to see put in motion to-day. There is vitality in the policy we advocate in opposition to the stagnant one we have had for the last eleven years. We were promised that a high protective policy would stop the exodus. Why, Sir, we have lost more people in ten years under the National Policy almost than we have kept in the country. We have spent $3,000,000 to bring immigrants to the country, and we have lost the $3,000,000 besides the immigrants, as well and half our natural increase. I have occasionally heard our friends opposite talk of us as the apostles of blue ruin, because we drew attention to the numbers of our people who were leaving our country, and to the decay of our industries. Well, let me read the National Policy resolution upon which our high protective tariff was based:

"Be it resolved that this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home."

Was there any blue ruin in this? Has the party which got into power on this blue ruin cry, the right to turn around and talk to those gentlemen who laboured in the interests of the country, and conducted it honestly, and gave it what we want now, honest government? Does it come well out of their mouths to talk about blue ruin?

"Such a policy will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving as it ought to do in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

Reciprocity of tariffs. What did our Ministers meet at Washington the other day? What was the bogie that startled them? They met there their offspring, reciprocity of tariffs and then the Minister of War sounded the bugle, and the three giants retreated quickly as they could. The idea of reciprocity of tariffs is the acme of the National Policy resolution. It is that on which it was built, and when they went to Washington and saw their offspring, that political monstrosity, they hurried away with all the speed possible. During last session it was with pain and regret to the people of this country that the First Minister died. After his death it became incumbent on His Excellency the Governor General to call upon some one to lead the House. It is said he called upon the present Minister of Justice, and that hon. gentleman refused, as he states himself, to act as Premier. I will not make this statement on my own authority, but will quote you a letter which I read in the Ottawa *Citizen* the other morning. It appears some gentleman in Calgary wrote to him asking him the question, and the hon. gentleman replied, with that jurisprudence which should characterize a Minister of Justice, and one who once occupied a seat on the bench, from which, according to our Conservative friends, he made a descent when he came down into the ranks of the party with which he is now associated, because in his early life he was trained under that great Liberal statesman Joseph Howe, and it is a singular thing the Conservatives cannot get a leader of their own growing. They appear to have no faith in those belonging to their own ranks, but recruit their leaders from the Liberal ranks. Here is what the hon. gentleman said in that letter:

"SIR,—Thanks for your kindness in sending me this cutting. The man who would assert that I have been intriguing to procure an office which I have just refused must be a fertile liar or a hopeless fool, and in either case is unworthy of notice. Any one who supposes that Mr. Abbott is not actually, as well as nominally, Premier, knows nothing of him or his colleagues. My opinion about the premiership has not changed, except that I hold more strongly than ever that Mr. Abbott is a man for the place.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. "The man."

Mr. LANDERKIN. "A man" I got from a letter in the *Citizen*.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not care where you got it. The letter I wrote was "the man for the position," and that is the way it was published everywhere except in the *Citizen*.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement as to that, and read it as amended.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. You had better.

Mr. LANDERKIN. "Mr. Abbott is the man for the place." Now, we heard the Minister of Justice speak last night, and we heard his followers speak of having great faith in the country. Well, if the Minister of Justice were offered the premiership of the country why did he refuse it? Had he lost faith in the country or the party behind him? What is the reason of his refusal? Was he not willing to serve when called upon by His Excellency? Was it because he lost faith in the country: or did he fear the integrity and loyalty of the boys behind him if he were chosen as Premier? That is a question for them to decide. After that the Governor went with his lantern into the vaults of the Senate where he found another leader in Mr. Abbott, who also was brought up in the Liberal ranks. The Governor did not look further in the House of Commons it may be noticed. He might perhaps have thought that the others would not refuse if he asked them, so he went to the Senate, and there he found Mr. Abbott. Mr. Abbott was a Liberal born, and consequently they entreated him to lead the Liberal-Conservative party, because they thought he had been well brought up. Then another thing which recommended him to them and would make him very strong with the American people was that his views had been some time ago in favour of annexation. That is one thing which commended him to His Excellency and the party. It was announced to the country and to the House that, immediately after the session, a reorganization would take place and a very strong and powerful government would be formed. They had a great many supporters in the House, and after the session they went up to Perth to jubilate with one of their supporters on the completion, I believe, of the Tay Canal. A number of the Ministers were there. It was all right that they should go there and should make speeches, and I find from their own newspapers that they did make speeches there. The Minister of Justice spoke, and I suppose he spoke for Mr. Abbott, the Premier, and he said there would be a reorganization of the Cabinet. I read this in the *Empire*. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I do not read the *Empire* every day. It must have been due to my misfortunes in not reading it every day that I did not see the letter to which he has referred last night. At all events I read the *Empire* on that occasion, and I read the hon. gentleman's speech. I suppose it was a just speech. At any rate it was a modest speech, but was scarcely what you would expect from a Minister of Justice. He said that the Government would meet Parliament with the strongest Cabinet that ever met Parliament since Confederation. The reorganization was to be so thorough and complete, and in conjunction with the giants they already had in the Cabinet, other giants were to be introduced to make it the strongest Cabinet since Confederation. I thought over that statement, and I did think that the Minister of Justice had a powerful conception of the greatness of those by whom he was surrounded. They had a good start. They had Mr. Abbott, who was a Liberal born and bred. They had the Minister of Justice, who was a Liberal until a little while ago; and then the others, I think, were nothing but the old Conservative material. I think they had a majority of that element. I ran my mind over the men who had held power in that Government since Confederation. Not the Liberal Government but the others. Well, Sir John Macdonald is not here; Sir George Cartier is not here; Sir Alexander Campbell is not here; the Hon. Thomas White is not here; Sir David Macpherson is not here; the Hon. James McDonald is not here; Sir A. T. Galt is not here; Sir Francis Hincks is not here; Sir Leonard Tilley is not here, neither is Sir John Rose here.

An hon. MEMBER. Nor Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did I forget Sir Charles Tupper? It is wonderful that I should forget Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Charles never forgets himself or his family when the estimates are being prepared, but he is not here. Yet the Minister of Justice told the people of Canada, when they all went up to jubilate at the completion of the Tay Canal, that the Cabinet they would form would overtopple all these men whose names I have mentioned, that these men who have gone before were but pigmies to those who were to come in this session. After that the press in Ontario began to get somewhat elated. They thought new blood was going to be introduced, and then the cry went up that Mr. Meredith was to be brought into the Cabinet in order to give an air of respectability to it. Mr. Meredith was boomed for some time. I do not know whether overtures were made to him or not, because the Minister of Justice has not told us that, but Mr. Meredith did not come in, and the Premier could only find one member in this House to take rank with those intellectual giants who are now in and that gentleman is the Minister of Public Works. He does, it is true, look something like a giant and to some extent he topples over some of those who were in before. Then they had to go outside the House and take in a gentleman who had been defeated in his constituency by an overwhelming majority, and he was to supply all the brains of those gentlemen who had gone before and were no longer here, so as to make the strongest Cabinet since Confederation. That is Mr. Patterson. I have nothing to say against Mr. Patterson, but I do not know that I could say as much of him as is implied by the statement of the Minister of Justice, but I may not be as good a judge in this matter as the Minister of Justice. Then they refer to the bye-elections. If I were in the Government, I would never mention the name of Louis Riel or the bye-elections of 1892. I believe that, when the history of those bye-elections is known, it will form the darkest page of Canadian history. I notice that our friends opposite do not jubilate very much over these bye-elections. I think they are afraid of an explosion in regard to them, and they are like people who stand on the brink of a volcano, and they do not know whether to laugh or cry over the results of those bye-elections. I was in a county where one of those bye-elections took place, and I heard the statement that the

Government had been reorganized, that they had kept that dreadful man Mr. Meredith, that fearful man, that terribly bad man Mr. Meredith, out of the Cabinet and had put Mr. Patterson in, and that, if Mr. Patterson and his friends were defeated, the Government would have nothing to do but to take Mr. Meredith into the Cabinet yet. Some of the people did not believe that Mr. Meredith was such a great man as was represented. At any rate, he was selected to work for the election of the member for London, and he was in London for a week, and during that week he did not appear on one platform to speak in support of Mr. Carling. The people there paid him so much attention that he actually complained of their attentions through the press. And this is the strength which has been added to the party. This is the powerful Government that meets Parliament at this session. Then the last Parliament was dissolved, for what? It was for the purpose of making a reciprocity treaty, and it was said that, immediately after the election, commissioners would go down to Washington and make a treaty which would give the farmers the advantage of reciprocity. For two days they kept up the cry that they were going for reciprocity. And did it appear on the part of the Government or their supporters that they were in earnest in doing this? Was not this an evidence to the Government that the current of public opinion was running in this direction, and was not this the reason why the Government dissolved Parliament in order to keep in the current? What did they do to set the current astray? What did they do to prevent the possibility of entering into a treaty? The Minister of Finance says that Mr. Blaine treated them courteously. The Minister of Finance seemed to be surprised that Mr. Blaine should treat them courteously, and why? Immediately after the dissolution of the House, Mr. Blaine and the President of the United States were cartooned from one end of this Dominion to the other—they were ridiculed and satirised in every possible way, although the Government had gone down on their knees, as it were, to the United States, and had dissolved a British Parliament in order to have the elections before the time Parliament had expired. As soon as they did that they began to cartoon the President of the United States and Mr. Blaine, the Premier of the United States. Is that the way to enter into a treaty with the United States? Is that the way this Cabinet, composed of giants, wants to make a treaty? Is that the way a Cabinet of the strongest character that has ever held power in this country since Confederation attempts to make a treaty? Dissolve the House to make a treaty; cartoon the President and Premier of the nation with which they are going to negotiate to make a treaty; satirise them in every possible way with great, big flaming posters and cartoons of an abominable character; ridiculing the leading men of the country with which they are going to make a treaty! I am not surprised that the Minister of Finance said he was surprised that they were treated courteously. I suppose that is what the Finance Minister had in his mind when he spoke the other day, he supposed these cartoons had not been forgotten on the part of Mr. Blaine, and therefore he was afraid they would be treated discourteously. However, we are glad to know that Mr. Blaine did not do that. But there was a time when they went there before. They went there last spring, they did not make a treaty then, and they did not stay there long. They did not go far in their treaty, and they did not go far before they found out the difficulties of making a treaty. They did not get the ear of Mr. Blaine that time. They did not go far before they found out they had grave difficulties to overcome in the way of making the treaty. There were bye-elections coming on, and they delayed the meeting until after the elections. There was another thing the Minister of Justice said last night. It appears that it takes a telegram six months to come from Washington here, or at least, it is six months before the Minister of Justice gets them. You would almost think the policy of this Government was a canal policy and not an electric policy, keeping up with the progress of this age. They went down on the 10th February, the bye-elections were coming on. The previous time everything was to be kept quiet according to the wish of Mr. Blaine, but this time everything, so far as our Ministers are concerned, was to be kept quiet, mum was the word. They said to the people: We are going to get a treaty, we are going to get better markets for the people of this country, but our deliberations cannot be made known until we meet Parliament, and we do not intend to meet Parliament until after the bye-elections are over. I understand that the Finance Minister went on a platform and told the people that the Ministers were going to Washington to make a treaty. Well, when they got down to Washington, we have from the Minister of Finance a statement of what they did at Washington. It is in his own words here, and I will read a little of it just to show you how devotedly they were attached to the desire of getting reciprocity with the United States. In the first place the Minister says:

"We met the Secretary of State in conference. I may say this, and I think it is nothing more than right to say it, that Mr. Blaine met us with the greatest kindness and courtesy. Although not in the enjoyment of robust health, and although he was in the midst of the arduous duties of a session of Congress, in the midst of diplomatic correspondence of a weighty and grave character, he gave up his time to the delegation of Canada, and for five successive days met them in full and frank and prolonged conference upon the various points treated of between the two."

Now, then they went on to propound their ideas; it was on the basis of the old reciprocity. Mr. Blaine said to them:

"He raised the question, as did also General Foster, who was his coadjutor in the conference, as to whether we were prepared to meet a proposal which would go wider than natural products, and take in and include a general reciprocity in manufactured articles as well."

Mr. Blaine raised that point, and how did they meet it? The deputation stood there, I fancy, in fear and trembling. Their masters who had sent them there, the Red Parlour, had told them: "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther"; and when Mr. Blaine propounded this policy, what we desire, and what we believe the people of this country desire, and they would say so if they had a free opportunity of expressing their will—when Mr. Blaine raised the question that he was prepared to talk to them about, that is to say, reciprocity on unrestricted lines, then they began to shiver, then they began to quake, they began to wonder what excuse they were going to make. We find this proposal of Mr. Blaine was met in this way:

"When that point came up"——

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend, I hope is not going to read the whole of that speech. It refers to a former debate. Though I am quite willing to give him the utmost latitude, still the hon. gentleman can hardly read the whole of that speech.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I quite agree with you: I am only going to read a few lines.—

"When that point came up, the Canadian delegation immediately raised the question and discussed it fully and freely with Mr. Blaine as to what would be the necessary conditions of such a reciprocity. Did it mean that we were to give United States products and manufactures preferential treatment in our country and discriminate against like articles from Great Britain and from other parts of the world."

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must not continue to quote from a former debate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will you let me read about the difficulties?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may state what he pleases, but he must not read from a former debate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I just want to state the difficulty: I will just give you a synopsis of the difficulty.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Very well, then I will let them deal with the difficulties themselves. As soon as Mr. Blaine proposed this, then our Ministers showed their difficulties, the lions in the way. How was our tariff to be made to assimilate with theirs? How were we to raise the revenue? And then they came down on their marrow bones before Mr. Blaine and said: Mr. Blaine, we never had much experience in these things. Of course we are the strongest Cabinet that ever met Parliament in Canada since Confederation, but we have not had much experience in reciprocity matters, neither do we know very well how to get out of the difficulties of the revenue. Now, Mr. Blaine, we are British subjects, but we do not think it beneath us to come to you for information. You know, Mr. Blaine, we are protectionists, just like you are, and we are only here to hoodwink the people, and we want your assistance, because you have had great experience. Now, this is about the way they approached Mr. Blaine. These are the utterances of the statesman himself, although I am not able to read them here to-night by reason of your ruling, in order to convince you of the soundness of the inferences which I draw from them. But I think the people of this country can draw their own inferences, and can see clearly that the Ministers went to Washington only to see how they could prevent any treaty being made in order to show the people that it was impossible to get a treaty made. And so we are to be excluded from the American markets by reason of their cartoons of the public men and the President of the United States, by reason of all the friction that they can create in order to disturb trade so that the United States may possibly be led to retaliate against the trade of our people. I do not believe there is a member of this Government who desires reciprocity with the United States. I believe they know full well that it would be fatal to their rule, and that it would be the end of their rule. Reciprocity with the United States would abolish the Red Parlour and the combines, and they live by the means of the combines and the Red Parlour. This Government could not stand for one day under a treaty of reciprocity, which would give our people freer air and better markets, and contribute in every way to building this country up as a great nation. We now have the English market, and hon. gentlemen opposite are never tired of telling us what we can sell in that market. Why, we sold in that market before many of the hon. gentlemen opposite were born. We have absolute freedom in that market, and we now want to secure a wider market for the products of the farm, one more convenient, and the value of our products would be enhanced by having two markets instead of one. There is the position, there is no use denying it. They cannot masquerade reciprocity any longer. They cannot deceive Parliament in regard to making a reciprocity treaty any longer, because now they have bolted and barred the door against it. They cannot take advantage of that pretense, and since the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance many of our people are leaving the country, their hopes are blighted by that speech and any one looking at the Minister would hardly imagine he could do so much ruin and drive so many people out of the country, as he has done since his Budget speech was delivered. I am a British subject, Canadian born. I should like to see a British Government here, one that would not take its first lessons in political economy from Yankee Blaine or any other Yankee. I want them to live at the foot of the Throne; I desire them to be British; I wish them to copy the tariff of England, and I wish them to be British in fact as well as in name. I do not wish to see our Commissioners going to Washington and saying: Dear Mr. Blaine, help us out of our difficulties; do you know any way in which we can raise the revenue? It is true that the present tariff has been our policy for years, and it was adopted because we were in desperate straits to get into power. Among the Commissioners who went to Washington was the new Minister of War, who was pitched out of the Customs by the Secretary of State. He was taken down there for the purpose of protecting the other two Ministers. They did not like again to go with the High Commissioner, they had to take the head of the Militia Department. He (Mr. Bowell) rode the Protestant horse, when in Opposition, but as soon as he got into power he put the horse in the stable, and it died of inanition, for he never had it out a day afterwards. He got into power through the influence of those friends, and he has never done anything for those friends since, except to pocket his salary and bank it every year. When their interests were at stake in this House he was found wanting; and the only thing that he ever did for the order that elected him was to vote for the passing of the Jesuit Estates Act. I can scarcely imagine one who had been a champion of British connection, when he went to Washington, and the three Ministers stood or sat down before, or at all events they were courteously received by the Premier of the United States, saying: Now, Mr. Blaine, do, for heaven's sake, tell us what we are going to do; tell us how we are going to get out of these difficulties. Do you not see the difficulties, Mr. Blaine? We would like to read what they are. Cannot you help us out of them, Mr. Blaine? What are we going to do? Just imagine Mr. Gladstone or Lord Salisbury acting thus. Look at the dignified bearing of Lord Salisbury at this time and o

British statesmen when negotiating with other nations. And look at our ministerial giants, who were to meet Parliament this session, going down to Mr. Blaine, the Yankee leader, and saying: Dear Mr. Blaine, we implore you to help us, to show us how we are going to raise this revenue when this arrangement has been made; you have had great experience, we have not been in Parliament very long; we have been very friendly to you; our Premier was at one time in favour of annexing our whole country to the United States; our Minister of Justice was formerly your standing counsel in law; as for ourselves, we have other cords that bind us to your great Republic; cannot you assist us, British subjects, to frame a treaty? No plan was found. The difficulties were insurmountable and the Minister of War sounded the bugle, and the giant brigade fell into line and beat a hasty retreat from Washington and came home. The treaty is *nil*. The work they did was a comedy; the termination of it was a farce. Everybody knows it, there is no use attempting to disguise it. The day has come when we must speak our minds plainly and boldly, and tell hon. gentlemen opposite face to face what we think about these actions. The Minister of Justice last night attributed to me something of which I did not altogether understand the meaning. I am not a lawyer, and perhaps I do not understand legal phraseology, but he used language in regard to a word that I used about a letter which I do not think was courteous from a gentleman occupying his position. The Minister of Finance had adopted the same tone, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has treated me with some discourtesy. But these matters make no difference with my relations to them—our relations are not strained. I do not care what they say, but I call the attention of the House to these circumstances in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may deal in a more courteous manner with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. On looking into public affairs I find that in the reorganizing of this Government which was to be so strong and in which every important interest was to be represented, the promises made have not been fulfilled. We have a very large export trade in fish, in the products of the forest, in the products of the mine, and in agricultural and manufacturing products, and during the last four years we exported from these sources $360,000,000 of products. In the formation of this Cabinet not a single one of these interests has been considered. There is not a gentleman in the Cabinet who represents the mining, the fishing, the forest, the agricultural or the manufacturing interest. The only accession to the power and strength of the Cabinet has been made in the legal profession, the Cabinet has two more lawyers this year than last year, and this makes it strong. Now it is composed of seven lawyers, one ex-journalist, an ex-miller, the Minister of the Interior is a surveyor—I believe in the *Parliamentary Companion*. The Minister of Inland Revenue is entered as a judge; Mr. Carling is a brewer—they were bound to keep him in. So there are two retired judges in the Cabinet now, but there is not a single representative of these large interests to which I have referred. On the reorganization of the Cabinet, representatives of these industries could not be found on the back benches, and only lawyers could be taken into the Cabinet. It is a singular thing that after the bye-elections they made known very soon their failure in Washington, but they took care not to make it known until after the elections. It does look to be a confirmation of the idea that this was never intended as a serious thing and that this was all done as a blind to mislead the people, to get them out of their regular way of thinking and lead them to forget the Government and what the Government had done in the reckless expenditure of the people's money. We were told that when they introduced the great National Policy it was to stop the exodus from this country. I have already told you, and you already know that the census confirms the statement, that the exodus has been greater under the high protective tariff than ever it was at any period within the history of Canada. Now when the Government have failed to get a reciprocity treaty I would like to ask them this: They raised the tariff for the purpose of getting a reciprocity treaty; they failed to get a reciprocity treaty, and I ask the Government now will they lower the duties, will they give the country a chance to progress when the object for which they avowedly raised the duty has been a failure? Will they tax the people less than they have been taxing them for the last 14 years; will they now give the country a respite from this high taxation, when they announce that their mission has failed and signally failed? They talk about our policy leading to annexation, but if I were a Tory that is the last question I would ever think of talking about, because all along the history of that party you will find that their policy has tended, and that their party in many instances has openly advocated annexation. Even now a large colony of their party in the Province of Ontario are going around and giving lectures in favour of annexation. They say that our policy leads to annexation, and they have quoted Mr. Blake in reference to that. I, too, will quote what Mr. Blake says and before doing so I would like to say of Mr. Blake, that with the evidence before him, with the evidence of the operation of the tariff for 12 years, with all these facts before him, I think that Mr. Blake, on a question of that character, is as eminently fit to judge as any man that can be found in Canada. Mr. Blake is a gentleman of such great caution that he was almost timid in looking into the future, but take him on evidence, and I think that he is an authority that cannot be gainsaid on a matter of that kind. Here is what Mr. Blake says about the National Policy:

"The Canadian Conservative policy has failed to accomplish the predictions of its promoters.

"Its real tendency has been, as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and the maintenance of that British connection of which they claim to be the special guardians.

"It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration and a North-West empty still; with enormous additions to our public debt and yearly charge, an extravagant system of expenditure, and an unjust and oppressive tariff: with restricted markets for our needs, whether to buy or to sell, and all the host of evils (greatly intensified by our special condition) thence arising; with trade diverted from its natural into forced and therefore less profitable channels, and with unfriendly relations and frowning tariff walls, ever more and more estranging us from the mighty English speaking nation to the south, our neighbours and relations, with whom we ought to be, as it was promised that we should be, living in generous amity and liberal intercourse.

"Worse; far worse! It has left us with lowered standards of public virtue and a deathlike apathy in public opinion; with racial, religious and provincial animosities

rather inflamed than soothed: with a subservient Parliament, an autocratic Executive, debauched constituencies and corrupted and corrupting classes; with lessened self-reliance and increased dependence on the public chest and on legislative aids, and possessed withal by a boastful jingo spirit far enough removed from true manliness, loudly proclaiming unreal conditions and exaggerated sentiments, while actual facts and genuine opinions are suppressed.

"It has left us with our hands tied, our future compromised, and in such a plight that, whether we stand or move, we must run some risks which else we might have either declined or encountered with greater promise of success.

"Yet let us never despair of our country! It is a goodly land: endowed with great recuperative powers and vast resources as yet almost undeveloped; inhabited by populations moral and religious, sober and industrious, virtuous and thrifty, capable and instructed—the descendants of a choice immigration, of men of mark and courage, energy and enterprise, in the breasts of whose children still should glow the sparks of those ancestral fires."

These are words of wisdom coming from Mr. Blake, who as a lawyer stands very high, and who as one able to express his opinion on evidence has perhaps no equal in this country. Protection is fatal to progress, and it has shown itself to be so in this country. The census returns are the proof of that fact, and there is no gainsaying it. It requires no argument to prove that protection has been deadly to our progress, that it has turned out of trade millions of dollars which should have been left invested in profitable pursuits. It is calculated to undermine the wealth and to destroy the character of the people of this country. It is calculated to build up a few industries, but its operations are hurtful to the great mass of the people of this country. One thing is certain, that if the Liberals were in power and could not get reciprocity, they could lower the taxes, and that would be a great boon to the people of this country. And if the Liberals should attain to power, and should be able to negotiate a treaty, as I believe they would; in the negotiation of that treaty the Liberals would not sacrifice Canadian dignity nor Canadian integrity to the United States, nor Canadian interests to Great Britain. There is one thing the people of this country can rely upon, and that is, that the best interests of Canada will be preserved and protected in any treaty which we will make, and if we had fair-play in this country, we believe we would have an opportunity of making a treaty. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, the way in which the Liberal party is handicapped in this country. See the improper use that is made of the means that are at the disposal of the Government. Look at the gerrymander, look at their Franchise Act, look at their patronage, look at the Senate, look at the public buildings which they use as instruments of corruption throughout the different ridings, look at their railway subsidies, which are calculated, I believe, not to develop the railway interests but to develop the political interests of the party which is now in power. I believe the day is coming when honesty must prevail in the government of this country. I believe that the people of this country will soon get tired of the means adopted by the present Government, and although gentlemen opposite have succeeded in the bye-elections by the use of means dishonourable and dishonest, which when they are well understood and known by the people it will be found that the small majorities have been won by stuffing the ballot boxes of the free people of this country. I believe that it will be disclosed, and that before very long, that bogus votes have been shoved into the boxes, and that the narrow majorities which are held by the Conservative candidates are held because of the bogus votes which were shoved into the ballot boxes by scoundrels who formed the brigade attached to that party. The idea of holding the bye-elections first in one riding and then a few days afterwards in another, was, I believe, to hold them just in time to let this brigade of 60 get from one riding to another, and to allow them to play their nefarious practices in the dark, up and down the line. Probably the people will find out that the money they used has been taken out of the pockets of the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite will understand the means that have been used; there is not a doubt of that. It is becoming known daily; and these things will go on until I hope the people will rise in their might and demand that the Government that rules in this British Canada of ours will be an honest government, and when boodle and ballot-stuffing, and bribing of the electors, will forever pass away from this country.

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

(In the Committee.)

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary . . $99,301 13

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to know whether the ordinary supplies for this penitentiary are purchased by tender and whether the lowest tender is always accepted. There are several items in connection with convict clothing on which I would like some information.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Tenders for convict clothing are called for every year in time for the contracts to be made from the 1st of July. The lowest tender has been accepted in every case since I have been in the department, with the exception of one case in which there was a difference of a few dollars which were accounted for in some other way. Practically, the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know whether circulars were sent to different parties asking them to tender, or whether they were advertised for in the ordinary way?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not send around circulars for tenders. We advertise in all the principal papers of Montreal in both languages.

Mr. LAURIER. I notice with great pleasure that of late years the administration of this penitentiary seems to have been placed on a better footing than it was a few years ago, when it had reached a stage very close to absolute disorganization. Yet a statement was made to me privately during the recess that the discipline of the penitentiary was not as good as it might be. I say this with great diffidence, and I would not mention it if I did not find in the report of the inspector a confirmation of the statement. The complaint I have heard is that the guardians of the convicts and the officers generally do not present as good an appearance in point of decorum, manners and discipline as might have been expected. It was suggested that probably these men were selected far more for political reasons, to reward political services, than for efficiency. Mr. Moylan seems to confirm this statement when he says in his report at pages 12 and 13:

"A great drawback to the work of reformation is the lack of training and of the essential qualifications in the officers, who are placed in charge of convicts, especially the guards. As a rule, these men have no previous knowledge of the duties which they undertake. They are unacquainted with the various phases and peculiarities of human character, and least of all, perhaps, with the nature and disposition of those with whom they are to be brought into daily and hourly contact. Their duties are too continuous and varied, as guards, to allow them time to supply the deficiency under which they labour, as regards the acquiring of the experience, tact and self-control requisite for the due fulfilment of the trust confided to them. Hence, those duties are generally discharged in a perfunctory and unsatisfactory manner. They cannot help this: they do their best for the most part, according to their lights. It happens, too, not unfrequently, that officers give bad example to the prisoners in their charge by the display of ill-temper, by the use of unbecoming and even of immoral language, and by otherwise violating the rules which they should rigidly observe. All this has a very injurious effect upon good discipline, and upon the minds of the convicts, who are not slow in taking advantage of any wrong-doing by those to whose care they are confided. What is the remedy for this? Clearly, the appointment of men, better qualified by discipline, education and training for a position of such serious responsibility as a guard or keeper. The present standard, in these essentials, is far too low."

The inspector goes on to say that even though it is not necessary to increase the expenditure to remunerate these men, their inferiority should not be taken as a reason why that should not be done. Now, it seems to me that this is a valuable suggestion. I rather fear, from the statement made to me, and from what I see in the report of the inspector, that men are selected to be guards from among uneducated people. Though, of course, their education need not be of a very high character, some of the men appear to be wholly uneducated, absolutely unlettered. It seems to me that this is not the proper class of men from whom those officers ought to be taken. I do not affirm this as a fact, but I repeat it as it has been stated to me. If Mr. Moylan says that the character of the men selected for guards is not such as would warrant us in expecting that they would properly discharge their duties, it is a matter which the Minister should take into consideration with the view of making an improvement in that respect.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman intended to apply the remarks of the inspector to St. Vincent de Paul exclusively. In making his observations, that officer did not confine himself to any particular place, and with regard to the particular persons referred to, I have never heard that there was any distinction to the disadvantage of the officers there as compared with those of any other institution. On the contrary, when I visited that place, from all I heard and saw, the conduct of the officers appeared quite as good as that of the staff at Kingston or Dorchester or British Columbia. I would hardly include Stony Mountain, because there the officers have the advantage of superior training, as far as discipline is concerned. But with that exception, the officers at St. Vincent de Paul are quite as intelligent and as well informed and fit for their duties as any to be found anywhere else. At the same time I fully agree with the inspector that we cannot get our officers from as well trained a class as we should, but it is not political interference which is the cause. As far as the management is concerned, we abstain altogether from influencing the warden in the selection of his officers. The Governor in Council of course has the appointment of the warden and the deputy warden, but the warden alone appoints his guards and keepers, and until the report is published I do not know the names of these officers. I have in fact the greatest hesitation in even recommending a person from my constituency I think fit for the place, as the warden might suppose I was endeavouring to influence his judgment. It is a mistake to say these men are wholly illiterate. The regulations require that they shall have ordinary rudimentary education, and they are generally selected on account of being physically qualified, active, intelligent men, and it is a great consideration they should have some knowledge of discipline. I agree with the views of the inspector as to the necessity of men more highly trained being engaged, men if possible who have been in the mounted police or perhaps in the British army, who at any rate have some training and notion of discipline, and can give a better example in bearing and conduct and language than the ordinary labourer can, and it is principally from the labouring class we have to recruit our guards and keepers. But that cannot be done without increasing everywhere the allowance, and I am determined, if possible, to ask Parliament to increase the allowance with the view of the improvement of the force. I explained to the hon. member for Yarmouth that I hoped to present next session a scheme for carrying out some of the views in the report with regard to a new reformatory for some of the younger convicts who are undergoing a first sentence and whose numbers I regret to say are somewhat startling, and with respect to whom we may fairly expect, as the inspector indicates, there will be better hope for improvement, if they be separated from the habitual convicts with whom they now have to resort. On both these matters I hope to be able to present to the House next session a scheme which will carry out, as far as possible, the views presented in the report, after hon. members have had time to consider them, but I will only be able to do so if the House will generously give me an amount large enough for that purpose.

Mr. LAURIER. In the remarks I made a few moments ago, I certainly did not intend to convey the impression that the administration of the penitentiary does not compare favourably with that of the other institutions. I never heard anything to that effect, but simply the remark was made to me, and no doubt that remark will apply also to the other penitentiaries. There was nothing in particular in the remark except that the appearance of the guard was slovenly; and no doubt if there was some military discipline in the penitentiary, the administration would be better. Nothing more was conveyed to me, but I was struck with the same remark made in the report. There is a good deal in what the Minister says as to the money grant not enabling a better selection of officers to be made, and I am sure the House will not begrudge the necessary money in order to put the administration of our penitentiaries on a better footing.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the Auditor General's Report, page B-128, I find that under the heading of rations, apples were bought at $5 a barrel, butter, 1,550 lbs. at 20 cents a pound. I cannot understand why the penitentiary should pay such an enormous price, especially if these rations were supplied by ten-

der. Take flour, 370 barrels at $5.80; lard, 1,080 lbs. at 12 cents per pound. If the hon. Minister will turn to the Kingston rations, he will find that lard was bought at 9¼ cents. Cornmeal, 600 lbs. at 3 cents. We know that is the retail price, and it is most singular if tenders were called for that the retail price should be paid. Molasses, 640 gallons at 45 cents; pork, 1,440 lbs. at 10¾ cents; pease, 21 bushels at $1.05, and I venture to say there has not been that price paid in Canada during the last twelve months. Potatoes, 121 bushels at $1.50, 126 bushels at $1.05, 8 bushels at 75 cents and 8 at $1.10. Tobacco, 2,422 lbs. at 48 cents. I suppose the convicts require something in the way of tobacco, but I think there was no necessity for its costing anything like that. Another item I call attention to is, Richard Gadbois, retired, $769.86. I would like to know under what circumstances that sum was granted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was one of the officers of the penitentiary, and that is his retiring gratuity when he left on the ground of ill-health. He must have had long service to receive that amount, probably twenty years.

Mr. McMULLEN. I presume that the officers in the penitentiaries can be superannuated?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No: not under the rank of deputy warden.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister say that these supplies were furnished after tenders were asked and under contracts let?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. I do say so unequivocally. Of course, some of those articles would differ in price according to the season at which they were purchased. For instance, I think the potatoes to which the hon. gentleman has referred were probably seed potatoes. A considerable quantity of potatoes is grown on the farm of the penitentiary. Then as to eggs, eggs are not used in the penitentiaries except for the patients in the hospital or on Christmas day, when a little better fare than usual is given to the convicts. I do not think the price for butter is extravagant, and there is not much butter used. All these articles have been supplied by contract and after tenders had been asked for. It is true that there has been a considerable discrepancy in the past in the prices paid at the different penitentiaries. I have endeavoured to remedy that since the 1st July, my attention having been called to it, and now the contractor contracts to supply the articles, at the option of the Government, to one or all of the penitentiaries in the Dominion at the stipulated price.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear the statement of the Minister, and I hope the result will be that some of these articles will be obtained at a less cost than in the past. I can understand that at some periods of the year supplies would cost more than at others, but I do not remember when butter was worth 20 cents a pound last year, unless it was creamery butter, and surely the Government are not supplying creamery butter to the convicts in the penitentiaries. In the west of Ontario you can get good dairy butter for 14 cents a pound, and in Montreal it is even less.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is evidently not speaking from experience in housekeeping in Ottawa.

Mr. McMULLEN. Surely the hon. gentleman does not get the supplies for the penitentiaries in Ottawa?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, but the prices are higher in Montreal.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is no place in Canada where you can buy the ordinary commodities, such as butter, cheese and peas, as cheaply as in Montreal.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can only say that if the hon. gentleman will get some one to tender at that price, I will give him the contract for all the penitentiaries in Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have seen the prices quoted in the *Empire*. If I know the period when the hon. gentleman sends out his tenders I will get some one to tender. I will not tender myself, because that might put me out of my seat, and I am sure that would be a great loss to the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think it is a wise provision that any person contracting should, at the option of the Government, be obliged to supply all the penitentiaries. That might safely be provided in regard to the penitentiaries in Ontario or Quebec or the Lower Provinces, but it would be hardly fair to oblige a man to supply a penitentiary in British Columbia or Manitoba. I think the prices at which the Government have been buying flour are very high indeed, and I would like to know when those contracts expire and for what length of time the tenders are called for. I am sure that I could furnish flour or get it furnished at far less prices. Do the tenders expire on the 1st July?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the 1st July.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And they are called for a year.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For a year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And then new tenders will be required to be put in to the Government about what time?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. By the 30th June, I think, but we advertise extensively.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Could the Minister of Justice tell me about what particular grade of flour is used?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Strong bakers. I do not know what penitentiary the hon. gentleman has in his mind when he says we pay a very high price for flour. I was under the impression that we got our flour at a very reasonable rate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the price now paid in this penitentiary is very much above the market price.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I observe that in the Kingston penitentiary and also under the one under discussion we have a vote for a schoolmaster, while in Manitoba we have that combined with a hospital overseer, and in British Columbia the vote is for accountant, storekeeper and schoolmaster. What is the duty of the schoolmaster? Is it to give instruction to some of the younger convicts, and at what time is the instruction conveyed? Is there a day school, or are there classes or what?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The convicts are formed into classes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At night?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, in the day-time, at various hours of the day, and during the time when it would not be reasonable that they should have that amount of recreation, from half an hour to an hour.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that the younger convicts?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All those convicts who are illiterate. In Kingston, the duties have been distributed among several officers, it being found more convenient there to have the prisoners continuously under the charge of the guards. At Stony Mountain the schoolmaster is also the hospital keeper, and it is found there to be more convenient to group them all. The duties of hospital overseer there are not very great, whereas in Kingston the hospital overseer has more than he can attend to.

Mr. FLINT. I see under the heading of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, there are certain charges for travelling, but there are no charges of a like kind with regard to the Dorchester Penitentiary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul is about 13 miles from Montreal, and the warden has frequently to visit Montreal on business. Dorchester Penitentiary is in the village, and the nearest city is half a day's journey away.

Mr. BOWERS. I see in the accounts that lamp wicks are charged at 90 cents a dozen, and lamp chimneys 20 cents a piece. I sell these things myself, and I cannot understand such high prices.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are different sums there. I do not know the reason of the variety, unless some of them are for lanterns which are placed in conspicuous positions about the yard for lighting at night. A large variety of wicks are required, it is a wicked place.

Mr. BOWERS. The very largest wick that would burn out half a gallon of oil a night, retails for five cents.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We do not want a wick like that.

Mr. BOWERS. For that reason these must have been the smaller wicks. I think there is something wrong in the charge.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is well that we should criticise these items. It is clear from the quotations given from the Auditor General's Report that a great saving could be made in the expense on our penitentiaries. I am not charging the Minister of Justice with neglect, but I believe that the retail price in many cases here, is charged in place of the wholesale price. The tenderers must surely have a loop-hole by which they can get in such enormous prices as are here quoted, instead of giving the wholesale prices upon which these commodities should be supplied. We have a number of these institutions in this country, and it is only by criticisms of this kind that we can hope to reduce their cost. Last year the Auditor General gave us a *per capita* cost of the maintenance of those convicts, but I notice his report does not give that this year. I think we should have information by which we can compare the cost of keeping the inmates of these institutions with the cost in other countries. I think the Auditor General's Report should contain each year the *per capita* cost of keeping these convicts, and that would enable us to judge whether the annual charge upon the resources of this country for the maintenance of these institutions, is increasing or decreasing. Last year it cost us something like $2.86 per head for the inmates of the Manitoba Penitentiary, which was the highest rate, and the next was the penitentiary which we are now discussing, and to the best of my recollection the Kingston Penitentiary was the lowest. I think the prices here reported in connection with the items supplied to this penitentiary, are far in excess of what they should be. These tenders and the bills of these supplies, should be carefully investigated in order that we may see if some reduction cannot be made.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps every article is not contracted for separately. There is a great variety of articles that have to be contracted for. I see some small amounts like $3 and $4. Does the contract cover all the items that we find under this expenditure, or are they contracted for separately?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There must always be some left that cannot be thought of, but the call for tenders does go greatly into details, and it includes all that the warden foresees would be required.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps it arises in this way with some of those items. Does the one person tender for all this variety of articles? If so, it may be by averaging them, one article may be lower, while another article might be very much higher.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the case. For instance, groceries. They tender for sugar, for flour, butter, salt and everything in the grocery line. When a person tenders the prices for which he will supply per pound, the warden supplies the estimates of the quantities required, he applies his quantities to those tenders, and the contract is awarded to the person who appears to have made the lowest tender.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did one person supply all these items, or were contracts let to several parties? Does one tenderer agree to supply all the different articles?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, we keep flour separate; we find it better to do that. In some cases, thinking that the prices that were demanded for flour were too high, we supplied the prison from Ontario. On another occasion I made an arrangement with the merchant who had been supplying us with flour, whose tender I thought was altogether too high, he thought it was not too high, and one made an agreement with me to furnish me flour at the market prices ruling at the time. We paid him at the regular quoted prices in the city of Montreal, making a slight allowance for transportation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who tendered for the flour?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not remember who has the contract this year.

Mr. FAUVEL. What was the nature of the commission of enquiry for which this sum is required to pay Mr. Moylan?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was an enquiry which took place about ten years ago, before I came to the department. One of the commissioners

Mr. Baillairgé, the late Deputy Minister of Public Works, had been paid, I think, $500. He had assisted the inspector of penitentiaries, but no allowance had been made for the inspector on the ground that he was already in receipt of a salary. Last year a special vote was made by Parliament equal to half the amount that was paid to Mr. Baillairgé.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In the receipts there is rent, $359. Is part of the premises rented?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are two or three cottages in which the officers are allowed to live on paying a rental of $50 a year each.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was supplied by the Oxford Manufacturing Co., for which an item of $5,455 appears?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Convict clothing, uniforms for guards and keepers.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I thought they were all made in the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is for furnishing the cloth.

Mr. LAURIER. With respect to the revenue from the penitentiary, do I understand that the revenue is collected from the parties to whom articles are sold?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. The officers are allowed to buy from the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How do the earnings of the convicts now compare with former years? This seems to be a very small amount. Formerly I think the labour of the convicts was farmed out, and there were contracts made with parties outside for the sale of the products. The notion came to be general here, I think, on the Ministerial side, that it was unfair that a prisoner should be competitor with others outside. It was thought that everything except articles required for the convicts themselves should be excluded from their occupation, and that they should be placed at some employment in which they should not come into competition with any industry actually in existence in the country. How far is that policy now adhered to, and what course is adopted in respect to the labour of the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When I came into the department the labour of the convicts in the Kingston Penitentiary was farmed out to a locksmith. It was rather remunerative, so far as the prison was concerned. We had some 80 convicts employed by him at a price which probably paid for their ordinary maintenance, not including ordinary management and prison salaries. There was a statute which declared that this system should cease when all the existing contracts ran out. This contract expired about three years ago, and we gave the contractor notice that under the statute it could not be renewed. We have had some difficulty since in securing employment for the men, and we would have experienced greater difficulty if it had not been for the work carried on there in connection with the construction of a new inner prison in which there will be more seclusion afforded for convicts both of the worse and better class, with a view to providing them with work in their own cells and keeping them separate. The employment of these convicts, who were formerly engaged at lockmaking, on prison construction has resulted in the building at very little cost to the country of a very fine structure for that purpose. So soon as this building is completed, I shall have to give attention to the furnishing of prison employment to a large number of convicts, and I propose to establish industries which will be carried on with as little machinery as possible, in order to give as much work as possible to the convicts and interfere as little as possible with outside employment.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I hope the Government will change the policy on which they entered when they passed the statute to which the Minister has referred. It seems a very extraordinary condition that instead of undertaking to make a penitentiary self-sustaining and compelling prisoners by their industry to support themselves, we should adopt a policy which will make their labour as little remunerative as possible, so that the burden of the maintenance of the convicts, the dishonest and criminal section should fall on the honest and industrious portion. The law-abiding and industrious portion of the community are compelled from their industry to support those who were lawless and whose liberty was dangerous to the rest of the community. I have not been able myself to understand upon what theory of political economy a Government or Parliament should come to the conclusion that it was really injurious to the industrial class outside of the penitentiary that those men who, if they were honest and true, would be so many competitors outside, when in prison should be prohibited from engaging in those duties that were most advantageous to the public and the least burdensome as regards the maintenance of the institutions. We should undertake to make the penitentiaries as little burdensome to the people as possible, and if they could be made self-sustaining that should be done; and the labours in which the prisoners are engaged should be of that kind in which they could find employment in future.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that a pair of buffalo robes was charged $90, three horse blankets $18, saddle bag, $10. The Minister can hardly consider these to be fair prices. I never heard of such prices being paid before. Are these articles included in the contract for which tenders were asked.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, they are not. They are articles furnished for the carriage and horses which belong to the prison and are for the prison service. The buffalo robes are for the carriage which goes in and out of the city when required for prison duty. I do not know anything about the prices of the articles, I am sorry to say.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hope the hon. gentleman will instruct the officers not to ask him to defend such items another year. These charges are altogether beyond reason, and the Opposition would be acting improperly in allowing such items to pass without protest.

Manitoba Penitentiary $45,388 30

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to notice a very large decrease here, and I would like to know how it has been secured.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With reference to the salaries, a new office, that of assistant accountant

and store-keeper has been created at $700 a year, but this increase has been set off by a decrease of $400 on the total salaries; the salary of the present warden is $350 less than that of the late warden. On maintenance there is a decrease of $1,420. It is the intention to grow more vegetables on the farm than formerly, which will reduce the cost for rations about $500. There is a decrease of $200 in the travelling expenses of convicts, and some other decreases on other items. On the repair expenses there is a decrease of $6,000, there is not so much coal or wood estimated for, and repairs to machinery and buildings formerly included are not included this year. There is a reduction on the amount for farm implements, as it is the intention of the warden to grow oats and other such crops.

Mr. WATSON. I am sure the House must be pleased at this report, and I was going to call attention to a few items in connection with the farm, but I suppose as the system is going to be changed it is not necessary. We find that each year there was a large expenditure on the farm for implements while at the same time they were buying large supplies of feeding for their stock in connection with that farm. It always appeared to me there was a great waste in that connection in the penitentiary. I find that the penitentiary bought 3,162 pounds of butter at 25 cents per pound. I have some knowledge of the price of butter in Manitoba and I am able to buy first-class butter at much less than the average price of 20 cents per pound all the year round. In the fall we can get first-class dairy butter for 20 cents per pound. I would like to ask the Minister also if supplies such as beef and mutton are secured by tender, and if the lowest tender is always accepted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We always ask for tenders for these supplies, and we always give the contract to the lowest tenderer, unless he is a person who has a very bad record as contractor, which is sometimes the case. I am under the impression that there is a contract for it, and that it was given to the lowest tenderer this year.

Mr. WATSON. I do not know if I am correctly informed or not, but I think I am. I believe that tenders were asked for the supply of beef this year, and that the contractor who had the supply for five or six years previously tendered at 5 cents per pound for beef and 9 cents for mutton; but the contract was let to another man at 5½ cents for beef and 9 cents for mutton. As there are 50,000 lbs. of beef used there, it makes quite a difference in the cost. I have not seen any report that the beef supplied by the contractor for the last six years has not been satisfactory. In fact he informs me that he never had any complaint of his beef from the officers who received it; but notwithstanding his tender at 5 cents per pound is thrown out, and the contract let at 5½ cents.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I had some vague recollections of a difficulty when the tenders came in, and the remark of the hon. gentleman refreshes my memory. The person who had the contract up to the 1st of July supplied us with beef at a lower rate and offered to do it for the future. We would not give him the contract for nothing. The meat he furnished was badly furnished in violation of the contract. It was giving us constant trouble, and he made on the supplies furnished us a great deal more money, although his tender was lower, than the present contractor. Before concurrence I will have the papers brought down and the hon. gentleman can have an opportunity of further looking into the matter.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask if the beef received under this contract is dealt out to the officers in connection with the penitentiary at contract prices.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. It appears to me that the Government is going into the retail butcher business in dealing out meat to the officers. I have learned that some complaints were made about this beef, but the contractor previous to last July informed me that the best cuts were selected and given to the employés about the penitentiary, and the balance was given to the convicts. If that is the case, it cannot be surprising if some complaints have been made of the beef furnished to the convicts. I do not know that the Government have a right to give a contract for beef at half a cent a pound more than the lowest tenderer offered to furnish it at; because the beef has to undergo inspection by the steward, and if it does not comply with the conditions of the tender, he has a right to refuse it. Besides, the contractor has to give some guarantee that he will furnish the beef according to tender, and I do not think the Government have a right in advance to judge what kind of beef it will be. If they did this, there would be nothing to prevent them giving the contract to a friend of theirs at one or two cents a pound above what they could obtain beef for from others. If the papers are brought down, we shall no doubt see whether any complaint was made to the contractor as to the quality of the beef furnished by him. I am informed that there was no complaint.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). I wish to say that complaints were continually made to me during the last three years by the various officers of the penitentiary, that the meat furnished was of inferior quality.

Mr. WATSON. Complaints may have been made to the hon. member for Lisgar, but I do not know that he is the proper officer to receive complaints. If the steward, whose duty it is to receive the meat, passes it, that is all that should be required.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman as to the right of a member of Parliament to hear complaints about the management of the penitentiaries. I am much obliged to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross) in undertaking to find out how matters are looked after, and it will assist the management of these institutions if members will visit them as often as possible, and make themselves acquainted with the way in which they are managed; and it will also have a good effect on the management itself. As regards our method of obtaining a supply of beef, I am aware that the butchers of Winnipeg object to that very strongly; but I do not care how strongly they think about it. If it is proper, consistent with my duty to this Parliament and the effective management of the prison or penitentiary, I am not going to consult the butchers of Winnipeg as to whether it is in their interest or not. The Stony Mountain staff is a little colony about thirteen miles from Winnipeg. The officers have no time or opportunity to leave their duties and go to Winnipeg and buy supplies.

There is absolutely no market surrounding the place, the nearest market being Winnipeg, and if they had to go there for their supplies, we should have very little of their time for prison duties. We therefore made our arrangements with all our contractors, not only that they should supply what was needed for the prisoners, but also what would be required for the officers. The officers receive their supplies at contract prices, and the amount is deducted from their wages at the end of each month. I do not understand that there was a complaint from the convicts in regard to their food. On the contrary, I think they are well contented with it. The complaint is on the part of the prison authorities who receive the meat. It is not a good answer to say that this beef is subject to inspection, and need not be taken if it is not according to the contract. We do not want to deal with a contractor who comes fifteen miles from the nearest market. If any of the meats were refused, the prisoners might be left without supplies.

Mr. WATSON. If any complaint was ever made of the meat supplied, the Mines Co., is perfectly right: but if no complaint was made, and this man was refused the contract at half a cent a pound less than the person who got it, then a wrong was done to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that 21 cents a gallon was paid for 3,000 gallons of coal oil. I would like to know whether it is American or Canadian oil.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is American oil.

Mr. McMULLEN. It seems to me it is hardly fair to the Canadian industries that American oil should be used in our penitentiaries. Even for American oil, 21 cents a gallon seems to be an enormous price. I would like to ask if tenders were called, how many were given, and whether the lowest tender was accepted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Tenders were asked and the lowest was accepted. In consequence of our being told last session that the price was very high which we were paying for oil, I took the greatest pains to endeavour to get it at the lowest price this year, but the result was not very satisfactory. We rejected all the tenders which we received for oil under the supposition that by advertising in the oil districts of Ontario especially we could get the contract for oil at a very much lower price. But we have not been very successful. After using every effort of the warden and inspector, and advertising specially, we have not been able to do better. The quality of the oil furnished for a time under contract made with the oil producers of Ontario was not such as could be used with safety and advantage to the prison at all. It was destructive of lamps, blackened them and gave a poor light, and the warden made a complaint against it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the party who tendered to supply the oil live in Winnipeg?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is he a wholesale merchant?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will bring the contract down and also the contract we endeavoured to make this year.

Mr. WATSON. I think that coal oil is received at fair price in Manitoba. Retail we have to pay 35 cents per gallon. This is one of the items the Government have to pay one-third more for than they would have if the duty were off.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice some other items require explanation. There are fowls and turkeys, 333 lbs. at 14 cents.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. These are for the officers at Christmas time.

Mr. McMULLEN. Molasses, 335 gallons at 70 cents here and only 45 cents in other penitentiaries.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is accounted for by Dorchester being a great many hundred miles nearer the sea board.

British Columbia Penitentiary.. $53,384 47

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the working expenses there is an increase of $2,900 accounted for by increase in heating and lighting, in cementing the floor of the wing, the present oak floors rotting away, lumber, &c., to rebuild a new fence. Under the head of Miscellaneous, there is an increase of $4,041, owing to the introduction of the hot water system of heating.

Regina Gaol..... $16,324 95

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The estimate last year was purely experimental because we were just beginning to use the gaol and did not know exactly what staff we would require. We have been obliged to increase salaries by $1,690 owing to increase of $100 in the gaoler's salary, the appointment of a deputy gaoler at $750 and an engineer at $840, who is paid for at present by the Department of Public Works. The small increase to the gaoler's salary is in consequence of finding immediately, contrary to expectations, the prison full, and the appointment of a deputy gaolor was due to the same cause. The staff was too small, and there was nobody on it who had any acquaintance with prison work, so we sent from St. Vincent de Paul one of our best guards as deputy gaoler. There is an increase of $400 over last year's allowance for officers' uniforms. For maintenance the House granted last year the sum of $10,000 which was unnecessarily large. The working expenses, $5,830, are made up of wood and coal $2,250, light $256, stable and out-buildings $800, building ice-house $1,000, fencing, &c., $3,300, maintenance of machinery, including oil, tallow, sheet rubber packing, sole leather, &c., $847, chamois skins, pipes, &c., for the kitchen, $100, stationery $50.

Mr. McMULLEN. The one schedule of tenders I suppose, is issued to all parties when calling for tenders for commodities?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; and when people in the same line combine to keep prices unreasonably high, we get the supplies from another place.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 31st March, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEPUTY OF THE SERJEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to inform the House that the Serjeant-at-Arms has, with my approval, appointed William Henry Bowie to act as his deputy during his temporary absence or indisposition.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

TRANSFER OF SHARES IN CORPORATIONS.

Mr. IVES moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 48) respecting the transfer of shares in corporations. He said: The principle upon which Parliament has proceeded has been to protect corporations, and to protect the creditors of corporations, but has not to any very great extent suited the convenience of business men who desire to make transfers. My amendment will not at all interfere with the rights of corporations to recognize transfers of stock, nor will it prevent creditors from exercising their rights over corporations, of preventing the transfer of shares where there is double liability, or in cases where there is an unpaid portion of the stock. It refers simply to fully paid-up stock, and provides that a transfer in writing made by the owner of the stock on a power of attorney executed by the owner of the stock shall bind all parties except the corporation, shall in fact make the title perfect in the transferee, subject to the right of the corporation afterwards to disavow the transfer if they have just cause for doing so. If this Bill becomes law, it will enable business men residing at a distance from the headquarters of the company to obtain loans, temporary or otherwise, or to make sales and receive the money without waiting for some days or perhaps a week until the transfer can be entered in the books of the company at headquarters and returned to them. The time has come when the convenience of business men should be considered, and happily, I think, it can be considered without doing away with the safeguards which the law has thrown around the corporation and the creditor.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ALFRED PINSONNEAULT.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked, Whether Alfred Pinsonneault, harbour master and inspector of the Chambly Canal, at St. John's, has resigned his position? If so, has he resigned in favour of his son, a farmer of St. Jacques le Mineur, and has the latter been appointed?

Mr. TUPPER. Alfred Pinsonneault has not resigned his position as harbour master, and does not hold the position of inspector of the Chambly Canal.

CANADIAN TOBACCO.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked, Whether is it the intention of the Government to continue in force the law preventing the cultivator from manufacturing into cut tobacco or cigars, tobacco required for his personal use?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not the intention to make any change in the law in respect to the manufacture or cutting of Canadian tobacco.

APPOINTMENT OF A POSTMASTER FOR THE PARISH OF L'ISLET.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (Translation) asked, What are the names of the persons who applied for the position of postmaster of the parish of L'Islet, after the death of the lady who held it, a few months ago? Who has been appointed, and by whom was the person so appointed recommended?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I have to say that applications were addressed to the department by P. R. A. Bélanger, Phédime Fortin, C. Leclerc and Amédée Plourde. The person appointed is Mr. P. R. A. Bélanger, The recommendations came from the member of the county.

ENQUIRY INTO THE DES AULNETS POST OFFICE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation) asked, Was an enquiry asked for with reference to the management of the post office of the village of Des Aulnets, in the County of L'Islet, and against the postmaster, Mr. Auguste Dupuis? If so, by whom, and on what grounds; and has the enquiry been granted, or is it the intention to grant it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) There was no enquiry asked for in reference to the management of the post office of the village of Des Aulnets, in the County of L'Islet.

THE STEAMER *ALERT*.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, Has an enquiry been held as to the cause of the loss of the steamer *Alert*, belonging to the Government and commanded by Captain Koeing? If so, who was charged with the enquiry, and what has been the result?

Mr. TUPPER. No enquiry has been held into the loss of the *Alert*, as that vessel was not lost. She is safe in the harbour at Quebec,

Mr. CHOQUETTE. But an accident happened last summer.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, a slight accident happened, but the steamer was not lost.

FRENCH REPORTS ON SUGAR-BEET CULTIVATION.

Mr. LANGELIER (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, Why the report of Professor Saunders on the cultivation of the sugar-beet has not been translated, printed and distributed in the French language? When members speaking the French language may hope to be furnished with copies in French of the said report?

Mr. FOSTER. The report of Professor Saunders on the cultivation of the beet-root was printed in

English and laid on the Table of the House. It is now being translated, and will be printed in French. I may also say that it has been distributed in English to the members and senators.

SUGAR-BEET BOUNTY.

Mr. LANGELIER (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, Whether the Government intend to continue for some years the bounty granted for two years for sugar made from sugar-beet grown in Canada? If so, for how many years?

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to say that I cannot give a definite answer to my hon. friend's question.

LOBSTERS AND WHITEFISH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. CORBOULD asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government during this season to place lobsters or lobster spawn in the waters of the Pacific in British Columbia? Also, whether it is the intention of the Government to place whitefish in the lakes of British Columbia?

Mr. TUPPER. It is not the intention to place lobsters or lobster spawn in the waters of the Pacific this season, nor is it the intention to place whitefish in the lakes of British Columbia this season.

POST OFFICE AT CAP ST. IGNACE.

M. CHOQUETTE (Translation) asked, Whether Mr. R. P. Vallée, Conservative candidate at the last provincial election in the County of Montmagny, made application, verbally or in writing, for the opening of a post office at Cap St. Ignace Station in the said county, which had been promised by the ex-Postmaster General? If so, when? And what was the reply made to his request?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member I have to say that Mr. R. P. Vallée did make application—I cannot say whether verbally or in writing—for the opening of a post office at Cap St. Ignace Station. The reply made by the Post Office Department was that when the opposition to such, as evinced by the petitions received by the department, was withdrawn, then the question of the opening of a post office at Cap St. Ignace would be taken in consideration.

REPORTS.

Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1891; Part I, Excise, &c.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Report of the Committee of the Privy Council in reference to cases of irregularity in the Civil Service.—(Mr. Foster.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When do the Government expect to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Civil Service Commission which was appointed some months ago, and which I understood would be in our hands by this time?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That Commission has not yet reported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you give us any idea as to when we may expect it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We expect to have it before the close of the session, but probably not for a month yet.

THE STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 13) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

That it is expedient to impose a fee of $10 for each inspection of a barge, boat, bateau, scow or undecked vessel required by "The Steamboat Inspection Act."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would be glad to have some explanation on the previous item, Bill No. 13, as that Bill and this resolution run together. The hon. gentleman did not happen to be in when the Bill was called.

Mr. TUPPER. I will make the explanation now. The Bill applies only to these scows. There are very few of them in Canada, and nearly all on the western coast, where they are used for carrying passengers and therefore come under the present law, and are subject to steamboat inspection, so far as concerns their safety for carrying passengers. We now pay to the hull inspector a fee of $10 for their inspection, and the fee is practically paid out of the Steamboat Inspection Fund; at any rate, we charge payments made for the inspection which the law now requires, to the Steamboat Inspection Fund. That is unfair to the owners of steamships generally who contribute to this fund, as, according as that fund is large or small in comparison with the expenditure, there is authority to fix the rate of inspection; so that as a matter of justice to those interested in the Steamboat Inspection Fund, and as a matter of administration, it is proposed to take authority to charge the owner of the passenger barge, this fee for inspection.

Resolution considered in committee, reported, and referred to Committee on Bill No. 13.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate.....$61,238

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to notice that there is some little reduction in the contingencies connected with the Senate, although any person who may go over the several items will come to the conclusion that there is great room for reduction. I would like to ask under whose charge or supervision are all the different items that are purchased and here entered in the list as contingencies for the Senate?

Mr. FOSTER. I think they are in charge of a committee of the Senate, called the Contingent Committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think some years a there was an attempt made to have an investigatig before the Public Accounts Committee with rega

to the expenditures of the Senate, but the committee were not able to get these people before it, in order to examine them. If we are asked to vote these amounts, the expenditure should be made under the supervision of the Public Accounts Committee, and the officers of the Senate should appear before that committee and answer all questions in connection with the expenditure. The committee of the Senate did not feel that their officers should be expected to appear before the Public Accounts Committee. If we are supposed to investigate all matters of expenditure in the country's interest, all officers of Parliament should be subject to the orders of the Public Accounts Committee, and be prepared to give information when called upon.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be very satisfactory so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, but we must recollect that the Senate is a body sitting as a part of this Parliament, and that they have the management of their own affairs. They have their Public Accounts Committee and their own methods of auditing and arranging and supervising these matters. We must give them credit for being able to arrange these details, and also credit for doing so with due sense of economy and what is necessary for the service. I think the hon. gentleman will not find, on examining the expenses of the Senate and the House of Commons, any more extravagance in that body than in this.

Mr. McMULLEN. If we are to be annually asked to vote this sum of money we should have power to investigate as to its expenditure. It is merely making a tool of this House to ask us to vote money and have no supervision as to its expenditure. I can understand that the Senate have their own Public Accounts Committee and investigate these matters; but they are not directly responsible to the people, as we are; they are the creatures of the Government of the day and are responsible to no one. We are responsible to our constituents to see that the public expenditure is kept within its proper limits. How are we to investigate the public expenditure, if it is not made under the supervision of men under the control of our Public Accounts Committee or the orders of this House?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the Minister explain the item for carriage of mails, $471?

Mr. FOSTER. It is for carrying the mails from the Senate to the post office and return. There is a similar item in regard to the House of Commons.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the Minister give an explanation of $200 for postage?

Mr. FOSTER. This item is for postage upon all foreign matter sent from the Senate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why were detectives supplied to the Senate last year? I observe they were paid $229?

Mr. FOSTER. That must have been for serving processes in connection with the investigations held.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What investigations?

Mr. FOSTER. The Baie de Chaleur investigation was held there, if the hon. gentleman's memory will serve him for a minute.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who were the detectives employed? Was it the member for Centre Toronto?

Mr. FOSTER. It may have been the member for Grey.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You had better send for the member for Centre Toronto. He seems to know all about it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want some more explanation about the detective service.

Mr. FOSTER. I have given a sufficient explanation; I have given the facts.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want an explanation in regard to the detectives.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman wants the names of the detectives, he will have to repress his anxiety until I can obtain the names.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, and the nature of the service performed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the investigations which took place last year before the committee, it was occasionally necessary to serve subpœnas in the case of persons who were not accessible, and for that purpose processes were sent to the province where the persons were supposed to reside. The item is for services of that kind. We do not know the names. The same course was followed in connection with the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see a similar item in our contingencies.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The expense was paid out of the funds at the disposal of the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister of Finance explain the item $160 gratuity, two months' salary, to late J. C. Wheeler.

Mr. FOSTER. He must have been one of the officers of the Senate who died, and the customary gratuity was paid.

Mr. MULOCK. I notice here an item of $1,688 for newspaper subscriptions. I do not think it necessary to have so many sets of newspapers. There is a very excellent reading room attached to the library where all the newspapers of any importance are available, but it seems to be necessary to have hundreds of dollars expended for newspapers for each and every department of this Government. Why cannot the Senators as well as the members of the House of Commons make common use of the reading room which is common to both? The library is common to members of both Houses of Parliament, and I think the reading room might very well be in the same position and the expense saved.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an old question. The Senators have had their reading room ever since they were a constituent part of Parliament, as the House of Commons has had its reading room. I suppose they might just as well ask why we do not take advantage of their reading room, and thereby save the expense of a large number of papers. This question was discussed some two years ago between a committee appointed by both Houses, but it was not found practicable to make any arrangement about it.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know that the reading room I refer to outside the Library is specially the

reading room of the House of Commons, but even if it is, there should not be two reading rooms if one will answer. I would not wish to interfere with the rights and privileges of the members of the Senate with regard to reading current literature. In fact, I believe that they should be in touch with public opinion, and if it were necessary to expend this money for that purpose it would be well spent. If the Senate will not do away with their reading room, let us do away with ours, and let the one reading room be common to members of both Houses. It is a pure waste of money to purchase two sets of newspapers.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I do not agree with the opinion of the hon. member, because at present the members have great difficulty in getting papers which they want in their own reading room, and sometimes when they go there, they have to come away and lose time without seeing the papers. If we bring more people into an already overcrowded newspaper reading room, I do not see how the matter would be improved. I think it is money well spent to have the newspapers for our own use.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I must express my own opinion upon this subject. I quite agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). It seems to me to be nothing more or less than a complete waste of money to have two reading rooms, one for the Senate and one for the Commons. Surely one reading room is all that is necessary for that purpose, especially when that reading room is situated in the central part of the building between the Senate Chamber and the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I happened to be a member of the committee that was appointed some three years ago, with a view of reducing the expenditure in connection with Legislation, and we found that when we made the same proposition that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Mulock) made, all the senators on the committee rejected it. We could not get them to agree to any diminution of the privileges they have been enjoying for a considerable length of time, and, unless we conclude to abandon our reading room, I think we will find it a difficult matter to get the senators to agree to any reduction of the privileges they now enjoy with regard to their reading room. I doubt very much whether they would be disposed to allow us access to their reading room if we abolished ours.

Mr. MULOCK. I move that the item under discussion be reduced by the sum of $1,688.44. The Senate cannot get their reading room without supplies being voted by Parliament. I do not wish to deprive them of the opportunity of reading the newspapers, but they can very well have that opportunity in the reading room common to both Houses.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the observations which Mr. Speaker made are very well worthy of the consideration of the House. The Senate has been in the enjoyment of this convenience ever since the organization of Parliament, and the reading room under the control of the Senate is managed on different principles altogether from those which regulate our reading room. Even if the Senate consented to reduce the expenses of their room they would not agree that the reading room which would then be common to both should be accessible to the public to the extent it now is. As the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) has stated, there is a great difficulty now during the session of Parliament experienced by members using that reading room, and occasionally when one goes to look for a particular article he finds that some one has been so attached to it, that he has taken it away with him. I think, if we examine the whole subject of the expenditure of the two Houses, we will find that the expenditure in connection with this House has been much more lavish, and is much more amenable to curtailment than the expenses of the Senate. We must not forget that the Senate is entitled to be consulted about any of its conveniences and privileges just as fully as this House is. The more decorous way is to confer with them, instead of undertaking, without the courtesy of a consultation, to strike out the item. I think the Senate showed, when the last conference took place, a disposition to meet this House half way, and that this House was not willing to go half way. It would be very desirable that we should look to matters in this House before undertaking, with a want of courtesy and absence of consultation, to say that something desired by the Senate ought not to be granted by this House. Let us at least treat the Senate with the respect with which we expect that House to treat us.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand from the Speaker that this item of expenditure has now existed for a quarter of a century—in fact, since Confederation. Then, when will it be in order, as a matter of courtesy, to reduce it? It is clear that the item should not be in both accounts. In the House of Commons' account there is an item of $2,000 for newspapers, which are within the reach of the Senate as well as the House of Commons. The Speaker says that some attempt has been made to bring about a common understanding for a reduction, but that it has failed. If it has failed, who is to solve the problem? Are we to stand here, out of pure regard for what may be incorrectly regarded as the rights of the Senate, and see the people's money wasted, or are we to proceed as a committee auditing the public accounts, and endeavour to ascertain where a prudent and wise economy may be introduced? I do not propose to deprive the members of the Senate of newspaper literature; far from it. I propose to reduce the amount expended for newspapers, $4,000 or thereabouts, to $2,000, not saying whether those papers shall be placed in the House of Commons or in the Senate reading room. When the money is voted, the Committee on Internal Economy will see that it is spent to the best advantage, and with due regard to the convenience of both Houses. When, I again ask, will it be in order, without offending the dignity of any person, to move to economize?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Any day of the session.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, this is one of the days of the session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This is not the place or the time.

Mr. MULOCK. I fail to see that. We are now voting the money, and I do not see that there could be any more opportune time to say whether we will vote the money or not. I do not mean this motion as a slight to anybody. I do not mean to say at this moment that the newspapers shall not be

in one part of the building or in another part, but simply that the amount of the expenditure shall be reduced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand that this motion is not to be regarded as a reflection on the Senate, because, from what the hon. Minister of Justice has said in comparing the contingencies of the two Houses, perhaps the comparison does not show favourably to the Commons. But I judge from what the Speaker has said, that it has occurred to the committee in charge of this matter as a very desirable improvement to make, but that some difficulties were found in the way. The amendment, as I understand, proposes a reduction of the amount, the committee being left afterwards to determine where the reduced number of papers shall be placed for the joint use of the Senate and the House of Commons. I cannot see that it is a reflection on the Senate. Of course one would naturally suppose that the room which is situated in the middle of the building, and which is common to both, would be the proper place; but I understand, from a remark which has been made, that a member of the Commons does not feel the same liberty to go into the Senate reading room that a Senator feels to come into the reading room which is apparently for the use of both. I cannot see that it is a reflection on either House that that should be known as the reading room of the Senate and House of Commons. This is just a move made in the direction of economy. I should be very sorry, so far as my vote is concerned, to have it interpreted as affecting the dignity or rights or privileges of the Senate; and I believe that the senators themselves, when they understood the motive, would not object to our saving that much money if it can be done in the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. No one objects to the saving of the money if it can well be done: but I think, with my colleague, that the method adopted is not quite the right one. My hon. friend who has just sat down says that the motion does not provide that the Senate shall not have a reading room. But he will understand that by simply striking out this item you would cut off the Senate reading room without making any provision for another. The action is not a complete action. As it stands, the motion proposes simply to strike off the reading room of the Senate, an independent and co-ordinate branch of this Parliament. It cannot be said that that is justified, because an attempt was made two or three years ago by means of a committee, to have certain things done looking to greater economy in both branches of Parliament. Not only was this item under discussion, but a great many others, and for a good many days: and I must say here, as a member of that committee, that the committee of the Senate met the committee of the House of Commons very fairly. The two committees after a full conference agreed to recommend a number of reductions: but their report was never acted upon by this House. Therefore I do not think that this House is in a position to impute to the Senate a want of desire to economize. This House never had the courtesy to take up that report and pass it. It was so thoroughly imbued with economy that it allowed the report to lie without taking any action upon it. So, if we have an honest desire to economize in both branches, we who hold the purse-strings in a certain respect, should not strike off what belongs to the other branch, without striking off what belongs to ourselves. It would be better to move by way of a conference, and in that the Senate, I have no doubt, will be quite ready to meet us; and, although it is much in the fashion to carp at the expenditures of the Senate, I am willing to stand by what I said, that this House is not in a position to throw stones at the other House, because, if there is an extravagant House within a radius of 500 or 600 miles, it may be within a radius of 5,000 or 6,000 miles, it is this very House of which we are members.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. Minister of Finance is lecturing the House for taking advantage of the report made by the committee in favour of economy. Now, I ask who is the member of this House who should take charge of such matters? Who has charge of the finances of the House, as well as those of the country? If any member of this House is responsible for neglecting his duty in that matter, surely it is the financial leader of the Government. I think, however, that the senators and the members of the House of Commons have got along remarkably well in the library for a great many years, and I see no reason why one reading room should not be enough for both. I am sure that if we could, in some way or another, enforce our rules for keeping strangers out of the reading room, and having it only for the use of members and the press and senators, we would have a great deal more room there, even with the senators, than we have to-day. As a member of the Library Committee, I have occasion to know that the library is not nearly large enough for the necessary supply of books in its ordinary growth, and if we could arrange that the room just between the House and the library should be used as an addition to the library instead of a reading room, where books of reference could be placed, it would be a great relief to the library.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for York should reconsider the motion he has placed in your hands, Sir, for two reasons. First, the Senate committee on contingencies frame their estimates and submit them to the Government for approval: and it will, I presume, be admitted that the Senate committee have carefully considered what the requirements are before submitting their estimates for approval. Then, when we take into consideration the fact that there are 215 members in this House who have the right of access to our own reading room, besides thirty members of the press gallery and other officers of the House, for instance, the *Hansard*, to whom we must give access, it will be seen that the accommodation afforded is not so great that we can, with convenience to ourselves and the senators, provide for the admission of members of the senate into that room also. My own impression is that the accommodation there is too limited as it is; and I for one would be sorry to see any action taken by this House which would interfere with what the senators consider a very great privilege, the privacy of their own reading room.

Mr. MULOCK. Did I not understand the hon. gentleman to say that this item had been the subject of conference, and that a common understanding had been arrived at to do away with one of the rooms?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman certainly misunderstood me. The advisability of having a

common reading room was discussed, but the objections urged by the senators prevailed, and the committee did not recommend any change to Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the opinion of the representatives of the Commons from that joint committee?

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly say that their opinion was unanimous. At all events, the proposition did not meet with the favour of the committee, and the report did not contain a recommendation that a joint reading room should be adopted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I understood the leader of the House correctly, he said that the senators were more disposed to economy than the Commons, and made a proposal to meet the case half way, which the Commons did not accept. It would be in order to explain to the Committee what recommendations in the direction of economy the Senate suggested which the Commons did not accept. The hon. Minister of Finance said that, as far as this House is concerned, those who have to do with the expenditure of the money are the most extravagant body in the world. Still I think the committee as a whole are disposed, where they see any extravagance, to lop it off, and they ought to be informed of any proposition which emanated from the Senate, so that we may have an opportunity of considering it.

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the committee was laid before the House three years ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman who leads the House stated just now that the Senate were disposed to meet the Commons more than half way and had made propositions in the direction of economy which the Commons would not accept. What are they?

Mr. FOSTER. You can see them in the report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Besides that, the Minister of Finance was good enough to tell us, speaking officially and with authority, that this House of Commons was the most extravagant body within a radius of 6,000 miles. I am quite sure he would not make that statement without good authority, and I am anxious to know what are the particular extravagances he desires to suppress. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether he aims at you as an unnecessary functionary, for instance, as we are almost the only body of our size which has a Deputy Speaker. When a statement is made that we are most extravagant, and made by the official guardian of the purse, he ought to tell us in what particular, in order that we may join with him in remedying this evil.

Mr. FOSTER. The Auditor General's Report will tell you.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it last year's report?

Mr. FOSTER. Three years ago.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman seems to have the report clearly in his mind when he makes this declaration, and it will be important to know what are the specific matters to which he refers. This is a new Parliament, and many of the men here do not know what the report contains.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood the hon. gentleman who leads the House to say that propositions came from the Senate in the direction of economy which were declined by the Commons.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What I said was that when a conference had taken place, the Senate had shown a disposition to meet us half way, and I thought at that time the House was unwilling to agree with the Senate, and the result was nothing was done. I am still of that impression, and I refer hon. gentlemen to the Senate conference.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What were the particular recommendations made by the Senate?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot state from memory.

Mr. MULOCK. Can any member of the Government say whether this particular item under discussion, economy in the matter of newspapers, was dealt with? Did they propose any joint service between the two Houses?

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine that came before the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. It is reality we are after now.

Mr. FOSTER. You will find the reality in the report. That came before the committee. The report is there, but it is impossible to recall all the conversations that took place in the committee three or four years ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The report evidently does not embody the suggestions of the Senate in regard to economizing. I want to extend my right hand to any member of the Senate who is in favour of economy. I would like to know if this report was printed and circulated amongst members?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, it was printed in the Votes and Proceedings of 1889.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I confess frankly that I was ignorant of the existence of this report, but I should like to know who were the members of the committee from this House, and whether any witnesses were examined.

Mr. FOSTER. No witnesses were examined. The House and the Senate each appointed a committee to sit jointly, and you will find the report on page 503 of the Votes and Proceedings of that year. Possibly, if we hunted through the proceedings of the House, we might find the names of the committee. That report makes 63 different recommendations. It embraces the statement that the committee had this question under consideration and did "not advise any alteration of the present system, inasmuch as the amalgamation would require an enlarged room, which, under the circumstances, would require a large expense, and there would be no saving in the staff, one officer only being now employed for each reading room. Moreover, many of the files of newspaper required for binding in the library are, on account of their careful handling and good condition, taken from the Senate reading room." It would do my hon. friends good if they would read over that report and see the result of the conference.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think some action should be taken on the subject-matter of the report read by the Minister of Finance. I hope this discussion will lead to interviews between the Senate and this House with a view of curtailing the expenditure in both. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance admit that the expenditure on this chamber,

which is under the management of the Committee on Internal Economy, is the most extravagant of any expenditure within 6,000 miles. At the same time he must remember that hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for the expenditure as they control a majority in this House, and no doubt the Speaker is a member of that committee. I am quite willing, if the senators consider it too far for them to come to the reading room of the House of Commons, to go to the reading room of the Senate if the room is large enough, and if not I think we should provide accommodation so that the reading rooms of both Houses should be together. We agree very well in the library where both Houses are together, and I do not see why we should not get along in the reading room as well. I notice that the expenditure of contingencies in the Senate amounts to about $700 a member. I do not know what it is in the House of Commons, but I believe there is room for a considerable saving in both chambers, and I think it is high time, notwithstanding the fact that this expenditure has been in existence since Confederation, that some economy should be exercised. It is evident to members of the House, and to many people in the country, that we could do without a great deal of the expenditure in that House as well as in this. I do not find fault with the senators for availing themselves of the privileges they enjoy, but I would be willing to meet them in their desire to obtain economy in their chamber as well as in this. We ought to endeavour to reduce the expenditure on contingencies in both Houses, and we should commence with ourselves as well as dealing with them, and should see if we could not get a general reduction all round.

Mr. MULOCK. It is clear that the House of 1889 did not approve of the joint recommendation of the committee, because it did not adopt it. The committee of that day did not proceed as economically as the House desired. Otherwise it is fair to assume that the House would have adopted the report. The action of the House if it is to be construed as meaning anything, is to be construed as condemnatory of the action of the committee, and I think the joint committee might have got over the very difficulty which they deemed insuperable. For instance, where they say that the throwing together of the two reading rooms would induce a mob to occupy the one, or at all events more than one room could accommodate, they might, instead of duplicating the papers, if they deemed it necessary to have two rooms in use, assign one set of newspapers to one room and another set to the other. I presume that the newspapers of Ontario are equal to all the rest of the newspapers from all the rest of the world taken into the two reading rooms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MULOCK. At all events, a fair distribution could be made between the two reading rooms, and you would thus save the duplication of the papers. The report shows that many of those in the Senate are not very much used, because it says that they are valuable for binding purposes on account of their not being very much used there. In fact, the whole report convinces me of the wisdom of the proposition I have made, and I hope the House will adopt it either in regard to the Senate or in regard to the same question when we come to the House of Commons.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The report to which the Minister of Finance has referred, almost entirely deals with the salaries of the officers of the two Houses, and as I have no opportunity to form a judgment on that question, I can make no comment upon that, but it appears that the committee also considered the advisability of amalgamating several departments which are now separated, such as the law department, the post offices, the accountant's department and the reading room, and after considering the whole thing they recommended that no change should be made in any of them. The separate post office, and the separate reading room were to be continued, and that has been done ever since. I suppose they must have considered the matter. The only recommendation was with regard to the stationery, that the amount to be expended for stationery should be limited, and that hereafter it should not be exceeded. But I find that it has been exceeded, by this House, by thousands of dollars, and by the other House by hundreds. Now, if that report was adopted and the officials who have control of this expenditure were notified of it, it seems to me that they are open to censure for having exceeded the limit.

Mr. FOSTER. You have just stated yourself that the report was not adopted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said, if the report was adopted; I did not know whether it had been or not.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then it was a report merely, but it was never passed upon.

Mr. FOSTER. The House took no action.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certainly, these recommendation have not been enforced by those who have control of the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. The Senate has gone very carefully into the recommendations regarding stationery.

Amendment (Mr. Mulock) negatived.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice an item here on page 189, one deed box, $18.75. What does that mean?

Mr. FOSTER. That is used for holding some documents of importance that had to be kept.

Mr. DEVLIN. I notice an item for ice, $348.30; who had the contract for supplying the ice?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say whether that was supplied by contract or not.

Mr. MULOCK. I was going to take exception to the item for postage for the Senate, $201. Do you have to stamp letters?

Mr. FOSTER. We pay postage on all foreign letters, and every department does the same.

Salaries, House of Commons.....$72,400

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a large number of officials in connection with the House of Commons, and I agree with the Minister of Finance that there is large room here for deductions. There are a number of names on the list that require some little attention. I notice a number of people hanging around the House of Commons, and to be seen in the library and other places. These draw a large

amount of money in salaries, and I think we ought to find out what they do in the House of Commons before we pass these items. I would like to know whether the staff of officials in the House of Commons has been reduced?

Mr. SPEAKER. The only reduction that has been made in the permanent staff is that of Mr. Duvernay, who has ceased to be on the permanent staff. If my hon. friend will look at the Estimates he will see a large reduction in the items this year. The late Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms, who is now Serjeant-at-Arms, had a salary of $1,900, and the Committee on Internal Economy came to the conclusion that it was not necessary to reappoint an officer at that large salary, and as we now provide for that service by the payment of only $300, there is a reduction of $1,600 under that head. Then Mr. Duvernay, who, as I said, has been dropped from the staff, had a salary of $1,000, which will now be saved. Then, in the matter of the accountant, the committee will remember that Mr. Hartney died recently, and the assistant accountant was promoted to the position at a salary of $2,000 instead of $2,800, so there is a saving of $800 there. Then the assistant accountant has been put upon the staff at the minimum pay of a second-class clerk or $1,100 a year, instead of $1,700 that the assistant accountant had previously. So that we have made a very large reduction in the expenditure by these changes. But there are additions and increments to the staff, statutory increases, that are allowed to the members of the staff, amounting to $1,000. Then the curator of the reading room, who was formerly provided for under the Serjeant-at-Arms' estimate, is now provided for under the Clerk's estimate, and a reduction has also been made in his salary; that is to say, the former curator had a salary of $800 and the present one commences at a salary of $600. Provision is made in the Estimates for the ensuing year to give him an increment of $50. So I think my hon. friend will agree that the large reduction that has been made, as is shown in the Estimates, a reduction of nearly $1,000 in the staff, shows that we have been paying due regard to the economies, which I am sure we all desire to practise in connection with this branch of the service, as well as in connection with every other branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who has been appointed Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms?

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Bowie.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are his other duties?

Mr. SPEAKER. He is my private secretary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the two duties will not clash. What salary does he receive as private secretary?

Mr. SPEAKER. He receives $300.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He will be available in case of the illness or absence of the Serjeant-at-Arms?

Mr. SPEAKER? Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I recollect right, there was some difference of opinion between Mr. Speaker and Mr. Serjeant in regard to the appointment of the deputy. Is the question settled? Because it is as well that we should understand it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is settled. I announced to the House that the appointment met with my approval.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I remember right, the point at issue was whether Mr. Speaker or Mr. Serjeant had the right to appoint.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, that was not the point at issue. I fully recognize the right of the Serjeant to appoint his deputy, but I hold that appointment must be made with the approval of the Speaker, and that no officer of this House can come on the floor of Parliament without the sanction and approval of the Speaker.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that that is practically taking away the right of the appointment by the Serjeant of his deputy, because if he can appoint no one without the approval of the Speaker, it is perfectly clear that he cannot appoint. An appointment subject to actual veto is not the right to appoint in practice, however it may be in theory.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that the Senate of the United States has the right to pass legislation and the President has the right to veto it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware of that; but I do not think that is on all fours with the right of appointment. I rather thought that the Serjeant-at-Arms had the right, either by law, statute or by custom—I am not quite sure which—to make his own appointment, and I should like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice on that point. My impression, I must say, is that the appointment rests with the Serjeant, but I am speaking of the recollection of the custom which prevailed, not with a distinct recollection of any statute on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. I refer the hon. gentleman to the parliamentary authority usually recognized in this Parliament: Bourinot's Practice, new edition, page 223, which says:

"He (the serjeant) has the right to appoint a deputy with the sanction of the Speaker, who will always appoint such an appointment to the House."

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps there are more subordinate officers connected with this House than we have need of. During a bye-election in my county I held a public meeting in a certain town, and after I had done speaking I asked any one representing the other side to speak. I had made a statement with respect to something that happened in this House last session. Up jumped an individual whom I did not know, and contradicted me flatly. He said he had been present at every single debate last session, and he knew that the statement I had made was absolutely untrue. I asked him who he was and what he was doing at the House. He said he had been a door-keeper in the House of Commons. I said: Certainly you could not have been attending to your duties as door-keeper and heard all the debates. He said he had heard them. What I am stating here is absolutely true. If the door-keepers of the House are engaged in listening to the debates for the purpose of going on public platforms to contradict members of the House, I think we should investigate the matter and dispense with the services of these gentlemen who are not absolutely required to open the door when members come in and out of the House. I mention this because

a matter which Mr. Speaker or the Government will not approve.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows there are door-keepers in the galleries who can hardly avoid hearing the debates.

Mr. BORDEN. This man was not in the galleries, but in the corridors. His name is Moore.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not remember any man of that name on the staff.

Mr BORDEN. He comes from Wolfville, N.S.

Mr. DEVLIN. I believe this applies to the permanent employés of the department who go out and take part in the elections and sometimes remain away weeks at a time. Last session we brought the subject up, and the late Premier said it was highly improper for employés to do so, and he would put a stop to it. During the recent provincial elections, we know that employés of the several departments were turned out loose and allowed to go about for weeks. So the hon. gentleman has not much reason to complain of a door-keeper when we have to fight an army of officials.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I notice that a change has taken place in one item of salaries. It brings up the question again of the relative expenses of the Senate and this House. We have a large number of faithful, and I believe hard-working messengers, who do their duties very well, and during the long sessions they attend to their duties very earnestly and attentively. A change has been made in regard to their salaries, by which they are paid so much per day, whereas in the Senate they are paid by the session. This is a change with respect to this House. They have hitherto been paid the same as the Senate messengers. I should like to know the reason for making this change, and why our messengers, who have twice the amount of work that the Senate messengers perform, should only get a per diem allowance, while the Senate messengers get a salary?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman no doubt alludes to the sessional messengers. The practice, prior to last session, was that the sessional messengers received $250 for each session. Last session it was represented to me by the messengers that, on account of the length of the session, they were entitled to an increase of pay. I frankly confess there was a good deal of reason in the proposition they made. But I came to the conclusion that if they were entitled to additional pay for a long session, as they alleged, at the rate of $2.50 per day, fixing the length of the session at 100 days, there was no reason why the rule should not work both ways. So I gave the messengers the option of taking $250 for each session, long or short, or taking $2.50 per day no matter what the length of the session may be. I think, on the whole, that was the most equitable view both as regards the messengers themselves and the public service, and the Committee of Internal Economy agreed with me in that view. The messengers elected to take $2.50 per day, which amounted to a very considerable sum last session, but it may not amount to a very large sum for this session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know how much we shall save, but we shall see. I want to call attention to the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) with regard to the interference by paid employés of this House. It appears to me that this is indeed indecent and improper, very indecent, and very particularly indecent and improper on the part of employés of this House, with whom members are continually brought into contact. I can conceive no more improper thing than that the men who are here employed and paid by the public at large, not paid by a particular party, should be allowed to turn themselves into hacks for the benefit of either side. Such a proceeding brings about a state of relations between members of the House who meet these employés on the public platform which is exceedingly unpleasant, and which I think members of the Government ought to frown upon and discourage, and which I venture to say if brought to the attention of Mr. Speaker he would severely discourage. My impression has been for a long time that Government employés ought not to be allowed to take part in elections. If it is done, most assuredly it will lay the foundation for the introduction of the American system, which I would regret to see introduced into Canada. I have always stated most explicitly that if it came to my knowledge that a Government employé had been acting in behalf of either one political party, whether it was for me or against me, he must take his political life in his hands and go when his friends go. With respect to employés in this House, such conduct is a very gross violation of propriety. It is quite unfair and quite impertinent for these men, who are the servants of the House of Commons, to be brought into such positions as my hon. friend mentioned that a door-keeper of this House was. I think that a due regard to the honour and dignity of this House would cause such a person to be dismissed, if he is still in our service. The idea that a man who is a door-keeper here should take upon himself to contradict a member of the House of Commons is—I think the hon. Speaker will admit—contrary to all ideas of discipline and pride.

Mr. FOSTER. He was not a member at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whether he was or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Generally speaking I concur in much of what has been said by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I do not go to the extent of admitting that an employé of this House shall be deprived of the right to vote because he happened to be employed in this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not said that.

Mr. SPEAKER. I venture to express the opinion that none of the permanent employés of this House have, since my occupancy of the office of Speaker, taken part in an election, as my hon. friend from Ottawa has indicated. I would not deprive these people of the right of leave of absence if they wish to go and vote in their respective constituencies. What I understand from my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) is, that the gentleman whom he says contradicted him in the recent bye-election contest, was not a permanent employé of this House, but one of the sessional messengers. I am sure my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would not impose upon me the duty of following those sessional messengers to their respective homes, and dictating to them

what course they should take in an election contest which takes place when the House is not in session.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am sorry Mr. Speaker misunderstood what I said. I did not refer to any employés of this House. What I said was that the hon. gentleman who preceded me, and who spoke on the subject, had little reason to complain if a door-keeper had taken part in the fight, at the distance which he mentions. I said we had greater reason to complain against the various departments over which hon. gentlemen opposite have control, and from which an army of officials go out in the county from which I come, and in other counties, not for one, two, or three days, but for weeks; absenting themselves from their office, and from their duties to take part in an election. The hon. Speaker, who reads the Ottawa daily papers, knows as well as I do who they are, because their names during election time appear in the reports of such meetings, as having taken part in the fight.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). While this matter is up I might say that in our section of the country it is a habit on the part of the postmasters to go out during elections and do all they can in opposition to those who are opposed to them. I am here to give the name of a prominent gentleman, Mr. Thomas Cowan, of Galt, who is the postmaster of that town. As soon as there is an election within 300 miles of him, he leaves his business in the town of Galt and goes out in opposition to the Liberal candidate. Last March he went to East Huron, and did all he could on the election stump against the candidate there. He went to East Bruce, and then to West Huron. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to permit these officials to leave their duties and become partizans in such a sense as that? I think they should tell Mr. Cowan that if he has business to perform in the town of Galt he should stay there, because it is unfair and unjust to allow officials of that kind to become platform stumpers in elections.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am the last man in this House ever to apply the *tu quoque* argument for any political consideration, but when hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House become so extremely virtuous on the subject of the interference of officials in elections, I would just like these hon. gentlemen from Ontario to look at home, and if they have an opportunity of giving advice to their leader in the Provincial Parliament I should be very glad if they would give him the advice which they are now giving to gentlemen on this side of the House. I say I do not care to apply the *tu quoque* argument, but as this subject has been mentioned, and as we have so much virtuous indignation from gentlemen on that side of the House, I say it would be just as well for them to impress upon the leader of their party in the Ontario Legislature, the exceeding impropriety—I think the rule will apply in one case as well as the other—of officials of the Ontario Government leaving their offices, deserting their proper employment, and travelling at the public expense to take part in Dominion elections. It is my misfortune to have a constituency in which the Ontario Government is specially powerful, and the persons I have to meet and whose exertions I have to counteract are chiefly officials of the Ontario Government. Gentlemen opposite talk about the Franchise Act and all the iniquities connected therewith; but I may mention an instance which happened recently, when a division court clerk in the Parry Sound district—he held some other office, too, under the Ontario Government which is the reward of political virtue there—left his work, spent from one to two months making up voters' lists, and spent another month or so in accompanying the revising officer to every court that he held. That was hardly a proper occupation for a division court clerk. If there is any official in the country who should carefully abstain from interference in politics, it is the division court clerks, who must have a very considerable amount of personal influence in all political matters, since they know the circumstances of every man in the division in which they live, and they have many opportunities in their official position of conferring favours and benefits upon these people. I say that a grosser case can hardly be conceived than that a division court clerk should make himself the political agent of a political party for a Dominion or Provincial contest. This is one of the subjects which gentlemen on the Reform side of the House might very properly consider, and when they are discussing the impropriety of officials taking part in elections, I wish they would apply the same rule to their friends in Ontario and speak to them on the matter of propriety upon precisely the same rules as they apply to officials of this House or this Government, and ask them to cease that sort of political occupation which those officials of the Ontario Government are so fond of indulging in. Officials of the Ontario Government who have in their hands the expenditure of a large amount of money can go and say to one settlement: You vote for O'Brien and you do not get the expenditure which you are entitled to, but vote for his opponent and you will get it. Talk about corruption, talk about bribery; why, sir, on a comparatively small scale I would like to know where bribery was ever practised by the Dominion Government to such an extent as the bribery practised by the Ontario Government, not only in Provincial elections but in Dominion elections on every occasion where it is possible to exercise it. I am speaking from experience, and a pretty bitter experience too, as regards the Ontario officials. Let hon. gentlemen opposite apply the same rule to them, and when we talk about the interference of officials in Dominion elections, let us understand, if we are to debar officials of this Government from interfering, that the officials of the Provincial Governments are to be equally debarred from indulging in these political practices.

Mr. PERRY. Although I have known public officials on several occasions to stump my county for Government candidates, I am not aware that one has been dismissed for it, although some of them have been absent from their duties for fifteen or twenty days. But that is not the case with Liberal officials. In my county there were two officials, who had been employed on the Prince Edward Island Railway for eighteen years, and because they were supposed to be Liberals and to have voted for the Liberal candidates, they were dismissed without an hour's notice, although they had in no way neglected their duties or committed any offences, and nothing could be found against them. The superintendent in Charlottetown was merely in-

structed by the department here to dismiss these men promptly, and they were dismissed. Last session I asked the reason of their dismissal several times, but not one word could I get from the dummies. They had no reason; these men were dismissed for no reason. There was no proof even that they voted for the Liberal condidates, and I defy the Department of Railways to give any proof; they merely suspected, and on that suspicion the men were dismissed without a moment's notice. I say it is a shame. Can hon. gentlemen opposite say that they have dismissed one of the men, and there have been many of them, who stumped my county and made speeches in favour of the Government? I believe, if the whole truth were known, that it would be found that they were prompted by their masters. But the poor unfortunate Grits, because they vote as they think best, are dismissed. I remember a wharfinger who stole all the money he had collected during two years; but because he was a friend of the Government, his trial occupied a whole year before he was dismissed by the department. If he had been a poor unfortunate Grit, they would not have allowed the bottom of his chair to get warm before they would have dismissed him. I am in favour of allowing officials to enjoy the benefit of their convictions in politics, with regard to voting for one side or the other as they choose; but they have no right to make use of their positions as public servants in order to stump the country and canvass in favour of the Government and against the Opposition. If they want to canvass for the Government or any other party, let them give up their office and go before the country as free men, just as I and my constituents do. It is unfair and unjust, and as long as this practice goes on, there will be every chance for a corrupt Government to exist in this country.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). My attention has been called to some remarks made by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) while I was out, with reference to an official taking part in his election. It would have been well if the hon. member had extended his remarks, and had called attention to several officials among his own friends in King's County, who had taken undue interest, and used, as I am informed, undue influence in the election, on his behalf. I have reference to certain postmasters in King's County, one in particular, who was very ardent for the return of my hon. friend, and who canvassed and spoke against the Government, and exerted himself generally in the most obnoxious manner. My hon. friend knows nothing about that when he speaks in this House about Government officials interfering, but he selects an individual who happened to say something to him at a public meeting. If this idea were carried out, I am sure it would be found that a larger number of Dominion officials in King's County and Annapolis County, particularly in Annapolis County, who are Liberals, and who held their offices ever since 1878, some of them longer, took active part in the elections; but they have not been disturbed. I know of my own knowledge one postmaster, two postmasters, yes, three, who took the most obnoxious part against me in the election. One of them in particular went into the revising courts, and nearly every one who listened to him knew that he was stating a great many things that were not true, in order to put Liberal votes on the list. Another one, a colonel of the militia, exerted himself greatly in the general elections of 1891. He went so far as to say: "We are going to have Mills out, we are going to defeat this Government, and we have got American money to do it with." That is what a colonel of militia in a principal portion of Annapolis County stated, and I can get a solemn declaration to that effect. If we are going to make these charges against officials, let us carry them out. I am willing to go into the matter; and if we do, there will be a great many vacancies in Annapolis County for me to recommend my friends to fill.

Mr. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has thought well to interfere in matters pertaining to King's County, not only here, but during the recent contest in which I was engaged. He familiarized himself, I believe, pretty extensively with the western portion of my county. However, we will let that pass for the present. I do not see that the remarks which he has offered here are very pertinent to the question under discussion. We are discussing a vote to pay the officials of this House. It has no reference whatever to the salaries of postmasters or any other outside officials. If it were in order, I could go beyond the officers of this House, and I could tell the hon. gentleman that my constituency swarmed with Dominion officials. But I do not consider this the proper moment to bring that matter up. Probably at some time during the session I may have a proper opportunity to discuss that question. But with reference to a postmaster or postmasters interfering in my behalf in King's County, I defy the hon. gentleman to name a single postmaster who ever spoke in public or took part in any public meeting in my behalf in the County of King's in the recent bye-elections. No such thing took place. The postmasters in that county voted, some for, some against me, as they had a perfect right to do, but in no case did they actively interfere; and I will say this, for the officers generally within the county on both sides of politics, that I do not know of one, except the individual to whom I refer, who took any active part in the elections. Mr. Speaker referred to the fact that that individual was not a permanent official. If I made a mistake with reference to that, it was because I took the individual's word. I asked him who he was, and he said he was a door-keeper. It turns out now that the statement was no more true than the statement he made on the platform, which was a downright absolute impudent falsehood. Mr. Speaker seems to say he can exercise no control over those individuals who are only temporarily employed. I am sorry he has found it necessary to come to that conclusion, because he is offering a premium to such persons to go on in their insolent attacks, and exposes himself to a similar indignity. I do not think it will tend to the elevation of politics that a gentleman, occupying the position of member of Parliament, may be subjected within a few months by a man whom he has sent here and there with messages, carrying letters and parcels, to the indignity of being contradicted and blackguarded on the public platform. I do not think that will have a tendency to raise the tone of Canadian politics or keep honourable, respectable men in politics, and I hope that Mr. Speaker will reconsider his decision.

I can prove every word I have said by the declarations, if necessary, of a hundred people who attended the meeting, and I repeat that when a man has conducted himself as this man has, he should not be allowed to continue in the service of the House. This man's name is S. E. Moore, and he appears in the Auditor General's Report as sessional employé at $2.50 per day. I have made some enquiry, and find this office is a sort of heirloom or family affair. There is the father and the son. The old man comes one year and the youngster next. Last year happened to be the son's year, this year to be the old man's for when I came back I found the old man on duty as door-keeper.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has accused Mr. Moore of making a false statement when he said he was door-keeper here last year. My hon. friend is not accurate, because he will understand that sessional messengers are employed as door-keepers during the session of Parliament. That is part of their duty. I may go further and say that I do not see on what pretense I could undertake to control Mr. Moore's actions during the recess. If any grave complaint of dereliction of duty, for instance, were made against him, if he had been accused of leaving the service of the House for the purpose of taking part against the hon. member for King's in the election contest, the hon. gentleman would have some basis for his argument. But let me point out that my hon. friend was not a member of Parliament when this gentleman spoke against him in King's County, but a candidate, and Mr. Moore had as good a right to speak against my hon. friend as against his opponent. If my hon. friend had been defeated, as many of his colleagues were, he would not have been here to accuse this messenger of having taken part in that election. If this man had been guilty during the session of the conduct charged against him, the case would be different, but during the time when the sessional messengers are occupied about their own business and not under our control, we have no right to interfere with them.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker says the only objection I made against Moore seems to be that he stated what was not true with reference to his position here. That is not all my statement. I say it turns out now that the man was not only stating what was untrue with reference to what I had quoted as having occurred in the House, but stated a falsehood with reference to the position he occupied.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, he did not.

Mr. BORDEN. That is what I said, and I repeat it. What I complain of is this: I made a statement with reference to the trade between this country and the Spanish West Indies, and I said that the Minister of Finance had last session coincided in my views. This is borne out by *Hansard*. But this individual stepped on the platform, and said I had stated what was utterly and absolutely untrue, that he had heard every debate in the House and no such thing happened. Now, if Mr. Speaker approves of that sort of thing, I venture to say he would not have approved it if I were supporting the side on which he sits.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I regret very much to hear the hon. gentleman make that last remark. It seems to me that the remarks of Mr. Speaker are quite in point, and I do not see from his standpoint, how he could take any action at all in the case put by the hon. member for King's. This man is not employed during the recess, and not being in the employment of the Government then, he had a perfect right to make what use he pleased of his time, whether to take part in an election or not, and I fail to see how any argument whatever can be based against the action of the Government or the Speaker for employing this man and their inaction in not dismissing him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is not desirable that persons, whether employed temporarily or permanently in this House, should be encouraged to take part in political demonstrations in the way this person is represented to have done by my hon. friend behind me. It is, I think, reasonable and proper that members of this House should not be exposed to come in contact with persons who have demeaned themselves in the fashion my hon. friend from King's describes this person to have demeaned himself. I do not mean to say there is not a difference between permanent and temporary employés, but I do submit that, as a mere matter of common courtesy among the various members of this House, it is desirable that our messengers should not be persons who will come into violent collision with members on either side. I am rather surprised at the statement of the hon. member for Brockville and of Mr. Speaker. I think it is a reasonable proposition that those employed as sessional messengers should be thought to observe a certain amount of reticence and decorum when brought into contact with gentlemen who have been or are candidates for seats in this House. That was all the extent to which my hon. friend's remarks went, and I do not think that it is desirable and proper that any man who has acted as this man is represented to have done should be reappointed.

Mr. FORBES. It seems to be very difficult for the Government to control these men of the name of Moore. Reference has been made to a man of that name here now, and I might refer to another man of the same name who is the revising barrister in my county.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think we must confine ourselves to the officials of the House under this item. There will be a subsequent opportunity to refer to any matter of that kind.

Mr. FORBES. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) referred to certain officials having taken part against him. In the county I represent, the officials of this Government did that to a much greater extent. As to the statement of the hon. member for King's that the man may not have been under the control of the Speaker at the time when he made the remark referred to, I think, when such a matter is brought to the notice of the Speaker or the Government, some notice should be taken of it. We find in regard to this that there is an alternation every year. This year it is the son, and next year it is the father. We are told that the son cannot receive the castigation because it was the father who committed the offence, but it should be stated whether the father is to occupy any position again.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have heard of the father's sins being visited on the son, but I never heard of the sins of the son being visited on the father.

Mr. FORBES. In the town of Liverpool in my county, the lighthouse keeper took part.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FORBES. I admit I am a little out of order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to reply to the remarks of the Speaker and the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). The Speaker referred to the fact that a sessional messenger or clerk is not under the control of the House except during the session, and that after the session it is not to be expected that his taking part in political discussions, either for or against the Government, is any breach of decorum. Where are we going to draw the line? Suppose the deputy clerk of the House, whose duties are largely confined to the session——

Mr. SPEAKER. He is a permanent officer.

Mr. McMULLEN. Moore is also a permanent officer. He comes here every year and he is as much a permanent officer as the deputy clerk, and if you are to allow sessional messengers to come here gathering political information and getting $2.50 a day, and then to allow them to go on the stump and abuse members of the House or candidates for election, where are you going to draw the line? Why should you not allow the deputy clerk or the clerk of this House to do the same thing. I understood the hon. member for Muskoka to say that employés of the Ontario Government stated on the public platform that if the people voted against their candidate they would not get any money for their colonization roads. I should like to know if he heard that statement himself. I challenge him to prove that he ever heard with his own ears any such statement in his riding. There is no man in this Dominion more to keep the officers of his department within proper limits than Mr. Mowat. I do not know of any officer of the Ontario Government being allowed to take part in any election with Mr. Mowat's knowledge or consent. The hon. gentleman suggests to us that we should attend to our own house at home before speaking of these matters here. I am not prepared to justify the improper action of any officer under the Mowat Government, but I think, before charges are made, there should be some attempt to bring these facts before the Mowat Government, and then, if that Government should fail to discharge its duty in disciplining its own officials, complaint may be made. I have heard of no case in which officials of that Government have interfered in elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. I challenge the hon. gentleman opposite to name one.

Mr. HUGHES. Adam Walters ran against Fairbairn.

Mr. McMULLEN. I ask whether the action of that man has been submitted to the Ontario Government.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Yes, it has.

Mr. McMULLEN. I challenge any hon. gentleman to cite one case that will bear in any respect a comparison with the exhibition we had during the last election, of Sir Charles Tupper coming out here, he being the High Commissioner for Canada in England, and travelling from one end of this country to the other while he was paid by the people of this country to discharge the duty of High Commissioner in England. Yet he comes here and lectures the people of the Dominion as to what they have to do, and abuses, in the most violent language he could lay his tongue to, the Opposition in this House, calling us annexationists. I challenge hon. gentlemen to find anything to compare with that exhibition made by Sir Charles Tupper, and yet they have made a charge that the Ontario Government were derelict in their duty in allowing their employés to go upon the stump. I have taken part in elections for 35 years, and I can say that I have never known any Ontario official to take part in an election with the knowlege of his Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. Take the case of Mr. Cowan, of Galt. He was appointed postmaster, he travels to various parts——

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to discuss these questions now. They can be brought up on a more suitable occasion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are on the question of House of Commons salaries. I have allowed this discussion to go on too long, but now I must ask the hon. gentleman to keep to the item. The member for Muskoka was out of order, but we have been out of order for a considerable time, and now I think we should stick as much as possible to the item under discussion.

Mr. FLINT. I have listened very carefully to what has been said in the hope that the committee and the Government would take a stand with regard to this question, and would intimate their disapproval of officers of the House of Commons taking a prominent part on the platform in connection with party politics. Now, I must say that personally I have had a great deal of pleasure in the relations I have had with the messengers and officers of this House, and I have found them very attentive and agreeable. But I must say it would be very unpleasant for a gentleman who had occupied the high position of representative of an electoral district, to meet these gentlemen upon a public political platform, feeling, in the first place, that they were salaried officials of the country, and in the second place, that he would be liable to meet them again where their social position, temporarily, at any rate, would be very different. I think that in the interest of these officials themselves, an intimation should be made that it would be displeasing to the Commons and to the Government if they took this prominent part in politics. In regard to their right to vote, I think it would be in the highest degree improper to intimate in any way that they were not at perfect liberty to exercise their franchise. I think every gentleman in this House will admit that it would be an entirely unequal contest between a door-keeper, or a messenger of this House, and a man representing, or who might represent a constituency in Parliament, to bandy words upon a public platform as to a question of veracity between one and the other, and this House would not be protecting its own dignity if it did not intimate to its messengers and officials that if they took a prominent part in politics they should do so at the risk of losing their positions. I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka

(Mr. O'Brien), whose position in this House always entitles him to be heard with respect, but notwithstanding the strong tone in which he spoke, I fail to gather from him whether he approved or disapproved of this sort of conduct on the part of officers of this House. Although he expressed his regret at being obliged to use the *tu quoque* argument, yet he dwelt upon that line altogether. Now, if this House were to decide for itself to disapprove of this conduct on the part of its officials, I believe we can safely leave it to public opinion in Ontario or anywhere else, to deal with the local officials of each province. It is unfair to these officials themselves, and it is unbecoming to the dignity of the representatives of the people, that this sort of thing should be allowed to go on, and I regret we have not had a stronger declaration from his honour the Speaker in connection with this matter.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). If I may be allowed, as there has been a challenge thrown across the House, I would state a case that is larger in enormity than the case which is referred to by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I will state a case that occurred in Annapolis County.

The CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. member not to wander off into discussion of local politics. I asked the hon. member for Wellington to drop the discussion on that subject, and he did.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before this matter has been entirely dealt with, I hope I may be allowed to make a few remarks in order to explain to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, whom I see now in his seat, how matters go in my county. As the hon. Minister knows very well, there are in my county hundreds of public officers, and I have to complain here that all these public officers are more or less influenced in election time; not only during federal elections, but also during local elections. In 1888, when the Government assumed the direction of the works which were under the control of the harbour commissioners—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Translation.) I will observe to the hon. member that we are dealing with the matter of contingencies, that is the salaries of the officers of this House. I know where the hon. member wants to come to; he wants to speak about the officers of the Government at Sorel. He shall have a later opportunity to speak about them. As other hon. members of this House were called to order, I will ask him to postpone his remarks to a later day.

Mr. BRUNEAU. (Translation). The debate has taken such a wild range that I thought I had the right to bring that question now.

Mr. LANGELIER. Mr. Speaker has laid down as a rule that the sessional employés, messengers and others, must stick to their work during the session, but they may do what they please outside the session. That is a departure from the rule laid down by the previous Speaker, the present Minister of Public Works. Every member who was in the House last Parliament must remember the debates that took place with regard to two French translators, being sessional employés, Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Poirier. These gentlemen were very good translators, never a word of complaint was made as to the manner in which they discharged their duties; as a matter of fact I think they were the very best French translators we have ever had as sessional translators. Still they were dismissed by the then Speaker—although I admit a great deal of pressure was brought to bear on him—not because they did not discharge their duties in this House faithfully, but because they had interfered in the election of the then member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), and because one of them had written in the newspapers against the then Secretary of State, Mr. Chapleau. A complaint was made by the Secretary of State that one of these translators had interfered in his election, and he was dismissed. A few moments ago His Honour, the Speaker, in answer to my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), said that the hon. member in whose election this interference took place was not a member of the House when the interference took place. The very same answer might have been made—the Secretary of State was not then a member of the House, when the interference complained of took place during the general elections of 1887. None of the members who complained afterwards were then members of the House. With regard to these two translators, their interference was nothing compared with what has taken place during the last election. There was this further in their favour. When they were appointed, it was distinctly understood that outside the session they would be at liberty to exercise their political rights, and to take any part in politics that they chose, and yet for having exercised that right they were summarily dismissed from the service of this House. I think that the same rule should be applied to employés of the one side of politics as is applied to those of the other side. As the rule has been adopted by the previous Speaker that the employés of this House should not interfere in politics, either in the general elections or in the bye-elections, I think the same rule should be applied now; and whenever an employé of this House, either high or low, interferes in any election, he should understand that he takes his official life in his hands.

It being six o'clock the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many messengers are retained in connection with the House of Commons?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are forty-five sessional messengers in addition to the permanent messengers, of whom there are twelve, including the two night watchmen.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does Mr. Speaker think it necessary to keep so many messengers?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will observe that the item under which the question of messengers will arise is the Serjeant-at-Arms' estimate, which will be the next item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the House rose at six o'clock a matter of some moment was under discussion as to which I should be glad to have the mature opinions of Mr. Speaker and of the Ministers, too. The point has been raised by my hon. friend near me (Mr. Borden) with respect to

the manner in which we should deal with sessional messengers not employed during the entire session, but who saw fit to interfere in elections in a manner referred to by the hon. member for King's. I submit that it is not expedient, and it is an indecorous thing that men who have been employed in this House, whether temporarily or permanently, should conduct themselves in the manner referred to by that hon. gentleman, and I was sorry before the House rose to hear Mr. Speaker make a statement which could only be construed, in my opinion, coming from a person in his position, as an encouragement to sessional messengers to conduct themselves in the fashion that has been referred to. I think that is to be regretted, for, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier), it was in distinct contradiction to the action taken by the late Speaker, the present Minister of Public Works. I will take upon myself to say this: Had the case been reversed, had a sessional messenger, though employed only for a short space of time, conducted himself towards a supporter of the Government in the way which the hon. member for King's described this particular sessional messenger to have conducted himself, I entertain no doubt, and I do not think a member of the House does, that that party would never have been employed again by Mr. Speaker. I think that the least that should be said should be that an officer of the House had so conducted himself. No regret was expressed. We were simply told that Mr. Speaker had no authority, which was technically true. I do not desire to censure Mr. Speaker for refusing to punish him, because he had no power to do so, but there should be an expression of opinion that no such action should be permitted, and any person who so acted would not again be employed by the House. That much is due to the dignity of the House at large, and that both Mr. Speaker and the Government should do.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask a question. Is the conduct complained of that of a person employed by the House?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A person who, for a considerable number of sessions, has been employed as a sessional messenger.

Mr. FOSTER. The young man, although last year was employed here as a sessional messenger, was, after the prorogation of Parliament, no longer connected with this House. He is a young man, who, at that time, was attending Wolfville College, and with respect to his return I think there is no certainty whatever. He is not here now, and is not an officer of the House. I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman will lay down the doctrine that a young man, who was once a sessional messenger and listened to the debates, after he left the service of the House and became a student at a college, has not an equal right in point of respectability, dignity and position as a citizen to express his opinion at a public meetting, just as much as a gentleman who was not a member of Parliament but a candidate for the honour, who might have been elected or not. Further, the young man had a perfect right, if he found sufficient number of supporters, to have been a candidate in opposition to the gentleman who was running in that county at that time. My memory was refreshed when the hon. gentleman told his tale of woe, and I remember that two or three weeks ago I received a letter from a gentleman of great respectability and worth in that county, and not a political partizan by any means. Writing to me on other matters, towards the end of the letter he referred to an amusing incident at a public meeting, which the hon. gentleman who is now the member for King's was addressing. At the end, a call was made for any individual who wished to speak in opposition to the candidate's statements. A lot of Wolfville boys, who were there in company with this young man, called out his name, and called it out incessantly. The young man did not wish to rise and speak, but on being called again and again, he simply said that the hon. gentleman, who was so valiant on the platform in telling the people what he had done in facing the Ministers, was, in his opinion, never very brave in Parliament in making statements when Ministers were present. It just struck me, whether or not these two relations, the relations of this afternoon and the relation of the letter, were not with reference to exactly the same incident and the same person. Now, if it was so, and if these statements are true, the young man has just as good a right in this democratic country of ours to stand on an equal plane with the candidate, before the people on the hustings. It would be different if he were a permanent officer of this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is an evasion of the question, I think. The point was raised by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) as to the expediency of such a party being employed again. I repeat distinctly that it is very inexpedient that men who are here without any disrespect to them--in a menial capacity, more or less, should, in the intervals between their parliamentary employment, conduct themselves as this person has done. This man has been here, on and off for the last eight years, the father and son having taken turns, I understand, but no doubt he is a useful debater on the stump, as I gather from the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think he is a debater on the stump. He was just called up at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He may or may not have been. The statement made by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Borden) is that this person contradicted him in a very offensive fashion, intimating that he had been making false and improper statements. I do not think it is desirable that parties who do that kind of thing should be regarded as eligible for employment for sessional messengers, in a relationship which brings them more or less in contact with gentlemen in the position of my hon. friend behind me. I think it is an objectionable thing, and I think it is due to the dignity of the House that an expression should have been made by Mr. Speaker that he did not approve of a man employed in that capacity acting in such a way, and who might return again as a sessional messenger. If he has cut connection with this House for ever and a day, I have nothing more to say. I understood Mr. Speaker, if I interpreted his remarks aright, to lay down the proposition that such demeanour was in no respect a reason why this man should not be employed again as sessional messenger. I consider it is a good reason why he should not be employed in that capacity, and I think that the conduct of the Government and Parliament during the

time of the late Speaker with respect to the two gentlemen referred to by my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Langelier), showed in a very clear manner how very differently these things are regarded when they happen to interfere with the comfort or dignity of gentlemen on the other side. I recollect perfectly well the case of the two translators, and their conduct was in no respect more objectionable, nor were the reasons for interfering with them other than those which did not in the fullest degree apply to the disability of the re-employment of this party. That is my position on the point, and it is not affected by what the Minister of Finance has said.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think my hon. friend has got a grievance, because this gentleman who was alleged to have made offensive remarks is not in the employment of the House now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He has been.

Mr. SPEAKER. He has certainly not been employed since this occurrence took place.

Mr. LAURIER. And will not any more ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not say that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Before we say whether he shall be employed again or not, I should like to hear his account of what occurred. This appears to have been a very excited political meeting, and, without in the least degree impugning the accuracy of the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Bordon), I think it would be most unjust to express an opinion that this young man is ineligible for employment until Mr. Speaker hears what his side of the case is.

Mr. FOSTER. That is fair-play.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, fair-play; that is what we want. It seems to me we need not enquire at this moment whether the young man behaved or misbehaved on that occasion. Are we to understand that the Government allow their employés, or the employés of this House in receipt of public money for work done around these buildings, to interfere in elections? If they do so, let us knew it. I do not care whether the conduct in this particular case is offensive or not offensive. Is it to be understood that employés of the Government or employés of Parliament are within their rights when they go on the stump in the country? It seems to me that they have no such right and that such conduct should not be tolerated or encouraged.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he an employé?

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, I think he was an employé. He has been a sessional messenger for years. He is not this year employed; but suppose he had come back at the opening of Parliament, are we to understand that under such circumstances when complaint was made against him, he should have been retained? It seems to me he should not have been retained in the service.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that the Minister of Finance did not catch the point raised by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The question was, that this afternoon, the Speaker distinctly led the House to understand that neither he nor the Government could be held responsible for the conduct of sessional clerks during the recess of Parliament. He led the House to understand that while sessional clerks were here and under the employ of the House they certainly should not be permitted to take such an active part, but that in the interval between the sessions they could do what they liked. I want to know if the Speaker is still prepared to adhere to the principle he has laid down? I fancy that if this person had acted in such a way towards a supporter of the Government he would reap the same result as was administered to the two *Hansard* translators and get bounced with very little ceremony. I should like to know from the Government whether they consider it is prudent and proper to accept the doctrine laid down by Mr. Speaker, that sessional clerks may become political stumpers when the House is not in session. That is the principle the Speaker has laid down, and that is the principle we want decided. If the Government are going to be responsible for that, I think it is very strange conduct on their part.

Mr. OUIMET. I think hon. gentlemen opposite have mistaken the ruling they have cited as coming from me when I had the honour of being Speaker of the House of Commons. The rule was never laid down by me that a sessional messenger, or a sessional clerk, or a sessional translator, could never during recess work in the elections. The principle that was laid down and the rule that was enforced was this: that these sessional translators, being more or less in the service of the hon. members of this House, had certain duties towards the members of the House, and if they choose to take any part in elections they could do it, but they have to preserve that measure of decorum and respect towards the members of the House to which hon. members are entitled. The two gentlemen who were referred to were not dismissed because they had taken part in the general election of 1886, but because it was complained, and it was established to my satisfaction and admitted by them, that they had been behaving towards a member of the Government and a member of the House, in such a disrespectful way, using silly language, and making themselves generally so obnoxious, that really they could not remain in the service of the House. I thought it was too bad that members of the House should have to be in constant relations with those men; and the same rule that I enforced then I would enforce yet if I were Speaker of the House, and I would enforce it not only on behalf of the friends of the Administration but on behalf of the friends of the Opposition as well.

Mr. LANGELIER. What we complain of is that the rule laid down by the Speaker to-day is not the same rule as that laid down before. The language used by the employé in question was very rough language, giving the lie to a member of this House. What the Speaker said this afternoon was that the man was a sessional employé, and that, after he left the House, he was no longer under the control of the Speaker and was free to use what language he chose towards a member of this House. That was the reason I said that the rule laid down this afternoon was different from the rule laid down by the former Speaker.

Mr. OUIMET. I did not understand the Speaker this afternoon to say that. He said that a sessional employé should not take part in an election, during a session; but that after the session he ceased to be under his control. The hon. member for Quebec Centre has said that giving the

lie to a candidate is a very rough thing to do. Certainly; but there are a great many ways of doing that. For instance, a man may say that an hon. gentleman is mistaken or in error, which comes to pretty much the same thing. Nobody will object to a man stating on the hustings that another man is stating what is not correct, or not true, but the latter may object very seriously to be told that he is a liar. While I would dismiss an officer of the House for telling a member that he is a liar, I certainly would not dismiss him for saying that the statements he was making were not entirely true, and I understood that such was the case with the hon. member for King's.

Mr. FLINT. I was in hopes that we would get a stronger expression from the Finance Minister at the conclusion of his remarks. He made a series of statements which were perfectly correct, and to which no one could take exception; but he either purposely or intentionally avoided the very point which the hon. member for King's and the members on this side of the House are endeavouring to induce the authorities on the other side to reach, that is, that they would be willing to intimate to the servants of this House that such conduct as has been described by the hon. member for King's would not meet with their approval. I think that is about as far as we could reasonably ask those who have control of these matters to go. While the Speaker was perfectly correct in saying that he had no power over those persons while they were away, yet the authorities of the House have a certain authority as to the character and deportment of those whom they employ. Now, I do not wish to dignify too much the individual who has been mentioned here to-day, because, as the hon. Minister of Justice has said, there may be another side to the story. The man in question may have a version which would put his conduct in a very favourable light. He is not under our jurisdiction at the present time, but I trust that members of this House, or candidates, who are recognized by custom as occupying the same social or political position as members, will be protected from being placed in a false position by those who at some time may occupy a different social position from them. Their liability to attacks of this kind may be very unpleasant to members on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have a prompt and efficient remedy, because the power is in their hands to dismiss offenders of that kind with a snap of their finger; but members on this side have no such remedy. With regard to the employés of other Governments, we ought to take as strong grounds as we do with regard to employés of this Government. Nobody has any desire to interfere with the proper and legitimate freedom of public officials as electors, but I think that the members of this House have reason to ask the Government to protect them from insolent conduct on the part of employés of this House, who occupy different positions from themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope I did not make myself misunderstood this afternoon, I drew a marked distinction, or desired to do so, between those who are permanent employés of the House and those who are not. As the hon. Minister of Public Works has stated, I do not pretend to say that there are no circumstances under which sessional employés ought not to be rejected because of their actions in regard to elections during the recess. But let us take this very case which my hon. friend from King's has been discussing this afternoon. He never brought the matter to my notice, though we have been in session upwards of a month. This man might have been employed here without my knowing anything at all of the circumstances which the hon. member has alleged; and it cannot be expected that we should refuse to employ a man because of some rumour that he had been guilty of impertinent conduct to a candidate in the Province of Nova Scotia, although the rumour may not have reached our ears. I do lay down the principle that there is a marked distinction to be drawn between the permanent employés of this House, who I think ought not to go on the stump at all or take any other part in elections than the mere recording of their votes, and merely sessional employés, who between one session and another have, I think, a perfect right to exercise their privileges as citizens in any election that may take place. As my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has stated, they may be guilty of conduct which would not justify us in employing them at the beginning of another session. Certainly such conduct, if it occurs during the recess, should be brought to the attention of the Speaker before the commencement of the session, so that he may be able to act with intelligence with regard to it.

Mr. BORDEN. With reference to that point, I quite agree with Mr. Speaker. At the beginning of the session, some time ago at any rate, I spoke to Mr. Dubé, the chief messenger, about this man, and he told me that the man was not here but that his father was. I, therefore, allowed the matter to drop, as I was not prepared to visit the sins of the son on the father, and if this discussion had not arisen to-day as it has, very likely I would not have referred to it specially. While on my feet, I would like to refer for the moment to the distinction which the hon. Minister of Public Works, our late Speaker, drew. It seems to me a pretty nice distinction. He said that he would punish an official for calling a member of Parliament a liar on the spot, but would not punish him if he said that he was a liar inferentially, in polite form of speech. He said there were many ways of saying politely that a man lied. I would put this question to my hon. friend. Suppose it could be shown to him that one of his officers, while not calling an ex-member of Parliament, made a statement which proved that that official was a liar, would he consider it was proper some action should be taken?

Mr. FOSTER. Who would be the judge?

Mr. BORDEN. The public records would be the judge. I repeat, as some members of the Government have referrred to this matter while I was not here, that I will go before a committee or any one of the Ministers, and will undertake to satisfy any one of them that this individual told a deliberate falsehood, and told it in an insulting manner; and I will prove my statement by Conservatives who were present, and by the records of Parliament which I quoted at the time I was contradicted by this individual, who said he had heard every word spoken during the last session, and that what I asserted was absolutely false. This question may be looked at from another point of view. It seems there are unnecessary

officials employed here, because this man claimed that he had heard all the debates last session, and I was not aware that we had a class of young men here in training to take stump and were paying them for it, and I think it would be wise on the part of hon. gentlemen in charge of this department to dispense with such unnecessary officials.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with Mr. Speaker that the matter should be brought to his attention at the opening of the session. Suppose there is an official employed now by Mr. Speaker who took an active part in an election not two months ago, addressed public meetings, opposed a gentleman running in the interests of the Opposition, and supported as best he could a gentleman running in the interests of the Government, what then?

An hon. MEMBER. Give him a position.

Mr. FRASER. Promote him. I think I will be able to satisfy Mr. Speaker of that. Of course this may be one of the regular conditions of life for these people employed by the Government. It may be that the Government employed them for that purpose, and I am rather surprised to hear for the first time that there is really a little backing down on behalf of the Government in this matter.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. FRASER. I am glad some person says "no, no," but I would like to have a clear understanding of the rule of the Government. Of course this occurred in the March election. The hon. gentleman came here, got his position, occupied it, went back during the bye-election and did the same thing, and again returned here to reap the gratitude of the Government which he had earned. If Mr. Speaker says the condition necessary for his dismissal is the knowledge brought to him of the fact, I can assure him that can be given him in a day or two.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have recently, as everybody knows, lost our old and faithful servant the Serjeant-at-Arms, and have appointed the former deputy in his place. I would like to know whether the arrangements made with respect to the new Serjeant-at-Arms are the same as those made with his predecessor. Of course, I am aware the salary is the same, but there were valuable privileges and allowances enjoyed by the late officer. He had, I think, a great number of rooms in this building, and fuel and light, and so forth. What are the arrangements with the present Serjeant in that respect?

Mr. FOSTER. They differ from the arrangements made with the late Serjeant. No perquisites are allowed. The salary is the same as that of the late Serjeant, and he is given a room in the building for the purposes of his office, and that alone.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that the Government do not allow the Serjeant-at-Arms any residential quarters?

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing of that kind. I said he had but one room, but he has two, a room for his office and a dressing room.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course if he is a married man, as in this case he is, he cannot very well reside in the building without inconvenience. I should think, all things considered, an officer like the Serjeant-at-Arms ought to have a reasonable number of rooms assigned to him in the building. I think myself it is quite probable that the late Serjeant had a good many more rooms than the public convenience quite warranted. If I remember aright, I think he had thirteen or fourteen.

Mr. SPEAKER. He had nine I know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think he had more, but really I should think we might afford our Serjeant-at-Arms more than an office in the building. He is a gentleman who ought to be here, and I suppose is here for a very considerable portion of the year, probably, at the very least one-half or two-thirds of the year, and it would appear reasonable he should have a fair number of rooms. Four or five ought to be given him. However, that is a matter for the Ministers, the Speaker, and the Committee of the House to consider. Still, I think that, having regard to the character and position of the official, he ought to have a little more than an office assigned to him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not often agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, but I must confess that on this question I think his pretension is right. It does appear to me that the Serjeant-at-Arms, who, as I understand, is in charge of the building, and is an officer of this House, ought to be provided with suitable residential accommodations, and that to give him but one office in which to transact his business is by no means sufficient or reasonable treatment. I hope it will be found even yet, on reconsideration, that accommodation—perhaps not to the same extent in character as that which the late Serjeant enjoyed, if he had thirteen or fourteen rooms—ought to be given him. I believe the present Serjeant would not require anything like that number, but he ought to have a reasonable accommodation afforded to him in his position, he being in charge of the building.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the unhappy contingency should arise when he would have to take one or two members into custody, he would not be able to accommodate them.

Mr. FOSTER. Such a contingency could not arise now.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I really think the Serjeant should reside in the building. He has charge of these buildings and of the messengers, and, being in that responsible position, he should live in the building. He has to be here always during night sessions, and when the House is not in session, he, or some other responsible official, ought to reside here. While I do not think he ought to get as many rooms as the late Serjeant had, I think he ought to have a sufficient number of rooms to accommodate him, and I suppose that means four or five rooms. The chief messenger resides here and occupies, very properly, a number of rooms, but he is an officer under the Serjeant, and I think the latter ought to reside here and ought to get quarters.

Mr. LAURIER. Up to the present time the Serjeant-at-Arms has always had a suite of rooms in this building, but there has been a departure this year, because the present Sergeant is not accommodated as his predecessor was. I do not know who is responsible for the departure, but I

suppose the hon. gentlemen opposite must be held responsible for it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was well understood before the vacancy occurred in the office, that when a vacancy should occur, the salary would not be continued at the same rate—a rate which I think the late Serjeant received partly in consequence of a very extended period of public service—and that the residential conveniences and emoluments should also be discontinued, partly because they were supposed to be unnecessary to the office, and partly because these rooms were needed for other purposes by members of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not by any means on account of the Serjeant himself, but I think it is in the public interest and for the convenience of members of this House, that that officer should reside in the building, and should have an opportunity of exercising that close control which can hardly be exercised by any one not residing in the building. I quite agree with one or two gentlemen who have spoken, that it is very probable the late Serjeant had a much larger number of rooms assigned to him than was necessary, but there is a difference between assigning ten or eleven rooms, and a matter of four or five rooms. I would like to know how many rooms the Usher of the Black Rod has assigned to him on the other end of the building. If I am not mistaken, he has enough to divide up, if we are going to stand on equal rights, with members of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. It might be convenient to know what has become of these rooms.

Mr. FOSTER. They are still in the building.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the House is entitled to know all about this matter. It has been said the responsibilities resting upon the Serjeant with regard to these matters are very considerable. He has the general oversight and care of the building, and I think in a building so costly as this, and the care of which is a matter of so much public importance, that the House should consider how far the Serjeant can exercise proper and efficient oversight over these buildings if he does not reside in them. It seems to me that the necessity must be very great and very pressing that takes this accommodation away from him.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the House has been informed, the rooms formerly occupied by the Serjeant-at-Arms are no longer so occupied. One of these rooms has been allotted to the Government for the purpose of receiving deputations, and I suppose the hon. members of the Opposition who were formerly in the Government, know the necessity of having some place in which to receive deputations. Another room upstairs has been allotted to the Printing Committee, and I think one of them has been allotted for the use of the Whip of the Liberal party; at all events, it has been arranged that a room should be given to the Liberal Whips. Then there is another room still vacant, and it has been reported to me by the Clerk that the chief of the translators would find it very convenient if he could have his staff collected in one room, under his immediate supervision, instead of, as I understand is now the case, doing their work outside the House, and I am considering the question of allotting that room for that purpose.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Does that leave all the rooms in the basement?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are two other rooms in the basement unallotted.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that there should be an officer of rank residing in the buildings who has a close supervision of all the officials of the House in attendance during the whole year. We ought to compel him to live here, and he should get leave of absence very seldom on account of the important interests entrusted to him. He should be bound to live here and to exercise close supervision over the buildings, and give us some value for his salary.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think every member of the House feels that there should be a rearrangement and a redistribution of the rooms under the control of the committee. I must express my thanks to Mr. Speaker for endeavouring to give us a small room for the use of the Whips of the party. If the rule is to be acknowledged which has been laid down by the Government and their supporters in the discussion that has just taken place, I suppose we must acknowledge that they have a right to act as they see fit in their appointments and the apportionment of the rooms. At the same time, I think that there ought to be some courtesy extended to the members of the Opposition in this House. The present arrangement is very unfair. I understand there are between 75 and 100 rooms in this House under the control of this committee, and the great majority of these rooms are monopolized by the members of the Government and their supporters, and the members of the Opposition are unable to get ordinary accommodation. When this large number of rooms was taken away from the Serjeant-at-Arms and given over to the use of members of the House, it did appear that one of them might have been allotted for the use of members of the Opposition when, as is well known, the members of the Government and their friends have such a large number of rooms at their service. When I applied to Mr. Speaker, he recognized our right and endeavoured to give us some accommodation. I would appeal to the members of the Government and to that side of the House to see whether or not some rearrangement could not be made in order to give us on this side—I do not say a fair proportion—but some small proportion of accommodation. This is a matter of considerable consequence to members of the House in the transaction of their public business, but no doubt the members of the Government are not aware of the dispositions which are made of the rooms in the House. I think one of the vacant rooms should be allotted to the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is proposed to utilize some of the rooms in the basement for keeping the records. I am informed that the bound volumes of newspapers and other records which are necessary for the information of members have grown to such an extent as to require additional accommodation, and I propose to use some of the rooms in the basement for that purpose. I may say that I have been a member of the House since 1874, and I never, until I was elected Speaker, had any accommodation in any room except what I got in No. 16 when it was allotted to the Conservative party,

and I could not occupy that very much because members used to smoke in it. I may as well say at once that my theory is that every committee room in the House ought to be open to every member of the House, and that there should be no room allotted to any particular person or set of persons. The room No. 16 has by courtesy and consent of the House been allotted to the Conservative party, and in the same way room No. 6 has been allotted to the Liberal party, but according to my theory there is no reason why the leader of the Opposition should not go into room 16 or any member of the Government into room 6.

Mr. LAURIER. I will go to room 16 with pleasure, but, as there is smoking going on there at present, I may have to stay away for the same reason as the Speaker.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are all welcome to come to No. 6.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I agree with the principle laid down by the Speaker, but the Speaker will remember that the party in power has not followed out his theory. The difference between room 16 and room 6 lies chiefly in the fact that No. 6 is used on frequent occasions as an ordinary committee room.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, not now. Other accommodation has been provided for the committees that used that room.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Room 16 was set apart for the supporters of the Government, and it is provided with all the necessary material in the same way as a private office, and there are one or two servants of the House placed at the disposal of the members who occupy that room. No such arrangement is made in the interest of the Opposition. I think we might be allowed something in the same direction, and all I would ask is that, before another session, at least one room of reasonable size may be set apart for the members of the Opposition—call it the Whips' room if you like—but a room where the members may be able to sit down quietly and do some work. Then I think they would be perfectly satisfied if they had a room of decent size of the kind I have mentioned.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad to hear the Speaker make the statement he did as to every room in the House being at the disposal of all the members, and that every member has a right to go into any room in the House. I remember that last session the member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) went into room 16 and found himself very uncomfortable there, and, though he was not ordered out, the organ of the party gave him a lecture on the subject of his having ventured to enter that room. I hope that in future none of the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite will make the same mistake. Then, of course, if all the rooms in the House are open to every member, the rooms occupied by the Speaker are open to them. We will be under a general invitation to go in and recline in the comfortable rooms which he occupies. He says they are to be at the disposal of all the members, and of course that is a general invitation to take advantage of the comforts to be found there as compared with the other rooms in the House. I hope the Speaker will not be surprised if, when the House is going on at great length, he finds his drawing room crowded with members.

Committees, sessional and extra clerks, &c.. ..... $13,600

Mr. McMULLEN. When we referred to the sessional clerks before, the Minister of Finance called attention to the fact that, at that time, we were discussing salaries of the House of Commons. We have now reached the sessional clerks, and I would ask the Speaker what the number of these clerks is now and whether he thinks the number is in excess of the requirements of the work?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think at present there are 29 sessional clerks, and it is proposed that, as these sessional clerks drop out, the number shall be reduced to 25. We believe that is the smallest number we can get along with, having regard to efficiency.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear that statement, because I was of the opinion, from the number I see around this building, that there was not enough work to keep them engaged. No doubt the Government has sympathy for men who have got old in the service, but we should get down to the number who are sufficient to discharge the duties of the House, and that number should not be exceeded. I am glad that we have now got down to 25 sessional clerks. How many extra clerks have we?

Mr. SPEAKER. None. This is the total number, and they are called extra sessional clerks.

Contingencies, House of Commons..... $23,100

Mr. McMULLEN. This is an item which deserves considerable discussion. Last year there were no less than three silk gowns purchased; one for the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, who is not now Speaker, one for the present Speaker and one for the assistant Clerk, at $75 each. In looking over the record I find that two silk gowns have been purchased each year. During the last three years no less than seven have been purchased, at from $65 to $75 each. Is it customary for the Speaker to get a new silk gown every year? The present Minister of Public Works when Speaker had a new one each year. I should like to know the rule. I do not draw attention to this item simply for the purpose of worrying hon. gentlemen opposite, but I desire to show that there is extravagance in connection with the contingencies of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. So far as I am concerned, a gown was purchased for me at the public expense when I became Speaker of the House. I may say it is now badly worn, but I have had it patched, and the hon. gentleman will not have to complain that I have purchased a new one this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to hear from the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to know what he has done with the old one.

Mr. OUIMET. The gown in question, which was not unpacked, was placed by me at the disposition of the Clerk of the House, who said he would wear it himself. I wish him good fortune with it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope the Minister of Finance will now retract the statement that we are the most extravagent House of Commons in christendom.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that the Clerk is provident in the matter of gowns.

Mr. OUIMET. I was left with an old one—with the shreds and patches.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are very glad to learn that we have a gown to spare, and it will not be necessary for the Speaker to use a patched gown. It is well this explanation should come out, because a gown is charged in the Auditor General's Report against the present Minister of Public Works as having been received by the retired Speaker.

Mr. OUIMET. I was not aware that it had been charged to me. As a Queen's Counsel I have had a gown for years similar to that worn by the Speaker of the House.

Estimate of Serjeant-at-Arms.....$33,882.50

Mr. FLINT. I would like an explanation of this vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is to provide for the extra sessional messengers, the sessional pages and the disbursements in connection with the House. For instance tradesmen's accounts and the laying of carpets and items in connection with the restaurant and the Speaker's rooms are included in this account. The expenses of charwomen is also included in this vote, and is a very considerable item. It will be observed that there is a reduction this year of $550 in this vote.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). What is the arrangement with respect to the reading room. I observe that you have dropped an officer there.

Mr. SPEAKER. We have attached him to the Clerk's branch instead of the Serjeant-at-Arms. We have given the curator of the reading room the rank of a third-class clerk instead of that of a messenger.

Mr. SCRIVER. What is the number of sessional messengers.

Mr. SPEAKER. Forty-five.

Salaries of officers of the Library.....$16,882.50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see a rather curious item here. We vote for the purchase of books for the Library of American History $1,000, and apparently you are going to pay $3,500, for preparing and printing a catalogue of the same. That looks rather an immense amount of sack to very little bread.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The members of the Library Committee who are in the House can explain it better than I. My information is that this vote is for an addition to the books connected with American history, of which there is a large collection, and the vote is for cataloguing the whole collection.

Mr. SCRIVER. I remember that at a meeting of the Library Committee last session it was represented that it was necessary to prepare a careful and elaborate catalogue on the works of American history. It is a very voluminous and somewhat extensive work, and the members of the committee were so satisfied with the representation of the librarian on the subject that they gave him the necessary authority to have it done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has always struck me in connection with the library, and I cannot understand it yet, why it is that the extra work cannot be done by some of the present staff without extra pay. I have no objection to the number of men employed there during the session, but one cannot shut one's eyes to the fact that during the recess of Parliament these gentlemen must have of necessity very little to do. It seems to me that they could do a great deal of this extra work then.

Mr. FOSTER. A large part of the vote may be for reprinting.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Even so, some of it must be for extra work in cataloguing. We have two librarians, one French and one English, and we have a very large staff in the library, so that during the recess they must find it very difficult to get anything to do. It has occurred to me time and again, and I have expressed my opinion as a member of the Library Committee in this House and out of it, that the staff could do this extra work during recess. I am not opposed to paying men a reasonable amount for any work they do, and if the work is of special character requiring men of experience I would like to see them paid well for it. A large part of this work is mechanical, and does not require very clever men to do it, and even if it does require clever men you have them in the library. As far as I am concerned I think we are going on a wrong principle in continuously and constantly voting money for extra work which ought to be done by the permanent staff.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So far as the librarians are concerned there is one thing which it is important to bear in mind, and that is that a librarian to be really useful must be a well informed man and he must give some attention to the literature that is being from time to time published. On this he may not be able to give the members the information which they require. If you go into the library for a work on a particular topic, it is very convenient if the librarian is acquainted with all the new works on that topic and is able to call your attention to them. If he does not give a good deal of his time to making himself acquainted with the contents of the books, and the subject with which they deal, he will not be able to make himself a useful librarian. I do not say that there are not other parties in the library who might do the work to which the hon. gentleman refers; but the librarians themselves, if they fit themselves for the efficient discharge of their duties, and keep abreast of the times, must give a good deal of attention to the contents of the books as well as to the management of the library.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am in full accord with what my hon. friend has said respecting the librarians. I do not expect them to devote themselves to mechanical work. I would be the last man to make any complaint of the librarians, who have always treated me with the greatest possible courtesy. That is not the point I make at all. The point I make is this: The House pays for a large number of assistants in the library, and though I do not ask that extra work should be placed upon them during the session, when most of them give a fair amount of work, yet there are six or seven months of the year during which the House is not in session, and it seems to me ridiculous that work which might properly be done by the assistants during that time, should be paid for every year as extra.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend a member of the Library Committee?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I think my hon. friend occupies a very responsible position, and he has been administering a strong censure to himself. That committee ought to know what every item is for, before it comes to the House, and if they think this work can be done by the regular staff, they ought not to have this item appear in the Estimates. The House, knowing that they appoint a committee to look after the library, pay very little attention to these details. I think my hon. friend has been very lax in this, and I hope he will in future carry out his good sentiments. I agree with him very largely. I think that if this work is not of a technical character, and if it is within the range of the assistants, they ought to attend to during the recess.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the face of the hon. gentleman's remarks there is something to be said for the view he advocates; but I have not been derelict in my duty in this regard either in the Library Committee or elsewhere. I have not failed to express an opinion on this subject on more than one occasion, but I do not happen to embody the Library Committee in myself or to control it. I will remind him that the officers I speak of are appointed and paid by the Government; and this vote is proposed by the hon. gentleman himself. I am not aware that it came before the Library Committee, or that the committee ever asked the Government to pass it. I have attended most of the meetings of the Library Committee, and it may be that I am wrong, but I do not remember that the Library Committee at any time requested this to be done. Even if they did, I do not think I would be out of place in expressing my views, which I have done quietly and respectfully, as to what should be done.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that this matter was not specially brought to the attention of the Library Committee by the librarian. The committee have always felt that a certain amount of discretion should be allowed to the head of that department, and they take it for granted that if a special vote were not necessary for this purpose, the librarian would not so report. My hon. friend may be right in saying that some of the clerks in that department have leisure during the recess for doing this kind of work; but those who are competent to do the work very likely have duties enough to occupy them, even during the recess.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I may be right or wrong, but I hold the opinion, and I have expressed it on several occasions, that there is a very vicious practice running through all our service. Officials in the different departments assume that they have a certain amount of work to do, and they do not expect to do any more. I do not speak of those exceptional men in the service, whose work is beyond all praise, who are ready to further the interests of their department by working extra hours and doing whatever is necessary to be done. But I believe it is generally understood that if a man writes an extra sheet of paper, he should receive extra pay for it. This has been a crying evil in the past. What I contend is that this work should not be looked on as extra work, and the country should not be asked to pay for it as extra work.

Mr. SCRIVER. I would advise my hon. friend to go and discuss this matter quietly with the librarian, and I think he will get some information on it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is all very well. It is for us, not the Library Committee, to be satisfied with these votes. There are nine people employed in the library including a general librarian and a parliamentary librarian. What the precise distinction is I am not advised; it may be that the hon. Minister of Justice, who has a subtle mind, may be able to tell me. As the session does not on the average occupy more than four months, during which the officers of the library are fully employed, it appears to me that there is no real reason why this work should not be done by the seven regular officers under the superintendence of the two chiefs. I do not know very much as to what goes on when the House is not in session; but I do not think that these gentlemen are very greatly overworked in the period between our rising and our returning. It is not quite enough to say that the chief librarian thinks it well that they should get extra pay. All the heads of departments are human beings, and do not like to put extra work on their employés, I suppose; and if they do, they are amenable to persuasion, and may be led to think that they should get extra pay. I do not think myself that there is work enough given those people to entitle them to draw a matter of about $4,000, first and last for this purpose.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is quite a mistake to suppose that this sum is to be distributed among the regular staff. On the contrary, I understand that, in the opinion of the librarian, extra help will be required. The work cannot be distributed among the regular staff and paid for extra except in violation of the law. The Government, in bringing down the Estimate, relied very largely on the fact that the library is administered by a very careful committee consisting of members of both Houses, and I presume the work of cataloguing will be carried on in a general way, on such principle as they approve. The Government will be exceedingly gratified if the committee can find a way to have the work done by the regular staff and the money saved, which we propose to give to extra clerks, only in case they are found necessary.

For the General Library.....	$10,000
For the Library of American History.	1,000
Contingencies	2,500
Binding newspapers, &c	2,000
Preparing and reprinting the Catalogue of the Library of American History.....	1,508

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do the Government purchase any books now outside of the grant for the library?

Mr. FOSTER. They do not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it in the power of the Library Committee to purchase any special book or give a subsidy or grant for the publication of any special book? The reason I mention this is because a petition was submitted to the Library Committee by Dr. Kingsford, last year, who was publishing a history of Canada, asking that his

literary labours be recognized by the purchase of a certain number of his books, and the librarian intimated that the amount granted by Parliament, $10,000, was not more than sufficient for the purchase of books actually required.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What we used to do was to purchase books occasionally for library exchanges and bring down a special vote for that. We preferred to discontinue that course three years ago, and since that time no such purchases have been made. But it has been understood that the appropriation of $10,000 is given the committee to buy the books required for the library, including books for exchange, but that nothing is to be spent in the way of giving subsidies to assist in the publication of any work.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose it is understood that this grant of $10,000 is to be expended wholly in the purchase of books and is not to be encroached upon for any other purpose connected with the library.

Mr. FOSTER. It cannot be.

Mr. MULOCK. It might be. I do not know whether it has been or not. I can see in the Auditor General's Report some items that are certainly not for the purchase of books.

Mr. FOSTER. There is the item for contingencies.

Mr. MULOCK. I was going to suggest that, in order to avoid a misapplication of any portion of the money, the Auditor General should separate the expenditure for books from the expenditure for other purposes. At present, if you will look at the report, page B-196, you will see, under the title of "Library Grant for Books," the names of dealers, and then there are some items towards the bottom that may, perhaps, not be for the purchase of books. For instance, at the bottom of page 135 you will find an item of $1,400 for the Queen's Printer, and other items amounting to about the sum of $500. It might be, that, deducting those, there would still remain $10,000 actually expended in the purchase of books; but to prevent any doubt, a separate account should be kept of this appropriation. There is another point to which I would call attention. The librarian does not seem to think it necessary to purchase any books from dealers west of Ottawa except on an odd occasion, and I doubt if he can always buy to the best advantage in Ottawa and Montreal.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. All the imported books he purchases from the agent in London.

Mr. MULOCK. If he does so, that is all right, but I see the names of Canadian merchants in the account, and among these there are none of Toronto merchants to speak of.

Mr. SCRIVER. This $10,000 was strictly appropriated for the purchase of books and is strictly so used. The accounts of these purchases are submitted to the auditor of the committee. I have been a member of the committee for years past, and have carefully examined the accounts, and I can say that this sum is devoted strictly to the purchase of books. With regard to what my hon. friend has said, the largest bills are from publishers and dealers in England and the United States.

Mr. MULOCK. Take the next item, $1,000 to the Library of General History, and turn to the Auditor General's report, B-197, the first item is for salary, $500.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for a vote below.

Mr. MULOCK. My previous remarks will apply to this expenditure as well. If we set apart $1,000 for the purchase of books of American history, the Auditor General should furnish a separate account of this item and not mix it up with other items, such as salary or anything else.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor's Report he will see that is exactly what has been done. The Auditor General has indicated every one separately. First, he has grouped the library salaries together, then the contingencies, then stationery, and then the library grant for books under which appear all those items my hon. friend speaks of.

Mr. MULOCK. Where does this expenditure of $1,000 appear.

Mr. FOSTER. In the item for books, included in the general table indicated under "Grant for Books."

Mr. MULOCK. There is another item of a special kind.

Mr. FOSTER. It is only a part of an item.

Mr. MULOCK. If it is intended to vote $11,000 to the Library Committee to be expended miscellaneously on books, it should be so stated, but the vote is $10,000 for books for the general library and $1,000 for books referring to American history. If there is anything in that, the account should be made up separately, so that we can see that the vote has been expended in that way, and I do not find that in the Auditor General's Report. The only thing we have on the subject is at page B-197, and the first item is "Salaries."

Printing, printing paper and binding.. $70,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this printing paper obtained? Is it by tender or by special arrangement?

Mr. FOSTER. It is by contract, as was explained last year in the Public Accounts Committee. The large item is the Queen's Printer's account for paper and printing.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under this heading I would ask whether the Department of Printing is now in a satisfactory condition or not. Is it because they are unable to overtake the work that the departmental reports are not presented to the House? I have heard that they are very much behind in their work, and that the work costs a great deal more than it used to cost when we let it by tender, irrespective of the interest on the enormous amount we have expended there on capital account, which we may count as dead loss. Is there any report from the new Superintendent of Printing as to the state of the work? I think we should have it before we pass this large amount.

Mr. FOSTER. That information will come more properly when we reach the vote for the Bureau itself. I was informed to-night by the Superintendent that the departmental reports are being hurried as much as they can be, that he has a very large staff on, and that the difficulty has arisen because, owing to the late sitting of Parliament,

the departmental reports this year came late and all at the same time, and that the voters' lists also occupied the attention of the staff. So far as I know, the Printing Bureau is in a state of efficiency.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the Minister of Justice whether the delay in the printing of the Supreme Court Reports is owing to the inability of the Bureau to get them out?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it is owing to the pressure of other work.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How long does the Minister expect we will be without those reports?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The same thing used to occur with the contractors at this season, but I think the pressure of the parliamentary work will be over in a few weeks. At all events I shall know in a day or so.

Mr. MULOCK. Has any account been prepared as to the total expenditure on the Printing Bureau, showing whether it costs more or less than the contract system?

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is hardly the proper item under which to enquire into the cost of the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MULOCK. We are now asked to vote $70,000 for printing, and I think we should know what is the least expensive way of having this service performed and the cost, the wear and tear, the depreciation of plant, all that ought to be taken into consideration in order to find out whether it costs less or more to get our printing done under the present system than it did under the old system.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will look into the matter and bring the information down when my own estimates are before the committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there no more detailed account of the expenditure on that item than is to be found on page B-197 of the Auditor General's Report, or can the Minister of Finance give us any further statement? What does that cover exactly?

Mr. FOSTER. It covers all parliamentary printing except the reports of departments. It covers Sessional Papers, Votes and Proceedings, and all documents ordered to be printed by the committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understand that when the votes of the Department of the Secretary of State are being passed, he will be able to make a statement to the House by way of comparing the cost of printing under the present arrangement, and the cost when we let it out by contract.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the Secretary of State could not tell us whether the old trouble between union and non-union labour in the Bureau still exists, or what policy has been adopted in that matter?

Mr. FOSTER. There has been no trouble since last session of Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the Secretary of State could not answer to-night whether union or non-union labour is employed in the Bureau, but when we come to discuss his department perhaps he will be able to give that information.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron.) Yes.

Mr. FOSTER.

Allowance to W. Wallace, ex-postmaster Victoria, B.C..... $240

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that if nothing else is increasing rapidly in this country, the general superannuation allowances appear to be going on by leaps and bounds. I see in the line below in our estimates, that you expect to pay $260,000 as superannuation in the year shortly ensuing. Now, it does appear to me that hon. gentlemen are running the superannuation business into the ground. $260,000 a year for superannuation in such a service as we have, in a country like this, is a sum which justly excites a good deal of annoyance and a good deal of criticism among the taxpayers. It does seem to me that if we go on at the present rate, we will find ourselves shortly with a superannuation list of three or four hundred thousand dollars. $20,000 in a single year is a very large expected increase.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will take the table of allowances from year to year, he will find that in the last two or three years superannuations have not been very numerous, and in every case they have taken place for good cause, on account of age, or to secure greater efficiency and economy. He will find also that the practice of adding time has been almost entirely done away with. For the last three years the practice has been not to add time except in certain cases where services have been of unusual character, and have been rendered by persons of large technical or other qualifications, and of long service. The vote which is asked for is only a forecast, more a guess than anything else. I imagine that the Civil Service Commission which is about ending its labours, will have something to say about superannuation, and it may be that they may make some recommendations which will benefit this branch of the service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I observe that payments are increasing, as was to be expected under the Act, having been in 1874-5 $101,000, they have gone on until they have now reached $240,000. I want to remark that the receipts do not at all increase in the proportion we would expect. In 1870-71 we received for the superannuation fund, $53,000, and the next year $54,000, and in those years we paid out a very small sum, less than we received, if I mistake not. In 1890-91 we received $62,000, that is an increase of some $9,000 during all these years, whereas, the payments have increased out of all proportion. Probably the great evil underlying the superannuation policy is that we do not exact sufficient percentage year by year from those who are entitled to come on the fund.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the same percentage.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is worthy of consideration whether the percentage is now sufficient. In view of the large amount required, $260,000, we should consider whether the percentage should not be increased. Do I understand that the Civil Service Commission has been considering this matter and will make a report?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot say definitely what they will report upon. I think we may assume they may.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have they been asked to report upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. Their instructions cover it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not know whether they have considered it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know what they have considered.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems in face of the facts, that the receipts are $62,000 as against $260,000 expended, that our receipts are not as large as they should be.

Mr. BOWELL. Originally the percentage was larger. When the law was first passed it was, if my memory serves me, 4 per cent, and then it was reduced to 2 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why?

Mr, BOWELL. It was thought to be too great a tax on the employés, and it was thought that 2 per cent would be sufficient. It is difficult to arrive at a definite conclusion and to form a correct idea by looking at the figures. It would be impossible to come to a correct conclusion, unless you had the names of all the parties who have been superannuated, also information as to whether the offices were filled and the amount of salaries of the new appointees. Suppose you superannuate a man receiving $2,000. A promotion may take place, or a new appointment made at a salary of $600 per annum. In such a case the new officer would only pay a percentage on $600 instead of $2,000, which would have been continued to have been paid if the superannuated officer had continued in the service. It is difficult, I repeat, to arrive at correct conclusions as to whether the country really loses or profits by this system of superannuation. Unless you had full particulars you could not by any possibility come to a correct conclusion on the matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would not assume that my opinion was worth a great deal, for I have not sufficiently studied the question. In reading the Public Accounts I find that we received $53,000 or $54,000 and it dropped to $34,000. Evidently some change was made. When I desire to ascertain the cause it appears very clear, because when $53,000 were received for 1871-72 the expenditure was $38,000. Those who were paying the fees complained that they were paying more than they should do. When we reduced the fees we exacted $34,000 in 1872-73 and $36,000 in 1873-74. In those years we paid out $64,000 and $77,000 respectively. The expenditure has since increased and the receipts have remained stationary.

Mr. FOSTER. We must be superannuating a high class of officers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is worth considering whether, if we have made a reduction in the percentage charged years ago, whether it is not now desirable under different circumstances to increase the percentage.

Mr. BOWELL. The remark of the Minister of Finance is literally true. Some superannuations have taken place in the Customs Department in Montreal with salaries running from $1,600 to $2,000. The total amount of such salaries received was between $10,000 and $15,000. They were superannuated on the basis of the salaries received three years previous. In no case has any officer been appointed to succeed at the same salary. The sum paid is debited to the superannuation fund, but really a large sum has been saved to the country by the reductions which have been made.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite evident that under the operation of the Act a very large amount has been added to the drain on the resources of the country. I was glad to hear the Minister of Inland Revenue say a few weeks ago when he attempted to defend the use made of this particular Act, that he believed that the Government would take up this whole question. It is about time they did. I have here the return the Minister of Finance laid on the Table of the House. It appears there were retired during last year 66 officers. Last year the number was 54. The number of superannuations appears to vary from 60 to 65, but this year it was 66. We have at present on the list 513, on June 30, 1891. The average allowance is $480; the gross sum paid last year was $241,410. It is clear that many men have been retired at an earlier period of life than is considered necessary. They have been retired at 59 and at 49. There has been a large increase in the Post Office Department and the Customs Department, no less than 20 superannuations having taken place in the latter. If a Minister can remove men under the Superannuation Act who have been drawing salaries of $3,000, and those positions remain unfilled for considerable period, why need they be filled at all? In the Customs Department there are no less than 10 vacancies, owing to the operation of this Act. Many officers have been removed and superannuated, and their places have not been filled by any appointees. It is a clear proof that there are any number of men in the several departments who should not be there. If we can in one year superannuate ten men and leave their places vacant, and still I presume the business of the country is being attended to.

Mr. BOWERS. I find that one man in Victoria, B.C., was superannuated at $240 a year when he was 34 years of age, and another man born in 1853, D. B. Gordon, of Ottawa, was superannuated in 1888, getting $255 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Customs stated, I understand, that when persons were appointed to fill vacancies caused by superannuation of officers, they received less salaries than the persons superannuated. I notice that a Mr. Labonté was retired last year, and that the person appointed to his place received the same salary, namely, $600.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman was not paying attention to what I said. I said nothing of the kind. I said that there were many cases in which superannuation had taken place, and where the positions were not filled, and I also stated that in many cases promotions had been made in which a smaller salary had been given to the person promoted. Where a man receiving five or six hundred dollars a year is superannuated, the person filling his place is likely to receive the same salary, because in cities like Montreal and Toronto, it is impossible to get men to work for a less salary, and if they did they could not live on it.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I think it is time that the Government should take this matter seriously into consideration. There is a very large amount of money paid out every year for superannuation, and if it cannot be curtailed in reference to the parties now in office, I think it should be so

arranged that persons coming into the service should not be a burden on the public funds when they retire. I find that during the last 10 years $1,492,984 were taken out of the public treasury for this superannuation fund. I believe that the feeling in the country is very strongly against this, and my own feeling is that it ought not to be continued. It may be true that persons now in the service have vested interests which we cannot ignore, but I think that the Government should make an arrangement with persons entering the service in the future so that they would not become a burden on the public treasury when they leave office. I hope that this will receive the serious consideration of the Government, and that they will be able to propound some scheme which will overcome this difficulty with reference to parties appointed hereafter, if not to those at present engaged.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the present scheme is not a sound one and I would venture to suggest one that I think would meet the case. I have done so before without producing any results, I am sorry to say. If there is a certain salary attached to an office I believe that the man appointed to that office should have a certain amount retained out of his salary, whatever proportion of his salary is deemed right, and that this should be funded for him, allowing him a certain rate of interest upon it and when he leaves office he could draw the money with interest.

Mr. BOWELL. And if he dies?

Mr. MULOCK. It would belong to his estate. That is a system we have recently adopted in Toronto in connection with an institution in which I take some interest, and I think it is going to give satisfaction. If you look at this list of superannuations you will find that men appointed at various ages, some well up in years, have only served a few years and are then pensioned off for life. I would like to know is there any system by which a person entering office is required to have a medical certificate to show that he is in good health?

Mr. BOWELL. We have to have a doctor's certificate now before the recommendation passes the Treasury Board.

Mr. MULOCK. When one looks over this list it is surprising to find how soon some of these officers are incapacitated through ill-health. I do not think you will ever get the present system to work properly, because a man may succeed in getting a certificate which would warrant you in appointing him, but when he wants to retire he can easily make out that it is in the interest of the public service that he should retire, and that he is not in good health. There always will be what I may call fraud in this connection. We have, year after year, an increasing army of annuitants, and there is one sound way of preventing these frauds, and that is to deduct from the salary each year the amount we propose to surrender him when he withdraws from the service.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is stated here that Mr. James Cowan, official referee, was superannuated last year, and that he was twenty-two years in the service. I think that can hardly be correct. I would like to know if there was any time added to Mr. Cowan's service?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox).

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was no time added; that is his actual service.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask whether in view of the large discrepancy between receipts and expenditures, of $200,000, the Government does not think it would be fair and just to make such an amendment to the law as would provide for a large increase in the receipts? I do not mean to say, of course, it would be possible to make receipts and expenditures equal, but the discrepancy is too large and the public will not be satisfied if it continues so in the future. The expression of the hon. member from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) shows that this dissatisfaction is not confined to one side of the House alone, but is spreading everywhere.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think I can say that the Government can undertake to proceed in any certain way as to adopting another scheme or as to heightening the percentage that may be paid. But this much I will say, that the Government expect that the Civil Service Commission will have taken this matter up, and will make a report upon it; and they intend very carefully to consider the whole question in the light of that report. There is plenty of good ground for difference of opinion with reference to the superannuation system. I think a great many arguments can be adduced in favour of it, in the line of real economy; but there is no use of our going into that to-night. It is a question which, from the magnitude it has assumed and seems likely to assume in the future, requires the attention of Parliament, and it will receive the attention of the Government and afterwards the attention of Parliament, when the Civil Service Commission shall have finished their labours and made their report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will observe one thing, that this superannuation allowance has assumed a very serious aspect, in view of the practice which we have adopted, differing from that of the English service, in allowing the average of the salaries to become very large. In some of the departments at headquarters, every employé will average $1,200 or $1,300 a year. In other countries that is not permitted. They have a superannuation like ours, but they do not allow men to be promoted by seniority as we do, and do not allow the average salaries to run up as we do. I have no doubt, considering the men who have become qualified for superannuation during the last few years, that in the course of four or five years, we shall have a superannuation allowance of $400,000 or $500,000, and I am perfectly certain that the whole superannuation system will be in a very great peril when that time arrives. There is a great deal of feeling, and not unjustifiable feeling, on this account throughout the country; and if no alteration is made in the system, I doubt very much if you will be able to retain it, although its abolition would entail a great deal of hardship upon many civil servants. It would be better for the Government to take the matter up now than to be compelled to deal with it in obedience to a great popular outburst which might sweep away the whole system.

Mr. WATSON. In my opinion, as well as in the opinion of many people in the country, the superannuation system is a fraud on the public, and ought to be abolished altogether. Why

should not the civil servants lay up for themselves like ordinary people. A great many men are superannuated who are afterwards able to occupy positions in active business. I have in my mind some superannuated men who are occupying some of the best positions in commercial life in Canada. The system is simply used by the Government as a means by which they can get rid of officers for the sake of appointing their friends to the positions they occupy.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot prove that from the records brought down.

Mr. WATSON. I think it can be proved. We had such a case in the Province of Manitoba, that of Mr. McMicken, who was superannuated on a large allowance, I think $1,500 a year, and who was afterwards Speaker of the Local Legislature. He lived for 15 years after he was superannuated: he only died a year ago. When he was superannuated he was a healthy, robust man.

Mr. BOWELL. Was his office filled by another?

Mr. WATSON. I do not care whether it was or not. If he was not required in the service he should have been discharged and paid his salary up to date. The Government are treating the civil servants as a lot of wards, like the Indians who cannot take care of themselves. It is suggested by my hon. friend that the Government should retain a portion of their salary because they cannot take care of it themselves. I believe they are all intelligent men, and why should they not be given their pay and be expected to save for themselves like the rest of us in this Canada of ours? The whole system is a fraud, and I think that the Government ought, in the future, at any rate, to use every means possible to curtail this expenditure which is growing every year.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Finance challenged the statement of the hon. member for Marquette, that the superannuation system was used for the purpose of removing one man in order to give another man his place. I would call the Finance Minister's attention to the very vote before us, $250 for Mr. Wallace. Mr. Wallace was the postmaster of Victoria. But it was necessary to find a resting place for Mr. Shakespeare, an ex-member of this House, and in order to do that the Government superannuated Mr. Wallace, giving him the full allowance he was entitled to. He kicked vigorously, however, not being disposed to give up the position, and it appears that the Government pledged themselves that each year they would bring in a vote of this kind to supplement his allowance, while Mr. Shakespeare is postmaster, receiving the salary of $2,000 which was formerly given to Mr. Wallace. And yet the Finance Minister has the face to say that the records do not prove the statement of the hon. member for Marquette.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither they do.

Mr. McMULLEN. This case of Mr. Wallace is an instance, and I will give another. Here is the case of the postmaster of Montreal, who was drawing $4,000 a year. He had served sixteen years and a half, and the Government added eight years and a half to his time of service, placed him on the superannuation list last year, giving him an allowance of $2,000 a year, and appointed a new man in his place at $4,000 a year. I would like to know if that is not using the superannuation system for the purpose of retiring one man to make room for another. The system has been abused all around, and the record does prove the statement my hon. friend has made. There is another case. The postmaster at Toronto was removed in the same way. It is high time this system was abolished. I do not believe that the civil servants themselves are in favour of it. I believe they would prefer, with the opportunities they now have of insuring their lives at a very moderate sum yearly, to have the system abolished. The system has been abused to this extent that the civil servants find themselves liable to be called on at any time to step down and out; and if they do not do it quietly, they will have to be forced to do it. They will be forced to apply for superannuation, under a medical certificate that they suffer from some peculiar disease in their toe or finger or head, so as to comply with the formal statute and enable the Government to retire them and appoint some one in their place. The fact that we have on the list 513 men costing us an annual outlay of $241,000 clearly proves my assertion. The Hon. Mr. Blake, when he had a seat in this House, brought in a resolution to abolish the whole system, and proposed that 5 per cent, or 2½ per cent should be deducted from the salaries and placed to the credit of the civil servants, bearing interest half yearly. Then, when they had to withdraw from the service, that money would be paid to them or their legal heirs, with accumulated interest. Until then, the money would be kept by the Government as a guarantee of good faith and of good service. I hope the Civil Service Commission will bring in a recommendation to abolish this system, and in so doing they will have the support of the country. I fancy we are now losing under it in the neighbourhood of $170,000, which is a net loss, after deducting the amount the officials have to contribute. In connection with the Customs Department, I notice that Mr. Purcell was superannuated last year, and now gets $1,220 a year as superannuation allowance on a salary of $1,600 a year, and his position has not been filled. I would like to know if it is intended to leave the position still unfilled, or whether it is the intention of the Government to replace him.

Mr. WATSON. The Minister of Militia said that some of these men were superannuated on account of their positions being abolished. There is one case which stands out more prominent than any other, and that is the case of Mr. Travis, formerly stipendiary magistrate of the North-West Territories, who, after having served one year and a half and proved himself eminently unfitted for the position, had ten years added to his time and was given a pension of $750 a year. Mr. Travis was well known to gentlemen on the Treasury benches from the eastern provinces, it was a mistake to appoint him, as he was not fitted for the office, and because the Government made a mistake they compensated Mr. Travis for it by allowing him $750 a year for the rest of his life. I could mention several other cases where men have been retired who are quite capable of performing their work for another 10 or 20 years.

Mr. CAMPBELL. My opinion agrees with that expressed by the hon. member for Lennox. I think the time has come when the Government should consider the question of doing away with

superannuation altogether, so far as new men entering the service are concerned, for of course the old men, who have been in it for years, have vested rights we ought not to disturb. With the new men, however, arrangements should be made that in their case no superannuation will be allowed, and then in a few years we would get rid of the wretched burden altogether. I do not see an object at all in carrying out this system. It is not done by any business corporation, and it is not a business transaction. If you pay a man $3,000 or $4,000, surely you can let him take care of himself and invest his own money, which he can do better than the Government can. The idea of the Government retaining 5, 10 or 2½ per cent is childish. Every civil servant can take care of his wages better than any one else can, and besides that we have insurance companies, who will insure the lives of any one at a small rate, being organized specially for that purpose. I do not think that the Government should go into the life insurance business at all. There has been great abuses in this system. In fact since the Auditor General's Report came down $20,000 have been added to the burdens of the people. In some particular cases the system has been more abused than in others. I saw a certain gentleman I could name, in my county, when the bye-election was held, actively promoting the interests of the Government candidate. That gentleman, I believe, is an ex-judge. He never paid a single farthing into the superannuation fund though he enjoyed a good salary, yet now he draws $1,600 a year from the Government and is also solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for which he gets a salary of $15,000 a year. Does it not appear to be absurd that a man who can earn $15,000 a year should have an allowance thus saddled on the people?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. How many years did the hon. gentleman say he served?

Mr. CAMPBELL. He is comparatively young, and I do not remember how many years he was judge.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He only served 25 years as a judge.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was he not paid sufficiently for the services he performed as judge?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Half the payment was statutory provision, the statute stating that when he served 25 years he should get a retiring allowance, and he was paid a small salary on that account.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think that should be allowed to exist any longer. Of course those who have entered the service under the old law there may be a difficulty to get rid of, but I think the law should be changed so that those who are now in the service should not expect any superannuation allowance at all. I think the case of our judges is worse than any other. All our civil servants have paid into the superannuation fund, but the judges do not pay in a farthing, and yet they are all paid a retiring allowance of two-thirds of their salary. Some system should be adopted by which gradually, in a few years, we might get rid of the heavy burdens now placed on the people of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Justice very abruptly challenged the statement of my hon. friend as to the length of service of Judge Clarke. I see here a retiring allowance of $720 to J. Travis. I would ask the Minister how many years he was in the service?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not know how many years he was in the service. I do not remember, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that he left the service because his office was abolished, and the statute under which he was appointed provided that, if the office was abolished, he should have a superannuation allowance based not only on the length of his actual service but with ten years added.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was from one and a half to two years in the service, and yet he gets a superannuation allowance. According to the statute, as I understand it, it is necessary for men to serve 10 years to entitle them to a superannuation allowance, or they have to get a number of years added. In this case there must have been eight years added, because I suppose there was no special Act passed to put Mr. Travis on the superannuation list. That is one case in which I think the Act has been abused in order to give a friend of the Government an easy competence for the rest of his life.

Mr. McGREGOR. There was another reason why Mr. Travis was superannuated. He was sent to the North-West as a judge, but he was more fitted for a lunatic asylum. I was in the district at that time, and the actions of that man should have sent him to an asylum instead of putting him on the superannuation list. He walked up and down the streets of Calgary as if he owned the town. He said: "Take that man and put him in prison," and to prison he went; and to superannuate such a man was not only doing a wrong to the country, but the parties who appointed him should be charged with wrong-doing in making the appointment. The only three cases of superannuation that I remember in our county were the cases of able-bodied men. There was William Bartlett, who was appointed in 1874, and, after 14 years' service, being as healthy and strong a man as any one in this House to-day, he was superannuated. He was a Reformer and had to make way for someone else. Then there was Mr. Robert Elliott, who was superannuated after a short time and is getting $600 a year now. And there was Mr. Charles G. Fortier, who had charge of the customs office at Hamilton, and he was superannuated in the prime of life. He has since died of la grippe, but up to that time, up to within a few days of his death, he was as strong as any man in this House or in the service. I have no reason to find fault if some good system is adopted, but, with the present methods of insurance and with the present means of saving money, there is no reason why these men should not prepare for old age as the rest of us have to do.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is the first time I have heard that Judge Travis was insane. I have known that old gentleman for 30 or 40 years, and I have never thought him a crazy man. He is now engaged in literary work, writing on questions of law, and he is an able man, an able lawyer. He had no desire to be superannuated. He made great complaints at being superannuated. He thought great injustice was done to him in that. I have seen him here two or three times since he was superannuated. I see some gentlemen here

who knew him when he was practising his profession in the city of St John. He is a man of sound mind. I cannot judge of his ability, but he must have been a man of ability to be appointed to that position. I have heard him called an able lawyer, and I think he ought not to have been superannuated. I read the report of the investigation into his conduct in the North-West, and I do not think he should have been discharged. I think he was sat upon by a set of men who were determined to disregard the law, and that he was in the right and they were in the wrong.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not desire to do the gentleman any injustice. The change of air may have had some effect upon him, but I was present in the court when he was impeached for his actions in that country, and the question was brought before one of the best judges of the North-West. Sir Donald A. Smith will tell you that Judge Taylor, the judge he was tried before, was an impartial judge, a gentleman of great ability, and he found Mr. Travis wanting, in so much that it was recommended that he should be superannuated or taken off the bench. I have no grudge against the gentleman. He never did me any harm whatever. I should be sorry to do him any injustice, but, when he was in the North-West, if I were upon oath, I would say he was out of his mind. I am glad to hear he is better.

Mr. SEMPLE. If there is one thing which should be remedied, it is the superannuation or pensioning of civil servants. We know that many are pensioners on the public bounty. Nearly a quarter of a million is set apart in the Estimates for that purpose every year. The number of such pensioners is increasing. It is not pretended by any means that they do not receive sufficient salary, because they all have large salaries, and the day's work they have to perform is very short. If they spend a certain number of years in the service they are sure to become pensioners, and consequently do not make provision for the future. Their sole desire is to live as well as they can, and to get a pension as soon as they can. If it was known that public servants after they cease to serve the Government, would have to depend on their own earnings, it would do a great deal to give this class the independence which they need. Mechanics, for instance, if they do not lay by a few dollars a year during the period when they can work, to make provision for a rainy day, come to be very poor at last, and a burden upon the taxpayers. True, there is provision for such persons in houses of industry, but these houses have to be supported by the taxpayers. I think the sooner this system is abolished the better. I notice on page 240–B, that W. Brown, Summerside, P.E.I., received $100. He was appointed 18th July, 1886, and he was pensioned in July, 1883. I think that case requires some explanation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought to have some explanation about Mr. Travis. I do not know anything about his merits or demerits, but it does appear to me that if a man is appointed a judge and superannuated in a year and a-half afterwards, there is a strong presumption of one of two things : either that the gentleman has been proved another failure as a judge, and deserved to be dismissed, or that he is treated with gross injustice. I hink this case requires explanation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The House has had the explanation ten times, but I have no objection to repeat it. He was appointed stipendiary magistrate in the North-West Territories, under the Act in regard to that subject, and making provisions for superannuation. An investigation was had into a number of charges which were made against him. While that was proceeding, or shortly afterwards, the office of stipendiary magistrate was abolished, and the court erected with the same tenure that the ordinary judges have throughout the Dominion, but having very much larger functions than the magistrates had. When the judicial system in that country was organized, it was quite apparent to everybody that this gentleman was totally unfit to be appointed to that court, but that did not deprive him of the right to compensation after the abolition of his office. The other stipendiary magistrates were appointed judges.

Mr. PERRY. I think it is about time that the Parliament of this country should call a halt in the matter of superannuation. I think the people of this country have every desire to pay their servants for every hour, every minute, every second that they work for the country, but when you come to tax the poor ratepayers of this country to pay people for doing nothing, and when they take the people's money and go to England or to Boston to spend it, men only 45 years of age, you are doing an injustice to the taxpayers. Why, Sir, when the Government does such things it would not be astonishing if the people came here and discharged all the members of this House and sent them about their business, and elect a new set of representatives, or at least a new Government, who would do justice to the people. I find that the superannuation last year cost us $241,110.49. Now, what is the amount paid by these officers in order to meet that sum ? If the Government made up their minds to tax each of these men a certain amount yearly in order to make up this sum, I would have no objection, and I say upon such a basis alone can we agree to continue the system of superannuation any longer. I repeat, why should the people of this country be called upon to pay a quarter of million of money to a few men for doing nothing at all ? Why, Sir, it is an unheard of thing. Is there any man who, in his own private business, would pay a servant for doing nothing ? Would the Minister of Justice himself pay his servant for doing nothing ; would he superannuate a man after serving him 25 or 30 years, or would any Minister of the Crown do it ? No, Sir ; and I say that these hon. gentlemen ought to adopt the same rule in conducting the business of the country that they would adopt in their own private business. They are sent here to protect the rights of the people and to take care of the purse strings. They are not sent here to take money out of the public chest and scatter it among a few men for doing nothing. It is a shame, it is a disgrace, to have an item like this in the Auditor General's Report and in the Estimates of this country, and it is time for the Government to prepare a scheme which will compel these officials to pay each into the superannuation fund a sum

equivalent to that which they would be entitled to take out.

Mr. BOWELL. In regard to the case of W. Brown, of Summerside, P.E.I., the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple) would have seen, if he had read the entry more carefully, that it was evidently a blunder. Of course the hon. gentleman could not know that the statement that Brown was in Summerside was an error, but he will see it stated in the Auditor General's Report that this man Brown was appointed in 1886 and was superannuated in 1883, so that this report actually gives a man a superannuation of $102 per annum, three years before he was appointed.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is evidently an error in the printing. I draw attention to page 18 of the Public Accounts. Mr. Brown had served 17 years; he had received $300 per annum and he was superannuated to promote efficiency and economy in the service, receiving $102 annually. True, he was only 58 years old, and had not arrived at the age at which he could be superannuated except for the reason given in the Public Accounts. I have a recollection of that transaction, because he was a locker in the Customs Department. The office was not filled because, from the number of employés, it was not deemed to be in the interest of the service to maintain so large a staff.

Mr. FLINT. I do not like to appear to agree by my silence with the sweeping condemnation of the whole system of superannuation which has been expressed by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Within certain limits the principle is a sound one. I can conceive of a great many positions where persons in the public service at very moderate salaries, and who during a long period of service become broken down in health, might be treated by the country to a reasonable and limited superannuation allowance. The principle has long been recognized as a fair one if properly administered. But the great complaint I have, and I sympathize with some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in this view, is that flagrant cases occur in which the principle has been abused, where men who have received large salaries and have not become broken down in the public service or lived to an old age, have been superannuated for one reason or another. I respectfully call the attention of the Government to this, and I ask them to devise some scheme by which these flagrant instances would not appear in the future. It is a great scandal to good government and a great injury to the public service generally, and it creates a feeling among hardworking people when they see the length to which this superannuation principle is carried out. As a personal allusion has been made to a friend of my own, Judge Travis, I may say I very much regret that the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) has conveyed the impression to which he gave utterance this evening. I remember the disturbances that occurred at one time in regard to the judge, and while I would not go so far as to defend all of the actions and sayings of that gentleman at the time of the troubles, yet at the same time I must state that I have had his acquaintance for a great many years and that he is a person of extraordinary ability. He may have some faults of temper, but is a man of profound learning and extraordinary industry which is to-day recognized very widely in the legal profession. Whether he was qualified for the high and delicate position of a judge may be open to question, but as to his mental capacity, and extraordinary industry, and his legal attainments I think there can hardly be any question.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to call the attention of the committee to an item of superannuation. It is the case of John Poupore, collector of slide dues at Ottawa. It appears from the report that this gentleman was appointed to the office at the age of 65 years. He was in office only seven years and was then superannuated at an annual salary of $884, and according to the report he was not then in ill-health, but he was 72 years of age. A note explains that he was retired in order to promote efficiency in the service. Is there any age in regard to these appointments? The Government appoints a man who is 65 years of age to a public office, and after he has been there seven years, they add ten years to his length of service, in order to entitle him to the Superannuation Act. In this case there was a gross abuse of the Act and disregard of the public interest. No hon. member would dream of carrying out such a transaction at his own expense. Why, therefore, should it be done by the trustees of the people and at the public expense?

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Poupore was appointed collector of slide and boom dues, but, at the time he was appointed, he discharged the duty of Crown lands agent for the Governments of Ontario and Quebec, the issue of licenses, &c., for the two provinces. About the time his superannuation took place the Governments of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec determined to take those territories into their own hands. Formerly the three offices were conjoined, the provinces paying their proportion of the cost of the administration of this particular office at Ottawa. When the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec determined to take control of these branches of revenue which were formerly performed by this officer, it was necessary to reduce the staff. Mr. Poupore was superannuated and a young man who was in the office was appointed at a much lower salary than Mr. Poupore was receiving as collector of slide and boom dues.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be some little reason for making some exception in this case. But if the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec had an officer on their hands whom they no longer required, it was for those two provinces to deal with this officer according to the merits and claims put forward. This duty did not lie with the Dominion Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. He was a Dominion officer.

Mr. MULOCK. He was engaged in performing provincial duties. Who appointed him?

Mr. SPEAKER. He was appointed by the Dominion Government, but by arrangement he discharged duties connected with those two provinces and the Dominion, and issued licenses for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. He was a Dominion officer, however, appointed by the Dominion Government.

Mr. MULOCK. The duties discharged by him were provincial duties. He performed them partly for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I do not see how the Dominion can be called upon to take

over an officer of 65 years, simply because for some reason he could not any longer be continued in the service of either province.

Mr. SPEAKER. That was not the fact.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see on what theory 10 years were added to his service, and he was made a pensioner on the Dominion for life.

Mr. BOWELL. The law provides that when an office is abolished as in a case of this kind, this action should be taken, and I think the party is entitled to claim it.

Mr. MULOCK. Was the office abolished?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; so far as the Dominion Government was concerned they had no longer anything to do with the office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are we to understand that Mr. Poupore was appointed at the age of 65 years without having previously served, because the appointment of an officer at that age who was afterwards to receive a superannuation is an abuse in itself. According to the law every man is entitled to superannuation when he attains the age of 60 years, and if I remember aright, after he reaches 65 he must be superannuated, unless the officer in charge reports specially that there are grounds for exempting him from the operation of the Act. The mere fact of appointing him at the age of 65 was an abuse of the Act.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to know if the late Deputy Minister of Fisheries is on the list for superannuation, and if not is he going to be? I am not prepared to-night to say that it is a wise thing for the Minister to do away with that department, but if the late Deputy Minister of Fisheries is to be superannuated, I say it is a shame. That gentleman is a strong, hearty, healthy man, and I do not know that he is 50 years of age. I am sure that if he is not required in that department there are other departments where his services would be of use to the country, without his coming here as a beggar asking the country to pay him about $1,500 a year for nothing. I want to know if he is on the superannuation list?

An hon. MEMBER. He is on it.

Mr. PERRY. I am surprised to hear that. It would be enough for an old man like myself who has been fighting politics for 40 years to be superannuated, but I think I am able to fight a good many battles yet; and the late Deputy Minister of Fisheries is well able to earn his living for many years to come. Even though there may have been differences between the Minister and himself, yet there was no investigation, except perhaps some kind of a one behind the screens, and we have nothing to do with that. He is boarding somewhere here in Ottawa, walking the streets with his cane in his hands, and he is a young man, hardly 50 years of age. He looks as healthy as the Minister himself, he is full fat, and is well able to earn his living for many years to come. He must be a smart man, he is a good scholar, he is an efficient man, and the people of the country generally do not find fault with the administration of the late Deputy Minister of Fisheries. I say again a it is a crying shame to superannuate such a man, and put such an expense on the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was the Customs appraiser of Toronto superannuated last year?

Mr. BOWELL. No, sir, he was not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has a new appointment been made in Toronto?

Mr. BOWELL. The dry goods appraiser resigned his position, and Mr. Davidson was sent from Montreal to Toronto to take his place, and the assistant in Toronto was sent to Montreal.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understand that he was a man named Cuthbert, and that he was a jeweller before being a dry goods appraiser.

Mr. BOWELL. He was appointed assistant appraiser to be used in any capacity that his services might be required. At the time Mr. Sergeant left the department, it was necessary some one should be appointed to assist. Mr. Cuthbert was found to be a general business man with more than ordinary ability and tact, having been traveller for a commercial house. He had a knowledge as well of the dry goods trade as the jewellery business, and he had also knowledge of hardware, so that he was what I might call a general all-round man. When I removed Mr. Davidson from Montreal, he was receiving $1,400 a year, in place of Mr. Sergeant, who received $1,600. I substituted Mr. Cuthbert for Mr. Davidson in Montreal.

Mr. McMULLEN. The question was brought to my knowledge by a wholesale dry goods merchant at Montreal who I think is also a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. He was complaining that the gentleman appointed was a person who had not that extended knowledge and experience in the dry goods business which he should have as an appraiser, and that the appointment was not in the public interest. He looked upon it as singular that a man who had been a jeweller should be appointed as appraiser in an important centre like Toronto.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Cuthbert is a worthy citizen of Toronto, but I never heard of his having any special knowledge of the dry goods trade. I think he has been carrying on the business of a jeweller in the city for the last 15 or 20 years. I can speak without any doubt as to over 10 years, and I think he was manager also for Russell & Co. in the jewellery business. If he did have any knowledge of dry goods at one time, it is probable that having been out of the trade for so many years, he would not be the best one in the world to appraise dry goods. While he is a very worthy citizen in many ways, you may find that he will not give satisfaction if he has to attend to dry goods. There may be enough for him to do in the jewellery line, although I fancy that most of the jewellery comes into Canada at night. So that, while I wish Mr. Cuthbert well and know him to be an honest man and a worthy citizen—the only drawback is that he has not had political light yet—I think he has been appointed on political grounds rather than on his merits.

Mr. BOWELL. The gentleman is not yet appointed; he is only on probation; and if his knowledge of business proves to be of the character mentioned, his appointment will not be confirmed.

Mr. MULOCK. I would not like to do him any injury.

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many years is it understood that Mr. Wallace is to get this additional allowance?

Mr. FOSTER. Till he dies. It is just in the same position as the superannuation allowance.

Customs $803,465

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this item, there is one matter of considerable importance which I know some hon. members who are not present wanted to discuss, that is, the mode in which the Government propose to deal with fines and forfeitures. There has been a good deal of complaint, as many members know, on the part of the mercantile community as to the way in which the customs law has been administered and as to the encouragement which they allege, rightly or wrongly, is given to informers, who they say have in a good many cases practically blackmailed some of the importers. It will be recollected that there have been suits, and a good many complaints made as a result of this system.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote consists of a good many items, and I would suggest that when we reach the one relating to the outside service, we allow that to stand with the understanding that the question which my hon. friend speaks of can be discussed on that.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in Nova Scotia.....$114,560

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the decrease caused by superannuation or permanent reduction?

Mr. BOWELL. Permanent reduction. I can give the hon. gentleman full particulars if he desires. I informed the House last session that I would make fuller investigations to see where reductions could be made. In many cases, superannuations took place and the positions were not filled. In others, services were dispensed with, some with a small gratuity. We also cut down the item of contingent expenses, and what is called "day pay." At Halifax the reduction by rearrangement of the staff amounted to $3,300.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In doing that, were you compelled to increase the superannuation allowance of any considerable number of officers?

Mr. BOWELL. Not to any extent.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have any of the ports been closed during the past year? Looking over the receipts I find several ports of entry where there is not sufficient collected to pay the salary of the collector. Such points should be closed. Are there any cases where the customs receipts are so very low as not to come up to the amount necessary to pay officials?

Mr. BOWELL. There are cases of that kind. There are some ports in the Maritime Provinces and on the line dividing the United States from Canada, in the Eastern Townships as well as in Manitoba, where the amount collected is not equal to the expenditure, but these places must be kept open in order to prevent smuggling. This question has been discussed nearly every session during the past thirteen years since I have been at the head of the department and a moment's reflection will show the madness of closing such ports. There have been some ports which have been reduced to outports on account of the falling off in receipts. For instance Guysborough has been made an outport on account of the falling off of the revenue, and Canso where the revenue has increased has been made a port. The same with Medway in Queen's County. Other ports of that character have been closed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite sure I notice somewhere the amount collected was not up to the expenditure and shall take an opportunity of bringing them under the notice of the Minister.

Mr. BOWELL. You are quite correct.

Customs, Ontario..... $201,255

Mr. MULOCK. Please explain the cause of this increase.

Mr. BOWELL. It may seem strange that in almost every province except Ontario and in the North-West there has been a large reduction. The explanation of the increase in Ontario of $7,250 lies in the fact that ports have increased and the work has increased to a considerable extent. A number of new preventive stations have been opened, and officers had to be appointed along the north shore of Lakes Huron and Superior and at Port Arthur. The general increases are as follows:—Amherstburg, $100 increase, accounted for by the increase in contingencies; Berlin, an increase of $100 to the collector, who does the whole work himself, and the revenue is increasing wonderfully. Brantford, an increase of $225, $100 given to Mr. Foster, $100 to the landing-waiter and $25 for contingencies. Brockville, an increase to two clerks of $100 each. In Chatham there is Mr. Fellows who has been removed from one port and added to another. Cobourg, there was an officer who was paid out of contingencies and is now on the permanent staff, causing an increase of $300. In Collingwood there is a transfer of one officer to that port and an increase of $50 for contingencies. In Cornwall there is an additional $50 in the salary of one of the officers. Guelph, an increase of another $100. Hamilton, an increase among different officers of $250. Kingston, an increase of $50 each to three officers. Morrisburgh, the old collector has been superannuated, and another appointed and an increase in contingency, making a total of $250. Niagara, extra pay through the necessity of placing on an additional man during the summer, $150. At Ottawa the increases amount to $700. In Owen Sound, extra pay arising from extra work through steamers making that a port of call, altogether $250. Peterborough, an increase to the collector of $200, making his salary $1,200. That is because the revenue ran up to $50,000 to $75,000 a year. In Picton, the increased pay of those not on the permanent staff is $300, which may be decreased or increased according to the work done. In Prescott an additional officer had to be appointed on account of the extra work caused by the crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the ferries, but, though it is an apparent increase, there will be a decrease at that port, from the fact that the surveyor, who received $800, has resigned, and the office is not filled and will not be filled. If it should be found necessary on account of extra work in the summer, an additional man may be put on at $400 or $500. At Port Arthur there is an increase of $350, arising from the fact that an officer has been appointed in conjunction with the Inland Revenue Department. He is stationed at Rat Portage, but he comes under the port of Port Arthur. At St. Thomas there is an increase of $100 to one of the officers. At Sarnia there is an apparent increase of

$1,300, but that is in consequence of a transfer of different officers along the lakes. At the Sault, extra pay during last year amounted to $500. In Simcoe, the apparent increase is $2,675, but Dover has been reduced to an outport and the officer there who received over $800 has been superannuated and another man appointed at $400. In Toronto, the appointment of an additional assistant appraiser and the increases to some of the officers show an increase of $1,200. I can give the hon. gentleman if he desires the names of those who have been appointed. At Wallaceburgh there has been an increase in consequence of the transfer of one man amounting to $100. That is the result of attaching it to Sarnia. The man who was transferred had $500 and another man was put in his place who had been receiving $600. At Windsor there was an additional man placed on the staff at $900 per annum; making a total of the increases in the province of $11,700. The decreases are as follows:—At Belleville one clerk who was receiving $1,000 was dismissed. His successor was appointed at $800 and $100 was added to the salary of the collector, making a net decrease of $100. At Clifton, one of the officers who was receiving $550 was retired and his place is not filled. Dover, as I have already stated, was reduced to an outport. It formerly cost $2,950, the officers had been transferred to Simcoe, and the officer there is receiving $400 per annum. At Fort Erie there is a saving of $100, less contingencies. At Gananoque, less extra pay, $100. In London there was a reduction by the readjustment of the staff amounting to $300, and at Woodstock there was an appropriation asked for last year of $500 which was not expended and which is not asked for this year, making the reductions amount to $4,450, and making the net increase in the province $7,250.

Mr. MULOCK. Who got the increase in Picton and when was the increase made?

Mr. BOWELL. That is extra pay and not an increase in salary. In that port one officer retired who was getting $200 per annum, and another, Mr. Niles, was appointed in his place, and the extra pay was given to assist the collector and for extra work. There is only one officer at Picton, and the Central Railway terminus is there, and he had to appoint some one to assist him at a cost of $300.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the officer was allowed $300 for this extra work?

Mr. BOWELL. That may apply also to the outports. There are outports at Wellington, Weller's Bay, at the shipping point of the Central Railway, and also two or three others.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman explain the increase of $300 at Cobourg?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Hagerman was formerly paid out of contingencies and he received $600, and there are $100 for contingencies, making $700. Deducting the extra pay which had been given of $400, a portion of which I suppose went to Mr. Hagerman, the net increase is left at $300.

Mr. MULOCK. Are the receipts at the port of Cobourg greater than they were?

Mr. BOWELL. I could not say unless I referred to former receipts, but the collections last year amounted to $15,847. There are only three officers: there, the collector, a clerk and a landing waiter. The station is about a mile from the office, and they have also to attend to the work at the port. There has been no additional officer added to the staff at that port.

Mr. MULOCK. There has been an extra clerk converted into a permanent officer. That is an additional expense. Formerly you had a sort of elastic system, an extra clerk whose services could be dispensed with, but now you have a permanent officer whose services, I suppose, can only be dispensed with on the condition of making him a pensioner for life. Did the requirements of the office necessitate this change?

Mr. BOWELL. The requirements of the office necessitated the employment of Mr. Hagerman, whether he remained there temporarily at $50 a month or put on the permanent staff at the same salary. I may say frankly that I am somewhat in accord with the hon. gentleman's opinion on this subject. The placing of men on the permanent staff—and that is what every one of them demands—certainly has the effect which the hon. gentleman indicates. Whether under any new system, either at headquarters or in the outside service, it would not be better to have a number of them paid by the month or by the year is a question for future consideration. The answer to that is whether you would get as good men to remain in the service, because if they had nothing to look forward to in the future they would go and come as they pleased.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say when this change took place, that is, Mr. Hagerman from being an extra clerk to be a permanent clerk?

Mr. BOWELL. I think some time during last year. It was done certainly a long time before the election.

Mr. MULOCK. I repeat my question with regard to St. Thomas, Toronto and London.

Mr. BOWELL. In St. Thomas, there is only $100 increase; it was given to a preventive officer at Port Burwell, who received $200, and I gave him an additional $100. He bears the sonorous and very oderous name of Backhouse. In Toronto, deduct salary of $800 which was paid to Mr. Moffatt, deceased; deduct $1,600 paid to Mr. Sergeant, who is retired, but not superannuated. Then you may add for a successor to Mr. Sergeant, $1,600, although the gentleman who is now performing the work is paid $1,400. Still, I take the same amount, because I think it is a little enough salary for a man in that position. There was an appointment of Mr. James A. Beall, at $600, and of Mr. McMurtney, at $600, and an increase given to the sub-collector at the outport of Midland. The hon. gentleman is aware the expenses of these outports are all charged to Toronto. There is an increase of $200 given to Mr. Fowley, one of the officers on the frontier; $100 to a man named Wilson, and an increase of $200 to the salary of Mr. Fleming, cashier, who has to handle about $4,000,000. Mr. Paterson, who has been made an assistant appraiser, is given $200 in addition. There is a total increase in Toronto of $1,200. The total expenditure for that port was $66,587, and the collections were $4,076,927. At London deduct the salary of James Grant, resigned, $600, and $1,000 which was taken for a new officer but no appointment has been made

yet. One of the chief clerks having died a short time since, then Mr. Dreany was appointed at $600, and Mr. McLean at $500. An increase of $200 is given to Mr. Talbot, who is performing the work of chief clerk. The total expenditure at the port was $13,230.27; collections, $516,881.24. I think Mr. Dreany was appointed during the last year. Mr. Talbot got his increase when he was promoted after the death of Mr. Ewing. He was promoted on the recommendation of the late Mr. Newburn, Inspector of Ports.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I notice there is a general increase all along the line, and I want to take this occasion again to call the attention of the Minister to the port of Woodstock. I notice in many cases where the revenue is not nearly as large as it is in Woodstock, that it cost a great deal more to collect it, and I hardly think that justice has been done to the officers there. Owing to the peculiar circumstances of the port, as the Minister knows, the work is much harder than it is at many other ports. The officials are very diligent and attentive to their duties and there should be some recognition of their service in this general increase all along the line. The Minister is aware of the fact that there are many other places where the revenue is not as large as it is at Woodstock, but where it costs a great deal more to collect it. I give St. Thomas as an instance, where smaller revenue is collected, but something over $1,000 more is paid for collecting it. At St. Thomas the public buildings are better, and there are greater conveniences for doing the work than at the port of Woodstock. While I have no desire to advocate an increase in the expenditure of the department in any way, I think the men at all the ports should be paid on somewhat the same scale, so that justice may be done at all the ports. In my opinion the officers at Woodstock have not been treated as well as the officers in some other ports, taking into account the duties they perform and the amount of revenue collected. The Minister knows that the matter of accommodation at Woodstock has been brought to his attention very often, he knows it is not what it ought to be, considering the large amount of business done there.

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what he means when he says that they are worse paid then they are at St. Thomas?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I notice on the list that in some places where less revenue is collected, the officers are better paid.

Mr. BOWELL. You said St. Thomas.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I instanced St. Thomas' It costs $4,200 there to collect $75,000. At Woodstock it only costs $3,105 to collect $77,000. That is a very material difference. These officers should receive the same pay, at all events, as officers who have less work to perform, considering also that the port yields a larger revenue than does the other. That is reasonable and just. It must be known to the Minister that owing to special circumstances, the work is heavy. The distance of the stations is great, and these officers work very hard at night in order to keep up with their duties. I have often seen them working late in order to get out their report. If they are not out early in the morning, they cannot get to the station and attend to their duties, and often for want of sufficient assistance merchants have been put to considerable inconvenience. I submit that the facts are such as deserve the consideration of the Minister. I simply made this proposition, that when a man does more work than another occupying a similar position, he is entitled to more pay.

Mr. BOWELL. The general proposition of the hon. gentleman is correct, and every one will agree with him. The highest salary paid at St. Thomas is $1,200. The collector at Woodstock, who is a very good one, receives $1,300.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He has been 30 or 40 years in the service.

Mr. BOWELL. Not quite so long as that. If the hon. gentleman had applied that remark to the late collector at St. Thomas, he would have been quite correct, for he was a very old gentleman when he died. I removed him from a small place to St. Thomas, and he proved a capital collector. The work at St. Thomas is altogether of a different character, and much greater in volume than the work at Woodstock. The fact is that some thousand dollars more may be collected at one port than another, but that is no indication of the work done. That depends on the number of trains at which the officers are compelled to attend in order to receive goods on their arrival. That is the case at St. Thomas, which is perhaps the most thriving town in Ontario next to Woodstock. I have removed officers from points along the frontier where very little work is now done owing to the construction of railways, and I have sent some of these officers to St. Thomas at increased salaries. I consider that the officers are paid in proportion to the work at both towns. In regard to accommodation, I thought a new office had been rented for the accommodation of the people of Woodstock. I will not argue the question of public buildings, because that may come up under the public works. When the hon. gentleman becomes Minister of Customs he will find that it does not follow that where there are the largest collections there is the greatest amount of work. That depends to a great extent on whether the place is a preventive station or a railway centre. It must also be borne in mind that two or three outports are attached to St. Thomas, which swell the expenditure, and this circumstance does not enter into the calculations as regards Woodstock.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman has not shown that I was incorrect, although his explanation as to why increases were not made may be satisfactory. The Minister knows that I simply took St. Thomas as a place close by, and I desired to be strictly fair in the comparison I made. I ask the hon. Minister to bear in mind that Woodstock is a more important railway centre than is St. Thomas, and the stations being situated at so great a distance the work is more severe on the officers. I do not complain in regard to the salary paid to the collector, but his assistants do not receive the same salaries as are paid in other places for the work they do, and the positions they hold. If I had desired to occupy the time I could have shown the Minister that I was thoroughly accurate in my statement, as may be shown by a comparison of the different places, and the number of officers and the amounts paid to each. I consider I made a very fair comparison. I should like the

statements I have made, which are all borne out by the facts, to be taken into consideration with a view to doing justice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have a somewhat similar complaint to make to that brought forward by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), with respect to the outport of Pembroke. I admit the truth of the statement made by the Minister, that the amount of revenue collected is not a fair test of the amount of work performed, but at this particular place a revenue of $25,000 is collected, and there is only one officer at a salary of $800. I am not asking that the salary of the officer be increased, but I want to point out that the efficiency of the service is not what it ought to be. The officer has to attend to the railway station, to look after parcels coming by post and various other matters. He has to attend every train that comes in, because he has not only to collect duty on those goods that arrive by rail, but he has to see that dutiable goods passing northward on the line are looked after when passing that particular point. The effect of it is that the officer is obliged to be out of his office during a very great portion of the time. I hope the Minister will consider the necessity of giving some assistance to the officer at that particular place.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the receipts at Barrington, Nova Scotia?

Mr. BOWELL. Collections, $1,053, and expenses $1,357.

Mr. McMULLEN. I thought the Minister said there was no port at which the cost of expenses exceeded the amount received.

Mr. BOWELL. On the contrary I said there were quite a number, and I gave the reasons why they were not abolished, and I stated it was generally in the Maritime Provinces on the coast, and also in the west, and in the Eastern Townships on the United States border, where it was necessary to keep up a kind of protective service.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the Minister know that C. A. Hagerman, landing-waiter at the outport of Newcastle, lives in Newcastle or does he live in Port Hope?

Mr. BOWELL. He must live in Newcastle if there is such a man there. If Newcastle is an outport the expenses are probably charged to Port Hope.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am informed he lives at Port Hope; perhaps there is not enough room at Port Hope for two or three officers, and that he is charged to the outport.

Mr. BOWELL. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there is nothing of the kind. There is no such case in the whole 1,000 officers that are attached to the Customs Department, and in no case can he or any other member show that any man has been charged to any other port or outport than that in which he does his duty. I am not in the habit of doing business in that way.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are we to understand that he is a resident of Newcastle?

Mr. BOWELL. If he is not, I know nothing to the contrary, nor am I prepared to say the hon. gentleman's statement is not true. If it is true the man is not doing his duty and it shall be looked into.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who is the officer at Pelee Island now?

Mr. BOWELL. McCormick. The same man who was formerly collector has been reinstated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was done with the man who was appointed and dismissed?

Mr. BOWELL. It is just one of the cases that my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) referred to. He never was appointed. He was put on temporarily to do work when McCormick was removed to the mainland to perform other work, and for reasons which I gave fully to the House last year. After investigation I found that Mr. McCormick was a good officer, and I reinstated him and dispensed with the services of the other.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). My recollection of it is hardly in that way. I thought that gentleman was regularly appointed, and fault was found because he had been dismissed, and the claim was disputed as I remember, and a certain amount was offered. Did he accept the amount that was offered by the department, or what was the amount given him?

Mr. BOWELL. He was paid at the rate of $400 or $500 a year for the actual time he was employed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Everything is lovely there now.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think everything is lovely. When I make the statement that he never was appointed I trust the hon. gentleman has sufficient confidence in me to believe it. Atchison had never been appointed, but was placed in the service temporarily. I understand the hon. gentleman to doubt that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is merely my recollection of what occurred last year. I think there was a telegram from the Minister saying that he had been appointed.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman interprets "appointment" to mean, that when I say to a collector: put a man on for a certain time, that was an appointment. But we do not consider that a man is appointed until the Order in Council is passed appointing him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I know the Minister of Customs sufficiently well to know that when he as Minister says he will appoint some one, he sees the appointment is confirmed by an Order in Council.

Mr. BOWELL. Not always.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With very rare exceptions.

Mr. BOWELL. I often say I will recommend an appointment under certain circumstances, and if the circumstances do not justify it I do not do so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I venture to think that when the hon. member undertakes to administer his department and to make recommendations to Council that he is about as powerful as all the other members of the Privy Council put together on that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the Minister of Customs, or his successor, recently superannuated an officer in Kingston of the name of Pigeon.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know Mr. Pigeon. I fancy he must be a man of about 70 years of age, it is true; but he is a hale and hearty man and well enough able to discharge his duty for some years to come. What was the reason of superannuation?

Mr. BOWELL. From age, and because I was informed that he was not attending to his duties as a housekeeper and messenger should do, and I supposed that he was unable to do it from his age. That was the representation made to me, and I superannuated him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am rather surprised if those representations were made to the hon. Minister. Who is appointed in his place?

Mr. BOWELL. I am only speaking from recollection, but I think a man named Carson.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I am correctly advised, Mr. Pigeon, who I should say is quite capable to discharge the duties of the office for some years, has been superannuated at the age of 70, and the man appointed in his place is 64 or 65.

Mr. BOWELL. If that is the case, I was deceived, that is all I can say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that is the case, the economy in the public service has in that respect been pretty seriously interfered with. I suppose you know the age of the officer appointed.

Mr. BOWELL. I can find it out.

Mr. MULOCK. Yesterday we learned that the Government had allowed fish from Newfoundland that were dutiable to come into Canada duty free. I wish to know whether any such privilege or arbitrary exercise of power has taken place with regard to anything besides fish.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). I think it is out of order. We are discussing the salaries and contingent expenses in the several ports of the Province of Ontario. I do not see what connection that has with the duties of fish from Newfoundland.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not discussing the fish question; that was disposed of yesterday. I am asking whether any of these officers in Ontario——

The CHAIRMAN. I have ruled you out of order.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps you will wait till I put the question. I referred to Newfoundland as an illustration that the Minister might better understand what I desire to refer to. It is well known that different rulings obtain at different ports. Not long ago a Toronto merchant informed me that a higher duty had been charged, depending, of course, on appraisement, on certain classes of goods, glass, for example, imported through Toronto, than was charged on similar goods imported through a certain other port. While that may depend on the judgment of the appraiser, a still greater injustice would occur if, in other circumstances, the law itself was disregarded. I wish to know whether any record of such cases is kept?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman wants to enter into the general question of the management of the Customs in reference to the orders given to the appraisers under the law, I shall be quite prepared to enter into that question at any time. But what that has to do with the particular item under discussion I am at a loss to know. These difficulties with the different appraisers have occurred ever since there has been a tariff; but I cannot say that I am ready to enter into that question under the Estimates.

Mr. MULOCK. We are now discussing an item involving an expenditure of nearly $1,000,000 for the enforcement of the Customs Act, and I think it is perfectly germane to this item to ask the question that I have asked. I desire to know whether there has been any authority given to any officer of the department to admit any dutiable goods free?

Mr. BOWELL. No such order has been issued. If the hon. gentleman refers to the question of Newfoundland fish which was discussed last night, explanation will be given as promised in proper time.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there a record kept of duties remitted?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. All duties that have remitted have been remitted by order of the Treasury and the Executive.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under what item does the hon. gentleman propose to discuss the question of the remission of duties or the non-collection of duties in the matter of Newfoundland fish?

Mr. BOWELL. It will come up when the papers moved for are brought down. I never supposed that in discussing the Estimates, we would have an attack made on the whole policy of the Government, and I submit to the hon. gentleman whether any question of that kind has ever been propounded or a Minister expected to enter into a general defence of the Government on any question of policy, in Committee of the Whole, when passing the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to point out that there are very few members present, and the promise was made that this whole question would be discussed when the papers are brought down. They have not yet been brought down, and it would conduce to the general information of the House, who take a strong interest in this question that the debate should be held over until then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is great convenience in discussing a subject of that particular character, when you can have question and answer. I think it is only fair, when discussing estimates of a million dollars for Customs to enquire into such a matter as the fact that for a period of years a particular duty has not been collected. I do not want however to press hon. gentlemen opposite on this occasion, and there is no objection, if an item be left over, discussing the matter later. I do not want a series of set speeches nor do I suppose hon. gentlemen want it, if information can be better obtained by short discussion and question and answer. We will not go on with the discussion now, it being understood that we will take it up when asked to pass the item of outside Customs service.

Customs, British Columbia..... $51,045

Mr. BOWELL. There is an increase here on account of establishing an office at Blaine, a new

town on the Sound, where the railway crosses the border, about twenty miles from New Westminster. There is also an officer appointed at Huntingdon, the crossing place of the line which connects with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are three officers in Chicago at a cost of $3,000. Why are they employed?

Mr. BOWELL. They do not cost us anything. They are placed there for the convenience of railway companies and to facilitate passenger traffic throughout Canada. The Grand Trunk Railway asked us to appoint an officer, Mr. Thompson, who has been in the service some years. They pay the money to us, and we pay it to the men. We objected to their paying the men because they would then become servants of the railway instead of being under the control of the department. Mr. Handwell had charge of the station of the Michigan Central, but is no longer there. As soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway made connection by means of the Wabash Railway, the traffic fell off to so great an extent that the company no longer required him there, and he has been relieved of duty. Mr. Reid, the third man, is paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is also an officer at Minnesota Junction, St. Paul, paid by the Northern Pacific Railway, and another at Tacoma, paid by the Northern Pacific Railway, in order to superintend the transfer of Canadian goods from Canada passing in bond through the United States to British Columbia.

Salary and travelling expenses of Inspectors of Ports and travelling expenses of other officers on inspection	$19,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many inspectors have we?

Mr. BOWELL. Five or six. Nova Scotia one; New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island one; Quebec one, extending as far as Kingston, and one from Kingston westward to Porth Arthur. Also one in Winnipeg who has charge of the whole North-West, and Mr. Clute in British Columbia, who is also collector at New Westminster and discharges the additional duties of inspector. Mr. McMichael, who is financial inspector for the whole Dominion, is now performing that work until a successor is appointed to Mr. Mewburn, deceased.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is the present staff of inspectors at all adequate for the work to be done, and is there any real economy in having a small staff as compared with the amount of revenue which may be lost to the country by the want of sufficient force? I consider that the country would be better served by having a better staff and the revenue would be increased.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not sure but that the hint thrown out by the hon. gentleman is correct. There is a very large charge for travelling expenses for the inspectors, and, if they are to be of any value, it is evident that their value must be conditional on their efficiency, and it is for us a very serious matter to consider whether the area travelled by these inspectors should not be reduced, so that a more constant and better inspection might take place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the Minister is not anxious to state who is to get Mr. Mewburn's position?

Mr. BOWELL. Not very anxious.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In regard to the position of Mr. Clute, while it may be very well to economize and not have too many officers, it may be possible to give one man too many offices. I see that Mr. Clute is collector of customs and inspector of customs, and he receives extra pay as an exciseman—in fact he receives pay from five different sources. The question arises whether he can be an efficient collector of customs and inspector of customs for all the ports of British Columbia, and fill these different offices besides?

Mr. MULOCK. Is there any difficulty in getting enough persons to fill the vacancy?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not found any.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending the 30th June, 1892, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 31st March, 1892.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

That the Message of His Excellency, with the Estimates, be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that I would like to take these Estimates up and pass them and let them go to the Senate and become an Act as soon as possible, because there are some items there which are sadly needed for the work of this House. Our own funds are almost exhausted in consequence of the long session of last year, and, therefore, I suggest that we might take this up to-morrow, if the hon. gentleman has no objection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As far as may be, we will be desirous to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman, but we would like to see these Estimates for a moment or two before making any promises.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that the Minister of Finance wishes to proceed with the Supplementary Estimates to-morrow. What other Government business will he take up?

Mr. FOSTER. The other Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could the Minister of Justice give us any idea as to the time when the Redistribution Bill will be ready for its submission to the House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, I cannot. I think I will be able to say something more definite about it next week.

Mr. MULOCK. When may we expect to have copies of the reports on which Governor General's warrants were issued?

Mr. FOSTER. They are being prepared.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 1st April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved:

That the time for presenting private Bills be extended to Friday next, 8th of April, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Canadian Railway Company.—(Mr. Gillies.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Kingston Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale).

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Niagara Falls and Queenston Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 55) to amalgamate the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Montreal and the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Hamilton under the name of "The National Loan and Building Society."—(Mr. Langelier.)

Bill (No. 56) to confirm an agreement between the Tobique Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Skinner.)

Bill (No. 57) respecting the St. John and Maine Railway Company and the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Skinner.)

THE LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved:

That the petition of Thomas S. Hobbs and others, electors of the city of London, presented to this House on Wednesday last, concerning the conduct of William Elliott, Esq., Judge of the County Court of the County of Middlesex, be printed in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved:

That the petition of Thomas S. Hobbs and others, of the city of London, be forwarded to William Elliott, Esq., County Judge of the County of Middlesex, for his information.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I ask that this resolution shall not be put, as it is out of order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is out of order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask whether the papers concerning the London election have been laid on the Table in accordance with the Address to His Excellency, and, if not, when they will be laid on the Table?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought they had all been brought down. I will see to that.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the leader of the Government when we may expect the map which the House agreed should be furnished representing the districts and the cities and municipal and county boundaries?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was ordered immediately after the passage of the resolution, and I will ascertain between this and Monday.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would also ask the Government as to the proposed report in reference to incomes over a certain amount, whether the Minister will be able to furnish us from the census with a statement of the parties who are receiving an income of more than $500 or $1,000, and the amount of those incomes.

Mr. CARLING. I will make the necessary enquiry, and let the hon. gentleman know on Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know whether any enquiries were made which would enable my hon. friend's question to be answered, because, judging from my recollection of the census papers I saw, I doubt very much if any such questions were put?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If there has been no such information collected, this census will be extremely defective.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question the hon. gentleman asked the other day was within what time such information could probably be brought down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I suppose he had not particular reference to the census any more than to any other source of information. I will endeavour to ascertain.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My impression was, when I put the question, that the information was embraced in the census, but there would be a little difficulty in furnishing the information expeditiously.

NATIONALITY OF THE POPULATION.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Agriculture when we may expect information as to the details of the nationality and birth-places of the population? It is now a year since the census was taken, and I should think that that information ought to be ready for production in a very short time.

Mr. CARLING. The question was asked in the House some two or three weeks ago. I made enquiry and was informed that we would likely have that laid on the Table of the House by the middle of April. I expect to be able to do so.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether any negotiations are at present pending between this Government and that of Newfoundland with reference to the settlement of the difficulties between the two Governments?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can hardly say there are any negotiations with the Government of Newfoundland. There have been communications with the Colonial Office on the subject of our relations with Newfoundland.

ORDNANCE LANDS—TORONTO.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of resolution (11th March) declaring it expedient to convey to the Corporation of the city of Toronto, certain ordnance lands of that city.

Resolution read the second time, reported and concurred in.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 58) to authorize the conveyance to the Corporation of the City of Toronto, certain Ordnance Lands in that city.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee. of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Civil Government—Department of Interior—To pay salary of Chief Clerk from 1st November, 1891, to 30th June, 1892, at $2,800..... $1,866 67

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that this is the salary intended to be paid to Mr. Burgess for his services, from the 1st November, 1891, to 30th June, 1892?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is time now we should understand what the Government propose to do with that gentleman. There was apparently a slight difference of opinion between two important members of the Government as to Mr. Burgess, when we last had that gentleman under discussion. Now, I think we ought to know whether the views of the Minister of Interior, or of the Minister of Justice are going to prevail, and whether Mr. Burgess is to continue in the position of chief clerk for his many merits, or whether he is, as the Minister of Interior rather intimated, to be restored in all honour and glory to the position which he has so well filled as Deputy Minister of that department. I think now the hon. gentlemen have probably come to an understanding, and we desire to know what they propose to do with Mr. Burgess.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not recollect that there was any difference or conflict of opinion with regard to Mr. Burgess between the leader of the House and myself, when this matter came up before. When the question was asked me what position Mr. Burgess occupied, I think I stated that a report of Council had determined that he should occupy the position of chief clerk, but I proposed to recommend that he should be reinstated. Of course, the report has now been brought down, and it indicates what conclusion was come to. This item is to pay the salary of a chief clerk, which has been unprovided for, and upon its being voted it will be paid to Mr. Burgess, who is now in the department, and has been acting, as I said before, as Deputy Minister up to the present time, without being able to draw any salary. After the Order in Council was passed an application was made to the Auditor General for his salary, and the Auditor General said that as there was no such salary voted by the House, he was unable to sanction it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not yet quite understand from the hon. gentleman what the Government propose to do. I did not see the report the hon. Minister alludes to. Is Mr. Burgess to become deputy head again or not?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The report which my colleague refers to is the report on which his case was originally dealt with, along with other persons in the department. The other day when the matter was mentioned, I merely wanted to guard against its being supposed that it had been decided upon to reinstate Mr. Burgess, whereas my colleague had merely stated what his own view was.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think surely we have a right to know. This is a matter of great public moment. The hon. gentleman has not forgotten that Mr. Burgess and a number of other parties in the Department of the Interior occupied the attention of this House for a considerable length of time, and were the cause of the production of divers blue-books, covering several hundred pages, one of which I have in my hand. Now, I think that the Government at this present time ought to be able to tell us definitely what they have decided to do with respect to Mr. Burgess, whether they think Mr. Burgess deserves to be reinstated, as was undoubtedly intimated by the Minister of Interior, or whether they think that they will continue him as chief clerk, deeming the reduction a sufficient punishment. I think that is a matter that the House have a right to be informed of at this stage, and that is the point to which I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Interior. We want merely to know what the Government have decided on doing. The question is of very considerable importance, having reference to the discipline of the department, and having reference to the matters which were brought to our attention in the Public Accounts Committee last year. Surely the Government are able to tell us what they intend to do with respect to Mr. Burgess.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid my hon. friend has not read the information which was brought down and laid upon the Table of the House. That information is contained in the report of the Sub-Committee of Council, which took up the cases of Mr. Burgess and the other employés of the Interior Department. If he had read that report he would have found the decision to which the Government came, and no other decision has been reached. That decision as regards this officer is simply this: That whereas he was at that time Deputy Minister, he should be reduced to the rank of a chief clerk, and that the House be asked to vote him,

not the minimum salary, but the salary of $2,800 as chief clerk. The item at present before the House is to carry out that recommendation. The recommendation was adopted, and by a minute of Council passed; it is the Government's decision, and no further decision has been arrived at. Mr. Burgess, as my colleague says, has been acting as deputy since. What arrangement will be made for a Deputy Minister in the future, is a matter that the Government has not considered, and consequently I can make no statement about it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can understand that this is a vote for the salary of a chief clerk; it does not require any explanation to see that. What I say is, that the Government ought to be in a position to tell us what they propose to do with Mr. Burgess. Here is a gentleman who was the head of a very important department, and whose conduct was censured by the Public Accounts Committee—whose conduct, as I understand, appears reprehensible in the eyes of the Government themselves. We ask to know what they propose to do with this gentleman. It was intimated to us very plainly and distinctly by the Minister at the head of the department that, in his judgment, Mr. Burgess ought to be reinstated. The question I put is a very simple and plain one, whether, in making that statement, the Minister of the Interior represents the decision his colleagues have arrived at; and, having been brought formally to their notice in that fashion by the Minister of the Interior, I think the House are fully entitled to know what the Government have decided on doing, and if the Government have not made a decision they ought to make a decision and let us know. That appears to me a very reasonable proposition under the circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have reached a decision, and the decision is that Mr. Burgess shall be a chief clerk, and if the House will vote this salery as of a chief clerk, he shall get $2,800 a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is no answer at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Government ought to agree on this subject before they invite a discussion in the House. Now, the leader of the House has told us one story, the Minister of Finance tells us a second, and the Minister of the Interior tells us a third.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no divergence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let us see for a moment. The Minister of the Interior says that it is his intention to press upon his colleagues the reinstatement of Mr. Burgess in the office which he formerly held. This is a frank declaration of his wish, so far as he is concerned. What is to be done with Mr. Burgess in the immediate future? The Minister who leads the Government in this House says: "I do not know; upon this subject the Government have not come to a conclusion." "Oh," says the Minister of Finance, "the Minister of Justice is mistaken; the Government have come to a conclusion." The hon. gentleman must not have read the return brought down to the House. If he will read it he will see that the Government came to no conclusion. Does the Minister suppose that by an inconsequential statement of that kind he can deceive the House or any member of it? The question is not what is Mr. Burgess's present status. Everybody knows that. The question is, what is the status the Government intend giving Mr. Burgess in the immediate future, and the information brought down gives no information on that subject, and the leader of the Government has frankly told the House that they have come to no conclusion. If that be so, what is the use of the Minister of Finance rising and making such a statement as he has just addressed to the House. We all know that Mr. Burgess was reduced to the rank of first-class clerk, that no provision was made for the payment of such an officer, and that it is about to be made at this moment. But there is this important consideration which grows out of the question: if Mr. Burgess is to be restored, then this is a temporary provision for a first-class clerk, and it should be so shown in the Estimates. If some one else is appointed, then there is to be a permanent first-class clerk added to the staff of the department. That is perfectly clear. If Mr. Burgess is raised to the position, unless the Government say that the appointment of a first-class clerk as a permanent officer is a necessity, there is no need of voting this appropriation beyond the time that Mr. Burgess is to hold that office. What does the Government say? Are they going to make a permanent addition to the clerks of the department, and make a permanent positition for a clerk of that grade, or are they going to restore Mr. Burgess to his former position and make temporary provision for his salary while he occupies this inferior rank? I say this is a matter about which the House should be informed. I am expressing no opinion on the subject, I do not propose doing so; but I ask the Government to inform the House what their intentions are in this matter, and they ought not to press the House to vote an appropriation until they are prepared to state to the House their intentions.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman has not read the item. If he had read the item, a large part of his criticism would fall to the ground. The item is: for the salary of a chief clerk from 1st November, 1891, to 30th June, 1892.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. It is only a portion of the present year, and this item carries no further than 1st July.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister is well aware that he can take an appropriation only for 12 months at most.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not take it for 12 months.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For the balance of the year. An appropriation cannot be taken for more than 12 months, and it must expire with the current year. Does the hon. gentleman propose to address such an argument seriously to the House? Does that furnish the House with any information as to whether an additional permanent first class clerk will be appointed or not? If we are to have an additional first-class clerk, let us know it; if not, let the hon. gentleman inform the House, so that the House will know precisely what is being done in the matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have a right to know what the Government propose to do in the matter.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is evident that the Minister of the Interior is more honest in his declara-

tion respecting this matter than are the other members of the Government. He has declared that it is his wish to reinstate Mr. Burgess to the position of Deputy Minister. This is shown by the fact that in the ordinary Estimates provision is made for the payment of a Deputy Minister at a salary of $3,200 annually. So it is evident that it is the intention of the Minister over that department, at all events, to appoint Mr. Burgess to the position of Deputy Minister immediately after 30th June. I think the Government should inform us what they intend to do in this matter. The investigation which took place with respect to the management of the Interior Department during last session before the Public Accounts Committee revealed a state of affairs which did not reflect credit on the head of the department and on the Government, because it showed clearly that the head of the department and the deputy head, if the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee is to be believed, had no proper supervision over the payment of money for that department of the public service. There can be no justification set up either by the Minister, or any one on behalf of the department, of the conduct of the officers of the department from 1885 up to last session. There were irregularities during the whole time, and irregularities which were contrary to the oath taken by the officials of the department, an oath which required that they should not be paid for extra services. During the investigation I paid particular attention to all that transpired, and I have yet to be satisfied that the work which was claimed to have been done, was done for the money paid. I am not satisfied in my own mind that the work was done at all, in many instances. But the system prevailed in the department of clerks making out accounts and getting other clerks to certify to them in order to draw money. That is the impression left on my mind by the evidence given, and in some cases this was borne out by the evidence. We have the evidence of Mr. McCabe to the effect that he had allowed his name to be used on an account for services which he never performed, and which he did not know had been performed. There can be no doubt that these irregularities were of a very grave character, and the punishment meted out to some of those engaged in the transactions was altogether unequal to the offence committed. Some officers had suffered by that investigation because they told the truth, although they were not so guilty as others mentioned in the report brought down by the Commission appointed to investigate the matter. That Commission has punished some men who should not have been punished, because they came before the Public Accounts Committee and told the truth, and it was in consequence of their having told the truth that we were able to make a successful investigation of the affair. They were punished by command of, or at the instigation of their superior officers. After reading the report of the Commission, I think the whole object of the hon. gentlemen who prepared that report was to endeavour to make it apparent to the House and the country that this system of irregularities prevailed before the present Government came into office. There was nothing to show that that was the case. It is true one of the witnesses who came before the Commission stated that he believed that he had some indistinct recollection of something of that kind having occurred under the Liberal Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, but there was no evidence to show that any such irregularities had taken place under the Administration which preceded the present Government, and the object of the report seemed to be to convey the impression that that system had been prevalent under a former Government, and it only came out under the present Government. The fact is there was no reason why these men should not draw extra money until after the passage of the Civil Service Act, which was in 1882.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. 1867.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is the amended Act to which I am referring. Previously there was a Civil Service Act, but it did not prevent the drawing of such money.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It did. The provision was exactly the same.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The idea of the Commission was to whitewash the officers and the department, and to endeavour to make it appear that they were no worse than the officers under a former Administration, and that those evils prevailed under a former Administration. That is no excuse whatever. If a former Administration were guilty of irregularities, that is no excuse for the present Administration allowing similar and worse irregularities to prevail. I think the Commission appointed by the Government to investigate this matter have let a great many of these men down very softly. I might just as well say what I think, I think that these officers know more than they have already told. I believe that there are men in that department who, if they were to tell all the truth, would shame the head of that department and the Government of this country, because I am satisfied they are in possession of facts which have not yet been brought before the public in reference to the transactions that have taken place in that department, and which would enable the public to see that the whole department had been rotten and corrupt for years past. This is the reason, Mr. Chairman, why these men have been let down so easily. They have been fined a month's pay because their mouths are to be shut, and because the Government knew that it would pay them to shut their mouths. But I fancy the time will come when we will be able to get at the bottom of the management of the Interior Department, and if the statements I have heard recently can be proven, and I have reason to believe they can, there will be revelations yet brought to light with regard to the management of that department which will startle some of the members of the Government themselves; because I suppose that they do not all know the transactions which have taken place there. I believe that the Government are entitled to give us this information, whether Mr. Burgess is to be reinstated in his office or not. A vote has been taken by the Government to pay the salary of the Deputy Minister, and this present vote is only in the name of a first-class clerk up to 30th June. I think we should know whether this vote of $3,200 for a Deputy Minister is to be paid to Mr. Burgess or not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is evidently not much use in replying to a gentleman who apparently only debates the subject for the purpose of giving an insult, and that is the position of the

gentleman who speaks about whitewashing, and our attempting to justify ourselves by showing that the record of some other Government is just as bad. No such attempt has been made, and that is almost the only observation I shall offer with regard to his remarks. The Civil Service Act which is said to have been passed in 1882, was passed in 1867 and contains the same prohibition against the regular clerks receiving extra pay that Civil Service Acts have always contained ever since. In pursuing the investigation which was begun by the Committee on Public Accounts, the committee of the Government found that the same practices had been committed by other clerks in the service, and the same penalty was applied to them, as would be applied by any persons attempting to hold anything like a fair investigation. With regard to the objects which the hon. gentleman not only surmises, but endeavours in the most offensive way to attribute to us, I shall leave them altogether unanswered. The persistence, however, which is displayed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), seems to me extraordinary, unless it is based upon some impression in their minds that something is being kept back from the Committee. I can quite understand why they should press for information if they suppose that there was some decision of the Government arrived at with regard to Mr. Burgess which has not been communicated to the House, or if they supposed his case was pending before the Government. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was quite mistaken in saying that I had stated that no decision had been arrived at with regard to Mr. Burgess. What I said was that no decision had been arrived at with regard to what the Minister of the Interior had intimated to be his view and wish in the matter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman excuse me. I did not pretend to say that there was anything in the Minister's statement which showed that Mr. Burgess had not been put in the position of a chief clerk. I understood that perfectly clear; but I wanted to know, was there any decision as to the question whether Mr. Burgess should be restored to the position of Deputy Minister?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If that is what the hon. gentleman meant to say, the inference was a little unfair, when he asked the committee to suppose that there was a difference between what I and my colleague beside me said with regard to the action of the Government. What has been done with regard to Mr. Burgess is stated in the words of the Finance Minister, and the committee will see it agrees with what I have said. The only decision arrived at is: that he should be deprived of the position of Deputy Minister and relegated to the position of chief clerk with the maximum salary. It is with a view to carry out that decision that the present vote is asked, and that of course will last only till the 1st of July. As to Mr. Burgess's reinstatement in the office of deputy, no recommendation has been made to the Government, and no application whatever has been made, and it would be impossible, therefore, for us to state what we would decide on any future application which may be made in this matter. At the present moment I have not the slightest knowledge that any such is to be made.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Well, Mr. Chairman, the information which my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked, has not been vouchsafed to the committee yet. The committee desired to know whether Mr. Burgess, occupying the position of a chief clerk and receiving the pay which the committee are now asked to vote to him, and discharging the duties of deputy head of the department, may not be paid the salary of Deputy Minister. The law allows that to be done, I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The practice has been to allow a chief clerk who discharges the duty of a Deputy Minister, to receive the pay of a Deputy Minister, and as this House has already voted the pay for a Deputy Minister, can he not receive that pay?

Mr. FOSTER. It cannot be done unless it is voted.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It has been voted.

Mr. FOSTER. You have got to have a special vote for it. We cannot pay the difference between the salaries without a special vote of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Although he discharges the duty?

Mr. FOSTER. It makes no matter what he discharges. If we decide that the difference is to be paid it can only be paid when voted by the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the hon. gentleman does not intend to propose such a vote.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not find it there, do you?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have eyes to see, and I have intellect to understand what is there. I asked the hon. gentleman a plain question and a reasonable question, and that is whether he intends to propose to the House that it shall be paid?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I intend to propose when I decide?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the hon. gentleman distinctly says that he declines to give the information. The House is asked in the face of this report to vote at the rate of $2,800 per annum to Mr. Burgess for discharging the duties of chief clerk, and whether the Government will ask the House at a further time to supplement that by the difference between this $2,800 and the salary of a Deputy Minister the hon. gentleman declines to say.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the House is entirely in ignorance as to whether Mr. Burgess is to be punished or not. The House is asked to vote this money without any information whether an additional vote will be asked for making Mr. Burgess's salary that of a Deputy Minister. The report which the hon. gentleman brought down, and which is in my hand, states, with reference to the case before the House:

"One case, that of the Deputy Minister, differs from any of the foregoing, in that, in addition to his knowledge and sanction of irregular payments, he himself ordered a cheque to be made out to an extra clerk with the understanding and direction that $100 of the same be paid to himself to recoup him for payment to an outside party—Mr. Anderson—for work performed by him."

I understand that the hon. gentleman is not only asking that the salary be increased to $2,800 from this date, but that the increase took effect from the day Mr. Burgess was appointed under this recommendation, so that the recommendation reducing him to the salary of $2,400 was never acted upon, is not intended to be acted upon, and his salary is to be $2,800 and not $2,400. I think that in that view of the case, the House ought to be taken into the confidence of the Government who should state why they do this. There may be reasons, and I do not say there are not. There may be valid reasons, but the Government have a right to state these reasons to the House, as to why Mr. Burgess was not left at the salary of $2,400, to which they reduced him, and why they paid him $2,800 a year from the day he began to discharge the duties of chief clerk. I think the paragraph in the report which my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) referred to, has justified the statement he made that the Sub-Committee of Council intended, partially to justify these irregularities, by intimating that they had occurred under a previous Government. The paragraph in the report reads as follows:—

"That from a period dating at least as far back as 1875 a practice began to grow up in the department under which occasional payments for extra work were made to permanent clerks in violation of the clause."

That is the clause. They do not state what the evidence was, or that any actual case occurred; but they say that a practice began to grow up. My hon. friend reminds them that no evidence was offered in the Public Accounts Committee justifying that statement, and if the Committee of Council, were in possession of evidence, in addition to that taken before the Public Accounts Committee, to justify it, I think they had a right to give it to the House, and to give the names of all the parties, as well as those attached to the report, who were guilty of irregularities between 1882 and 1889. It is stated in this report that during the years from 1882 to 1889 inclusive, this occasional practice became frequent, and under it several permanent clerks received extra payment. Now, I do not think the House is being treated with that perfect fair-play which it has a right to expect. The Minister of Finance himself was one of the committee who recommended that Mr. Burgess's salary be reduced to $2,400. I assume that he had good grounds for that recommendation. He now recommends that that $2,400 be increased to $2,800—not from to-day, or because of anything that has transpired since—at least he does not tell us so—but dating back from the time when the Deputy Minister was degraded. If he asks the House to vote this sum for the anterior period, I think he has a right to tell the House why he asks it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think a good deal more. I think we have a perfect right to know what the policy of the Government is with respect to Mr. Burgess. This is not an affair of yesterday; it has been within the knowledge of the Government for at least nine months. The facts known to us now were known to them as far back, I think, as the 1st of July last; nine months is ample time for them to make up their minds what they will do with a deputy head guilty of the irregularities that Mr. Burgess was guilty of. What we have a right to know is how the Government regard the conduct of a deputy head who not only permits irregularities to exist, but who is himself guilty of them. This is not a mere question of extra payment. That might be allowed to pass as a venial irregularity. This is a deliberate use of false names, over and over again, by these parties. Persons who do not exist or who were not in the employ of the department, were constantly named for a period of years as having done work and received payments. What we want to know is how the Government regard the conduct of a deputy head who permits such things to exist in his department. We have a right to know whether they propose to reinstate him or to keep him as chief clerk. To all intents and purposes Mr. Burgess is to-day Deputy Minister of the Interior; he is performing the duties of that office: he is acting, as we have been told by the head of the department, as Deputy Minister, and is receiving a salary very nearly commensurate with that which he enjoyed as deputy head—$2,800 instead of $3,200. Under these circumstances, the country at large and this House have a right to know what the Government propose to do, more especially after the statement made by the Minister of Interior, when he intimated that his view of Mr. Burgess's conduct was that he was a fit and proper person to be reinstated. Now, Sir, I do not know what the reasons of the Minister may be, but I must say that my hon. friend had reasons for saying that the public would be justified in forming the opinion that Mr. Burgess knew a great deal which it would be inconvenient to reveal if under the circumstances he should not be reinstated.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is any need for any extra heat about this matter. I think the report of the committee, and the explanations that have been given in furtherance of it by the Minister have been fair and frank. The Government do not wish to conceal anything, and are not concealing anything. The Government have explicitly stated in the report their opinion of all these irregularities. The Government after full consideration of them, have awarded a certain penalty, and the report of the committee, indicating what they thought was a proper measure of punishment, has been brought down and laid before the House. The Government, in carrying out their judgment as to the penalties that ought to be inflicted on these gentlemen, ask that a certain sum be voted. That carries out their intention and the intention of the committee; and it was recommended to Council, and adopted by Council. Mr. Burgess had been guilty of lapses, or of conduct such as necessitated punishment, and the Government thought it would be a sufficient punishment that he should be deprived of his high and responsible office of Deputy Minister, and should be reduced to the rank of a chief clerk. At the same time, the committee felt and the Government felt that the degradation in rank, together with the loss of $400 yearly of salary, was severe enough punishment. Although there may be a point for my hon. friend to hang his contention upon in the wording of the report, the idea was simply this, that we had no power to fix a salary other than the minimum salary of a chief clerk. At the time, it did not occur to me, and I suppose it did not occur to the other members of the committee, that there was no vacancy of a chief clerkship in that department, and consequently the wording of

the report was as it was. But it was the intention of the Government when Parliament met to ask that Mr. Burgess's salary should be placed at $2,800 instead of the minimum of $2,400. As my colleague has stated, the Government have decided that after discussing and considering it. They have discussed and decided nothing else. We come down and ask the House to give effect to their decision in this supplementary estimate for the remaining months of the year. We could not do anything else without first coming to Parliament. It is impossible for us to give Mr. Burgess the difference in salary, as my hon. friend intimates we should, unless we come to Parliament and ask Parliament for the appropriation; and when the full Estimates are brought down next year, the intention of the Government will be plainly seen and can be read from those estimates. The intention of the Government at the present time, frankly and honestly stated as I have done it, is shown in this supplementary report. With reference to other remarks which have been made as to the heinousness of these offences, as to our going back to 1875 and so forth, the Committee of Council extended its investigations both beyond the particular persons mentioned and beyond the period treated by the Public Accounts Committee. There was no intention to conceal anything. We simply went back as far as possible in time, and we found certain facts, and set forth those facts without palliating any of them, whether under one Government or the other. With regard to the assumption that this was done in order to whitewash Mr. Burgess, and that punishment was not given because there might be something to reveal, I do not think it is worth while to notice these statements. It is a cheap way to make one appear virtuous by saying that if there were a chance to give evidence in regard to certain things, certain things might be shown. The better way is to show them. But the Government took the view that they had to apportion what they thought would be the proper punishment for these offences exposed by the committee. They did not intend, in the first place, to err on the side of excessive punishment, and they did not propose to let any who had been guilty of wrongdoing escape without punishment. So far as the Government are concerned, there was not one single thought as to what any one in the department might know or might not know, when the recommendations were made or the punishments were given to them. Now, there were lapses, and somebody says the Government ought to express its sentiments with regard to those. The Government expressed its sentiments in that report. Its opinion is that such methods were irregular, that they ought to be punished, that they were contrary to the law, but at the same time none who fairly went through the investigation of the Public Accounts Committee, and no one of the committee who went through that wider and further investigation afterwards, on which our report is based, can come to any other conclusion than that, although the letter of the law was violated, and although punishment should be meted out to those who violated it, yet at the same time the public treasury did not suffer; and I take issue entirely with the hon. gentleman on that side who states it is his conviction that the work was not done for which charges were made. My opinion is that, back as far as 1875 and even further back, you will find the beginning of the practice which grew more prevalent from 1882 and culminated in 1890 when it was stopped by the department itself. The committee do not intend to palliate the offence, but the practice did grow up, and the reasons are set forth in the report why it did grow up, but neither the Government nor the treasury were in any way robbed of their due, service was given for the money paid, and having gone through with the committee from beginning to end, I have no other than a settled conviction that these clerks did the work and did good service for the Government, and that in the end money was saved for the treasury rather than lost. That view does not prevent the conclusion that there was a wrong system which ought to have been stopped, but we must take into question as well that it was stopped before the investigation of the committee was undertaken, as appears from the report of the committee, based of course on the facts. Now, with reference to Mr. Burgess, I think that, taking into account his services and character, we must not stand up here and because a technical wrong, or a wrong, leaving out the word technical, has been committed, sit as merciless judges in the matter. Every one may have a moment of weakness, to quote the phrase used by the leader of the Opposition and which I believe he plagiarises. We must temper justice with mercy, and take into account circumstances as they are developed along the whole course of these transactions. We will gain nothing for the public, and we may do violence to our own conscience and sense of right by being over-severe in matters of judgment: and as regards Mr. Burgess, I have no hesitation in saying that, taking his character and conduct into account from the beginning to the end, although he was guilty of a technical wrong which he ought not to have done, I think his punishment is amply sufficient.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the only thing we can gather from all this, putting the three statements of the Minister of Interior, the Minister of Justice, and the latter statement of the Minister of Finance together, is this: that, practically speaking, all the punishment they choose to inflict on Mr. Burgess is to make him chief clerk for one year and then restore him to his office. Now, if the Minister of Finance will state what the Government are going to do, this discussion will come to an end. Of course we can express our opinions to the House, and the country can form theirs as to the course the Government propose to take, but that I think the Minister ought to do. He ought to tell us if he considers that this penalty for a single year of reducing Mr. Burgess to the position of a first class clerk is sufficient. To all intents and purposes, he has told us they are going to reinstate Mr. Burgess, as soon as our backs are turned, in the position of deputy head, with the old salary of $3,200 a year. By putting the statements of the Ministers together, I can draw no other conclusion.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not responsible for the conclusions the hon. gentleman draws. He has drawn before now some very extraordinary ones and has not always found that the people approved them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not affect the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. The conclusion he draws is not correct. He cannot either logically or honestly draw any such conclusion from the statement I have made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The conclusion can fairly be drawn from what has been stated by the hon. gentleman's colleague who is in charge of the department whose conduct we are now discussing. The hon. gentleman was asked a question point-blank by the hon. member for South Oxford, and he informed the House that it was his intention to recommend that his late deputy, acting deputy in the interim, be reinstated. Nothing can be clearer than that the hon. Minister at the head of the department stated his intention to reinstate Mr. Burgess as deputy head, and I do not think my hon. friend is drawing any illogical or dishonest conclusion when he assumes that the Government are going to do what the Minister of Interior said they would.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has said that justice ought to be tempered with mercy. That is right and proper, but if the hon. gentleman will set a custom such as this, he has evidently in his mind the intention of applying it by-and-bye. What is the case in hand? It is that of Mr. Burgess, and the hon. gentleman has intimated that in his case justice ought to be tempered with mercy. To what extent? We had it from the Minister a moment ago that for the present the salary of Mr. Burgess is to be reduced to the sum of $2,800, and he is to be deprived of his rank. At one time it was intended to reduce his salary to $2,400, but the hon. gentleman has made an explanation on that point which is not very clear. It is only after being pressed again and again that the hon. gentleman brought down the report of the Committee of the Privy Council, and in that the intention is expressed of reducing the salary to $2,400. This the hon. gentleman explained was simply an oversight, so that the intention from the first must have been to vote the salary of $2,800. How long is Mr. Burgess to be reduced? At present he is discharging the duties of deputy head. As far as that is concerned, there has been nothing altered in his position. Deputy head he was by law and by fact up to a certain period last fall, and deputy head he has continued to be since by fact though not by law. It must be manifest to the hon. gentleman that there is no other conclusion to be drawn from his words and from the words of the head of the department, and from the action of the department, than that Mr. Burgess is to be restored to his position on the 1st July next. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that Mr. Burgess could not be restored because his salary was not voted and the Government would have to come again before Parliament, but the salary for a deputy head has been voted, and therefore the Government can at any moment restore Mr. Burgess to the position of deputy head from the 1st July next.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. LAURIER. Then why were we not told that before? Now we are told that the Government have made provision for the appointment of the deputy head. Is it their intention or is it not to appoint Mr. Burgess to the position he occupied a short time ago, is it the intention to pay him the salary for the work he is now discharging? There is no other conclusion to be drawn from the action of the Government. If the intention of the Government was to degrade Mr. Burgess to the salary of a chief clerk, they would have given him the work of a chief clerk, but instead of that they give him the work of a deputy head, and, in all fairness and seriousness, I say there is no other conclusion to be drawn than that the Government have decided—not perhaps formally in Council, but amongst themselves—that Mr. Burgess is to be restored to his former position on the 1st July next.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure the hon. gentleman will take my word that there has been no such decision at all. There has been no recommendation to Council, there has been no discussion of the matter, nor has there been any decision in Council. My hon. friends press me to say what I cannot say, that is, what the intention of the Government is. The Government has formed no intention.

Mr. LAURIER. Then they ought to have done so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I desire to call attention to some inconsistencies in the report presented by the Committee of the Privy Council in regard to these irregularities. Clause 2 states:

"That from a period dating at least as far back as 1875 a practice began to grow up in the department under which occasional payments for extra work were made to permanent clerks in violation of this clause of the Civil Service Act."

The third clause says:

"That during the year 1882 to 1889 inclusive, this occasional practice became frequent, and under it several permanent clerks received extra payments, either in the name of outsiders or fictitious persons, or through temporary clerks for work performed wholly or in part by themselves."

When we turn to clause 5, it is stated by this Committee of the Privy Council that the sums paid irregularly to permanent clerks, as nearly as could be ascertained, amount to $9,017.43, from 1875 to date. I stated before that it was evidently the intention of the committee to leave the impression upon the House and the public that this practice had started in 1875, and to shield the present Government and the present head of the department on the ground that this practice originated under the Reform Government. I have proof here to the contrary, because it is stated that all the amount paid, that is, $9,017.34, was paid between 1881 and 1891, and they do not find a dollar paid out for these services before 1881, though the report says that the practice prevailed from 1875.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It says it began to grow up in 1875.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They do not point to a single instance of one dollar being spent in this irregular manner from 1875 to 1881. This report contradicts itself in that way, and shows that it was the intention of the committee to cover up these irregularities and to whitewash those who had committed them by leaving the impression that they had prevailed previous to the present Government coming into office. Now, I will call the attention of the Government to a little bit of the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee. I might entertain the House for hours in regard to this evidence, but I do not intend to do so. It is very evident that the Government intend to reinstate Mr. Burgess. Now, I will call their attention to one statement made by Mr. Burgess before the committee. I have no prejudice against Mr.

Burgess. I believe in a certain degree he has been a capable official, but he has done some things which cannot possibly be sustained by this House. This was sworn to by Mr. Burgess. Mr. Bowell asked him :

"I understand you to say that to your knowledge no permanent clerk in your department has received extra pay?"

And the answer given by Mr. Burgess was :

"I say, with the exception of Mr. Turner who was here this morning, there has not."

Then the chairman, that is, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), asked :

"You speak of the whole department?"—I do.
"You do not know of any other?—No."

This irregularity in regard to Mr. Turner was one of the most startling brought out in the whole investigation. It was shown that Mr. Turner had drawn $2,444.56, that this system of paying Mr. Turner extra money had been going on for years, that he was having his accounts certified to in the name of a man who was supposed to be called Joseph Wright, and it was proved before the committee that Joseph Wright was never a resident of Canada, that he was a distant relative of Mr. Turner, that he was a schoolmaster in the States, and visited Mr. Turner occasionally, but the accounts were made in Mr. Wright's name, and Mr. Turner endorsed the cheques in Mr. Wright's name. The evidence also showed that Mr. Wright had died, and that Mr. Turner had gone on signing the dead man's name to the cheques in order to get the money. Mr. Burgess declared on oath that he knew of no other case where the public money had been paid for these services except that of Mr. Turner, and here we have the report of the Committee of the Privy Council giving us a list of thirty or forty officials in the Department of the Interior who had been drawing sums for extra services ranging from $30 and $40 and $70 up to $2,444.56. And yet we are told that this man is an efficient servant, and that he ought to be reinstated. We are told by the Minister of the Interior that he intends to reinstate him. Yet we have evidence to show that this man, as the deputy head of that department, swore that he knew of no irregularities except in this one case of Mr. Turner, and we have the Privy Council Committee exhibiting the fact that thirty or forty officials in that department had been carrying on this system from 1881 to 1891, and that $9,017.74 had been paid for these services. Now, they can form their own estimate of Mr. Burgess's abilities and capacity to discharge the duties of that office, and if they want to reinstate him, they can do it. I have nothing against Mr. Burgess personally : I am merely trying to discharge my duty in looking after the interests of the public.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has struck a mare's nest, as usual. Because there is one statement there which says that this practice began to grow up in 1875, and thereafter assumed larger proportions, comparatively, from 1882 to 1889 ; and because in another part there is a list of those who have received and certified to these irregular payments extending from 1880 up to the date of that investigation, that therefore there is no proof that previous to 1880 money had been paid contrary to the Civil Service Act. Now, the bottom falls out of that entirely when I make this statement : The committee could not go back too far, and the committee set the limit backward to which they should go for the apportionment of the punishment, at 1880, and that list is simply a detail of the accounts paid irregularly, those who certified to them irregularly, or the manner in which they were certified to, whether it was a temporary clerk or an outsider from 1880 to 1891. That list is simply to apportion the punishment over that period, and for those persons only. If my hon. friend will look over that list he will find that every person who wrongfully received, or wrongfully certified to, or assisted in, the payment of money between those two periods, received his punishment. That is all there is to that. He then makes a point in reference to the evidence given by Mr. Burgess. He attended that committee : he might have had the fairness to state to this committee that Mr. Burgess asked leave to go before the committee again to testify that when he made that statement he had reference to one particular case and had not given the whole facts, but that there were other cases, and he came before the committee and stated them and asked leave to amend his evidence. I think the sense of fairness of most hon. gentlemen would lead them to take the amended evidence rather than the first.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister of Finance is altogether wrong with regard to the reading of this clause in the report. The report says : "That the whole sum thus irregularly paid to permanent officials for extra work amounted, so far as can be ascertained, to $9,017, from the year 1875 to date."

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes : I am now reading from the report. If you do not believe me I will hand it over to you.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I would ask leave to amend that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is just as I read it before. Then the committee go on to show that while the whole amount from 1875 to date was $9,017, they give a table to show the sum that was paid from 1881 to 1891. Now, I would like the Minister to straighten that out. He accused me of making a statement not borne out by the evidence, and I have the evidence in my hand to show I was right. I would like him to admit either that my statement is correct, or that his report is not correct.

Mr. DICKEY. I cannot follow the reasoning of the leader of the Opposition when he says that the Government has arrived at the conclusion to reinstate Mr. Burgess after the 1st of July. I have heard nothing to-day or on the previous occasion to lead me to that conclusion. I do not think, either, that any fault can be found with the Government in respect of the punishment which they inflicted upon Mr. Burgess. I think no one who knows Mr. Burgess, and the position he formerly filled, and his degradation to a lower rank, involving the loss of a large amount of salary, can come to the conclusion that the punishment is not sufficient for the offence which he committed. At the same time, I desire to say that, speaking entirely for myself, I should be sorry if the Government did reinstate Mr. Burgess as Deputy Minister. It is very awkward to discuss a matter of this sort involving personal matters, to discuss the conduct of

a gentleman whom we know personally, and against whom we are very desirous not to say a single word. But in a matter of this sort we have a public duty to perform, and the impression that the perusal of the evidence taken by the Public Accounts Committee last year, conveyed to my mind, is that Mr. Burgess has proved himself disqualified for the management of a large department. He undoubtedly connived at the illegal payment of moneys, some of them under circumstances which seem very little creditable—I do not say that it involves any moral guilt, but the very fact that he held the high position that he did, involving large responsibilities, calls for a stricter account from him than the same irregularities would call for if they were committed by a man holding a lower position. We have to consider also that the very fact that Mr. Burgess connived at these irregularities, demoralized the discipline of his department, and brought it into such a state that we have it in evidence that one of the clerks sent a message to him that unless he got a certain favour he would tell something that would make Mr. Burgess ashamed. That, Sir, is a position that no deputy head of a department should put himself in. I think for these reasons, much as I regret saying anything whatever that would injure Mr. Burgess's prospects, so far as my judgment goes, these facts disentitle Mr. Burgess to be replaced in the position of deputy head of the department.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish to inform the committee that the amended item reads as follows:—"To pay the salary of A. M. Burgess, chief clerk, from the 1st November, 1891, to the 30th June, 1892, at the rate of $2,800 per annum, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act."

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask a question. I find that this provides for the pay from the 1st November last. The revelations before the Public Accounts Committee took place, I think, in June. How was Mr. Burgess paid between the end of June last and the 1st November? Was he paid, or is it the intention to pay him, as chief clerk, or as Deputy Minister of the Interior?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was paid at the end of October, and he was acting Deputy Minister up to the end of October.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The revelations were made in the month of June, and they were of such a character as, I think, fully justifies the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) in saying that Mr. Burgess's reinstatement would be a very grave matter. I do not intend to say anything to hurt Mr. Burgess. He is a gentleman for whom I have personally a great respect, but I must say that I think the Government are very severe upon him. They talk about tempering judgment with mercy, but I think they have practised it to a very small extent. During these five months from the time the crime was revealed up to the 1st November—I suppose it was for fear of shocking him—they have let the thing go on, but paying him his salary, and now they intend to pay him to the end of the year at the rate of $2,800 per year. Now, I say that is hardly the mercy we ought to expect; it is not sufficient leniency. Many poor men have had to expiate such conduct behind prison bars and be maintained at the expense of the country. Mr. Burgess, however, had to pay his own keep and expenses. Indeed, the Government have not shown him sufficient leniency, for they are going to make a deduction at the rate of $400 per year from his salary. It is a little too hard—harsh treatment, as compared with the crime.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I should like the Minister of Finance to state how he can straighten out his report.

Mr. FOSTER. It could be easily done if I had the original document here. I shall have to find the original and compare the copy with it. What I suspect is that there is an error in the words "from 1875 to date." I think those words should be "from 1881 to date." That does not controvert the statement that the practice has grown up in 1875.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It certainly controverts your statement, if it appears that the whole amount was paid for from 1881 to 1891, because it has not been shown that any money was paid previous to that date.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not the object of the committee in the table to show what money had been paid previous to 1880. The investigation went back to 1880. The amounts that were paid in that way, and the names of the parties to whom they were paid, were limited to the years 1880 to 1891.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is this report based on evidence taken in the House, or did the Commission take evidence?

Mr. FOSTER. The Commission had the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee under their consideration, but there were a good many clerks whose names were not brought before the Public Accounts Committee. These had to be investigated individually, as they were not investigated by the Public Accounts Committee, and the Committee of Council investigated not only these cases, but the cases of those who were brought before the Public Accounts Committee. The committee investigated every individual case, both those that were brought before the Public Accounts Committee and those that were not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to see the evidence of regular payments being made previous to 1881. I do not remember any statement made before the Public Accounts Committee which warrants the statement that irregularities began in 1875. One witness, I think, made a statement before the Public Accounts Committee which was liable to that interpretation, but he stoutly denied afterwards that his words were rightly understood. So I should like to see the evidence which the Minister of Finance says the Commission took.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been very much surprised at the answer given by the Minister of the Interior to the question as to Mr. Burgess's salary up to 1st November. I have a very distinct recollection that Mr. Burgess was not treated at the time as the other offenders were. They were suspended, and of course their suspension at once debarred them from their salaries. But Mr. Burgess's resignation was offered and was not accepted. I took some interest in one of the offenders, Mr. Henry, whose friends complained very bitterly that his salary was suspended, although his offence did not compare in enormity with that of Mr. Burgess, while Mr. Burgess was drawing his salary by reason of the fact that he had tendered his resignation,

which had not been accepted. I enquired into the matter and was assured there was no such discrimination being made, that Mr. Burgess's salary had not been paid and was not to be paid; and I was very much astonished to hear it stated to-day that during all that time Mr. Burgess was drawing his salary under the circumstances I have detailed. I do not desire—because, perhaps I am not altogether a fair judge of Mr. Burgess—to speak in very strong terms about him; but I desire to say this, that I do hope, from all I have known about Mr. Burgess and I speak now of matters that are on record—that the Minister of the Interior will not carry out his intention, and, if he does, that the Government will not ratify it, to restore Mr. Burgess as deputy head of the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to enquire from the Minister of Finance whether there is any record with respect to the evidence given before this Commission, particularly as to transactions between 1875 and 1881?

Mr. FOSTER. We took no minutes of evidence. We had all the witnesses brought before us, and we examined them ourselves. I think, however, there were some tabulations made. If there were, I will look into them and see what they showed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume in that case the evidence was not taken under oath.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not taken under oath.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I draw the attention of the Minister of Interior to this fact: On 18th March the hon. gentleman said, as will be found on page 287 of *Hansard*, as follows:—

"I said he has been acting as deputy, but he has received no salary from the time he placed his letter in my hands until the present moment."

It would seem from the statement of the Minister of Finance made to-day, that the hon. gentleman was mistaken.

Mr. DEWDNEY. That was my impression at the time I made the statement. When the matter came up subsequently, the Minister of Finance asked me for a memorandum with respect to the date up to which the salary was paid. I sent to the accountant, and he forwarded a memorandum stating that Mr. Burgess had received his salary up to the end of October?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then Mr. Burgess received his salary as Deputy Minister up to the end of October?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will state his policy with respect to this matter, in view of the statements made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who have very distinctly stated their views as regards Mr. Burgess. I should like to ask those hon. gentlemen also what they think of the present position of affairs? They say that Mr. Burgess should not be continued as deputy head of the Department of the Interior. But as a matter of fact he is Deputy Minister now, he has been discharging the duties of Deputy Minister ever since this investigation took place, and as a matter of fact he was paid the salary of the Deputy Minister up to 1st November last. I should like to know whether it commends itself to those hon. gentlemen that the matter can be got round in this way, that Mr. Burgess can retain his position of Deputy Minister of the department, while nominally a first-class clerk at a slightly reduced salary. It does not seem to me that that can possibly meet the views of those two hon. gentlemen.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When are we to see the original report, because I am interested in knowing whether the statement made by the Minister of Finance is correct, or the report is correct?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not been able to go to Council and get it yet. I will take the trouble to look into it and compare them and see where the error exists.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the committee to be put into possession of the document, or is the Minister to do the comparing and report to the House?

Mr. FOSTER. I will do it.

To pay the following clerks for part salary which they did not receive whilst under suspension:—	
K. J. Henry	$285 48
L. C. Pereira	183 87
H. H. Turner	150 66

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, we would like to know with respect to this item, precisely what has been done with each of these three gentlemen. What practical punishment was inflicted upon them at all, and what does this vote mean?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend just exactly what it is. These three men were men who were brought up before the Public Accounts Committee, and immediately upon the evidence being given they were suspended, and the moment they were suspended their salaries ceased. The amounts of their salaries which accrued while they were under suspension are the amounts which are set here opposite their names. Parliament was in session; it was impossible to make the investigation that the sub-committee of the Council made afterwards, and it ran along for a considerable space of time. After Parliament was through the sub-committee went to work and made a full investigation, and they found that there were other clerks outside of those three—although they had not been brought before the committee and the proof adduced which would have brought out the facts—who had been receiving money in violation of the Civil Service Act. The punishment which was inflicted according to the report of the committee was an equal punishment upon all; that is, the loss of a month and a half's salary. But these three gentlemen from the circumstance of their having been called before the committee and put under suspension would, if that had been allowed, have had a punishment unequal to the others. They would not only have been fined a month and half's salary, but they would also have lost the salaries which would have accrued during the period they were under suspension. This is done to equalize the punishment upon all—because after all, whether a fictitious name was used, or whether it was the name of a temporary clerk that was used, there is little practical difference in the transaction. The money was got in defiance of the letter of the law, and the opinion of the committee was that the punishment should be equalized.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is one statement made by the Minister of Finance which I hope was made in a moment of weakness, and which I trust he will reconsider. That is, the statement that it makes no difference whether there was fraud and deceit or a mere evasion of the law. Now, I think that in our service, and in every service, it makes a vast deal of difference whether there is a mere evasion of the law in getting a little more money, or whether that evasion of the law is accompanied by fraud and deceit, such as took place in some of these cases, by using false names. I am very much surprised indeed to hear the Minister of Finance say that the cases are on all fours.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You said there is no practical difference.

Mr. FOSTER. I said there was little difference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I can say is, that there is a very wide difference, a difference which ought to be marked and visited with a much severer punishment. I hold it no trifling matter at all that false entries and names should appear in the books of the department. I hold it as a very serious offence, and I am very doubtful indeed whether men who have records in the use of false names, and who put names improperly on the backs of cheques, are at all the sort of persons who ought to be entrusted with the care of public affairs; particularly in a department like the Department of the Interior where it is possible for clerks who desire to misconduct themselves to do a very great deal of harm to the public at large, and to innocent parties. That portion of the hon. gentleman's remarks I trust, in the interest of the public service, and for his own credit and reputation's sake, he will reconsider and retract. Now, as far as Mr. Henry, Mr. Turner and Mr. Pereira are concerned, I desire to know from the hon. Minister what work they did, if any, during the period of their suspension?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They did no work. They reported at the office occasionally. It was not their fault that they did not do the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, upon my word, Mr Chairman, the ideas of discipline of my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, have been formed and framed on a model which I think is better adapted for the latitude of the Rocky Mountains than the latitude of Ottawa. We know that there used to be said that there was a certain place beyond which the King's writ did not run, and possibly the exigencies of the situation in Manitoba required a very much more liberal dealing with public servants than we have been accustomed to here.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You would not expect clerks to work if they were suspended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, but if men do no work I think there is good authority for saying they should get no pay. Practically speaking, these gentlemen have done no work, and they are to be paid for the time they were cooling their heels about the streets.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the way they are punished.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. But that is really a dangerous precedent to be set in the Civil Service, and I should not be surprised if others would wish to be suspended on the same terms — one month's deprivation of salary and four months' holiday. I think we could find outside the Interior Department, a good many Civil Service clerks, and not the worst of them either, who would be willing, on these conditions, to agree to a temporary suspension. I want to know, are these gentlemen replaced in the same position as before, or what positions are they to hold?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are all in the same positions as they occupied before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to Mr. Henry I do not recollect what was proven about him, but as respects Mr. Pereira I formed a strong opinion. I had no acquaintance with that gentleman, I have no prejudice of any kind against him; but he was assistant secretary of the department, and if my recollection serves me, it was proved that the assistant secretary had been conspicuous for irregularities and had used false names. Now, I tell the Minister of the Interior this: that if you pass over cases of that kind, and restore men to high and important positions in the department after they have been proved to have done what Mr. Pereira was proved to have done, that you are deliberately holding out a premium to misconduct. The importance of all this matter lies here. We do not want to punish these poor people, they certainly were put to some considerable, and rather serious penalty by being gibbeted as they practically were before the Public Accounts Committee for a long time. We do not want to punish them, but in the interest of the whole Civil Service, it is necessary to inflict punishment on men holding high and important places in the Civil Service who have been proved publicly to have committed the acts that Mr. Pereira and Mr. Burgess did. It is on that ground and no other that we have deemed it necessary to discuss this matter at considerable length. Mr. Pereira was one of the chief officers in the hon. gentleman's department, and it was proved clearly and distinctly, unless my memory is altogether at fault, that he had used false names. I do say, Sir, that it is highly improper and that it tends to demoralize, not merely the hon. gentleman's department but the whole Civil Service, that men who have so little regard for their position as to commit a fraud of that kind—for fraud it is, notwithstanding the easy mode in which the Minister of Finance seems to regard it—should hold high positions in the Civil Service of Canada.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think no one who was present at the investigation will agree that these cases were all alike. I think there was a vast difference in the criminality of the transactions of the various officers of the department. I think that Mr. Henry is fully entitled to be paid. He was among the first witnesses to be called, and he showed by the way in which he gave his evidence that he had a desire to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and I believe he did; and it was in consequence of the evidence which Mr. Henry gave before that committee that we were enabled largely to go on with the investigation. Mr. Henry was placing himself in a very hard position by giving the evidence he did; but he told truthfully all he knew in regard to these irregularities, and I think if there is one man in the department who deserves the consideration of

this committee and the Government, it is Mr. Henry. I do not know Mr. Henry personally; he is no friend of mine; I do not know anything about him: but I was present at the investigation. I believe he is a deserving man and tried to discharge his duty. I believe it was shown in evidence that Mr. Henry simply carried out the command of his superior officer, although he had on several occasions resisted the seductive influence of that officer, and declared that he would no longer do that kind of work; and that is the reason the matter came to light. I think there should be no hesitation in the committee voting this $285.48 to Mr. Henry. The case of Mr. Pereira is a very different one. Mr. Pereira admitted on oath that he had taken the work himself out of the department to his own home, that he had made up the accounts in the name of Ellen Berry, a person who had no existence, that he had certified that the account was correct, that the cheque had been issued to him, that he had drawn the money in the name of Ellen Berry. Now, I am not a lawyer, but that looked to me very much like a criminal transaction. An hon. member says, even if the work was done. I have doubts about that work being done at all, and I have doubts about lots of other work being done that was certified to by officers like Mr. Pereira. I think Mr. Pereira gets off very lightly, indeed. His case will bear no comparison whatever with Mr. Henry.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to add a word to what my hon. friend has said. I was in the committee during the investigation, and in my humble opinion Mr. Henry did not deserve suspension for what he had done. I think it was very clearly shown, both by his evidence and by the evidence given afterwards, that it was done not only under the instruction but under the determined dictation of the deputy head. I do not know Mr. Henry or anything about him, apart from seeing him come before the committee and give his evidence. But I was surprised to learn that he had been suspended, after the straightforward, upright manner in which he gave his evidence. The case of Mr. Pereira is altogether different. I can remember the manner in which he gave his evidence. He appeared virtually to glory in the course he had taken in drawing money for services which had not been performed by himself, and drawing that money under a fictitious name. I think it is not fair that these three men should be placed on the same footing. I think Mr. Henry acted in a dignified, honourable, upright manner, and in my opinion, did not deserve suspension.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). We all know that various irregularities took place in the Department of the Interior last year, and that the Government suspended a large number of those found guilty of irregularities. Some of us had to appeal to our constituents afterwards, and for my own part I claimed a considerable amount of credit for the Government for the prompt manner in which these men had been suspended. But if the men guilty of these irregularities are now to be taken back and paid their wages for doing nothing during the time of their suspension, while they were walking about the streets of Ottawa, I am afraid that we are going to lose a great deal of the credit which we have been taking for the Government. Mr. Burgess occupied a high and responsible position, and Mr. Pereira as well as he received a high salary. When we find County Court Judges getting smaller salaries than these officials, and when we find these devices to obtain more money, I think the Government and the head of the Department of the Interior should have very good reasons to advance before they ask us to vote money to pay the salaries of these parties for three or four months while they were walking about the streets, while, perhaps, other parties were paid for doing their work. I think before this vote is passed the Minister should advance very good reasons to the House before this vote is granted.

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as Mr. Henry is concerned, I desire to bear my testimony in addition to what has been said by other members. I took pains to investigate Mr. Henry's case. He was formerly a constituent of mine when I represented Cardwell, and from the investigation I made, it seemed plain to me that while undoubtedly he had been guilty of an error of judgment, it was in obedience to the direction of his superior officer, Mr. Burgess, on whom the whole responsibility should rest. It must be remembered that Mr. Henry, whose whole offence was in certifying accounts in contravention of the Civil Service Act, in obedience to the order of Mr. Burgess, he did not get a single cent of that himself, or was the better of it in any way or shape. During the long session Mr. Henry did not receive his salary, although it appears that Mr. Burgess, by whose direction the offence was committed, was getting his, and now is to be taken back; and now it seems that Mr. Henry is to be punished by the loss of one month's salary. I certainly think that Mr. Henry ought to be paid in full, and I make the statement here in Parliament in order that no stain may rest on his moral character, because, although guilty of a technical offence, he certainly was guilty of no moral wrong.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If Mr. Henry is to receive the whole of his salary, because the only indiscretion he committed was in improperly certifying accounts, there are others in exactly the same position.

Mr. LAURIER. Who are they?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know at the present moment, but I think there were several.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What wrong did Mr. Henry do but certify the accounts under the direction of the deputy?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He did not do it under the direction of the deputy.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, it is in the evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Last year I examined Mr. Henry's case carefully, and I came to the conclusion that his offence, if offence it was, was very mild indeed. He was chief clerk at the time, and the irregularity he committed was to sign a cheque at the instance and request, if not direction, of his superior officer. The evidence sworn to was this (page 20 of the report):

"When you certified to this account, did you know that the services had been performed?—It was in this way. I was coming in from luncheon about 2 o'clock that afternoon, and I knew that Mr. Humphreys had been wanting to get an additional cheque as a sort of remuneration. He was getting $1.50 per day, and the deputy had allowed

him to get an extra 50 cents a day or something like that. He was to get it in this way about every five or six months to prevent others in the department being dissatisfied. I looked upon Humphreys as being a better man than many in the department who, if they knew he was getting this additional sum, would probably bring political influence in order that they might also get it. I had no hesitation in doing it, although I said at the time I did not think it was right. But I was anxious that he should get some additional remuneration, I was coming into the office about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, when I met Mr. Burgess. I think it was in 1887. He was leaving for the North-West the next day, and he said to me—he met me on the top of the stairs—' Henry, if you make out that cheque in favour of Mr. Humpherys and add an additional $100, I will approve of it.'"

Mr. TUPPER. There was no compulsion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, but the suggestion made by the deputy head was that he should certify the account. It was the deputy head who allowed Humphreys 50 cents a day extra in this surreptitious way; and as Henry thought Humphreys entitled to additional remuneration, he acceded to the request of the deputy head.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That 50 cents a day was not for himself.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, it was for Humphreys and had been allowed by the deputy head, and though Henry did not think it correct, still at the request of the deputy he certified the account. He seems to have suffered for refusing to certify certain accounts for Mr. Pereira. At page 103 of the report will be found Mr. Henry's statement of facts, and I do not think his name ought to be published with that of Pereira as being a delinquent in the same sense.

L. C. Pereira $183 87

Mr. MULOCK. It must be regretted that the Sub-Committee of the Privy Council have endeavoured to gloss over this very serious offence in the way they have. In that report, from begining to end, there is not a word of condemnation for the deception practiced by the various officials in the Department of the Interior. I cannot conceive of anything more calculated to demoralize a public office than for the Government themselves to report, as they have done, with regard to these offences. They do not venture to say one word of rebuke in their whole report touching these frauds. They say they have examined into the matter, and find that no loss was occasioned the public by these frauds. Well, one has no means of knowing to what extent they examined the work done, work which consisted largely of putting in time. How could the members of the Government say what amount of time was put in by the various clerks at extra work, when that time was put in at their own houses, or at all events not during office hours. The report is most unsatisfactory, and the conclusion, as the hon. member for South Oxford says, offers a premium for frauds upon the public service. The clerks are not to be punished, but have been given several months, leisure during which they rendered no service to the country whatever and are rewarded, in fact, for this long period of idleness. Why, had they asked for leave of absence for five months, on what terms would it have been granted? They might have got one month, or the regular fixed holiday, at no expense to themselves, but beyond that their pay would have been stopped during the whole period of their absence. Yet in this case men who have put the country, by their actions, to a heavy expense, and brought a certain amount of disrepute on the whole service, are now practically to receive full pay, only one month being docked during the whole period of their absence. The Government have, in fact, condoned their offences, and are asking Parliament to do so as well. We could not do a more demoralizing thing, and I for one decline to be a party to it. I do not wonder at the Minister of Interior condoning them. I fail to see how he could do anything else, considering the fact that the transactions occurred in his department, and that he is to blame wholly, in the first instance, as head of the department where these transactions occurred.

Mr. DEWDNEY. For what year?

Mr. MULOCK. For the time the Minister was in office, during which period the demoralization increased. One of his own servants would have been included in the list, had the committee been inclined to do their duty fully. If the sub-committee had done their duty, a reference would have been made to this by them.

Mr. DEWDNEY. You were blackguard enough to do it last year.

Mr. MULOCK. I call upon the Chairman to make the Minister of Interior apologize for that observation.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The language of the hon. gentleman is certainly unparliamentary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I apologize to you, Mr. Chairman, and I will say that gentleman was gentleman enough to make the observation.

Mr. MULOCK. An apology to you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is not sufficient. I must insist on your requiring the hon. gentleman to withdraw the observation.

Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. I understood he did so.

Mr. MULOCK. Then, if the committee had done its duty they would have dealt with the Minister of Interior as well by taking evidence of the irregularities committed by this servant of his. I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman being indignant and losing his temper. I do not wonder at his displaying his true character, when brought face to face with a transaction of this kind. I do not wonder at his use of observations which called from you, Sir, and the committee, a moment ago, the censure of the committee for the violent and unparliamentary language he used, but I do wonder that his colleagues chose to pass by this transaction in silence and now call upon Parliament to endorse the finding of the committee. I protest against it. I say you are proposing to demoralize the public service in asking us to reward persons who have violated the letter and the spirit of the law. There is one redeeming circumstance in connection with it. The wrong, the injury to the public credit, and the disgrace to the public service occasioned by these minor officers could not have taken place had there been an efficient and faithful head of the department. I offer that excuse for these men. That is the only apology that can be offered, and the proper way to deal with the whole case, of course, would have been first of all to dispose of the head of the department. Then you

would put the axe to the root of the tree; but I say, in order to be consistent, if you maintain the head of the department in office, you cannot do less than reward the men who were unfaithful in consequence of his neglect.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There seems to be a strange distinction made between men who are servants of the Government and men who occupy positions in other walks of life. I was not a member of the Public Accounts Committee last year, but from what has been stated here to-day, this man whose case is under consideration now has been guilty of an offence for which, if it had been committed in a private office, he would not only have been deprived of his position but would have had to atone for his conduct in a public institution probably at hard labour. What is the punishment here? A month's salary is deducted, and the interest on it for the time the poor fellows are kept out of it, and we may be called upon in further supplementary estimates to make up for that and the month's salary as well. Is it to go to the country that this is the standard of morality which the Government sets up for its guidance, that the man who in a private position would be deprived of his situation and placed in solitary confinement at hard labour for months, or it might be for years, is here to be rewarded in this way, or whether we have a law which places all on the same footing?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not think this item should be passed at all. We will review some of the evidence given by Mr. Pereira himself. He is asked:

"I am informed that you have been in the habit of drawing money, other than your salary, from the department. Is that the case?—I have.

"In your name, or in what other names have you drawn money?—In the name of Lizzie Evans.

"Any others?—Ellen Berry.

"Any others?—No.

"Just those two?—Yes.

"You know Lucy Evans?—No.

"Did you ever draw any money in the name of Lucy Evans?—No.

"Where does Lizzie Evans live?—She is my wife.

"Who is Miss Berry. Not your wife, too?—That is an assumed name.

"There is no such person?—No.

"How did you come to make out an account in Ellen Berry's name?—I would like to make some statement to the committee."

And then the witness goes on to state some arrangement made by him with the Deputy Minister.

"How much did you get that year under the name of Lizzie Evans?—$280. In the spring of last year, 1890, I was very much pressed with work, and I had made application to the Deputy Minister for some sort of assistance, and I reminded him that my wife had not got the benefit of the whole of what the late Minister had sanctioned to be given to her on my behalf, and he authorized me to allow her to help me in my work to the extent of a further amount which would about cover what the late Minister had sanctioned."

So you see the Minister of the Crown was aware that this work was being done, and that Mr. Pereira was taking the work out of the office under another name.

"How much did he sanction?—He sanctioned at least $400, I know.

"A year?—No, for the whole thing; and I am not sure that he did not say that it might be extended to $600; but I have nothing to show for that and I am not certain.

"Have you anything to show for the $400?—The work that was done in the spring of 1890 was done during April and May, and the account for it would have been made out in my wife's maiden name in the same manner.

"Ellen Berry?—No; Lizzie Evans. I had incidentally heard some talk about extra work, and had heard it mentioned in a peculiar way: 'We know who this man is and that man, and we know who Lizzie Evans is.'"

This is nice kind of talk to be going around the department, the clerks in the department saying: "I know who Lizzie Evans is, I know who Ellen Berry is, I know who Joseph Wright is," but no, they could not know who Joseph Wright was because Joseph Wright had no existence, neither had Ellen Berry; yet this was under the management of a superior officer like the present Minister and of a superior deputy in regard to whom this committee reported.

"I took upon myself the responsibility, of which this committee will be the judge, of not allowing my wife's name to appear any longer in the matter, and the account I made out myself in Ellen Berry's name."

He was ashamed to have his wife's name used any longer, and he substituted the name of Ellen Berry.

"When the cheque was made out, I endorsed that cheque."

This is the man whom it is proposed to reinstate and to reward.

"There is no such person as Ellen Berry. The work was done by my wife, and I took the responsibility of making the account out and the cheque in that other name for the reason which I have explained.

"When you had this work given to your wife, why did you call her 'Miss Lizzie Evans?' What was that done for?—I did not think it was desirable to make it public in any way that my wife was getting work.

"For what reason did you not, if it was honestly earned? Why did you object?—For one reason I suppose that if it were known, very likely a number of other permanent clerks might ask for the same thing.

"You state that the Minister authorized you to get up to $400?—Yes; up to $400; but I am not certain that he did not say it might go up to $600. I may state that, because I have a note with me as to that.

"Whom did you get the information from that you were to be allowed to go up to $600?—The Deputy Minister said that he thought that that authority had been given. He was not quite positive on the point, but he was certainly positive about the amount of $400.

"How did you come to draw more than $400?—I did it under the authority of the Deputy Minister, because he was under the impression, and I have no doubt he had good grounds for having that impression, that the Minister had said it might go up to $600.

"You were more interested in this than the Deputy Minister, but your impression was that it was $400?—No, Sir: what I said was that I knew that I had something to show it was up to $400, but beyond that I had nothing except the impression, but what I received from the Deputy Minister.

"Who was present beside the Minister and yourself when this understanding was come to?—Nobody else was present,

"Was the Deputy Minister not present?—I presume the Deputy Minister had an interview with the Minister, because he conveyed the information to me.

"After you had had a consulation with the Minister?—I had had several consultations with the Minister about it."

Then questions were asked as to the manner in which the work was done.

"What I understand you is, that this work done in the name of Ellen Berry, was done by your wife?—Yes.

"And when she did the work you certified the account was correct?—I did in the case of Ellen Berry.

"Did you select the work, or did your superior officer select it?—I selected the work.

"You selected the work, took it home, and afterwards when it was done, you certified to the account in this fictitious name?—Yes."

He not only certified to the account in this fictitious name, but he actually endorsed the cheque made out in the name of Ellen Berry and drew the money. He selected the work, took it home, stated it was performed, brought it back, certified that it was performed in the name of Ellen Berry, had the cheque made out in the name of Ellen

Berry, and endorsed the cheque in the name of Ellen Berry, and for this he is to be rewarded by being paid the amount of $183.87. That is to be his reward, after being reinstated in the department, for being guilty of all these transactions.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I hope the House will give no uncertain sound on this matter. However we may differ on political matters, we should agree upon this principle, that those who are in the departments should give an honest life to the service, and if they are discovered doing that which is dishonest, or savouring of dishonesty, or any violation of the law, their offences, however much you may feel disposed to be merciful to them, should not be condoned by this House. Give officials to understand, and give the Government to understand, that this country must have honest Government, and that the officials under them must be honest. I know it is pretty hard for the officials to be honest under this Government. I do not know but perhaps the measure proposed by my friend for North York (Mr. Mulock) is the proper one, that the axe should be laid at the root of the tree, and those who will tolerate, those who will condone in the departments, acts that are prejudicial to the public service, and at variance with the principles of common honesty, should be immediately dismissed from the service. Now, I am a little surprised at the Minister of the Interior losing his temper when speaking after the hon. member for North York. It almost leads one to believe that there is something wrong in the head of the department, because when a person loses his temper he loses his case, and when he begins to call bad names and apply offensive epithets to those who differ from him, there is sometime a possibility of a nigger being in the fence. Now, last session we saw the Minister of Public Works, who was charged with permitting some irregularities in his department, crowded out, and the Government took a great deal of credit to themselves for crowding out the Minister of Public Works. We saw in the Province of Quebec, when the leader of the Government there was suspected of much less grave irregularities, the people crowded him out. Although the late Minister of Public Works had given long service to this country, he was crowded out of the Government, and the Government took a great deal of credit to themselves for supplanting Sir Hector and filling up his place with another. Although they took great credit to themselves for doing this, I have an idea that, even supposing those charges against Sir Hector were correct, he is a more honest man than any man that is in the Government to-day. But while they were willing to throw him to the wolves, and while he is loyal enough to them to allow the wolves to devour him, it is a singular thing indeed, that others in whose departments conduct almost as bad was discovered, they should continue to preside over those departments. For myself, I tell the Government that I will not support in the department, conduct on the part of any of the officials that is not correct and honest. If there is one thing that I want in public life, there is one thing positive that in the public service I shall contend, I shall fight, for honest Government, and I desire the officials to be honest, although I know it is almost a physical and a political impossibility to have honest officials under the present Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I regret very much that the Government has seen it their duty to take this course with these officials. With regard to Mr. Pereira, and in face of the very serious evidence that has been given by himself and corroborated by others, I think it is very much to be regretted that the House should undo all the good work that was done during the last session of Parliament by the Public Accounts Committee. I fear that the Government, before long, will have cause to regret that they reinstated men who were found guilty of these very grave and improper acts; it is to be regretted, I say, because there was something like $20,000 of money spent in that investigation that took place before the Public Accounts Committee. If we are going to condone all past acts of this kind, in this Chamber, and the offences that have been brought to light are to be taken no notice of, I think it is proceeding in a very improper manner. I care not what sympathy there may be in the bosom of the Minister for those men who were shown to have been guilty of irregularities, or how he may feel regarding them, or those dependent on them. I say that in view of future efficient and honest service, these men should have borne the consequence of their acts. I am sorry that the Government have decided to ask the House virtually to condone all these irregularities and these dishonesties, and to vote a sum of money to make up for the loss of time they have sustained while they were suspended from their posts. Now, I was rather surprised at an admission made by the Minister of Interior this afternoon. I do not wish to deal harshly with any Minister; I know the enormous amount of labour they have to perform, but still, after hearing him admit before the Public Accounts Committee last year, that Mr. Burgess was not receiving any salary, I am surprised to hear him admit now that, after all, he was. It is well that Ministers should keep themselves thoroughly posted upon questions relating to their departments, so that members of Parliament may have reasonable grounds to rely upon the accuracy of the statements of Ministers, instead of being called upon a few months afterwards to hear a Minister get up and ask to be permitted to retract a statement that was not correct. Now, a good many irregularities were brought to light last session in the Department of Interior: evidence was brought before the Public Accounts Committee showing that there had been systematic stealing going on—because it is nothing short of that—by men who were apportioning out work to be done by their wives and their relatives and it is unfair for this House, it is lowering the dignity of this House, to ask it to vote money to pay these men salaries during the time they were suspended. What object is there in holding a public investigation before the Public Accounts Committee if, when offences are exposed, the Government come down and ask the House to condone those offences, and undo everything that has been done by the Committee of Public Accounts? I am surprised that the Government should have the hardihood to ask us to vote the salaries, and I think a good many people will come to the conclusion that the Government must have been in a very tight place when they asked the House to sanction the voting of this money and virtually to condone the offences that have been perpetrated by these people. The public will think that these men were able to hold a whip

over the Government, and to threaten the Minister, in order to compel them to meet their demands. Perhaps some of these men may have been in a position to say: Well, if the Government do not settle with me I will make further exposures. I have tales that I can tell that will make matters very unpleasant for the Government, and I will tell them unless they reinstate me where I was before, and pay my salary during the time I was suspended. I will expose them.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. Robillard.)

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate W. C. Edwards & Company—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

SUPPLY.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the House took recess, I was expressing my regret that the Government asked the House to pass a vote of this kind, to reinstate this man in the position he held before, notwithstanding the fact that irregularities had been proved against him in the Public Accounts Committee. During last session very valuable services were rendered to this country by the investigations which took place before that committee, and I had hoped a lesson would have been taught the civil servants for many years to come, that if men were found guilty of irregular and improper acts they might count upon receiving punishment at the hands of Government and Parliament. I was glad to notice that the Minister of Justice in some of his addresses during recess vindicated the course taken by the Government with respect to the irregularities brought to the notice of the House and the country, and stated that those men found guilty of irregularities had been deprived of their positions and turned out into the street. That kind of statement answered the purpose for a time. The bye-elections were brought on, the people were led to believe that the Government were disposed to do right, that they had dismissed those servants who had been proved guilty, and now we might expect purer, better and more honest work at the hands of the civil servants. The bye-elections are over, and those who were proved guilty of irregularities are being taken back, one by one. This is the first instalment; we have the cases of Pereira and Turner. The other man, Mr. Henry, did not merit dismissal. I look upon this as being a very serious matter. If in future investigations members of the Civil Service are found who have committed improper acts, to have converted to their own use money or valuables belonging to the Dominion, they can point to the punishment meted out to these men who have been found guilty of wrong-doing. We are establishing a precedent which will be in after years referred to as evidence of the lenient and charitable conduct that characterized the action of the Government towards civil servants. It is a very unfortunate state of things. It is bad enough to take these men back into the service, but to pay their salaries during the time they were walking the streets and doing nothing is a gross injustice. They have not served the country while walking around the city. To now offer to pay their salaries for time so spent is to offer a premium on wrong-doing. If a civil servant wants a holiday, and his request refused, all he has to do is to commit an irregularity, whereupon he will be suspended for six months and receive his salary. It is a very convenient way of getting a holiday. This, I say, is the first instalment of cases. We are begining with the little ones. Perhaps before this House rises we may have votes with regard to some other persons who have been dismissed. If we are going to have a general political jubilee of sin-forgiving we had better extend it, not only to the civil servants, but to those outside who have been found guilty of wrong-doing. Perhaps there may appear in the Supplementary Estimates a vote for the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), not only of his sessional allowance, but of salary as a Minister. That hon. gentleman has the same right to be reinstated as the civil servants in question. What is sauce for one should be sauce for the other. The Government during the bye-elections pointed to the fact that the late Minister of Public Works had suffered for his wrong doing, and that he had been punished for the irregularities in his department. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite tried to make him a scapegoat for the entire party. As of old: they laid their hands upon his head and he was sent away to the wilderness. However, he did not stop there, and he is in this House again. I contend that in order to carry out the policy of mercy which the Government are extending to these civil servants, they ought to go ahead and grant a general pardon for all the iniquities committed. If this is the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite are going to punish wrong-doing, the sooner we have an end to the whole farce the better.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Their policy is discrimination.

Mr. McMULLEN. If they do not know any better I would recommend them to go ahead and bury all the sins that their friends and civil servants have been guilty of, and to reinstate them all in the same position as they were before. In this whole business the country has been deceived and humbugged. I can say that on every platform on which I spoke during the elections, we had friends of the Government there who pointed to the fact that civil servants were turned out of office and punished for their misconduct, and that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) was also made to suffer for the wrong-doing which had been done. Now, as soon as the political show outside of this House is over, we are asked by the Government to initiate a policy of reinstalling these men who were guilty, and to compensate them by paying them their salaries during the time they were suspended. I trust that the country will see that the whole thing is a farce. What is the use of having a Public Accounts Committee at all, what is the use of subpœnaing witnesses from all parts of the Dominion, at a cost of $20,000, to testify before Parliamentary Committees, if after the whole thing is over the Ministers

are going to bring in legislation of this kind and to reinstate these men who have been suspended? It is turning the Public Accounts Committee, and the Privileges and Elections Committee, and the Investigation Committee into a farce. I think, when the country gets an opportunity of pronouncing on the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite in this matter, they will have their eyes open and treat them as they deserve. I find on this list of names, Mr. Senécal. He was found guilty of a considerable amount of wrong-doing, and was dismissed. Why should the Government single him out for punishment any more than the others, when the others are allowed to go free and when Senécal's conduct was not much worse than the others? What is the use of going through the farce of prosecuting these men in the courts, when the House may be asked later on to reinstall them and perhaps recoup them for the time they were in jail. If the policy of the Government is carried to its fullest extent I have no doubt that the House will be asked to consent to a vote of that kind. The country has pardoned the sins of hon. gentlemen opposite, and these same gentlemen are now measuring out to their subordinates the mercy which they received themselves. Mercy begets mercy. I am inclined to think the country is to blame for all this. They have pardoned hon. gentlemen opposite their iniquities, and if the country had not pardoned them, the probabilities are that we would not be asked to consent to such a vote as this to-night. The electors are responsible for all this, because if they had pronounced upon the Government as it deserved we would not be asked to reinstate Mr. Pereira to-night. I do not know whether the country did this in the absence of boodle and everything else, but at all events the Government secured a pardon and now they are extending their mercies. I commend them for their mercy, because it is in accordance with the way things should be—when mercy is granted mercy should be meted out to others. It is about time, however, that the representatives of the people should put a stop to this kind of thing, and deal with the Civil Service of this country as it should be dealt with. If we had made an example of this man Pereira, and of the other men who committed the same misconduct, the other civil servants of this country would have quivered in their shoes before they ever dared to do anything wrong. Now they will point to these men as having been dismissed and suspended, and when a convenient season came around as having been reinstalled and remunerated for their wrong-doing. It is a farce, and I hope the country will make note of the conduct of the Government in this matter. The people were astounded last year at the report of the disgraceful condition of some of the departments and the record of some civil servants, but now they are to be told that these very men are to be esteemed and paid for their iniquities. I feel sorry that the Ministers have felt themselves called upon to ask the House to consent to the passage of an item of this kind, and to begin the pardon system so early in the history of this country, even before the trials of some of the persons who have been prosecuted come off. What will the judge and jury say when they see the Government acting in this way? I have no doubt that they will say: What is the use of convicting these people and sending them to gaol, because, for all we know, the Minister of Justice will grant an order to release them and reinstate them in their positions. Probably the jury will be disposed to follow the example of the Minister and deal out mercy to wrong-doers. They will think that they should not convict one man for doing, when others are compensated for doing a similar thing. They will see that the Government dealt mercifully with Mr. Pereira and reinstated him, and they will naturally think that they should be merciful also. It is my opinion that if the Government are disposed to pursue this policy, that we should have a general year of political jubilee and pardon the sins of every man who has been guilty of breaking the law. Reinstate my respected friend from Three Rivers, condone the old errors, put every man back where he was and begin everything over again.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not have said anything but for a part of the discussion that took place before six o'clock. It was stated that in the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee there was nothing to justify the assertion that these irregularities had taken place before 1885. I think that statement was made both by the hon. member for North Wellington, and by the hon. member for North Brant. I have in my hand the evidence taken before that committee, and I find that the very reverse is the case. In the examination of Mr. Henry the following questions were asked:—

"*By Mr. Taylor:*

"By looking over the accounts for moneys paid, can you ascertain exactly when this practice was first in operation, whether in 1871 when you commenced, or what year after that? Have you any way of reaching that?—I got work in that way in the Finance Department in 1872.

"*By Mr. Foster:*

"For what work?—Counting notes.

"That is the practice to-day? When did you go into the Interior Department?—In 1873.

"Did you get any extra work in that department?—I did; prior to the Civil Service Act going into effect."

It was, on the other hand, contended that even though this practice was in existence before 1885, it was not illegal, because the Civil Service Act did not prohibit it. I have here a copy of the Civil Service Act for 1868, and I find that the provision in that Act is very much the same as that in the present Act. It is in the following words:—

"No moneys or compensation shall be paid for any extra service whatever which any officer or clerk may be required to perform in the department to which he belongs."

Again, it is contended that the oath which these officers were obliged to take since the Civil Service Act of 1882 was passed was so stringent that they could not perform extra services and be paid for them without violating it; but I find that the oath is exactly the same in the Act of 1868 as it is in the Act of 1873; and if it was a violation of the law in 1888 or in 1890, it was equally so in 1873. I do not cite this as a palliation of the offence; I do not think it is; two wrongs do not make a right; but when hon. gentlemen assert that there were no irregularities between 1873 and 1878, they are not justified, because the evidence brought out the fact that these irregularities had taken place years ago and had continued from time to time until they were stopped last spring. There is another thing I noticed last summer, that many newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite had a great deal to say about the rigorous punishment meted out to the small fry at Ottawa who had been

found guilty of certain irregularities that did not amount to much, while the perpetrators of great wrongs were allowed to go clear. That was what we met with generally throughout the country, and when we contended that whatever was done would be considered and a suitable punishment for the offence administered, it was asserted that these men were punished too severely for having done comparatively little wrong, while others who had committed great wrongs were not punished at all. The hon. member for North Wellington asks: Why not let Senécal and Bronskill go instead of suing them? I think their cases were entirely different. In the one case labour was performed for which parties were paid; and although the hon. member for North Brant expressed his opinion that that work was never done, we know that all the civil servants who came before the committee swore that the work was done and honestly done, and I think we are justified in receiving a man's oath and assuming that he is telling the truth—if not, he is committing an act of perjury, for which there is a severe punishment. Therefore, when the work was done according to the usual rates paid for such work, and full value given, the offence was not a very great one. But while saying that, I think that in some instances perhaps the punishment meted out is too light, in view of the fact that they are public officers. They are not like persons in private life. They ought to be made such an example of, that others coming after them would not be likely to do the same thing. In regard to Mr. Burgess, who is the head of the department, I think I have a right to assume from the evidence that if he did not order these acts, which was a technical violation of the law, to say the least of them, at all events he allowed them to go on while knowing the wrong was being done, and I think the punishment should be more severe in his case. Certainly I for one, understood, that from the day he handed in his resignation, until he was reinstated, he did not receive any pay. I know that I have said so on many platforms throughout the country during the elections; I said it believing it to be correct; and until this evening, I did not know anything to the contrary. I must say that in my opinion he should have received more severe punishment. But it is evident that these irregular practices prevailed for long time. During the Mackenzie régime men were under review for irregularities and practices not exactly of the same nature as these, but irregularities quite as wrong, and were suspended for a time and afterwards taken on again. If I remember rightly, engineers and other officials were treated in that way in the time of the Mackenzie Government. Consequently one Government seems to have been as much in fault as the other. If because men have done some slight injury they are to be turned out entirely, and deprived for the rest of their lives of the positions they have occupied for many years, I think it would be an extreme punishment. While they should be punished, I think there are mitigating circumstances that would not justify a very rigorous punishment being inflicted on these young men who gave value for the money they received.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the last speaker had been in the House before six o'clock he would have understood from the report brought in that the committee appointed by the Privy Council had investigated, or professed to investigate this matter more fully than the Committee on the Public Accounts had done. Of course, the investigation before that committee was curtailed, owing to the many other investigations which had to be brought before it; but the Privy Council appointed a committee to investigate this matter more fully, and we have the report of that committee now before the House, and it states distinctly that while it was believed that these irregularities had commenced as far back as 1875, still the committee were not able to find that one single dollar was expended until 1881 or 1882.

Mr. SPROULE. May I remind the hon. gentleman that his word was that there was no evidence to sustain the contention that irregularities had taken place before 1885?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We have evidence taken by the committee appointed by the Privy Council to the effect that no such money was expended until 1881 or 1882, and that after that time the payments for extra work were commenced. Consequently the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey amounts to nothing, for the simple reason that the Government have confuted the statement which he has made. They have confuted the statement made by the hon. member for Grey by the evidence they have produced themselves through the committee appointed to investigate the matter. The hon. gentleman says no evidence was given before the Public Accounts Committee to show that in some cases no work was done for the money paid. If he will look at page 40 of the Public Accounts Report, he will find the following evidence produced:—

"You state that this man Nelson did not work for this account dated January 27th, 1890, excepting in office hours?—Yes, with the exception of the two Sabbaths, in which I went to his house. We worked for about four or five hours. I took the galleys.

"Oh, you were reading proof. Who held the copy?—I held the copy.

"And you worked four hours each Sunday?—It might be four, five or six. We started at ten in the morning, and I did not come away until half-past three or four in the afternoon.

"You were kept continuously at work?—Oh, yes.

"But there was no work done for this at all?—Except during office hours."

And yet we have an hon. gentleman getting up and saying it was proved conclusively that work was done for all the expenditure in this direction. Now, we have the sworn testimony of one of the witnesses that no work was given for the amount of this account, and furthermore, I think we ought to take into consideration the oath which every one of the civil servants has to take before entering on the duties of his office. That oath was read during the investigation, and it was read to show that some of the gentlemen who appeared as witnesses, and who were officers of the Interior Department, actually did not remember that they had taken this oath, although it is compulsory on them all to take it. Now, the oath could not be more stringent than it is:

"I solemnly and sincerely swear that I will faithfully and honestly fulfil the duties which devolve upon me as a clerk in the department, and that I will not ask or receive any sum of money, services, recompense or matter or thing whatsoever, directly or indirectly, in return for what I have done or may do in the discharge of any of the duties of my said office, except my salary or what may be allowed me by law or by an Order of the Governor in Council: so help me God."

We have the evidence of the Government's own Commission that no money was paid——

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Certainly we have. That evidence was read this afternoon, and if some gentleman on the other side will produce the document, I will prove it again. It was proven this afternoon. There can be no doubt about it. There was no money paid until 1881 or 1882 for these services, according to their own report, and we have to go by their own report, so that no matter what the oath was during the time of the Mackenzie Government, it was not affected by this matter, since no money was paid. I contend that any officer of the Government who took this oath and then took part of this money, which amounted to over $9,000, for extra services, certainly forgot himself very much when he forgot that he had sworn not to do so. My hon. friend from North Wellington spoke about protecting the sinners. It would be only dealing out even-handed justice to all parties if this year were declared a year of jubilee. The Government professed before the committee that they were sincerely desirous of having all these men punished. They were going to see that no infractions of the rule would be allowed to go unpunished, and they boasted all through the country of their intentions. I heard the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) declare on the stump that this Government was pure, that it was going to mete out justice to these men, and that they were all to be punished. I hope the hon. gentleman was in the House this afternoon when the hon. members for Victoria (Mr. McDonald) and Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) and other hon. gentlemen got up, and declared that while they had announced on the hustings they believed the Government was sincere in desiring to punish these men, they found that the Government was going to stand by these men and forgive them all the errors and sins they had committed in the Department of the Interior. If these men are to be forgiven, we ought to forgive all men guilty of infractions of the law. We ought to forgive Arnoldi and Bronskill and Senécal and Bradley. We have nothing in this report with regard to Bradley, who was secretary of the Railway Department, and who for one whole year was drawing $60 a month for his son, who was studying medicine in Toronto and Montreal. Not a word is stated in that report by the Commission appointed by the Privy Council as to what has been done with Bradley, and I would like to know what they have done with him. All these men I have mentioned have as good a right to be reinstated as those who have been. They have all been proved guilty. But it seems there is to be one method of dealing out justice in one case and another method in another. The Government should be consistent and treat all alike who are equally guilty. Notwithstanding the statement made by the Minister of Justice, I repeat that the Government know full well, as I know, that they are afraid of some of these men who hold offices in the Interior Department. I know, from my own knowledge, that these men are capable of revealing matters in connection with the management of the department, which would disclose a state of affairs far worse than anything yet divulged before the Public Accounts Committee, and probably, before this session closes, we will have an opportunity of enquiring into some of these other irregularities.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was going to say a word before the hon. member for Brant spoke, but I am glad he has given me the opportunity of meeting the statements he made in this House before, that the officers referred to in the vote have been dealt leniently with, because the Government are afraid of something these officers might disclose. The hon. gentleman has made that remark more emphatic just now by declaring that he knows that to be the case. For one, I know that not to be the case. The Government are afraid of nothing which these persons or any person in the public service have to disclose. As the hon. gentleman has given the information that further enquiries may be pursued during this session, and that this vote, which some members on the other side seem to think is tempering justice with a little too much mercy, is designed for the purpose of affecting their testimony, their disclosures or their conduct with regard to such investigations, I make now, on behalf of the Government, the statement that we are not afraid of anything these persons or any other persons in the public service may have to say; and I make the statement here, that it may reach every person in the public service, that they are free to disclose anything they can with regard to this Government, its policy, its management of the departments, that they may disclose it anywhere, and at any time they please, and will have perfect immunity in doing so, except in so far as the consequences of any offences they may themselves have committed against the public service or against the public interest, may be concerned. They shall receive perfect immunity, and we shall be in the judgment of this House as to whether we shall have exercised with regard to them any severity whatever for disclosing anything which it may be in their power to disclose and with regard to the disclosures of which we do not care one straw to-night or at any other time. I am glad to say our friends opposite, although excessively severe on those officers for a time, are becoming more lenient and taking a more contented view of the situation. The hon. members for North Brant and North Wellington are in such a forgiving mood that they want all offences condoned and forgiven, with the single reservation made by the hon. member for North Wellington, that while he is willing to forgive all sinners he must except the country, and that he cannot forgive. Now, Mr. Chairman, I felt some hesitation about saying much upon this question for this reason, that, to say what may be said in mitigation of these officers' offences seems, for the moment at least, to appear like apologizing for them and extenuating something which everybody must condemn. There is not the slightest doubt as to the statement made by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the practice which resulted in this exposure and this punishment existed for a long time in that department and prevailed very widely in that department. It existed principally in that department because there was some kind of excuse for the employment of the regular clerks at extra work. While it could only be done during extra hours, it could be better done and more cheaply done, by the regular clerks than by outsiders. Therefore, it seems to have existed more

or less for about 20 years in that department, during which the extra work was permitted to be done by the regular clerks, but without any vote of Parliament for the services which they rendered. That practice increased of late years, and when we came to consider the number of persons who would fall under punishment for receiving money in this way, we found it absolutely necessary to adopt some reasonable limit of time as to the commission of the offence. The investigations of the committee did not go very far back, but we fixed ten years as a not unreasonable time in regard to those who had committed what was then considered a very venial offence, if it were an offence at all; and the commission of the act would have been entirely forgotten if attention had not been called to it by this enquiry. We did include a number who were brought before the committee, but who were shown by research to have done just what these persons who are named in this vote have done. I mention this as right and fair to the persons who are named in this vote. I do not apologize for them, for, when persons are forbidden to take public money, though they do work for it, it is reprehensible for them to take that money, and it is especially reprehensible to take it in a private or secret way, so that those to whose knowledge it would otherwise come may not be aware of the fact. We were met with this peculiar state of circumstances. If, during the session, we had dealt with the cases and had announced to the House that a month's salary was to be forfeited I think the House and the public sentiment of that time would have thought that the punishment was not too lenient a one, but the members of the Government were pressed with the very onerous work of a heavy session, and we were unable to take up and pursue the investigation, which had only been begun by the Committee on Public Accounts, until the end of the session. Some of these officers had been suspended at the beginning of the enquiry, some were suspended later on, and some had only recently been suspended. To say that we should make them forfeit their salaries for the whole period of suspension, and, perhaps the month's salary beside, would have made the punishment very unequal and unfair. It is not our fault that the delay took place, but it was not fair to make the punishment of those officers so unequal because we had not the time to devote to the matter. Having decided what would be a fit punishment to inflict, we imposed that, and decided to ask Parliament to pass a vote for the salary which was not paid during these unequal periods of suspension. It has been suggested that during the bye-elections we pretended to the country that we were dealing more severely with those officials than the facts show. That is not correct, because the report of this committee was published at once and commented upon long before the bye-elections. I do not think more than 48 hours elapsed after its adoption before the newspapers contained the names of the officers and the penalty each would have to suffer. That was long before the bye-elections, and I think the principal point taken in the press, and especially in the Opposition press was that we were dealing with great severity with these offenders, the object being to make it appear that we were allowing other offenders to go scot free. I think the House, in its sound judgment, will conclude that, as regards these officers, the penalty imposed upon them is not too lenient under all the circumstances. It is said that it is not reasonable to give these officers pay for a time when they were doing no work. It must be remembered that they are employed by the year and have no other means of supporting their families, and, when an officer is suspended for three or four months, during which there is a compulsory idleness, the loss of his salary during that time might be too great a punishment for the offence he is supposed to be guilty of. We have to consider whether the officer, willing to do his work and suspended in that way by our compulsory edict, should not have his case reviewed and dealt with on fair terms, and I think, if the House will consider the matter apart from political feeling, most of the members will conclude that we have not erred on the side of undue lenity, and that we should not be more severe than we have been in depriving these officers of a month's salary.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand the Minister of Justice to say that this system has prevailed for about 20 years, and I understood the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to say it prevailed as early as 1871. I do not remember at present in what year this department was organized, but I do not think it was in existence quite as early as the year the hon. gentleman mentions. I am not aware of any evidence of any irregularities except the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee last year and the report the hon. gentleman has submitted to us, and in neither the report of the Public Accounts Committee nor the report the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House, is there any evidence of any of these irregularities occurring previous to 1881. I know nothing of what transpired in that department before 1876 or after 1878, but between October of the former and October of the latter year, I do know something of what took place in the department. I know there were great irregularities in the outside service, and the parties who were concerned were dismissed from the public service, and this was made known to the public. The information came into my possession shortly before I retired from office and was placed in the hands of my successor. Those irregularities were connected with the Indian service in Manitoba and the North-West. There could hardly have been such transactions as the committee have exposed without the knowledge of the Deputy Minister for the time being, and so far as I know the Deputy Minister who had been for many years in office had been very careful. I know that he brought under my notice immediately upon my entering office, a suspicion of mismanagement with regard to Indian matters, and as soon as the facts could be ascertained I had them investigated. I am inclined to think if there had been any other irregularities that came to his notice he would have mentioned them. It would be satisfactory, at all events, before we are called upon to discuss any irregularities that took place at an earlier period than those investigated by the committee, that the evidence of those irregularities should be in the hands of the House, if any such exist. Now, let me say with regard to the observations of the Minister of Justice, that I agree with him that this is, to some extent, a judicial proceeding on the part of the House, and we ought to consider

and I think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have considered the character of the offences with which the parties were charged, and the extent to which the evidence supports the various charges. It does seem to me, so far as I remember the evidence that was submitted, that these three parties whose names are given here, and whose salaries are being supplemented by this vote, do not stand exactly upon a footing of equality, and this vote does not carry out the view expressed by the Minister of Justice in the speech which he has just addressed to the committee, that we should deal with Mr. Henry, Mr. Pereira and Mr. Turner in exactly the same way. Now, so far as Mr. Henry is concerned, I do not understand that he ever profited to the extent of a dollar by any irregularity. The charge against him was that he had approved of a cheque, that he was recommended to approve of by the Deputy Minister, that he had not exhibited sufficient firmness in that matter, and that he had so far failed in his duty to the department. But I do not understand that Mr. Pereira stands in the same position as Mr. Henry. I understand that Mr. Pereira did give out work to parties who were not entitled to receive it, that he himself took work from his department as extra work in the name of fictitious parties, and that he received in the name of those parties extra compensation, and that he certified to work that he had himself done under the name of those imaginary persons. Now, that is a most dishonest transaction; that is, in my view, a highly reprehensible proceeding. I do not think from a moral point of view, that there is any comparison between a proceeding of that sort and a proceeding such as the irregularity charged against Mr. Henry. Now, if that be so, these two parties are not being dealt with in the same way, they are not being put upon a footing of equality, because the offence committed by the one is wholly different in its character from the offence committed by the other. If that be so, then it seems to me the public service will suffer. I do not see that the public service will suffer very much from the restoration of Mr. Henry. I think his evidence went to show, and his conduct went to show, that there was no intentional disposition to do wrong, there was no desire on his part to persist in wrong-doing, that his conduct on the whole showed that he was disposed, as a public officer, to discharge honestly his public duty. Now, when you take the case of Mr. Pereira a wholly different state of mind is exhibited, a wholly different character is presented in the transaction from what is exhibited in the transaction of Mr. Henry. I submit to the Minister of Justice that in undertaking to deal with Mr. Pereira in the way he is dealing with Mr. Henry, he is at the same time inflicting an injury upon a public department. I quite admit that a party who is suspended, and who has no knowledge whether he is going to be restored or not, who is without employment for several months, is, in the fact that he is so out of employment and out of office and in a state of suspense, being punished for what he has done. But when, at the end of that period of time, you take one who is an offender in a very slight degree and put him upon a footing of equality with a man who is a cheat, whose conduct in every particular shows that he is cheat, I submit with all candour to the House, and without any party feeling or bias in the matter—because we are dealing now with the rights of individuals—as essentially unfair. I submit that Mr. Henry and Mr. Pereira do not morally stand upon a footing of equality before this House, and the payment of the one will not have the effect upon the department that the payment of the other will have. I think that they are in a different position, that they stand in different moral categories, and that while one may fairly, after this lapse of time, receive compensation subject to the reduction that the Minister has mentioned, I do not think that that rule applies to the other; for everything connected with the wrong-doing of Mr. Pereira seems to me to show a character and a disposition not at all desirable in one who occupies a position in the public service.

Mr. PERRY. It appears to me that the policy of the Government in respect to this matter is to countenance and encourage irregularities on the part of the Civil Service in the departments under their control. We find that something like $10,000 have been drawn from the year 1881 to 1891 irregularly, some of this money has been drawn under fictitious names; I believe the most of the money was paid in the name of a person living in the United States. Some was paid in the name of a dead person; some was paid in the name of a young man who was at school for 12 or 15 months, his father drawing $60 a month for the time the boy was at school. Well, Sir, these men who have been guilty of these irregularities are all to be forgiven, nay, more, they are to be paid a premium. The Government are actually asking this House to pay a premium to all the wrong-doing they have committed. Have the Government any security that these officers will be better in time to come? Have these men gone on their knees and said *mea culpa*? Have they confessed honestly, squarely and conscientiously, that they will never do it again? I say the Government have been trying to saddle this irregularity upon the late Administration, framing a report that this was going on since the year 1875. It has been shown by an hon. member on this side of the House that these improper practices commenced in 1881, and that was acknowledged by a Committee of the Privy Council. A greater injustice was never perpetrated than that now proposed. These men are all Tories, but if any impropriety is committed by a Grit, the Minister of Justice will land him in a penitentiary. These men are, however, friends of the Government, and they can steal money by the thousands, by the ten thousand or fifteen thousand dollars, and they are all right. I wish to go back for a few moments to 1887, a short time after the election. We find that an officer in the Government service, Mr. Ronald Campbell, a preventive officer in Prince Edward Island, who had discharged his duties faithfully, and even risked his life to collect money due to the Government, was dismissed from the service. He was a very hardworking man, and after the people had shown their good sense by returning two Liberals, this man was accused of improper acts. A horse must be obtained to put a saddle on. It was stated that Mr. Campbell had voted and supported the Liberal candidate. He demanded an investigation. A court was arranged for, but he was not notified to attend on the day it was held, and before he knew that his case was being tried, it was over, and in a day or two he was dismissed.

That was the way in which the Government administered affairs in Prince Edward Island. But the same measure of justice is not meted out to their Tory friends. Let me now refer to a case that happened not long ago at Summerside, in the county I represent. The postmaster caused an ordinary letter, not a money letter, to be dropped into the wrong box, and a few days after he was dismissed without an investigation being held or a moment's notice given. For what was he dismissed? I suppose to satisfy some hungry shark about Summerside who was hanging about to get the office—a man who wanted to figure round this House at the expense of the voters of Prince County. The postmaster must be thrown on one side as a beggar. No superannuation, and even no consideration must be shown him. He did not happen to be in the same political boat with the Government, and there was no reward for him; he had to be victimized. I hope, however, this man will be able to live notwithstanding all the acts of the present Administration. I will now go a little further. After 5th March 1891, two men in my county, who had worked on the railroad for eighteen years, who were supposed to have voted for the Liberal candidates, although it was never proved that they attended meetings or voted for the Liberal candidates, were dismissed. The Government did not institute a court of investigation and did not give these men an opportunity to defend themselves. No, they must be dismissed without an investigation. The superintendent of the Island railway said these men must be dismissed promptly. Who gave the order? I am told the chief superintendent in Ottawa. But who prompted him to adopt this action? Was it the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Railways or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? None of them will admit doing so and assume the responsibility for that action. If men are proved guilty of dereliction of duty let them be dismissed. When men are guilty of a gross misdemeanour—I will not call it stealing, although it seems very much like it—it is time they should be dismissed and an example made. When the branches of the tree are rotten the trunk must be likewise affected. We are becoming ridiculous in the eyes of the world as a people who are not fit to control our affairs, and it is high time we commenced to remedy these evils. Must it be said that we have no men capable and honest to carry on the business of the public departments, that all our good men have gone to the United States? I hope we have still a sufficient number left to provide true and honest men to conduct public affairs in an upright and honourable manner. The Government must remember that they are not going to be for ever in power, that a change will occur some time, and if these irregularities are allowed to go unpunished, a succeeding Government can say in defence, that they were simply adopting the plan of their predecessors. I am ashamed of the action of the Government. I am ashamed to think that they are palliating the wrong-doing of their officers who are Tories, while down in Prince Edward Island, where our people happen to be Grits, officers are dismissed without reason, and even without having the benefit of an investigation held.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Most undoubtedly this particular item connected with Mr. Pereira should be struck out. I listened attentively to what the Minister of Justice had to say. He avoided dealing with the real question in hand, which is whether these three parties stand on the same footing, and whether a just conclusion has been arrived at. I have no hesitation in saying, and I was present during a greater part of the sittings of the Public Accounts Committee, that I recollect the impression made on me at the time by the way in which these men gave their evidence. I concur in what has been said in regard to Mr. Henry. He appeared to make a plain and truthful statement. He did not appear to have benefited to any material degree by the irregularities that had taken place, but his case and that of Mr. Pereira are totally different. Mr. Pereira was distinctly guilty of fraud. Mr. Pereira was distinctly guilty of using false names and causing false entries to be made in our public accounts, and if I am not very greatly mistaken, using false names on cheques. As I intimated two or three times before the recess, I consider that a totally different question from the question of a mere irregularity in receiving a little more money than they were ordinarily entitled to. I attach far greater importance to it by reason of the fact that Mr. Pereira was assistant secretary. What do the members of the Government do with the head of the department? Practically, as far as Mr. Burgess is concerned, we have heard to-night that his punishment is to amount to this: that he is to be fined $233, that being the difference between $2,800 a year and $3,200 for eight months, and that he is to be reinstated on the 1st of July. I attach no other meaning whatever to the statements made by the Minister of the Interior and by the Minister of Finance than this, and if that be the intention of the Government, I say that they are deliberately doing all that in them lie to degrade and demoralize our Civil Service. As they propose to deal with Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister, so they propose to deal with Mr. Pereira, the assistant Secretary, who has been proved guilty of fraud; a fraud which verges close on to a criminal offence, if indeed it is not a criminal offence to use a false name on a cheque. He is not to be punished at all, because I regard the forfeiture of one month's salary as entirely indequate to the punishment of his offence. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I for one protest against this. I refuse to vote for it and I will divide the committee on the question as to whether Mr. Pereira is to be indemnified after the conduct proved against him in the Public Accounts Committee for his proceedings during the time he was assistant secretary. I will add, Sir, that it looks very like turning the proceeding of the Public Accounts Committee into a farce, when a month's forfeiture of salary is all the punishment that is to be inflicted on parties proven to have done what Mr. Pereira has done.

Mr. SPROULE. As the question was brought up by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the assertion made that no such payments or irregularities took place during his time in office, I may state that in looking up the Public Accounts of that day, I find that the same system had obtained during the Government of which he was a member. I have before me the Public Accounts of that day, and I will refer to a few cases in the Department of Finance where these payments were made: W. Lord, for extra work, $243; F. Toller, extra work, $52; F. White, extra work, $35.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were they permanent clerks?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, they were.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I). How does that appear?

Mr. SPROULE. Some of them are in the department yet. It appears as paid out of contingencies, and is not voted in the Public Accounts, while the Act says: "No allowance or compensation shall be made for any extra services whatsoever which any officer or clerk may be required to perform in the department to which he belongs." These gentlemen in the department to which they belong were paid out of contingencies for extra work, and without any vote in the Estimates, and upon the same principle as the men to whom we are now refering. Therefore I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not strictly speaking correct. I find in the Customs Department the following entries: J. Barry, extra work, $318; F. Bennett, extra work $489; G. W. Grant, extra work, $39 and J. R. Piché, paid in the same way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not find that they used false names. I draw a distinction between deliberate fraud and extra payment, which I admit is an irregularity that may have occurred at various times, although my recollection is that there were different provisions in the Civil Service Act at the time the hon. gentleman refers to than what there are now. I draw a wide distinction, and every man in this House must see there is a wide difference, between receiving extra sums and making false entries, and drawing false cheques and causing these to appear in the Public Accounts.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a distinction, I admit; but what I understood the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) to say, was that no payment of any character in evasion of the law, had been made prior to the year 1881. That is what I understood him to say, and I confess I was somewhat surprised when I heard that remark made, because I know that of all men in the House, a gentleman who had given so much study to that question as the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) must have been labouring under misapprehension when he made it. I know my own experience is that when I entered the department it had been a regular practice of paying for extra work, and I put a stop to it. The consequence was I had for a time a little rebellion on my hands. The work was behind and the commissioner came to me and told me that the officers refused to bring up the work unless they were paid extra for it. I told the commissioner to tell these gentlemen the work must be done and the returns ready for Parliament. I refused to give them one cent for it, as being contrary to law, and I told them further that if they refused I would dismiss them and get somebody else to do the work. The work was done as I expected it would be, but without their having received extra pay for it. I know from my own personal experience that large amounts had been paid in this way prior to 1881. I do not say they were not paid before the hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, but I say that the practice had prevailed at that time, and I should not have referred to it now were I not under the impression that the remarks made by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) would lead the House to suppose that no payments of this kind, contrary to the Civil Service Act of 1868, were made prior to 1881. I remember that before the committee last year I read the oath which has been now read by the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I also remember distinctly what was said to me at the time by the members of the Opposition. The retort was pointed—I find no fault with it, but it is unnecessary to repeat it. I say that this is a practice that has been prevailing for years, and I have no doubt prevailed before hon. gentlemen opposite came into office, except perhaps in those departments where the Minister had personal cognizance of what was going on and put a stop to it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the facts. I do not suppose he was in the House when the facts were brought out as stated in the report of the committee that was appointed by the Privy Council to investigate this matter. I do not know whether he was a member of that committee or not. The report was passed over to that side of the House and it has disappeared. I think it should be forthcoming now, and that no member of the House had a right to dispose of it until the discussion closed. The Minister of Public Works sent over here for it, and he passed it around to some other member and it has disappeared. I think we ought to have it in our possession. The report distinctly states as I have already said that these irregularities had occurred from 1875 up, and then went on to say that a certain sum of money had been discovered as having been paid for extra services, and a statement was made showing the years during which these payments were made, and the amount of the payments footed up to the total sum in the other clause of the report, setting forth that about $10,000 had been paid is this way between 1881 and 1891. What other conclusion could any one derive from it? I am basing my statement on the official report made by the Commission appointed by the Privy Council, and if we are not to take that report as authentic and if we are not to be at liberty to quote from that, and to believe the statement of facts in it, then I would like to know what we can base any argument upon. The report distinctly says what I have stated, and I think the Minister of Militia can understand that I have good ground for the statement I have made; that there were no payments made prior to 1881 or 1882 in this direction. I think the hon. gentleman will see that I was justified in making that statement.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Why not? If the report is correct I was justified in making that statement. Neither the Minister of Justice nor the Minister of Finance have stated that that report is not correct, and, therefore, we must take it as authentic. That being taken as authentic, I have perfectly good grounds for stating that no payments were made previous to 1881 and 1882 in this direction. Now, I think the Minister of Customs ought to accept that and agree with me that I had grounds for making the statement I did.

Mr. BOWELL. If it would not be considered an offensive word, I would say that the hon. gentleman's argument is disingenuous. He ignores the fact that, according to his own statement, the report stated distinctly that these irregularities existed from 1875 until the time the report was made.

He treats that as a falsehood and declares the other portion of the report to be true. That is really the position he takes. If the report is to be taken in its entirety, then the hon. gentleman must agree that these irregularities commenced at least as far back as 1875 and that they continued up to the time of the investigation. But he bases his whole argument on the circumstance that the committee only gives an account of the irregular payments made in this way from 1881 up to the time they made their report. We have a right to say that the committee meant exactly what they said, that the irregularities existed from 1875, but that when they gave an account of the payments made they only gave them from 1881 up to the time they made the report. If the report reads as the hon. gentleman says, it would be to that extent self-contradictory, and the inference I would draw would be that probably 1885 is an error for 1881. Even supposing the report bore the interpretation put upon it by the hon. gentleman, that does not affect the fact that these irregularities did exist to my knowledge, and the Public Accounts show that they did.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then it amounts to this, that the Committee of the Privy Council did not perform their duties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statements read from the Public Accounts by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) do not establish his proposition at all. In the first place, they relate to another department. I understand that these enquiries, which have been reported upon by a committtee of the Council, related only to the Department of the Interior. If they related to all the departments, then I misunderstood the report. What has been read from the Public Accounts by the hon. member for East Grey does not relate to that department at all, but to the Department of Finance and the Department of Customs. It does not appear, nor has he undertaken to satisfy the committee that the parties whose names are mentioned there were any other than extra clerks, and the Act in that particular does not apply to persons who are not on the permanent list. Then, he does not show that if they were on the regular permanent list, their employment was not authorized by Order in Council. What he has read is really no evidence at all of the proposition which he undertook to establish.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Bothwell has made one mistake. It was in criticism of my statement that the same irregularities had existed between 1872 and 1885, that the hon. gentleman assured the House that to his knowledge during the time he was a Minister of the Crown they had not existed. Now, I do not think it was material to the argument that I should show that they existed in the Department of the Interior of which he had control. I took the first department that came to my notice in the selection of the names that I found, and they belong to the permanent Civil Service. I did that because I believed the practice was in contravention of the Civil Service Act of 1868, in which the oath was just the same as it is to-day. Then the hon. gentleman says that there is no evidence that they were not employed by Order in Council. They were permanent civil servants, therefore there was no necessity of their being employed by Order in Council, and the payment was made out of the contingent fund.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think that the committee have adroitly had their minds taken off the real question before them. The question is not whether in a period anterior to 1881 or 1882 there had been irregularities in payments to civil servants. I think the hon. gentleman for North Brant proved this afternoon by reading the Order in Council that there had not been irregularities before that time; and the only answer made to him by the hon. Minister of Finance was that possibly the report of the Committee of Council brought down was not a correct copy of the original.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you in earnest?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is what I understood him to say. I would like to ask the hon. member to correct me now if I am not correctly reporting what he said.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not objecting to your report of what I said, but I do not think the hon. gentleman can be sincere in making the statement as to what the Order in Council, and gloss of the hon. member for Brant, proved.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not the Order in Council, but the report of the committee of the Council, which I say satisfactorily established this fact, that, so far as the moneys which they reported to have been irregularly paid were concerned, they were paid in the period between 1881 and 1891.

Mr. FOSTER. No, but exactly the opposite.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My hon. friend read the report, and the answer the hon. gentleman gave across the House was that, so far as the language of the report is concerned, it proves exactly what you say, but I imagine it must be an incorrect report.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The very reverse of the statement is made on the face of the report, namely, that these payments were made and this practice continued from 1875, and the names and amounts which are stated in the appendix to the report are the payments to the officers who are to be made the subject of punishment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is not what the report said nor what the hon. gentleman read. Nor did the report say these practices continued in the anterior period to which we refer at all; but it said in one of the paragraphs, that they began to arise --whatever that may mean--and that is the only reference made in the report to a period anterior to 1881.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to read the clause of the report, probably he will change his opinion. Section 5 says: "That the whole sum thus irregularly paid to permanent officials for extra work amounted, as far as can be ascertained, to $9,017 from the year 1875 to date." That is in the body of the report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Exactly.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is not the report I read to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Things have come to a pretty pass in this House when an hon. gentleman, without seeing the document from which I am reading, will state that is not the report. If that hon. gentleman has any sense of propriety at all, he will apologize to the House. I do not ask him to apologize to me, but I think he ought to apologize to the House. I have been a long while in the House and

never heard a more audacious statement since I have been in Parliament. This is in the body of the report. That is the report which was brought down. Now, then, my hon. friend states that that report proves conclusively that there were no moneys paid from 1875 to 1881. I have read the report. Hon. gentlemen in this House can draw their own conclusions as to what it means. The hon. member for Brant, who made the quotation a little while ago, in so ungenerous and uncourteous a way, took the appendix to this report, a tabular statement purporting to be the amounts that were paid to permanent clerks, and the heading of it is from 1881 to 1891. That is a tabular statement appended to the report. The report of this committee, as I read it, covered from 1875 to 1891. The tabular statement "A" purports to be a statement of the moneys paid from 1880 to 1891, and they footed up to $9,017.34, the exact sum that is stated here to have been paid from 1875 to 1891.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I am stating the matter fairly and the hon. gentleman ought to appreciate my fairness. My hon. friend who just preceded me, did not, I think, state it fairly. I am giving you what the statement of the report is, and I am giving you what is in the appendix in the form of a tabular statement. When that was brought to my notice by the hon. gentleman, I explained that there seemed to be a discrepancy and that there must be something wrong with the figures. The statement in the body of the report I have no doubt is correct and the figures of dates in the appendix wrong. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Interior, kindly went over to his department and got the original statement from which this report to Council is made up. The original statement is exactly the same, the figures tot up exactly the same, but there is written here "extra payment to permanent clerks from 1875 to 1891." Now, without further investigation, I come to the conclusion that in this, which is a copy of this tabular statement, a mistake is made in putting the figures 1880 to 1891, because this is labelled as being from 1875 to 1891. Anyway there is an error somewhere, but it is not an error in the body of the report, and it does not contradict the statement at all which was made in the body of the report, that irregularities of this kind did exist as far back as 1875, and that many payments were made, and I have here a statement, which was before the committee and from which these figures were taken, and I have the names of persons who from 1875 to 1880 were paid sums in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let us have the amounts.

Mr. FOSTER. And to which the body of the report refers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has not read the report in any sense differently from the way it was read by my hon. friend this afternoon. He read the very same paragraphs and the very same appendix, and he proved that while the body of the report showed these irregularities continued from 1875 to 1891, and while a certain sum was alleged to have been paid covering the whole of that period, the schedules which are attached giving the dates when the money was paid show that every dollar was paid between 1881 and 1891. That is the statement made by the hon. gentleman and repeated by the Minister of Finance, and if there is a mistake in the report brought down, he will be at liberty to correct it. But that is not the point immediately before the committee. The point is whether Mr. Pereira has been shown to have been guilty of conduct which would not justify us in voting that he be reinstated and paid his full salary. Now, the plaintive enquiry made by the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. McDonald) has not been answered. The hon. gentleman plaintively enquired this afternoon, and I thought with a great deal of honesty: What am I to say to my constituents? I went to them in the bye-election and told them the Government were honest and were going to punish the wrong-doers. What am I to say when I go back, after finding that they have not done so? In the speech which the leader of the House made this afternooon, he never answered that plaintive enquiry, and I am very much concerned for the member for Victoria, N.S. He will be met on every platform with the statement he made that these people were going to be punished, and by the fact that, instead, the Government reinstated them and repaid them all their salaries, barring one month. Now, Pereira is not only charged with the irregularity to which reference has been made, but with a more serious offence. He is charged with having certified an account in the name of a fictitious person and with having obtained money from the public treasury under false pretenses. He certified to the Government that a certain person, known as Ellen Berry, had done a certain amount of work. That was a false representation, and he obtained on that representation a cheque in Ellen Berry's name, and endorsed Ellen Berry's name on the cheque. There was no such person in existence. These acts are certainly indefensible from any moral standpoint, and they come perilously near, if they do not reach, what is known as a legal offence. How is this going to be justified? There is no comparison at all between the offence alleged to have been committed by Mr. Henry, which may have been inadvertently committed, and, at any rate was of a very trivial character, and the offence committed by Pereira. Do not let us get away into general discussions as to whether irregularities were committed under the old regime as well as this. Take the question: Are we justified in replacing this gentleman in the position he formerly occupied, from which he was suspended? and are we justified, after the leader of the Government had pledged his word, that every man guilty of wrong-doing should be punished and after that that statement had been repeated by the leader of the House time and again, in the House and on the public platform, in doing the very reverse of what was stated? And here we are tearing and throwing to the winds these pledges and promises and reinstating these gentlemen whose conduct I have not heard any hon. member on the other side condone. Are they prepared to say to-night that this conduct of Mr. Pereira meets with their approval? If they are not, what are we to say to the 800 or 900 men in the Civil Service who are looking to see what view Parliament takes, not the view of a committee of Council may take, biassed as they may be by considerations of one kind or the other—but what view Parliament takes of conduct which has been proved upon oath, which is admitted to be indefensible, and which, if it is al-

lowed to go unreproved, will spread like a canker-worm through the service and will eat out of it all that is good. If this vote is persisted in, I will join my hon. friend in voting against it as being indefensible.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister of Finance tries to make the committee believe that I have endeavoured to mislead it in this matter. He says he has other papers in his possession, and I think we should have those papers in order to get at the facts. I based my statement on the report which was made by the committee appointed by the Privy Council, and I contend that the statement I made before is borne out by this report in every respect, and that I was justified in making the remarks I did, and that the Finance Minister had no right to make the remarks he did in reference to me.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say why I made that statement. When I read that report, I understood the hon. gentleman to state that was not the report he read from, intimating that I was not quoting correctly from that report, or that I was trying to palm off another on the House. That is what I understood him to say, and that is what I took exception to. I am not objecting to his using that schedule in the way of a quibble, of which, no doubt, it is capable.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the Finance Minister had read all the paragraphs of the report, he would not have made the statement he did. He read only one paragraph of the report, and it is necessary to read the three paragraphs in order that the whole sense of the argument may be got at. The paragraphs I read were as follows. The second paragraph is :

"That from a period dating at least as far back as 1875, a practice began to grow up in the department under which occasional payments for extra work were made to permanent clerks in violation of this clause of the Civil Service Act."

Paragraph 3 is as follows : —

"That during the years 1882–1889 inclusive this occasional practice became frequent, and under it several permanent clerks received extra payments, either in the name of outsiders or fictitious persons, or through temporary clerks, for work performed wholly or partly by themselves."

Clause 5 is as follows : —

"That the whole sum thus irregularly paid to permanent officials for extra work amounted as far as can be ascertained to $9,017 from the year 1875 to date."

Then, when I turn to the schedule, I find that the statement there is that the extra payments from 1881 to 1891 to permanent clerks amounted to $9,017, showing conclusively that the whole sum paid for these services was paid from 1881 to 1891. If the Government choose to bring down reports to this House which are not correct, they are to blame, and they cannot blame the Opposition for taking one of their own reports as being correct. I do not yet know in what respect it is incorrect. The Minister of Finance says he has some other documents, but he has not produced them to the committee, though he says there were some other payments made between 1875 and 1881. In that case this report certainly cannot be correct, and the Government have no right to bring before the committee statements which are not correct. If they are brought before the committee, the members of the committee have a right to rely upon them, and therefore there can be no justification for the assault made upon me by the Finance Minister. I am striving to do my duty in this matter here, as I was in the Public Accounts Committee, and if we are not to give any credit to the documents produced by the Government themselves, where are we to get the evidence ? Are we to ask the gentleman who formed this committee, Mr. Foster, Mr. Haggart and Mr. Dewdney, to come and give their evidence ? This report is their evidence, and it shows that my statements are correct. If there is any other information in the hands of the Government, we ought to have it before us before this item is passed. This is not a full report, if the Finance Minister has still something in his hands, and this committee should have possession of the other facts before the vote passes.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to give a very short reason for the faith within me in regard to the vote which I shall give if this goes to a division. I do not choose to sit still under the accusation which has been hurled across the floor of the House by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island to the effect that those who support this motion approve of the conduct of these clerks. I think that was a very exaggerated statement to make and one altogether without excuse. These gentlemen have been punished. My hon. friend said in his remarks that the leader of the House had not stated that they had been punished. Well, if he did not say how they were punished, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) told us how they had been punished, and the hon. gentleman might have heard him say distinctly that in his opinion there had been a punishment and a severe punishment. In other words, these gentlemen had been suspended and for months had been kept in a state of mental suspense not knowing whether they were to be employed again or not. I know that is true in regard to this individual whose case we are now discussing, because I have met him several times when he was suffering under great mental anxiety. I agree with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) rather than with my friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) in reference to that matter. Now, so far as the charges that have been brought against this gentleman are concerned, I am quite sure there is no member of the House on either side, who for one moment will defend his conduct ; but on the other hand I do not think there is any advantage, and there is certainly no generosity, in exaggerating the misconduct of that gentleman or any other gentleman in the Civil Service ; and when it is said that his offence approaches morally to a legally criminal offence, I think it is going a very long way indeed. We know very well that there was work done, and that the money that has been paid was paid for work done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No.

Mr. McNEILL. It has never been denied that there was work done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It has been denied : I have read the documents to show that work was not done.

Mr. McNEILL. There has been no attempt made to prove that work was not done ; and the course that this gentleman took, however irregu-

lar it was, however improper it was, at all events, was in execution of the work which he was permitted to do. It was admitted that he had the permission of the late Minister of the department to do the work ; and while he was guilty of these irregularities we must remember, however reprehensible they were—and no one on this side of the House for one moment will deny that they were reprehensible—we must remember that he was guilty of these irregularities largely to prevent inconvenience accruing to his chief in the department. One of the difficulties to be overcome was that if any individual in the department got extra work, others would expect the same, and there was an understanding that he should be allowed to do this extra work as quietly as possible. So that while it was altogether irregular, and while it was altogether improper, I think it was a very harsh thing to speak of this man having committed fraud in the sense in which you speak of a crime. For my part, I very much regret that expressions of this kind have been made use of in reference to a number of civil servants unless they were very much better founded than in this case they are.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) certainly feels under some embarrassment when he intimates that he is obliged to give a vote in favour of this transaction. He has described it as irregular and improper, and one that had to be carried out as quietly as possible, to use his own words, I suppose as being one that would not stand the light of day. Therefore I can well understand both he and other hon. gentlemen feeling embarrassed at being obliged to condone a transaction of this character. But I desire to bring back the discussion to the main issue before the committee. It is not whether some former Administration from which the people withdrew confidence, did the same things. I do not understand that the practice of previous governments in their administration of the departments, is to be a precedent upon which subsequent governments shall establish policies or carry out methods of government. The very fact that the Government that is said to have done wrong is defeated, should be in itself a reason for their successors ceasing to depend upon precedents set by them. I know not, nor do I care, whether any government did secret things or not, but we are face to face with the question, not whether a civil servant, as the hon. member for North Bruce very correctly says, did a legal thing with the sanction of his chief ; it is not a question about an individual, it is a question as to the proper administration of public affairs. My hon. friend for North Bruce has put the question properly when he said that these men having done these things with the sanction of their chief, are not themselves the blamable persons, but those who authorized them, aye, who practically, by their acquiescence, ordered the transaction in question, are the responsible parties. Therefore we come back to the question that the individuals are not the responsible persons before Parliament. The persons accountable to Parliament are the Administration, not the individuals who do the work. The Government of the day is the responsible party, and it is the Government of the day who in this case is responsible ; it is their trial, not the trial of a few unfortunate civil servants, that is being discussed here. Therefore I can understand my hon. friend being obliged, being compelled, by the party whip, to stifle his conscience and to vote in support of his chief. He knows full well that he has been coerced, he is not a free man in this transaction any more than my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule.)

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BOWELL. You have no right to say that.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, we will admit that he is a free man. Let him act as a free man when the time comes. The hon. member for East Grey became extremely virtuous in regard to a previous vote here. He never uttered a word while Mr. Burgess's case was under discussion, but after the item had passed before this committee, then he ventured to express an independent opinion when it would not do any harm to the Administration. And so we have our friend here asking for absolution in advance for the vote he is about to give. Now, I say the principle involved is simply this : If an Act of Parliament is passed laying down a certain rule of conduct for the service of the country, that rule cannot be departed from except on the responsibility of the Administration, and if it is departed from with the sanction of the Administration then the Administration is responsible, they are the blamable parties, and it is not the unfortunate individuals whose case we should discuss so much as it is the responsibility of the Government. Therefore I return to the statement I made before recess, that in this case, primarily, the present Minister of the Interior is the responsible person, and with him his colleagues who now have made his cause their own. It was an improper thing for the Minister of the Interior, who was on trial, as it were, in this issue, to have been one of the sub-committee to consider these questions and to pass judgment upon them. When it became necessary to investigate transactions of this character, touching as they did his administration, a regard for propriety alone ought to have suggested to him that the question ought not to have been enquired into by himself. He might have allowed the Administration, if regardful for appearances, to have insisted that the enquiry should be conducted by persons who were not themselves on trial. Yet we find here that a member of the Government sits in trial on his own case. If this issue should turn adversely to the Administration, the one primarily to suffer is the Minister of Interior, and we are asked now to pronounce judgment on a report founded upon his judgment, he, in fact, asking the House and the country to whitewash him, to vindicate his administration on a report made ostensibly by him in a judicial and independent character. That is not the kind of a report that ought to have been made, and he saw the weakness of the situation when it became necessary to make an enquiry under such circumstances. The question, therefore, in my judgment is, whether the Acts of Parliament are to be lived up to or not, whether they can be avoided, whether the Administration of the day is superior to Parliament. If so, what are we doing here? What is my hon. friend, who boasts so much of regard for British institutions, doing, when he has demanded that Parliament should abnegate its functions and let the Administration override legislation? Are we but a registry office ; are we but echoes of an Administration, that we should stand here and

say that Parliaments may enact, but Administrations will do? What would become of the laws if the judiciary should ignore them? The judiciary is the only institution which stands between us and wrong, the only protection we have either in regard to liberty or property. What is legislation for, and what is the use of a Statute-book, if an Administration can ignore it as the present Administration are now doing? That is the issue involved. I say it is a grave one, and let this House condone this transaction and it compromises the honour of the country and the system of administration. For my part, I repudiate all responsibility, for I care not what precedent hon. gentlemen opposite may establish. The guide for my political conduct in the administration of the affairs of the country is that the Acts of Parliament must be lived up to, so long as Parliament allows them to remain on the Statute-book. That should be the guide of every legislator who proposes to be true and loyal to his country, and the member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) should be the last one under those circumstances to manifest that disloyal spirit and to ignore those statutes that have received the solemn sanction of Parliament, in favour of a political party of the day.

Mr. McNEILL. I very much regret that I have fallen so low in the opinion of the hon. gentleman opposite. He has changed his view in respect to my conduct in this House from that he expressed last session, when from the very same seat on the last occasion I spoke, he said he knew me too well to suppose that for a moment I was actuated by anything else but conscientious convictions.

Mr. MULOCK. I think so to-day.

Mr. McNEILL. To-day the hon. gentleman says I am not a freeman, but am whipped into line by the party whip. His opinion is that that statement is consistent with the view that I was acting conscientiously. If these are his views, I do not know that a mind so constituted is one that I need deal with very long. These two views are entirely contradictory.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will pardon me, but I must leave the chamber.

Mr. McNEILL. As the hon. gentleman has found it convenient to leave, I will not occupy the attention of the House longer.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I want to call the attention of the House to this fact. The Minister of Finance made a statement and he based it on a paper he had in his possession. I have asked the Minister of Finance to give me an opportunity to look at that paper, and I think the committee should be placed in possession of it. I am not a very old parliamentarian and I do not know what is done in these matters; but when, in discussing a matter of this kind, a Minister of the Crown produces in this House a paper which forms the basis of his argument, any member has a right to have that paper put in his possession, in order that he may be able, equally with the Minister, to discuss it intelligently. The Minister of Finance had no right to refuse this committee the paper from which he quoted, and before this item is passed we should be put in possession of the information which the Minister said he obtained from that paper. I therefore ask that the item stand until we obtain it.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is unfair for the Minister to refuse to allow hon. members to use that paper. I think the member for Brant should be permitted an opportunity to answer the hon. member's allegation by being permitted to use that statement. I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior a question: Was Mr. Pereira paid up to 30th June last for acting as Private Secretary to the Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that was the case. I am not very sure as to the date, but I think he was paid up to 30th June last.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to know if Mr. Pereira actually did the work as private secretary, or did another person do it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He did whatever work I gave him to do in that regard. I cannot say from memory what he did, because he was acting at one time as private secretary for the Department of the Interior, and he did work for both branches of the department. He did a certain amount of work in both these departments.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the Minister of the Interior has two private secretaries; one is secretary connected with the Department of Indian Affairs and the other is secretary to the Department of the Interior?

Mr. DEWDNEY. At the time the appropriation was made the Department of Indian Affairs was not connected with the Department of the Interior, but when they were united, the right to have two secretaries terminated.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it not a fact that during a portion of the time the Minister had three private secretaries? I am so informed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I do not think it is pertinent to this question whether like irregularities under a previous Administration would change the condition of affairs; but as a matter of information, I would like to know what the law was in that respect. If I understood the Minister of Justice rightly, he said there had been no change in the law in regard to these payments in the Act of 1882, that the law was just the same prior as it was subsequently.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What I said was that the prohibition was just as strict in the Act of 1868 as in the Act of 1882 against regular clerks receiving extra payments.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I wanted to know what his interpretation of the law was, because the impression seemed to have prevailed in the minds of the witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee that it was changed by the Act of 1882. When Mr. Henry was examined he stated as follows:—

"*By Mr. Taylor:*

"In looking over the accounts for moneys paid, can you ascertain exactly when this practice was first in operation, whether in 1871 when you commenced, or what year after? Have you any way of recollecting that?—I got work in that way in the Finance Department in 1872.

"*By Mr. Foster:*

"For what work?—Counting notes.

"That is the practice to-day?—When did you go into the Interior Department?—In 1873.

"Did you get any extra work in that department?—I did; prior to the Civil Service Act going into effect.

"*By Mr. Somerville:*

"It would not be contrary to law before that Act passed?—No.

"*By Mr. Taylor:*

"Did you get any extra work in 1874?—I do not know that I did.

"In 1875?—I cannot say.

"You have no reason to believe you did not, over and above your salary?—I have no reason for believing, but I do not know that I did. In fact, I am almost certain I did not get anything.

"Did any of the other clerks?—I do not know; I cannot speak for them.

"You do not know whether they did or did not?—They may have done so.

"*By Mr. Paterson (Brant):*

"Would it be contrary to law previous to 1882?—I do not think so.

"But after that it was irregular?—Irregular and illegal."

That was the impression that was on the mind of that witness, Mr. Henry, viz., that it was not irregular or illegal prior to the Civil Service Act of 1882.

Mr. BOWELL. That was the impression of the whole committee until the law was looked up.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is a point I do not understand. Bearing upon this question I think that Mr. Burgess took something of the same view, and on page 28 of his evidence he says:

"*By Mr. Taylor:*

"But in 1876 permanent clerks were occasionally employed overtime and paid for it?—I know that some of the clerks of the Interior Department were employed overtime in the Finance Department.

"*By Mr. Paterson (Brant):*

"But anything before 1882 would not be irregular, so far as those payments were concerned?—I suppose not: on the mere ground of the law, there was no irregularity in paying those extra clerks."

That impression was on my mind, and it evidently was on the mind of the Deputy Minister administering the affairs of this department, namely, that what was proper before 1882 would be irregular and improper after 1882. The Minister now tells us that he was mistaken as I understand. However, that does not affect the question that is under consideration at the present time. The question is that this amount be stricken from the Estimates, and in reading the evidence that was given by Mr. Pereira himself, it does seem to me that it is a case that would be hard to justify. Not only is it difficult to justify the reinstating of him in his position, but still worse the paying of his salary during the time of his suspension. I have no desire to be unduly hard upon any one; but the testimony of this gentleman was that he selected the work himself, that he took it home, that the work was said to be done by him, and he certified to it, no one else having any supervision of it at all. The question was asked:

"Have you anything to show for the $400?—The work was done in the spring of 1890, was done during April and May, and the account for it would have been made out in my wife's maiden name in the same manner.

"Ellen Berry?—No; Lizzie Evans. I had incidently heard some talk about extra work, and had heard it mentioned in a peculiar way; 'We know who this man is and that man, and we know who Lizzie Evans is.' I took upon myself the responsibility, of which this committee will be the judge, of not allowing my wife's name to appear any longer in the matter, and the account I made out myself in Ellen Berry's name. When the cheque was made out, I endorsed that cheque. There is no such person as Ellen Berry. The work was done by my wife and I took the responsibility of making the account out and the cheque in that other name for the reason which I have explained."

It does seem to me that from his own testimony it was a very serious case indeed. When this work was being done, if he thought it was right why hesitate to go on and use the name of his wife for these payments, why change to the name of Ellen Berry? It was claimed that work and value was given for the money; but he says himself that he gave out the work, that he alone certified to the work, and that he did it to the amount of $280, in his wife's name. He states that subsequent to that, finding it became known in the department and that people talked about it, he put the cheque in the name of this fictitious person, certified it was done by her, had a cheque drawn out in her name, endorsed that fictitious name upon the cheque and drew the money. Taking the gentleman's own evidence and giving him all the advantage you can in reference to it, it does seem that if he is treated in the way the Government proposes it will tend very much to demoralize the public service. I am at a loss to see, after listening to all the explanations given by the Ministers, upon what ground they proceed in this matter.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think we ought to have the document which the Minister of Finance says he based his report upon, before we have a vote on this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The appeal which the hon. gentleman makes to the Minister of Finance is one which should meet with response. The Minister of Finance undertook to administer a rebuke of a severe character, and I humbly submit an unjustifiable rebuke, to the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) for a remark he made across the House. He proposed to answer the argument that the hon. gentleman had made, based upon an official return which the Government had brought down, by reading from another official document which he said he held in his hand, and which was not laid on the Table and has not yet been laid on the Table. The hon. gentleman whose construction of the report was impugned, asked the Minister of Finance to send that document across the House and the hon. gentleman has refused to do so, so far. Only one inference can be drawn. I do not think it is a courteous thing to refuse, nor do I think it is consistent with the practice of Parliament to refuse to exhibit the document. I do not remember a case in my experience in Parliament—and it is just as long as the experience of the Minister of Finance—in which a Minister of the Crown reading an official document to contradict another official document which had been previously brought down, refused to give that document into the hands of his opponent. As to its being discourteous I submit it to the hon. gentleman's own sense, and as to its being against parliamentary rules I would submit it to hon. gentlemen who have sat here longer than I have, whether they have ever known a case in parliamentary history similar to that now before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There can be no doubt whatever of the rule. It is clearly laid down, that when an hon. member undertakes to read from any public document which has not been laid upon the Table, it is the right of the House to have that document laid upon the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the authority?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is no doubt about the authority.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to hear it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will turn it up for you.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If there be no legal authority I think a sense of what is just and right and manly would, at any rate, lead the Minister to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. May be our sense of what is right and just and manly differs. The hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies), in the usual style of fable adopted lately—not lately either—on the other side of the House, says that I read from an official document——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I said you read from what you said was an official document.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that I read from an official document. If the hon. gentleman says his words were that I read from what I said was an official document, that I must deny.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What I said and what I intended to say was that the hon. gentleman had read from a document which he said had come from the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am within the judgment of the House. I quite well remember what the words were. The hon. gentleman, as I understood him, said that I had read from an official document. I did not read from an official document: I read from a private memorandum which I had in my possession at the time, and from notes from which the report was made up. The hon. member for Brant may have a very strong liking to exploit the private papers and memoranda of other hon. gentlemen; he will not get mine.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Did the hon. gentleman say, or did he not say, that he was reading from a document from the Department of the Interior, and did he not say that it was the original?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood his statement to be that he was reading from a document which had been prepared in the Department of the Interior, and from which the schedule in the report laid before the House was copied.

Mr. McGREGOR. And that there was a difference in the dates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whether or no, the case is perfectly clear. The Minister of Finance undertakes to contradict the hon. member for North Brant on the faith of a particular document in his hands, from which he makes extracts. According to all parliamentary usage, there is no doubt that when a Minister of the Crown chooses to produce and quote from a document for the purpose of contradicting another hon. member, the least he can do as a matter of courtesy and fair-play is to give his opponent the means of seeing on what grounds he makes the contradiction. The only inference to be drawn from the action of the Finance Minister is that the document, if put into the hands of the hon. member for North Brant, would contradict the Minister's own statement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for South Oxford has to go a long way from the facts to draw that inference. The Minister of Finance did not undertake to contradict the hon. member for North Brant from that document at all. He contradicted him from the report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He failed to contradict him from the report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He failed to contradict him from the report; he did it from the private document.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Both hon. gentlemen may assert that, but every one who was in the House at the time knows that the Minister of Finance rose in consequence of the assertion of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., that the hon. member for North Brant had proved from the report that these irregularities had not begun at a certain date. The Minister of Finance declared that the report proved nothing of the kind, and for the purpose of establishing that, read from the report two passages that went back to 1875. He afterwards referred to the appendix to the report, which he admitted gave some colour to the statement of the hon. gentleman that the report proved what he stated, but he went on to say that the appendix was erroneous, and in doing that made reference to a private document. But he did not use the private document for the purpose of contradicting the hon. member for North Brant at all.

Mr. LAURIER. Here is the rule laid down—that no member of Parliament is to quote from a document unless he is prepared to lay it on the Table of the House. I quote from May, page 378, the edition of 1883:

"Another rule or principle of debate may be here added. A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it on the Table. This restraint is similar to that rule of evidence, in courts of law, which prevents counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested; and when the objection has been made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Could anybody suppose, when the Minister of Finance undertook to contradict a document which he himself had brought down as an official paper by reference to another document, that he would not be ready to place that document before the House? If any one had supposed that he would quote a paper with the intention of putting it in his pocket afterwards, objection would have been taken at the time; but no one supposed that. The hon. gentleman now says that he did not quote from a public document, and that he is not bound to place it on the Table of the House. Well, if it is a private paper, what evidence can it have against an official document? Are we to have public documents brought down by the Government contradicted by private papers? This is a procedure which cannot be tolerated in the House of Commons or in any public assembly in a constitutionally governed country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This document in question cannot be regarded as a private document. It is a document prepared in a department by a Minister of the Crown in his official capacity or by his order, for the purpose of enabling the committee to prepare the report which they have laid before the House. It is a part of the public

proceedings connected with the particular transaction which resulted in that report.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What makes you suppose that?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Finance said so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I was listening attentively to him, and he said that it was from that document that the appendix to the report was taken, and he referred to that document to show that the date on the appendix was a mistake. How do we know that the dates in these two documents are not the same? Surely there is nothing prepared in the department which is not official.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Chairman, I would like to have your ruling on the point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that hon. members have been discussing a document that is in the hands of the Minister of Finance. There is only one way of deciding the point, according to the authorities; it is to ask the hon. Minister if that document is a private or a public document. I cannot give any decision until I get an answer to that question, and I now ask the hon. Minister whether that document is a private document or a public document?

Mr. FOSTER. A private document.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am bound to take the word of the hon. Minister that it is a private document. Now, the authority which we follow on parliamentary procedure in this House (Bourinot) states:

"It has been laid down by the highest authorities that when a Minister of the Crown quotes a public document in the House, and founds upon it an argument or assertion, that document, if called for, ought to be produced. But it is allowable to repeat to the House information which is contained in a private communication. When such private papers are quoted in the House, there is no ruling requiring them to be laid on the Table."

As the hon. Minister of Finance says that it is a private document, I cannot rule that it should be laid on the Table.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think you are justified in ruling as you have done from the authority you have quoted, but I think we should now establish another practice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the point is disposed of.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am discussing this vote. We have this established, that a Minister of the Crown can produce before this House a document prepared by a committee appointed by the Privy Council and attested by them as correct, with their signatures attached, and yet when it is proven clearly and conclusively that that document sets forth a certain set of facts, the hon. Minister is at liberty to say that he has in his overcoat pocket, down at his house or hotel, some statement which will show that the official report is not worthy of credence. If this system of parliamentary government is to be tolerated, we will have these men set up as dictators. A Minister may bring down a blue-book or official report and place it on the Table of Parliament, and then, when it is proven in discussion that statements are made in it of a certain character, the Minister can say he has a little document in his pocket which is of a private character, and which he refuses to produce, contradicting his own official blue-book. This is exactly the position taken by the hon. Minister; and if it be correct, we ought to understand that the Government are not responsible to the people. We ought to understand that their blue-books and official documents are not to be relied upon, but may be contradicted by any private document which a Minister of the Crown has concealed somewhere and which he will not produce. I think that is a very small position for the Minister of Finance or any member of the Government to take. If there were any manliness in the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Justice, they would at once produce this document in confirmation of their statements. If they do not, we are at liberty to think what we like about its contents. We have to accept the public documents, but are at liberty to think what we like about the other. We are at liberty to think that the Minister of Finance has not quoted the other document correctly, since he will not produce it, and we have the right to assume, in view of his statement, that no dependence can be placed on his official document. I do not care whether I am infringing upon parliamentary rules or not, but make what I believe to be a correct statement in the matter. The Minister of Finance may say that I have insulted him and the House, but I have said what I believe to be correct, and I maintain that his position cannot be justified.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend to be insulted by my hon. friend. I did not ask him to apologize to me but rather to the House or committee, and now, after this agonizing appeal from him, I think I must relent and ask the page to take this document over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to know by whom this statement, which has just been handed to me, was made up?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has been told it is a private document, and I do not suppose he has the right to insist on the name being given of the person who wrote it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Now that it is produced, we have a right to ask questions about it. It is in the hands of the House now, and we ought to be informed as to the writer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Very likely it was prepared by Ellen Berry.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This purports to be a document showing payments made to permanent clerks from 1875 to 1891.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not that satisfy you?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It would suit me better if the hon. gentleman would give a little more information about it. It foots up the same amount as in the report, $9,017.34.

An hon. MEMBER. Signed by whom?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Not signed at all.

Item agreed to—yeas, 60; nays, 39.

H. H. Turner..... $150 66

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the circumstances connected with the Turner case? No dates being given, I do not know exactly how much of this $2,444.56, which seems to have been paid extra to Mr. Turner, was received for purely extra work. I should like the hon. gentleman to explain the circumstances under which Mr. Turner was suspended.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Turner was suspended immediately after the evidence closed before the Public Accounts Committee last year, and the reason for his suspension is contained in the evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What page?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Page 64.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I wanted more particularly to know was how Mr. Turner came to receive so large a sum as $2,444.56 for extra work. It is by far the largest sum in the whole statement submitted to the House, and I presume there is some explanation to be given why Mr. Turner should have been enabled to obtain so large an amount as that. Apparently it would appear to be as much as the man's whole salary should have amounted to for five or six years.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It extended over a number of years, I forget how many. He had been in the service for a number of years before I took charge of the department. I do not know any of the particulars connected with his service more than in regard to the other clerks, but he did more work than any of the others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is his position?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He is in the Accountant's Branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, in addition to his salary as a permanent clerk, which I suppose might be about $1,000, he received this amount in six or seven years?

Mr. FOSTER. It is an average of $349 per annum.

Mr. HAGGART. It brought his salary up to about $1,100.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be about 50 per cent additional. Was this a case in which there was any substitution of names?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We might as well have the information as to these payments. I quote from the report of the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee and from Mr. Turner's own evidence as given at page 9. When he was called and examined, he said he kept the ledgers. The next question was:

"There appears in the Auditor General's report an amount paid to Joseph Wright for extra work $237.50, and I understand from Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister, that you are the party that has got this money?—Yes, I got that money.

"How did it come that you entered it in Joseph Wright's name?—In the first place, before my wife died——

"Just a moment. When did your wife die?—Unfortunately, I have lost both. It was my first wife who did the work, and after she died the name of Joseph Wright was substituted for hers. He went to the old country, and I believe is since dead.

"When did she die?—About five years ago. I married again and lost my second wife.

"It was after your first wife died that you substituted Joseph Wright's name for that of your first wife?—Just that.

"How long has Joseph Wright been dead?—I said I believe he is dead.

"How long is it since he went to the old country?—About a year, I think.

"What was he employed at in the city while here?—He was not employed at anything.

"Did he live with you?—He did not live with me.

"Was he a man of means?—Well, no; not a man of any great means.

"He must have had some way of living?—Yes: I suppose he had. I only saw him occasionally.

"How often did you used to see him?—Not every often.

"Did he ever do any of this work?—Certainly not, He is a connection of my first wife's. He never did any of the work; that is what suggested it to me.

"Who suggested it to you to put it in the name of some other person?—I do not know.

"It must have been somebody?—I think the suggestion came from Mr. Douglas.

"What Mr. Douglas?—He was at that time the assistant secretary of the department. I think the suggestion came from him.

"Did you submit Mr. Douglas's suggestion to anybody?—No, sir.

"Then you adopted that name from that out?—Yes.

"Here are Joseph Wright's cheques. Who signed the name on the backs of the cheques?—I did.

"You put Joseph Wright's name there?—I did.

"Have you a power of attorney from Joseph Wright?—No.

"Had you any authority from Joseph Wright to do that?—Oh, yes.

"You endorsed Joseph Wright's name after his death?—No, sir; I do not know that he is dead.

"You said he was?—I said I believed he was: I had heard a report that he was dead.

"Do I understand you to say that this Joseph Wright had no existence at all?—Oh, yes; at one time. I believe he may have now.

"What relationship did he bear to you?—He was a distant connection of my wife's.

"Did he do this work for you and you received the money?—I did the work, and I received the money.

"And used his name?—And used his name.

"And subsequently after he left this country, you signed the name of Joseph Wright?—Oh, yes, but I think only once.

"You say he left this country about a year and a half ago?—About 15 months ago. I won't say exactly.

"But Joseph Wright did not do any of this work?—Not any.

"And the work was done by yourself?—I won't say that.

"Who did the balance?—The late balance?

"During the last five years?—I did it myself.

"But practically speaking Mr. Joseph Wright, as a person doing this work, had no existence at all. You used his name?—Yes.

"When he went to the old country, did he give you permission to use his name?—Not particularly.

"But you used his name?—Certainly.

"Who was Joseph Wright; what was his business or calling?—He was a school teacher, over in the States.

"Was he not residing here?—No. He came to see us once or twice.

"During the whole of this five years you say Wright visited you only two or three times?—Yes.

"And during the whole of this time, Wright's name has figured on the backs of these cheques?—No; because there have been no cheques issued for the last fifteen months. You have to take that period off.

"You commenced using Joseph Wright's name about five years ago?—Yes. I was told it was used for five years, but it is not over four; it is only three and a-half.

"What bank are those cheques drawn on?—The Bank of Montreal.

"To bearer or order?—To order.

"Did you draw this money personally?—I drew it personally.

"Did the bank know you?—I do not know. They always paid the cheques; they always paid my salary cheque too.

"Will the bank pay cheques here that anybody presents?—I do not know. The cheques may not have been given me at the same time.

"Could you give us Mr. Joseph Wright's present address?—I think so.

"What is it?—3 Victoria Terrace, Lightcliff, near Halifax, Yorkshire, England.

"I understand you to say he was dead?—I said he might be. If he is not you will hear from him at that address.

That is some of the evidence. I will not weary the House by reading any more. This money was drawn in the name of a man who taught school in the States and came over here three or four times in five years and visited the man who drew the money in his name, and during the whole time this man signed the cheques with Joseph Wright's name, presented the cheques at the bank, and drew the money, amounting to over $2,000. If this practice is worthy of the commendation of the Government, and if the gentleman who was guilty of this is to be reinstated in office, of course the Opposition cannot say much about it. The Government must take the responsibility as they have the ruling of this matter. As to the document which has been sent over by the Minister of Finance, it is impossible to gather any information from this, for the reason that there are no dates given of the payments made to these men. I fancy, from the names on the list, that these are the names of men who have nearly all, I believe all, drawn money which goes to make up this sum of $9,017 since 1881. If the Minister has any other information which would lead this committee to understand that any portion of this money was paid prior to 1881, I would like him to present it to this House, because I think we ought to be put in possession of that information. The Finance Minister now claims, in opposition to the statement made in his own official document, that some of this money was paid prior to 1881. Now, if some of this money was paid prior to that date, he must have some information to lead him to make that statement, and I would like him, for the information of this committee, to give the name of any gentleman here who drew any of this money prior to the year 1881.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can give you from recollection the names of Mr. Clayton, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Henry.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I notice that the names of those parties who are on that list are nearly all names of men who have been appointed since 1880. Now, there is Mr. Steers, one of the names on that list, who was for a short time in 1878 taken into the department on account of his being in distressed circumstances, and he was able to do some extra work for which he was paid day by day. He was taken into the Surveyor-General's Branch of the public service. That rule would not apply to him, at all events.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Why?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Because he was not one of the permanent civil-servants to whom the Civil Service Act would apply. Now, Mr. Rogers is one of the parties mentioned who, the hon. gentlemen says, received pay prior to 1881. Mr. Rogers was a witness before the Public Accounts Committee last year, and I think he was questioned with regard to that very matter, and I think that his statement made before the committee does not bear out that statement. If he has made such a statement it would be interesting to have the evidence before the commissioners on that subject, and it would be interesting to know for what he was paid.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I may say that one of the names mentioned by the Minister of the Interior has been erased from this list, that of Mr. Clayton.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, that was for the reason that he drew his money before 1881, at the time these were included in that memorandum. Mr. Clayton, I think, drew his in 1875, therefore he did not come within that memorandum.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then I am to understand from that statement of the Minister that his name was erased from the document because he drew his money before 1881?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, he was not fined a month's salary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. For the reason that he drew his money before 1881. Were any of the others on this list in the same position?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, none of them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, if that be the case, it must be evident to this committee that Mr. Clayton being the only man who drew this money before 1881, and his name being struck off, there can be no other names on this list who drew money previous to 1881.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They might have drawn it after 1881.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is precisely what we are contending, what I contended all along. I have always said that the Minister of the Interior is the most honest-minded man in the Government. I have admired him, and although there were many things to investigate in his department, I have admired his candour. Why, a session or two ago he got up and declared that he got his Geological Report printed in Montreal, because he could get it done cheaper than in the Printing Bureau. Now, he has let the whole cat out of the bag. He tells us that Mr. Clayton was struck off this list because he drew his pay before 1881. Now, the only deduction to be drawn from that is that every other name on that list is the name of a person who drew the money after 1881. Consequently the contention that I advanced some time ago that there was no money paid, according to the official report made by this investigating committee, from 1875 until 1881, was correct. Now, if that deduction can be drawn—and there can be no other—the statements which were made by the Minister of Finance were baseless and groundless, and not supported by the facts.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the committee ought not to pass over unnoticed the paper that the Minister of Finance has laid on the Table. That paper shows according to the statement just now made by the Minister of the Interior as to those irregularities beginning about the year 1875, that when the statement was made up, between 1875 and 1881 there had been the one payment to Mr. Clayton, and that was a payment of $50, that all the other payments were made since the beginning of 1881, and that paragraph in the report relating to irregularities earlier than 1881, is based upon the one single payment to Mr. Clayton. Then there is another thing shown, and that is that the appendix to the report of 1881 is a correct statement, both as to dates and as to amounts. The Minister of Finance said that the appendix to the report was erroneous, that the date must be inaccurate, that the commissioners, when they made their report, must have made a mistake, that the House could not rely upon the accuracy of that statement, and that he would give correct statements from the paper which was in his possession from which he said that appendix had been

taken. Now this statement exactly corresponds with the appendix, except as to the one statement that $50 was paid to Mr. Clayton, which the Minister of the Interior says is struck out in pencil, as we saw it on that paper, because it was paid at an earlier date than 1881. So we have now an opportunity of estimating the whole force and effect and meaning of the statement that these irregularities began at an earlier period than 1881. The hon. gentleman gives three names of parties that were in the department at that time. I do not dispute that. But the hon. gentleman will see that Mr. Rogers's name and Mr. Henry's name are not struck out, that the amounts paid them are not struck out, and the statement in the appendix to the report he brought down, shows that payments to them were made in 1881, and subsequently to that time, not before, because if they had been made before they would have shared the same fate as the payment made to Mr. Clayton.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No, you are wrong there, because some of them had to suffer, and did not receive any money at all, for having certified to those who did receive it irregularly.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is another branch of the subject, and I think the candid statement of the Minister ought to be accepted. He says that the reason this man's name was struck out was because he got his money before 1881. That proves conclusively that the type-written document was a correct record, notwithstanding the statement that was made by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in reference to Mr. Rogers. If he will look at page 108 he will find that Mr. Rogers was examined, and Mr. Somerville asked this question :

"Did you ever get any money for extra work performed? Where?—I received extra money in the department during 21 years."

I go to page 110 :

"The custom which you spoke of, and which, in your opinion, was second nature, as you put it, was it prevailing in the department since 1870?—Of giving extra work to permanent men?

"Yes.—They used to do it. I used to get extra work in the time of Sir Richard Cartwright, when he was Minister of Finance. There were men who were first-class clerks engaged then in destroying notes. It was confidential work. They would come on at 7 o'clock in the evening and work until 11 or 12.

"*By Mr. Taylor:*

"Did they draw the money in their own name?—Their own.

"*By Mr. Somerville:*

"There was no necessity for their trying to evade the law?—No; because it was not considered wrong. It was considered right for a man to improve his time, just as men in the Civil Service use their time for literary work."

I read this to contradict the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that Mr. Rogers had not drawn extra pay. The fact is he did draw it from both departments, and he swore it was the prevailing practice for twenty-one years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Allow me to mention that there was no objection to Mr. Rogers, who was not, if my memory serves me, a clerk in the Finance Department, but a clerk in another department, receiving extra pay for extra work done in another department.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The statute allowed that to be done. What was prohibited was, that extra work should be done by a clerk in the department to which he belonged. That was the law, which is a totally different thing. It was the practice and the legal practice that a clerk who belonged to one department could do extra work in another department. The prohibition extended to clerks being paid for extra work in their own department, and Mr. Rogers did not violate the Act.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That it was the law and that it was right and proper is perfectly obvious. What was the reason of the law? The reason of the prohibition which prevailed against a man undertaking to obtain extra work in his department was to prevent him remaining idle during the hours when he should be employed in order that he might find extra work after hours. That can be established beyond all controversy and has been the practice in some of the departments. The employment of a man after hours in a department to which he does not belong was no interference with the policy of the law, because it did not affect the work in the department of which he was a regular clerk.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then Mr. Rogers was in the Department of the Interior, a permanent clerk there. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 111, he will find what Mr. Rogers stated in his evidence :

"*By Mr. Paterson (Brant)* :

"Was the account made out in your own name or anybody else's in the time of Sir Richard Cartwright?—There was just a pay sheet.

"Was the pay sheet signed in your name, or was it signed in the name of some person else?—I do not think so.

"Do you believe that prior to the passing of the Civil Service Act any extra work you did was paid for in the name of any other person?—It may have been. I did not get any in my department since. It was only subsequent to the death of my brother in the North-West.

"Why did you say this custom grew out of a custom which had prevailed in the department prior to the passing of the Act?—I think I stated what was quite right—that in the time of Mr. Mills I did one or two little jobs and got paid for them, but not in my own name.

"You did work in the time of Mr. Mills and were paid, not in your own name?—Yes; I was paid in the name of my sister-in-law. She was helping me."

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Read on.

Mr. TAYLOR. If any hon. gentleman wishes anything further read he can read it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will not read it, I will do so. This is a continuation of the evidence, right after that read by the hon. gentleman :

"*By Mr. Barron:*

"In the case of Mrs. Mills she did extra work?—Yes; we both did the work.

"And it was in her name the account was put?—Yes; it was work for the Ordnance Lands Office.

"At that time there was no law against that sort of thing?—I never followed that sort of thing.

"When you say the custom was kept up, the same custom as formerly, that is not exactly the case?—I think you misunderstood me. I said there was not a custom at all allowing permanent clerks to get extra work. Of course, there might be a number of cases, but I could not answer for them.

"When permanent clerks got extra work they got paid for it in their own names in Mr. Mills's time?—Yes.

"Not in anybody else's name?—No.

"Did you never see the statute upon this?—I read it; but it did not interest me very much.

That puts another light on the subject altogether.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said a clerk could do work only for another department, but this Mr. Rogers was a permanent clerk in his department and he did the work, according to his evidence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will look at Mr. Rogers's testimony again, he will see that this man did not pretend to say that he got work out of this department, or that work was given to him surreptitiously or fraudulently. He said that his sister-in-law got work and he assisted her in getting that work. The Minister of Justice shakes his head, but that was Mr. Rogers's statement made immediately after the committee rose on the day after testimony was given. I asked Mr. Somerville to have Mr. Rogers called and re-examined on the subject. It was not done; but I venture to say that if Mr. Rogers were called to-day and told the truth, he could not testify to anything else than the work taken out to which he referred was work obtained by another party, and whether he assisted or not in doing the work is a matter about which the department could know nothing. That there was any intention on the part of Mr. Meredith, who was deputy of the department, to give out work to a clerk under another name than his own, or to other than a clerk who was not entitled to receive it, I do not believe; and the testimony of Mr. Rogers does not establish any such proposition.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The testimony of Mr. Rogers is here; the questions were asked by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) himself, I will read them to show that the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is perfectly correct. At page 111, I find the following:—

"*By Mr. Taylor:*

"I understood you, whether correctly or incorrectly, to say that during the time of Mr. Mills you had done some work in which your sister-in-law assisted you?—And got paid—yes.

"In whose name was it paid?—I got the pay in her own name, as well as my memory serves me.

"*By the Chairman:*

"I understood you to say that the work was done jointly by you two, but it was paid in the name of your sister-in-law?—We both did the work and it was pay for her for work we did.

"*By Mr. McGregor:*

"She got the money, did she not?—Yes."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, read.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I will go on and read:

"*By Mr. Bowell:*

"You got the work for your sister-in-law, you assisted her in doing it, she drew the money for the work which the two of you did in your own house?—Certainly.

"*By Mr. Chapleau:*

"The work was for her?—Yes.

"And you said that in a certain manner the extras were to compensate you for your brother being killed in the North-West?—We had a great deal of trouble and loss and expense. I acknowledge that I merely used my sister-in-law's name, because, according to custom, I could not get it otherwise; but I did the work, and I would have made it out in my own name, but it was not the custom, and probably the Auditor General would not have allowed it to pass."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Why, Mr. Chairman, that refers to the time of the hon. gentleman himself. Mr. Rogers was killed in the North-West in 1885, and the hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible as the Minister of the Interior proves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the work that was done in my hon. friend from Bothwell's time, was done by a lady and she got the money. The work that was done in the time of the present Minister of the Interior was done improperly by this party and put in a lady's name. The irregularity occurred under the present Minister of Interior as he himself shows, and not in the time of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I will just read the clause so that there can be no mistake about it. The clause as it existed at the time is this.

"No allowance or compensation shall be made for any extra service whatever which any officer or clerk may be required to perform in the department to which he belongs."

The statute, I believe, was subsequently altered, and for reason, and at the time that Mr. Rogers did work, which he alludes to and got extra pay, he was perfectly within the law and had a right to do it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The evidence proves the case of Rogers to be just like the other case; his getting work for his sister-in-law, they doing work together, and he drawing it in another's name. However, I do not see any relevancy to the vote in all this discussion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I agree with the Minister of Justice that it has no relevancy to the vote, but I cannot help giving my thanks to the Minister of the Interior for being so honest and candid again. He removed the doubt which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) was trying to assert, as to some irregularity having occurred during the Mackenzie Administration. The Minister of the Interior comes forward and satisfies the committee that it was not done in the time of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and he says: "No, it was done in my own time." As far as the vote before the committee is concerned the evidence has been read from by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) and I can see very little difference between the conduct of the gentleman for whom this vote is asked and the conduct of Mr. Pereira which was discussed in the earlier part of the evening. Mr. Turner was not guilty of the irregularity simply of doing extra work at extra hours. If that had been permitted by the superiors of the department, I think the subordinates ought not to be punished, and I think that if that had been his only offence, the withholding of a month's pay would perhaps be sufficient punishment under the circumstances. The facts are that this gentleman not only did extra work but that he did it in the name of a man whom he believed to be dead. He made out the account in a dead man's name, received money from the Government under false pretenses, and endorsed the cheque in a dead man's name.

Mr. TAYLOR. The evidence does not prove it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He said the man was dead, but he was not sure.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Nelson swore positively that when he used his name that he was still alive.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You have got the wrong man, it is not Nelson at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Turner, in his evidence said:

"You endorsed Joseph Wright's name when he was dead?—No, sir, I did not know he was dead.
"You said he was?—I said I believed he was."

So he made up the account in the name of a man whom he swears he believed to be dead. Therefore he received the money under false pretenses. His conduct is just as bad as the conduct of the officer who has been already pronounced against from this side of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. The principle involved in this item is worthy the consideration of the House. I contend that in the face of the evidence that was brought before the Committee on Public Accounts, showing that he had drawn money in the name of a man whom he believed to be dead, proved that there was fraud. If a man will jeopardize his position by lending himself to such a questionable transaction as has been clearly proven out of his own mouth, he is not fit to be in the Civil Service of the country. To reinstate him is bad enough, but to grant him a salary with the exception of one month's pay, is something which this House should not endorse. After the revelations which were brought out in the investigations last year, and after the indignation expressed throughout the country, I cannot understand that we can so forget our duty to the people as to condone fraud at the first meeting of Parliament, and pass such a vote as this now submitted to us.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not want Mr. Turner, whom I know very well, to lie under the imputation that he used a dead man's name, knowing him to be dead. If you look at page 10 of the evidence, you will find that Mr. Turner, referring to his wife, swore this:

"When did she die?—About five years ago. I married again and lost my second wife.
"It was after your first wife died that you substituted Joseph Wright's name for that of your first wife?—Just that.
"How long has Joseph Wright been dead?—I said I believed he is dead.
"How long is it since he went to the old country?—About a year, I think."

Then on page 11 he said:

"Who certifies your accounts now?—Since the scrip ceased, there have been none. I have received none of this extra work for the past 15 or 18 months. I have never received a dollar extra since then."

So that he had no account for the previous fifteen or eighteen months, and it was a year previous that Mr. Wright had gone to the old country, and he had since heard that he was dead. Yet the statement is made that Mr. Turner had signed the name of a man whom he believed to be dead.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman explain to the committee where is the legal or moral difference between drawing money in the name of a man who is dead and drawing it in the name of a man who is alive? Is not the false representation the same? This man obtained money under false pretenses by falsely representing to the Government that a certain man named Joseph Wright had done a certain work, and he received a cheque made payable to Joseph Wright for that work and endorsed that cheque. Whether Joseph Wright was dead or alive does not affect the offence of evading the rules of the department by using a third party's name and obtaining money under false pretenses; and now you are going to condone it.

Mr. TAYLOR. He says, in his evidence, that Mr. Douglas asked him to substitute this name, and in reply to the hon. Minister of Finance, he gave this evidence:

"Did you sign Joseph Wright's name to these cheques?—Certainly.
"And with his consent?—And with his consent.
"Although you have no written power of attorney?—No."

So that he had the assent of Mr. Wright to sign the cheques.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman read question 162:

"When he went to the old country, did he give you permission to use his name?—Not particularly.
"But you used his name?—Certainly."

Mr. TAYLOR. If you look at the former part of his evidence, you will see that Mr. Wright went to the old country about a year previous, and Mr. Turner had not got work for about eighteen months.

Item agreed to—yeas, 26; nays, 23.

To meet expenditure for rates, taxes, insurance, ground rent, &c., of the official residence, and income tax on the High Commissioner's salary	$1,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Highly objectionable. This gentleman has not been acting as High Commissioner at all. He has been acting simply and solely as heeler and stumper in Canada for the benefit of a political party, and we ought not to be asked to pay rates, taxes, insurance, ground rent, income tax or anything else for a man who was not in England and was not doing his duty as High Commissioner. I object *in toto* to the item.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think we require some explanation with regard to this. Is there not a fixed sum voted for this purpose, I think $4,000, out of which the High Commissioner is supposed to pay his own expenses?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My recollection is that he was to receive a salary of $10,000 a year, which the Government practically increased to $12,000 a year, and he was to receive $4,000 a year to cover all other expenses, including those here specially referred to. Now, it is proposed practically to increase those extra charges from $4,000 to $5,200. These are charges which the High Commissioner had to meet before: and if I remember rightly we have a statement in the Public Accounts showing that the High Commissioner received $10 a day and travelling expenses for canvassing for hon. gentlemen and their friends in this country instead of being in England discharging his duties. It does seem to me a monstrous course to adopt towards an officer occupying the position of High Commissioner. If hon. gentlemen opposite think the High Commissioner is not adequately paid, they ought to have come down and stated that to the House, and asked for an increase in his salary.

Mr. FOSTER. With his usual accuracy my hon. friend has stated this was never paid before by the Government but always by the High Commissioner out of his salary. Unhappily for the hon. gentleman the facts of the case show the contrary. This amount has never been paid out of the salary of the High Commissioner but has always been paid by the Government. The vote is here because the amount has been allowed to lap over from year to year, and I ask this vote now in order

that we may not continue as before paying last year's debt with this year's appropriation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find under the head of "Civil Government," 1891-92, item 24, the following:—

"Contingencies, rent and insurance on office, income tax, fuel, light, stationery, &c., and amount—$2,000—required towards the contingent expenses (water, light, fuel, carriage-hire, cabs and railway fares, of the High Commissioner, and $1,200 for contingencies, rates, taxes, insurance, ground rent, &c., of the official residence, including income tax, $10,050."

Now the hon. gentleman has $10,050 already voted for this year and he asks $1,200 more.

Mr. FOSTER. That exactly carries out my statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $10,050 is ample for all purposes. It is a perfectly monstrous job. We give this gentleman $10,000; we provide him with a residence, the furnishing of which costs $40,000 or over; we have been paying him for contingencies of one kind or another $10,000, which makes $20,000, besides the interest on $40,000, or about $22,000 a year. It is perfectly monstrous, particularly in view of the charges made during last election, and in view of the fact that he is only in London attending his duties about half the year. I do not regard the hon. gentleman's explanation as at all satisfactory, because the sum of $10,050 is ample, and the extra sum of $1,200 entirely unnecessary.

Mr. FOSTER. After we have had this general statement, suppose we return to the question raised by my hon. friend from Bothwell. The statement read from the Estimates bears out exactly my opinion. For a number of the preceding years the $1,200 has been paid out of the succeeding year's vote. The vote of $1,200, for instance, taken for 1891-92 went to pay the $1,200 which should have been paid out of the preceding year's vote, and now I am asking this amount in order that we may pay this year's rates, &c., out of this year's vote.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I quite understand the hon. gentleman. This has been going on for years, and the fact is, practically, that we are voting $1,200 to Sir Charles Tupper for rates of some years away back which it was not then the intention of Parliament should be paid by us. The first vote of this amount, which was evidently intended to meet the expenditure falling due in that year, was devoted instead to the preceding year, and now we are asked to give a double vote in order to pay for a year during which Parliament never intended that sum should be paid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No doubt when the Government adopted the principle of paying these contingencies by an allowance of $1,200, the money was applied to a previous year for which no provision had been made, and now the Government come down and ask $1,200, not to pay for 1892-93, because that is already provided for in the $10,000, but some previous years, although it was never intended that such payment should be made. The hon. gentleman knows that if Sir Charles Tupper took money to pay a previous year's rates, he applied it to a purpose for which Parliament had not voted and that has been going on for a series of years, and the hon. gentleman now practically proposes to pay an account that may be seven or eight years old. It seems to me that the office, even if it were closely attended to, is not worth the amount which the people are called upon to pay. The High Commissioner has taken the stump in this country to advocate the cause of hon. gentlemen opposite. He has received money for these contingencies, the payment of which could only be justified on the assumption that he is in England discharging his duties marked out by law, but, instead, he has been here defending the cause of the hon. gentlemen opposite, travelling from point to point, and receiving a salary, and, in addition, travelling expenses and $10 a day. A more monstrous proceeding, I venture to say, has not been recorded in the history of the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What amount of income is taxed?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose his income of $10,000 as High Commissioner. I will find that out.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We ought to know that, because we cannot be called upon to pay the tax on a private income. It is very important that the House should know what the rate is.

Mr. FOSTER. I will get that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I thought the Minister would have had it before he made this proposal.

Mr. FOSTER. I had it, but I do not carry it round with me.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You ought to carry it here.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that last year the amount of $250 was entered as income tax. That is about £50 sterling. It is right the committee should know what amount of income that is for. Sir Charles Tupper may have a very much larger amount of income than what he receives from us, and it is not right that we should pay the income tax on £40,000 or £50,000 a year.

Mr SOMERVILLE. I should like to know if the Finance Minister accepts the explanation from this side of the House in regard to this vote. He tried to make it plain that this vote was for certain things to which he alluded, but afterwards it was shown clearly that it was to pay certain arrears of taxes and other matters which had not been voted and which this House did not intend to pay. If this is the case the committee ought to be put in possession of the information. If we are to pay Sir Charles Tupper $1,200 for taxes which the House did not intend should be paid out of the public treasury, we should know the reason for it. I think as far as the High Commissioner's office is concerned, we pay an enormous amount. During the discussion last year, the Finance Minister said he would take into his serious consideration the propriety of adding the allowance of $2,000, which is given to Sir Charles Tupper in addition to his $10,000 salary, to the salary where it ought to appear, because the salary is really $12,000 instead of $10,000. I think the High Commissioner receives a great deal of consideration from the Government of this country. We have evidence of that in the fact that Sir Charles Tupper was sent for to come out to this country post-haste in order to assist in the general election here, and he was paid handsomely for his services to the Conservative party during that election. For travel alone, from 28th January to 15th April, he was paid for 78

days at $10 a day, $780. Then there was his fare from Liverpool to New York, $243.33; fare from New York to London, $250; other expenses, details not given, $266.65, totalling up, $1,539.98. I think we treat our High Commissioner too liberally altogether. For a young country like this, I think we cannot afford to go on incurring these expenses year after year to add to the comfort and convenience of Sir Charles Tupper, who has not been a faithful representative of this country in England at all, because if he were he would remain there and discharge his duties and not come here and take an active interest in party politics in order to keep in place and power the men who ought to be his masters, but whose master he is, and who keep him in his office in England where he receives immense sums of money which he knows how to wring out of the Government of the country because he has rendered them great services in coming out here when there is a general election. This is not the kind of man who should be our High Commissioner. We should have a man who would be above being influenced by party politics, a man who would look after the commercial interests of the country and who would do his duty to both parties. Sir Charles Tupper is not the servant of the Government. He is the servant of the people of this country, and he should do what he is paid to do, and not come here to perform the duties of a citizen and make the country pay his travelling and other expenses, in order that he may add to the popularity of the Conservative party and keep in place and power the men who vote the money of the people for his and their benefit. I think this outrage should be stopped, and I suppose the Government will continue to serve Sir Charles Tupper in the future as in the past, because he has served them and is so anxious, for a consideration of $10 a day and travelling expenses, to leave his office in London, where he is paid by this country to discharge his duties, and to come to Canada to assist the Conservative party. I think there should be more honour in the Conservative party than to continue that. I do not believe that there is any honesty left in that party. There is more honour and more honesty in the Liberal party than to tolerate anything of that kind, and, if the Conservative party had a spark of honesty in them, they would not continue to pay this man for services which he has not rendered and which their own books show have not been rendered. He is paid $12,000 a year to discharge those duties in England, and yet he spends nearly a quarter of a year in Canada in electioneering, and the people of Canada have to pay his travelling expenses and $10 a day because he chooses to come here and work for the Conservative party. I say that no party should be guilty of such contemptible conduct as this. The Government should be ashamed of their action in this matter, and for paying this money to Sir Charles Tupper, when they know it is dishonest for them to put their hands into the public treasury and pay him for services he does not render to the country but simply to the party that keeps him where he is.

Mr. SPROULE. If he was instrumental in keeping the Government out of the hands of people like that, he would be worth ten times the money.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this charge is unjustifiable. Sir Charles Tupper gets $12,000 a year, and he is allowed for his cabin fare from Liverpool to New York, and from New York to London.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. We are not discussing contingencies and travelling expenses, we are discussing the item of $1,200.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend is perfectly in order. He is pointing out why this appropriation should not be made, and one of the reasons why it should not be made is that Sir Charles Tupper was not in England but in this country, and therefore should not be paid for the time he was absent from his duty.

Mr. McMULLEN. If you are paying Sir Charles Tupper's contingencies in London, we have a right to enquire whether he was in attendance in London or not. He has received at the hands of this country $10 a day for extra salary—because it was nothing else but extra salary—and then when he comes to this country his passage money is paid, and his fare is paid to go back to London; and in addition to that, for items that were not accounted for at all, he gets $266; and he gets $10 a day besides that. Now, that shows that he is getting a double salary, and we are voting at the same time $1,200 to cover contingencies with regard to his residence in London when, during three months' time, he was not there at all. I notice in looking over these items voted to the High Commissioner that it is necessary to search the Auditor General's Report from beginning to end. Last year he was entered as having received a sum under the head of immigration; he was entered as having received an allowance under the head of commercial agent; in another place he was entered as having received a sum in connection with a mission to Japan, or some other place. Now, I think it would be much better if the Minister of Finance would include all these items in the salary of Sir Charles Tupper, and if it is to be made $15,000, why make it that, and let him pay his own taxes, house-rent, servants, the disinfecting of his house, and everything of that kind. We are asked to vote items from time to time and duplicate them. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite did not want to bring them before the House at the proper time, and he has been allowed to play ducks and drakes with the money voted by this House, and now we are asked again to revote a sum that has long been past and spent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When this Parliament sends a gentleman to England to represent Canada, it is expected that he shall be treated in a manner befitting his high position, and the dignity of this country. Parliament, in its wisdom, has determined what amount would be requisite for the purpose, and it has increased the original amount, so that no fault can be found with respect to that. We come, then, to consider the question of what you are going to grant supplementary to that, something that was not contemplated, something that Parliament has never declared to be necessary, because if the salary of the High Commissioner is insufficient, it should be raised. The fact that it has never been proposed by the Ministers to raise it, is proof that in their judgment the salary is adequate to maintain the office as we would like to see it maintained. What the Opposition take exception to now are such items as are now before the committee. This amount has

been included in the past year as an amount supplementary to the salary, and now in addition to that, without any reason being given why it should be done, we are asked to duplicate this year a vote of $1,200 for ground rent and income. There is no use in trying to look at it in any other way. The explanation of the Minister that one year has been lapsing after another, does not change the fact at all. The fact remains that if there has been a lapse from year to year, it only demonstrates that in the first year it was not the intention of Parliament to pay this sum, and if Sir Charles Tupper used the money voted in subsequent years and so applied it when Parliament did not say it was to be granted, he was not applying it to the right purpose. So it is impossible to view it in any other light than that this $1,200 is another $1,200 in addition to what was voted for that very same purpose before. When you look at it in that light it is quite right and proper for the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to come in and look at other items. You are not only duplicating this year and paying a double amount of $1,200, but you have, as he has shown, from the Public Accounts, paid him in addition to his salary $780 while he was neglecting his duty instead of attending to it, you let his salary run on. I do think with those who have already expressed the opinion, that a proper sense of dignity and independence on the part of Sir Charles Tupper himself, ought to lead him to refuse the acceptance of that $780. Sir, the Ministers on the Treasury benches begin to look very grave when a charge is brought up that a civil servant has been found on the public platform taking part in an election when he should be discharging his duties, and they would by their countenances almost indicate that they consider it was something they would not like to defend. But what is that in comparison with this? Where is the civil servant that has ever gone upon the public platform advocating the Conservative cause and battling against the Liberals while his salary went on in Ottawa? Where is one that ever did it? And yet the highest civil servant that Canada has, does not scruple, does not hesitate, does not blush, to ask it and to take it, and the Finance Minister does not hesitate to ask Parliament to vote it. The Finance Minister would blame the Opposition if they refused to maintain him in proper dignity, but here we object to entertain a vote which is duplicating amounts. To say nothing of the offensive part that Sir Charles Tupper took in the elections, in addition to that outrage on public decency, as we understand it, but outside of that to pay him for doing that, to pay him for neglecting his duties while his salary is going on, and on top of all that has been sanctioned by the House, to come now and ask us to give him $1,200, to duplicate that $1,200 which he has already had, is just asking a little too much; so it strikes us, and that is the reason we appeal against this vote. It is a vote that ought not to be asked, it is a vote the House ought not to sanction, because it is duplicating and voting in addition to the other sums that have been voted to him, this sum of $1,200 to which he is not entitled, to which the Minister of Finance has not shown him to be entitled, and the Minister of Finance ought not to ask Parliament to do it, and the supporters of the hon. gentleman behind him ought not to manifest any uneasiness at all when the vote is criticised, because if they will look at it in all its bearings they will admit that this Parliament deals very generously with its High Commissioner. When we look at the duties of civil servants not to engage in an offensive manner in matters political, and when this High Commissioner, who ought to be an example for the whole service, took part in these elections, when in addition to his salary, and as an enormity above all others, Parliament is asking us to pay him $10 a day in order that he might thus lower the position he occupies, while his regular salary is going on—the whole matter is utterly indefensible, it must be indefensible, it seems to me, in the eyes of all who will look at it dispassionately and without party feeling.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice by the Auditor General's Report that Sir Charles Tupper has received among others the following sums: On page 275, $587 in connection with official residence, and $1,000. On page 325, $10,000 salary; on page 218, $1,538.78; in all $13,042.55. Now, we are going to vote $1,200, which will make the amount drawn last year, $16,242.55, besides the office.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is a violation of the provision of the Civil Service Act, and it is clearly a violation of the law. It certainly was not intended that the Government should employ paid agents to go round and advocate their cause. As the law now stands a candidate would be unseated for doing so. Accordingly every member of the Government who endorses this policy should be unseated and disqualified if this amount is passed. There is nothing so clear as that this is the true interpretation of the law. The Minister of Justice in speaking at Perth some time ago complained bitterly of the controverted election law. He, at that time, said his seat was in jeopardy, because some one had conveyed a sick voter to the polls and hired a cab to do it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If a boy will bring me a paper I will quote what I read. The statement was that our seats were in jeopardy because someone had conveyed sick people to the polls and had hired a cab to do it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not make such a statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister of Justice, I believe, has escaped through the six months' limit

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have yet to hear it: I did not know it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand that while the Minister of Justice has escaped under the six months' limit, three members have been unseated in Nova Scotia since that period. It appears very peculiar that the Government can import their High Commissioner, pay his expenses and travelling allowances, increase his salary and have him go round the country and abuse not only the people who differ with him, but also the various institutions of this country. It is a scandal and shame and should not be tolerated; and this House is not adopting the course it should follow in meeting these engagements. I believe if a case was prepared, and the Minister of Justice is well qualified to prepare it, and submitted to the Supreme Court, that body would not endorse such conduct on the

part of the Government. The dignity of the position should keep Sir Charles Tupper from taking the stand he has done, and it should prevent him coming from England and taking part in elections, and acting so offensively. He would not have done so unless such was the wish of the Government, and when the Government increase his salary and expenses it is a shame and something which the people should not tolerate and which this House should not endorse. I am opposed to this grant. I do not believe it should be passed, for it is contrary to the constitution under which we live and it is contrary to the election law. It is very reprehensible; it is a defiance of the Civil Service Act and a bad example to afford to the whole civil service to allow the principal civil servant to draw on the revenues of the country as Sir Charles Tupper has done. He was furnished with an official car in which to travel from one end of the country to the other, at the expense of the Dominion, furnished also with meat, drink and refreshment and an additional per diem allowance for going round to abuse those who differed from him. By going down on his knees to the railway companies he enabled the Government to get free tickets to send voters from one part of the country to another. He did this on a promise to pay for them, but the Government afterwards refused to make such payments. I cannot express adequately the feelings of condemnation I entertain in regard to the appropriation of this amount. I do not know where this state of things is going to end. It appears, at all events, that the High Commissioner in the preparation of the Estimates never forgets himself, nor does he forget any member of the family; all of them are kept at the public expense, and are always crying loyalty to the institutions of the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the report of the High Commissioner been printed?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I got a copy last night. The report has been brought down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the Minister read the report? What does Sir Charles report with respect to his work, from January to March?

Mr. FOSTER. I will not take from the hon. gentleman the pleasure of reading it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will be interesting to notice his services to Canada during those three months. Does he mention his visit to Essex, which resulted in the Liberals carrying the constituency by from 700 to 800 majority? He might, perhaps, base a claim for the sympathy of the Opposition on that ground, and for the result at London. Does he mention that he referred to the United States, the great nation to the south of us, as an enemy, and to his statement that he had defeated 60,000,000 there, as well as the enemies at home? It will be interesting reading as to what Sir Charles did during those three months.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt you will be a great deal wiser afterwards.

M. PATERSON (Brant). Possibly so. I have the Minister's statement that Sir Charles reports what he did during January, February and March last.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I should like to understand how the allowance of $10 per day was arrived at. Did Sir Charles Tupper fix that amount, or did the Minister of Finance?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are not on that item.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think I have a perfect right to refer to this matter, it has been referred to before.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If my hon. friend will allow me to remark he is not speaking about the item under consideration.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Others have spoken on the same subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I know, but it must come to an end some time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is stated, as viewed by the Opposition, that this $1,200 is for a purpose for which a sum has been already voted, that in fact it is an absolute present of $1,200 to the High Commissioner, and the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is stating that the High Commissioner does not deserve it at our hands, and he is alleging as his reason that we have already treated the High Commissioner in a generous manner.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is not speaking on the item before the committee now, and he is out of order.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Before the item is passed I think we may ask the Ministers if they would kindly tell us what year this amount is really to be paid for. The Auditor General's Report last year shows the details of this item which was paid, and we have again voted it in the other estimates. I think we all feel that there seems to be never a time when the High Commissioner is not getting his hand into the public treasury some way or other, and under some excuse or other.

Mr. DALY. What about your hand—would you like to have it in the treasury?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). My hon. friend has taken good care that I should not have the opportunity, but I am able to hold it up before the House and say it is clean. I have never hunted around the Government to get my hand in the treasury. I have never gone to the North-West and taken part in any colonization companies or "isms." I have never asked this Government, or any other Government for that matter, either one way or the other, to favour me individually. I have paid my own bills and fought my opposition fairly and honestly, and perhaps every one here cannot say as much.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). If hon. gentlemen opposite choose to raise this question they need not object if they are answered. If they wish to open up the question of discussing side issues I will discuss them along with anybody else. I am not afraid of any man in this House, or of any of these side issues being raised, but I think that gentlemen who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Coming back to the question we really have before us, what I want to know is this: It is notorious that the High Commissioner's name turns up, as my friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said, in every conceivable connection in

the Auditor General's Report. You cannot get into any item in any way indirectly connected with the business over in Europe, but you will find an amount smuggled in some way in connection with the High Commissioner. Now, in addition to all these modes of getting expenditure in for the benefit of the High Commissioner, we are asked this season to duplicate another expenditure of $1,200. Last year it appears in the Auditor General's Report, we have voted it again for the current year, and I think we may very well ask what year actually does this $1,200 represent. Has the High Commissioner not been able to secure enough of plunder out of the treasury, when we pay him a salary in Europe as High Commissioner, and pay $1,500 additional to take care of the office and do the work there, when he is going around Canada for 3 months out of the 12: not attending to the interests of Canada, not attending to the interests of the people who pay his salary over in London, but who has descended to, I venture to say, a level in political discussion that has been reached by no other gentleman who professes to hold a respectable position in society in Canada. I say under these circumstances I think it is time that this thing should come to an end. We either have some use for a High Commissioner in London or we have not. If he can leave that office and become electioneering agent for the Government in Canada for 3 months out of the 12 and in addition to drawing his salary charge us for taking him backwards and forwards and all incidental expenses, and again coolly charge us $10 a day in addition, I think it is time that the services of the High Commissioner should be dispensed with, or else that we should get one who will attend to the interests of Canada and not become an electioneering agent. As my hon. friend from Brant remarked, we have had heretofore serious objections against the civil servants leaving their duty and taking part in elections, and junior members of the Civil Service have been exposed to pretty severe criticisms in this House for doing on a small scale and in a local way, what our High Commissioner is doing all over the country and openly, after a fashion that I venture to say no thinking man on the other side of the House will in cool blood undertake to justify. If it is going to be established that our High Commissioner, instead of attending to the interests of Canada in England, is going to be brought over here as an electioneering agent of the Government in this country, and to abuse the political opponents of the Government who I venture to say have just as much interest in the welfare of Canada as the High Commissioner has, I think it is time that the High Commissioner's office should be abolished. The question at issue is: For what year is this money to be paid? It is not for last year, it is not for the current year, and I think we are fairly entitled to ask for what year it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood that the sum of $2,000 which was a special allowance to Sir Charles Tupper, covered some portion at any rate of this special item. It seems to me that we are duplicating this item. My recollection is that in Sir A. T. Galt's time $4,000 was assigned to him in addition to his salary, for house-rent and that class of contingencies; and I think that the $2,000 in addition to the sum we have invested for the purchase of a house for Sir Charles Tupper, fairly represented the greater part of these items here. If it does not what does it represent? There is no detail given in the Auditor General's Report, or I would not trouble the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. No details have been given of the $2,000. It has simply been paid each quarter and the voucher received. That $2,000, I suppose, goes towards the personal contingencies. It has been the practice for several years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What personal contingencies?

Mr. FOSTER. Other contingencies that more particularly pertain to the office of the High Commissioner; a great many expenses which my hon. friend can see the High Commissioner is liable to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What sort?

Mr. FOSTER. Various.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What kind?

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot go into details, but there are expenses that necessarily attach to a man in the position of Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner, incident to his office. I imagine that if my hon. friend were himself High Commissioner, he would find that he would not make a fortune out of the amount paid. He would find his expenses to be very high. As has been very truly said, a representative of Canada must live in a manner somewhat corresponding to the position of our country, and if my hon. friend did that, I think he would have to draw on his private income in order to keep up the position and meet the necessary incidental expenses of the office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that is an explanation at all. I am simply stating to the hon. gentleman what my recollection is as to the allowance made to as able a man as Sir Charles Tupper, that is, Sir Alexander Galt. We did not allow him all these additional items which the hon. gentleman proposes to allow Sir Charles Tupper. We did allow him $4,000 to cover just such contingencies as the hon. gentleman refers to. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any right to ask for this $1,200 and tell us that there are mysterious contingencies, this, that and the other, which he thinks we may understand, but as to which not one particle of evidence is given to the committee. Before we proceed with this item, I think we ought to be informed where the $2,000 goes to. If the Government take the responsibility of saying that they require to raise the salary of the High Commissioner, they can if they see fit, having a large majority behind them, overrule any objections which we may raise, and make Sir Charles Tupper's salary $12,000 or even more, but it ought to be done in that way, and not by a side wind. The $2,000 is not secret service, I suppose, or anything that the hon. gentleman needs to conceal. It appears to me that it is for reasonable and legitimate services. Let him state what it is for, and after the $2,000 is accounted for we should be informed what the additional $1,200 is for, which has already been granted for 1891, and is now asked for 1892 and will be asked for 1893; because if this is paid it must refer back to five or six years ago when it was not intended to vote this item.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the Finance Minister ought to state what year this money is required for.

Mr. FOSTER. It is for the current year.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understand that that has already been voted, so that it cannot be for the current year. I think the Minister of Finance ought to be candid enough to state what year this additional sum is voted for.

Mr. FOSTER. It is voted for the current year, I have explained why. Because you see in the Auditor General's Report for 1890-91 that $1,200 has been paid for Sir Charles Tupper, it does not follow that the $1,200 was not just as I have stated in my explanation, viz., a sum paid in that year, but paid to cover an expenditure in the previous year. This has gone on until this year when I determined to stop it, and ask for this amount, so as to bring each year's expenditure level with each year's services.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see how that can legally be done.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that there is an appropriation for the amount for 1890-91 as well as for 1891-92, so that his explanation does not account for it. The only way in which you can account for this condition of things is that the money was taken by the commissioner and applied for the payment of these expenses in a year before Parliament made any provision for their payment. If the commissioner proposes to use the money voted for this year in paying the expenses of another year, for which no appropriation was made, it is no explanation whatever for the Finance Minister to come here and say that there is no provision made for it. It imposes no new obligation upon us if the commissioner chooses to take the money we appropriate for this year and apply it to a prior year. That is his mistake, and not ours; and the Minister's proposition practically amounts to this, that he now proposes to make an appropriation for the first time to pay expenses of this character that were met otherwise by the High Commissioner several years ago. It is not taken to pay these charges for the current year, otherwise you would have a double appropriation for this particular year. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford has asked the Minister to state the application of the $2,000 that was received. I remember very well, when this office was first established, that there was an appropriation of $10,000 for salary and $4,000 for house-rent and all other expenses of the High Commissioner. When it was proposed to purchase a house it was said that this charge would be diminished. It was proposed subsequently to fix a smaller sum, and that smaller sum was to meet the very expenses that are now being met by this $1,200. But practically the proposition before us, apart from this item, is that we shall pay the commissioner a salary of $10,000, that we small provide a house that cost upwards of $40,000, that we shall pay contingent expenses amounting to $3,500, and that we shall make an appropriation of $1,200 to meet expenses of this sort that took place some years before. It seems to me that this is an appropriation of which the country will not approve, not only the Reform party, but a very large section of the Conservative party will say it is not proper to pay these large sums to a gentleman who, instead of being in London to discharge his duties, was here a large portion of the time in the interests of the party, and because he served such interests, his expenses were paid out of the public treasury instead of by himself. There is no more justification for paying Sir Charles Tupper out of the public treasury for travelling from one point to another in this country, to attend public meetings held in the interests of the Conservative party, than there would be for paying any other individual. The appropriation is a monstrous one. If the hon. gentleman proposes that there shall be a paid agent of the Conservative party to canvass at the general election, he had better put it in the Estimates as such, and if the $10 a day travelling expenses are not enough to charge against the public treasury and $1,200 more are required, let the hon. gentleman come down and say that from this time out that tribute is to be levied on the Reform as well as on the Conservative party for the purpose of furnishing their chief electioneering agent, during the period of every general election, a large sum of money from the treasury of Canada which both political parties alike contribute. The hon. gentleman may go back as far as he likes, he will find that he will come to a year for which no appropriation was made and for which this present appropriation is to be improperly voted. That is an improper proceeding, an improper and wholly and unjustifiable proceeding. It would be unjustifiable, even in the case of a commissioner who devoted all his time to the business of his office, and it is still more condemnable when demanded for a commissioner who is away from his duties a large portion of his time.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise simply to deny what the hon. gentleman insinuated in the latter part of his address, namely, that the $1,200 is meant to be a payment to Sir Charles Tupper for any other purpose than that said here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is impossible it can be for this purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman makes that statement as he insinuates it, he makes a statement for which he has no foundation in fact at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And what is that?

Mr. FOSTER. This item did not originate with me. It was put in the Estimates by the clerk of the Finance Department who is an honourable man.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not care.

Mr. FOSTER. I know the hon. gentleman does not care.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What has that to do with the matter? Here is your account.

Mr. FOSTER. This item was placed in the Estimates for my approval by the accountant of my department. I asked him for an explanation, and he gave me that which I have given to the House. I believe his explanation, I believe he was not actuated by party motive of any kind. I think he is above that. He simply said to me what I have stated here, that we had been in the habit of paying the preceding year's charge of $1,200 out of the succeeding year, and asked me to put this in the Supplementary Estimates in order to square the matter up, and not continue paying a preceding year's debt out of a succeeding year's appropriation. I asked him how it was possible to pay the past year's debt out of the succeeding year's vote, and he said it was done any-

way, and it had been done for years, and he wished to put a stop to it. The fertile imagination of the hon. member for Bothwell sees in it a political trick. He sees in it some way of paying Sir Charles Tupper for political services. There is nothing of the kind in it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That does not alter the fact at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It alters the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There has been an illegal appropriation of money specifically voted by Parliament, through their being diverted from one year to another. What officer has the right to do that? In England it would cost him his place. A scrutiny of all the expenditure in England is made yearly, a very minute and careful scrutiny, so that such an illegal appropriation of money could never take place there. Somebody has improperly and illegally taken money which Parliament has voted for one purpose and spent it on another. The hon. gentleman's own statement confirms this, and Parliament has a right to know who it is that has dared to take public money voted for a specific purpose in a specific year, and apply it to some other purpose in some other year. If Parliament chooses to sit idly by and let this matter go, we had better surrender our conscience to the High Commissioner. We cannot afford to allow a statement like that to go by unchallenged. It is the most serious statement made since this House went into Supply, that moneys voted for a specific purpose in a specific year have been, without the authority of Parliament, laid out for another purpose in another year. In some way or other, and with the connivance of the department, Sir Charles Tupper obtained $1,200 which the House never voted.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The vote of Parliament has been set at defiance, and it must have been set at defiance by the deliberate connivance of some one in the hon. gentleman's department, and we have a right to know who the culprit is, so that the House may, I hope, punish him. Surely we are not to vote money here and when we find that that money has been misappropriated, receive no information from the Government and make no enquiry about it. I presume there are some gentlemen on the other side of the House who are as jealous of the rights of the House of Commons in regard to the expenditure of money as we are upon this side of the House. It is for their interest that the constitutional right of Parliament to control this expenditure should be protected, and, if they see that the will of Parliament is being thwarted and that the money voted by Parliament for a certain purpose is misappropriated, we should have something to say in regard to that. This is too serious a matter to be slipped over as the Minister of Finance desires without going back to the year when the error was first made and finding out how the misappropriation took place and who was the culprit. The House ought not to pass this vote until it has this information, and, if the Finance Minister cannot now supply that information, he should let the vote stand until he can give the information to Parliament and then let Parliament act against the offender after it has the information to show who the offender is.

Mr. FLINT. There is a question of principle here. We are asked to vote about $18,000 for the High Commissioner's office, in addition to the High Commissioner's salary, and besides that there is now under discussion a large amount of money which has been paid to that gentleman for political services during the last campaign. If we pass this item, I think any member of the Government would be justified in charging to the contingencies of his department his time and expenses during the last campaign. I am not complaining of the salary of the High Commissioner, because I think, if we admit that the position should be filled, the salary should be something corresponding with the position, but we find that we have a department of Government in London which is costing a great deal more than many of the departments here at Ottawa.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. Did he not kill a cow?

Mr. FLINT. I think that gentleman is better acquainted with cows than he is with the High Commissioner's office. The contingencies of the Privy Council office are actually less than the contingencies of the High Commissioner's office. I would call the attention of the committee to some very extravagant charges which seem to me are made here. Take the matter of postage alone; we find that the High Commissioner's office is run on a very extravagant scale. We find that $1,571 was spent for postage stamps, postages and cablegrams. That seems an enormous sum of money, and a glance over some of the most busy departments of the State here shows that their expenditure is less than this. Apart from the outrageous principle of charging the country with the expenses of a partisan politician travelling up and down the country, certainly the expenditure upon these contingencies should be looked into. If we pass that vote, it will be a precedent to enable any Minister in the Government to place in the Estimates charges for time and travel in any contested election. I think the Opposition are doing only their duty in calling attention to this particular phase of the High Commissioner's office. Last session we had a somewhat heated discussion on this subject, and I am sure that many sincere men on the other side of the House must have seen the justice with which the Opposition showed the character of the issues as presented by Sir Charles Tupper. He did not put the issues between the two parties fairly before the country, but he assumed an offensive attitude to a party as loyal as himself, and no doubt in many constituencies that influenced the minds of the people against the Opposition and that must intensify the feeling of those who now protest against this vote. I hope the Minister will withdraw this vote which appears to be simply a mode of paying Sir Charles Tupper for his services during that campaign.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister of Finance should see that it would be wise for him to withdraw this vote. The member for South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) says the High Commissioner is worth this because he killed a cow. Very well. Put that in, Sir Charles Tupper, $1,200 for killing a cow. Then we will know what we are voting it for. As it stands now it is not right and should be withdrawn.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) I see the Minister of Finance seemed to feel aggrieved at the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell that this was really a vote to cover expenses incurred by the High Commissioner for political services. If the Minister of Finance wishes to escape from the disagreeable conclusion which may be drawn from this, it is necessary for him to give us some more light on the subject. There must have been a certain year in which the money was first diverted from the purpose for which is was voted by this House, and was used for an object for which it was not voted. The hon. gentleman pledges his character that the clerk in his office is an honourable man. Then the Minister should see that it is due to himself and to that member of his department that he should state honestly what year this diversion of money first occurred, what were the circumstances, how it escaped the attention of the Auditor General, and should put us in possession of the facts so that we may locate the year when this money was spent. If the Finance Minister insists on passing the vote as it is now presented, I say that, if the facts are presented to any popular audience, they will be inevitably forced to the conclusion that this is simply an indirect way of presenting Sir Charles Tupper with $1,200 for his political services. That gentleman turns up in every section of the Auditor General's Report. In one quarter he charges for extra expenditure in one place and the next quarter he appears in another place. If this thing is to go on it would be better at once to come down and ask for another ten thousand of an increase to the salary of the High Commissioner, so that we may get rid of the disagreeable feeling in going through the Public Accounts that there is an attempt to conceal the expenses in connection with the High Commissioner. It does seem to me that it is not just to the Finance Minister's own position, to say nothing of the House, to ask us to vote this item without more direct information.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down, has repeated the accusation; I have only to meet it in the same way as I did before. I have given the whole expenditure as it has been presented to me, and before concurrence in the item, I will give all the information I can as to what occurred. I can say, however, that it might occur without any misappropriation at all. But I am certain that Mr. Dickieson would not give the item unless it were a proper item. If hon. gentlemen will allow this to pass, I will make a full explanation on concurrence as to how the lapse occurred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For myself I would be disposed to accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, but the hon. gentleman will see himself in the Civil Government item that this sum has been voted in terms for the service of this year. Now, when you duplicate that, it would be far better to say, if you go on with this, that it was omitted to be voted for some particular year.

Mr. FOSTER. We can do that on concurrence if necessary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the Auditor General's Report for 1891, I see some of these identical items, or similar items, appear to be included in the comparatively small sum which was paid to Sir A. T. Galt and to Sir Charles Tupper in that particular year. I suspect it will be found that this really goes back as far as the year 1881.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have made an appropriation for the present year in the public Estimates before the Supplementary Estimates are brought down. If last year the money was taken to pay the year before, if the year before the money was taken to pay similar expenses in the previous year, the hon. gentleman must see that it comes back to a year for which there is no appropriation made, and that being the case, then this is not an appropriation for the present year.

To pay Pierre Chapleau for proof-reading 484 pages of Civil Service List (revote)	$121 70
To pay for proof-reading 488 pages of Civil Service List, 1891	61 00

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this man engaged in any other business?

Mr. FOSTER. He was engaged at the time he did this work in this work alone.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is he permanently engaged in any other work?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This gentleman is not in the Civil Service, and has never been. He was specially employed for this particular work. The money was voted last year and lapsed.

Mr. LAURIER. Do I understand the Minister to say that this gentleman was never in the service before?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). That is what I am given to understand.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I think he has been a sessional clerk.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that each year the number of persons who get paid double pay is increasing rapidly. Four or five years ago there were 150, now there are 400. There is one man, for instance, who gets $2,350, and he came here and served during a few days that the Deputy Clerk was indisposed, and for that service he got $200 extra. My reason for asking with regard to this man was to know whether he was employed in the Civil Service.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron.) My information is that this gentleman has never been in the Civil Service. He was specially employed for this work.

Mr. LAURIER. I notice this item reads to pay Pierre Chapleau for proof-reading 484 pages of Civil Service List (revote) $121.70; to pay for proof-reading 488 pages of Civil Service List, 1891, $61. How is it that for the same amount of work of the same character twice the amount is paid in one item?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). All these items are connected with work done by the same gentleman. I may inform the committee that it is not intended to give out any proof-reading in future. It will either be done in the Printing Department, or in the department with which the work is connected, without additional payment being made to the clerk.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why was not the list prepared in the proper department?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). This has not hitherto been done, but it will be done in future by the regular clerk without extra pay.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What explanation is there to offer for the fact that the first item is more than double the second?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The explanation is that in addition to the proof-reading, the list was compiled in French in 1891. For the proof-reading alone $61 was charged.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice by the Civil Service List of 1883 that it gives the religion, nationality and province of each civil servant, and the province from which he comes. Why has that been dropped? I think it is highly desirable that we should have it.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). If it is found to be the wish of the House I have no doubt the Government will take it into consideration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We concluded some time ago that no use to the public could be served by keeping up these distinctions amongst the civil servants.

Salary of J. W. Hughes from 1st January, 1892, to 31st March, 1892.....$227 50

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this gentleman in your own department?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is he doing clerical work?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He is doing the better class of clerical work, indexing and matters of that kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When did he go to the Justice Department?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Within four or five months.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The gentleman is an old friend of mine, but I understood he was in the Customs Department.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was in the Railway Department but the work he had been doing there stopped, and I got him into my department as a temporary clerk.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have heard of some peculiarities with regard to this gentleman and perhaps this is his reward.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of Marine.—(Mr. Tupper).

General Order of the Supreme Court of Canada under the Controverted Elections Act.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.35 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FLINT. I would call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that an Order passed at my instigation last session, on May 27, asking for certain returns in reference to the fishing bounty, has not yet been complied with.

Mr. TUPPER. I will look into that matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would like to know when the other papers referring to the London election will be brought down?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). There has been the utmost expedition used with a view to obtaining these papers, but the Superior Courtsin Toronto as well as the revising officer and the judge in London have had to be applied to, and this will lead to delay.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Certain papers were laid before the House in regard to the question between Newfoundland and Canada the other day. I have had the opportunity of going through those papers, and I find one very important paper is missing, a despatch from Lord Knutsford, dated the 4th August, 1891, containing a proposition which emanated from the Newfoundland Government for a settlement of these differences. That despatch is not among the papers, and it is impossible to come to anything like a proper conclusion about these matters without that despatch. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether it was designedly omitted for a purpose, or whether it will be brought down? Also, I want to ask the hon. gentleman, as it does not appear on the papers, what is the nature of the proposition which went from Canada on the 4th March last, and that the Newfoundland Government forwarded through the Secretary of State? There are the two propositions, one emanating from the Newfoundland Government, and which appears to be contained in a despatch from Lord Knutsford, of the 4th August, 1891; and the other, a proposition which I assume went from the Canadian Government lately, dated the 4th March, and which was referred to in some of the hon. gentleman's papers.

Mr. TUPPER. Speaking at the moment, so far as I remember, my impression is that one or both of the papers to which reference is made, are waiting for the approval of Her Majesty's Government before being brought down. There are several despatches which are withheld until consent is obtained. I will make enquiry and inform the House definitely.

OVERFLOW OF LAND AT COTEAU.

Mr. BERGERON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to a matter of some importance at the present time. This morning, coming up from Montreal, we came near being delayed at Coteau station by the overflow of water at that place. I suppose there are 25,000

acres of land covered by water in that neighbourhood. The water almost touches the bridge that crosses the river at St. Polycarpe, and in many places the water comes almost up to the height of the rails. I think this would be a very good occasion for the Government to send some engineers there and find out whether the water can pass through its natural channel, and whether the proposed canal will have the effect of blocking up the channel. The Government ought to take some action at the present moment. At present the farmers cannot claim any damages, but if the canal is built the Government will probably know in a short time at how much the farmers will estimate the damages for their land being covered by water.

Mr. HAGGART. The staff of engineers that surveyed the canal is now there, and they are employed in the construction. There is no doubt that as they are on the ground they will take cognizance of what is going on in that section of the country. After the debate in the House some time ago, when the hon. gentleman drew my attention to the difficulty likely to arise from the passage of water under the canal, I asked my engineers for information upon the subject, and they said they had made careful calculations, they knew the amount of country the water drained, and there was ample provision, according to their plans, for the passage of the water under the canal.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Canadian Railway Company.—(Mr. Gillies.)

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Kingston Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Metcalfe.)

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 56) to confirm an agreement between the Tobique Valley Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Skinner).

Bill (No. 57) respecting the St. John and Maine Railway Company and the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Hazen.)

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY CO.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. GAUTHIER) asked, Whether the Government have received an engineer's report on that part of the railway of the company called the Great Northern Railway Company, located between the village of New Glasgow, in the County of Terrebonne, and the parish of Ste. Julienne, County of Montcalm, traversing the parish of St. Lin, County of L'Assomption? If so, how long has the said report been filed, and what is the purport thereof? Have the Government paid to the said company the whole of the subsidy granted for the building of its railway? What is the amount paid and remaining to be paid? Do the Government intend, during this session, to grant to the said company a further subsidy for the extension of its railway?

Mr. HAGGART. On the 30th January, 1890, the engineer reported on the first 10 miles out from New Glasgow, upon which $20,000 was paid. On the 17th January, 1891, the engineer again reported on the 10 miles I have referred to, upon which a further sum of $9,500 was paid. On the 18th November, 1891, the engineer again reported, showing practically no further work done on this 10 miles, and showing work to the value of $2,350 remaining to be done to complete the 10 miles. The Government have not paid the whole of the subsidy granted for building its railway. The latter part of the question I am unable to answer for the hon. gentleman.

MORTON DAIRY COMPANY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What are the claims of the Morton Dairy Company in Township 4, Ranges 23 and 24, west of First Principal Meridian? Are they lessees or owners; if lessees, when does their lease expire; if owners, when did they purchase the land, and on what terms? What quantity of land do they possess, and if the terms upon which they got the land have been complied with?

Mr. DEWDNEY. 1. The Morton Dairy Co. have no claims in the sense of unsettled claims in Township 4, Ranges 23 and 24, west of first meridian. 2. The company are not now, and never were at any time, lessees of any public lands in that locality, nor anywhere else in the North-West, but they were permitted in 1885 to purchase a tract of 8,160 acres in the two townships mentioned, at the regulation price of $2.50 per acre. They had entered into an arrangement with the Government to establish the industry of dairy farming and cheese-making, and the raising of cattle on an extensive scale, and if they had carried out the terms of that agreement they would have been entitled to get their lands at half the regulation price. They appear to have done a great deal in the direction of fulfilling the conditions of the agreement, but not enough to warrant a sale to them at half price, and the compromise arrived at was that they were permitted to buy the area mentioned at the regulation price. The land was patented to their assignees on the 19th June, 1886.

POST OFFICE AND BANK DEPOSITS.

Mr. TISDALE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to increase the interest upon deposits in the Post Office savings banks to 4 per cent?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the intention of the Government at the present time to increase the interest on such deposits.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure with a view to suspend the operation of the Electoral Franchise Act, and to provide that no revision of the electoral lists shall take place this year?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). It is the intention of the Government to introduce such a measure.

CIVIL SERVICE LIST.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, 1. What is the number of persons on the Civil Service List of Canada? 2. What is the total annual amount of the salaries of such civil servants?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The Civil Service List will be laid on the Table of the House, and it will give all the information desired.

ACCIDENT TO STEAMER *ALERT*.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether an enquiry has taken place respecting the accident which happened last year to the steamer *Alert*, belonging to the Government and commanded by Captain Koeing? If so, by whom was it held, and what has been the result?

Mr. TUPPER. Speaking subject to correction, on inspection of the report of the commissioner who conducted the examination—this report being now in Quebec for the purpose of litigation pending there—I may state, in answer to the enquiry, that the *Alert* grounded at the island of Anticosti last season, but sustained very slight damage. An enquiry was directed to be made, under the charge of the examiner of masters and mates, Capt. Smith of the department, and the result of the enquiry was a full exoneration of Capt. Koeing and the officers from any blame. The cause of the grounding of the steamer at that island was the fact that the boatswain had cut the leadline and tied it together again in order to make it secure, and had neglected to re-mark the line. Accordingly, the soundings made at that particular time were incorrect.

MONUMENT TO THE LATE PREMIER.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect a suitable monument to the memory of the late Premier, on the grounds near the House of Commons? If so, when?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is the intention, so soon as a vote of Parliament is obtained.

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. MURRAY moved for:

Reports, documents, memorials and correspondence relating to the further grant of a subsidy towards the completion of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railroad.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my object in moving this motion is to ascertain as to whether this road is going to obtain assistance from the Government. The road, I understand, is in a critical condition. When I placed this motion on the Order Paper I was not in full possession of information which I have since obtained. I desire to ascertain whether the company will obtain from the Government money necessary to complete this road. I am not aware that they have directly applied to the Dominion Government for aid, but I understand they intend to do so. I am quite satisfied that if such aid is not obtained, the road will not be completed for years. The company seeks a renewal of the charter by a special Act of the Legislature. I think the House and the Government should interest themselves in this enterprise. The people of the County of Pontiac labour under very great disadvantages. They have given this company a bonus of $100,000 to assist in the construction of the road, and they are very much interested in its completion. It is bad policy on the part of the Government to leave the company in a crippled condition financially, if that is its position, and I am told it is, because it has the effect of driving people from the country. A direct levy has been laid on the people. In fact, the sheriff is determined to levy the amount due on the bonus. It is very well to talk about people being driven from the country by direct taxation which might be due to unrestricted reciprocity, when the sheriff is now endeavouring to levy an execution for $80,000 coupons, including interest and costs. While the Dominion Government has largely aided roads all over the Dominion, here is a road at the doors of the capital placed in this unfortunate position. I can quite understand that the Government have assisted railways for the general benefit of the country to the extent of $3,200 a mile, but they have departed from that rule in many instances. Looking over the reports, I find there are many cases in which this subsidy has been exceeded. The Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway, 62 miles, was granted $5,160 per mile, or $320,000. The Montreal and Western Railway Company, from St. Jérome towards Le Désert, 70 miles, was granted $5,160 per mile, or $361,270. The Baie des Chaleurs Railway, 70 miles, was granted $8,857 per mile, or $620,000. The North Shore Railway Company was paid by the Provincial Government for 159 miles from Quebec to Montreal at $6,000 per mile, or $940,000. The Canadian Pacific Railway, for extension from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec, 160 miles, was granted $9,375, or $1,500,000. The North Shore Railway, Montreal to Ottawa, 120 miles, was granted $12,000, or $1,440,000. The Canada Central Railway, Pembroke to Callendar, 120 miles, was granted $12,000 per mile, or $1,440,000, besides a bonus recouped to the town of Pembroke of $82,500. The Northern Junction and Pacific Junction Railway Company, Gravenhurst to Callendar, 110 miles, was granted $12,000 per mile, or $1,320,000. The Canadian Pacific Railway, 2,185 miles at $12,000 per mile, or $26,184,000. The North-West Railway of Canada, 330 miles at $10,000 per mile, or $3,300,000. All these roads have received for one reason or other very liberal grants, and I think the circumstances of this important road, the Pontiac and Pacific Junction, would warrant the Government in dealing with it in a liberal manner. In my opinion, the road will otherwise remain for a long time unfinished. I desire to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the total cash subsidies granted to railways amount to $46,140,957. The total land subsidies granted are 49,758,033 acres, which at $2 per acre will give $89,516,066; or a total of $135,557,023. Taking the population of Pontiac, according to the Dominion census, we have 20,000 people, which at $27 per head would give $540,000 as the proportion of the whole railway subsidies of Canada due to the County of Pontiac. So that considering the County of Pontiac, an old county which has contributed largely to the revenue of the old Parliament of Canada at least, and is contributing largely as a tax-paying county to protection, if you will: I believe it deserves fair and due consideration at the hands of the Government in regard to this particular road. True, Sir,

I am here as an opponent of the present Government, but it does not follow, I hope, that justice should not be done to that county.

An hon. MEMBER. It does follow.

Mr. MURRAY. Well, it should not follow. I know that some queer things have been done by all Governments, but here is a case where the Government have an opportunity of showing that they will be influenced in the interests of the people, and not solely in the interests of party. I do not say that I have every confidence in the Government. I differ with them on the trade question, but notwithstanding that, I hope that they will do what is fair and right by the people I represent. The people of the County of Pontiac have been deceived in this matter; they have had great promises held out to them, but they have been misled into voting this $100,000. They were led to believe then that the railway would be extended all through the county, but now it is only extended some 30 or 40 miles. Of course this is to a certain extent their own fault, because they should have guarded themselves better in the by-law, and had I known as much about the true position of the by-law then as I do now, I might have advised the people to oppose the granting of that bonus. However, the unfortunate condition of affairs exists, and the question is whether it is worth while for the Government to take this matter into consideration, and to deal with it as I believe they ought to do. I would ask the Minister of Railways, whom I look upon as representing this portion of the Dominion in the Cabinet, to take that matter into his serious consideration. I would ask that he should ascertain as far as possible the true condition of affairs there, and that he will act, as I trust he will, in the public interest in regard to that matter. I beg to propose, seconded by Mr. Devlin, the resolution which I have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, there can be no possible objection to bringing down all the papers and documents in the possession of the Government with reference to granting subsidies to this particular line. I can tell the hon. gentleman all the papers that we have in reference to it. There has been an application for a subsidy, and the usual subsidy per mile was granted for the whole length of the railway from the city of Hull to the town of Pembroke. The only application that we have in the department for any other grant, or any other subsidy, is for a subsidy of 2 miles of road to connect it with Ottawa. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to make the best case he possibly can for his constituency, and to show the amount of money they would have been entitled to if they got a fair distribution. But it is rather a long-drawn argument to say that there has been a certain sum of money granted for railways all over the country, and to add to that 49,000,000 acres of land given to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the different railways in the North-West, capitalizing it at $2 an acre, in order to show that Pontiac was entitled to a sum of $540,000. I am frightened that on the same system of reasoning nearly every constituency in Ontario and Quebec would be entitled to nearly the same sum as Pontiac, and a great many of them to more, because a great many of them have not even received the consideration that Pontiac has.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY.

DOMINION COTTON MILLS COMPANY.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of the original Letters Patent of incorporation of the Dominion Cotton Mills Company (Limited), and of the Supplementary Letters Patent increasing the capital stock of the said company from $100,000 to $5,000,000, and copies of all correspondence, petitions, statements and evidence submitted to the Government in support of the issue of such Supplementary Letters Patent.

Copies of the original Letters Patent incorporating the Canadian Coloured Cotton Mills Company (Limited), and of the Supplementray Letters Patent increasing the capital stock of the said company from $100,000 to $5,000,000, and copies of all correspondence, petitions, statements and evidence submitted to the Government in support of the issue of said Supplementary Letters Patent.

He said: Saturday evening's papers in Toronto announced the completion of an enormous deal, as they explained it, which was the purchase by the Canadian Coloured Cotton Mills Company, with its capital of $5,000,000, of nearly all the coloured cotton mills in the Dominion, and they characterized it as a very extraordinary operation. Well, Sir, they only had half the facts, because the same parties who controlled that company had already under their control another company also with $5,000,000 of capital, which had acquired a monopoly over the grey cotton fabric mills of the Dominion. Now, the Dominion Cotton Mills Company was incorporated in October, 1890, with $100,000 capital. The chief applicants were: A. F. Gault and D. Morrice, Montreal. They made their application in October, and letters patent were issued on the 28th November, 1890, incorporating them. Within a month after that, on the 24th December, 1890, supplementary letters patent were issued to that company, increasing their capital from $100,000 to $5,000,000. That company has now acquired a monopoly in the manufacture of grey cotton throughout Canada. They have acquired the Halifax Cotton Company, of Nova Scotia; the Windsor Cotton Company, of Nova Scotia; the Moncton Cotton Company, New Brunswick; the Hochelaga Cotton Company, of Quebec; the St. Anne's Spinning Company, of Quebec; the Coaticook Cotton Company, of Quebec; the Kingston Cotton Company, of Ontario, and the Grey Cotton Company, of Ontario. This, I understand, includes all the grey cotton mills in Canada except Parks & Sons' mills in St. John, N.B. That concern is, I believe, in the hands of liquidators and is being operated for the benefit of the creditors, and it is a question whether, and how long, it can stand out against this huge monopoly. The mode in which they operated was, I understand, to use the Hochelaga mills and the St. Anne's Spinning Company, with which the original promoters of this scheme were connected, to depress grey cottons by over-production and cutting prices. They then bought all these mills, paying usually part cash and part bonds of the Dominion Company, which had originally no mills at all of its own. That succeeded so well that the same promoters organized another similar institution for getting control of the coloured cottons in the Dominion. Letters patent were granted to them on the 20th of February, 1892. By the original letters patent their capital was also $100,000; but within three weeks supplementary letters patent were issued to them by the Government, increasing their capital to $5,000,000. Now, that Coloured Cotton Company, as I understand, on Saturday last,

bought and closed their arrangements with the following companies:—The Canada Cotton Co. at Cornwall, the Stormont Cotton Co. at Cornwall, the St. Croix Cotton Co. in New Brunswick, the Dundas Cotton Co. in Ontario, the Ontario Cotton Co. in Hamilton, the Merritton Cotton Co. at Merritton, and the Lybster Cotton Co. at Merritton. They have, I understand, leased the Gibson mills in New Brunswick for ten years. They are the selling agents for the Hamilton Cotton Co. of Hamilton; and, as in the case of grey cottons, the only institution standing out against them so far is the Parks & Sons' cotton mills of St. John, N.B. There is the same process to obtain these mills that was practised in the case of grey cotton. They have run them down, cut prices, and at last forced them to come into this arrangement in self-defence. Now, what may we expect to be the result to the people of Canada of this vast combination in one of the staple necessaries of life? We may, of course, expect in a short time a marked rise in prices. No doubt that is what they have organized for. They have not had time yet to increase prices much, but I believe the fact is that one year ago raw cotton was worth from 4 to 5 cents a pound more than it is to-day, while the prices of the manufactured articles are kept up so far at the same figure. Of course it is a monopoly, and there is no law apart from the height of the tariff that will prevent this combination from increasing prices to the consumer. There is no Government regulation of prices and no means that I know of, by which the public can interfere with them, so long as the customs tariff remains as it is, to prevent them raising their prices up to the utmost limit. The strongest dry goods houses in Canada might almost be driven out of business by these monopolies. Suppose they refused to sell to them, or suppose they put onerous terms on their sales. They have the strongest houses at their mercy. Then, I believe that the promoters of this combine are also interested more or less in woollen goods. They can very easily make a condition that any house that wants cottons, and all want cottons, must also buy woollens from them; or anything else that they choose to dictate may be forced upon their customers. Of course, we know that when divers mills were competing for trade, if goods when delivered were found to be not according to sample, the purchaser could send them back; but this mighty monopoly can refuse to take back samples, unless forced to do so by law, and they might coerce their customers by refusing to sell to them. They can, and I suppose will, refuse credit to all small houses in the trade. As a matter of fact, from enquiries that I have made, I know that there are no wholesale dry goods men in this country who dare to complain against this thing publicly; their hands are tied; they are coerced, intimidated; and unless the representatives of the people in Parliament, who are not afraid of the monopoly, let the public understand something about it, it will never be checked or exposed. Of course, a monopoly of this kind could only be possible under the fostering influence of the high tariff; we know that. We were promised competition when the high tariff was given to us. For a while we did get competition, and the consumers perhaps got the benefit of it. But we know very well that there was an enormous amount of capital lost, destroyed, wasted in that competition. This monopoly has established itself on the ruins of those cotton companies, not by investing the original capital, perhaps not 50 per cent, in many cases much less than 50 per cent of the original capital invested in these mills. The proprietors have given up control of everything, the competition is done away with, the capital is lost, and the monopoly exists. Now, there is a possibility in this of enormous profits to speculators. Would the promoters have gone to the trouble of getting two companies patented, with an authorized paid-up capital of $10,000,000, without intending to make a handsome thing out of the people of Canada in a short time? That Dominion Cotton Mills Company has been in existence a little over a year, and its promoters are tremendously interested in sustaining our high tariff. Our tariff puts money into their pockets, and it would be only natural to them, as I am informed they did, although so young, to contribute very liberally to the Red Parlour election funds in Montreal during the election, of 1891. They contribute freely to the Red Parlour in Montreal, or, in other words, the Montreal Industrial Association presided over by a distinguished member of the other House. They could, of course, easily afford to contribute their share of that benign influence which has been spoken of as having so mysteriously rained down like the dew from Heaven in so many constituencies at the bye-elections, and I believe that they did so contribute. Their names have been positively given to me. I have moved for a return of papers comprising the original letters patent of incorporation of the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, Limited, and of the supplementary letters patent increasing the capital stock of the company from $100,000 to $5,000,000, and copies of all correspondence, petitions, statements and evidence submitted to the Government in support of the issue of such supplementary letters patent, and I have moved for them with respect to both these companies. It is a nice scheme certainly for an incorporated company, and I draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to it. Suppose this had nothing to do with the cotton company, for a moment. Here is a company which comes and asks for incorporation with a capital of $100,000, on which, under the terms of the Act, it has to subscribe 50 per cent and pay up 10 per cent. Under the terms of the Act, if they comply with this condition and satisfy the Government as to expenditure and *bonâ fide* character of the enterprise, they have no further subscription to make on the new capital, and no futher payment to make on the new capital at all. They subscribe the original $100,000 and pay up 50 per cent on that, and then they get an increase. In these cases they have an increase of fifty times what their original capital was. It has been increased by the Order in Council. That is a very good scheme. As a professional man, if I were advising a client of the easiest way to get incorporated under the Dominion Letters Patent Act so as to pay up very little, I would tell him, as apparently these people have been advised, to apply first for only one-fiftieth of the capital they really require and then, within a month as these people did, apply for supplementary patent for increased stock. That would be granted to fifty times the original amount and then they get off with a small subscription and a very small payment down. Another thing, if they had any big object in view such as this, of buying out the whole industry of the

Dominion, they would not have to advertise their large capital. Nobody would suppose that a cotton company with $100,000 capital would do very much harm to the country, and therefore the notice given in the *Gazette* would not alarm anybody, but when they apply for supplementary letters patent they do not require to give any notice in the *Gazette* at all. These gentlemen did not give any notice. The first thing the public sees is that an Order in Council has been passed by the Government and supplementary patents issued, the announcement is published in the *Gazette* after it is all over and nobody's notice is drawn to it. The Government may say that such proceeding is a matter of ordinary routine under the Act, which says that :

"After the contractors have passed the necessary by-laws, they shall, in their petition for supplementary letters patent, furnish a copy of such by-laws and establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State or of such other officer as is charged by the Governor in Council to report thereon, the due passage and approval of such by-law, and the expediency and *bonâ fide* character of the increase, and the Secretary of State is bound to keep a record of any requisite evidence in writing, by oath or affirmation or by solemn declaration."

Well, now, I should think we would expect to find some very strong evidence laid before the Governor in Council, of the expediency and *bonâ fide* character of the sudden increase, within one month, from $100,000 to $1,000,000 of the capital of this company ; and even if the Government were so confiding and innocent in the matter as to accept every statement of the first company which applied for this sort of thing, in 1890, I should think, when everybody in the country had heard that that company were acquiring this monopoly and were organizing for that purpose, they must have known it when only a few weeks ago, on the 20th February, 1892, these same people came with an application for a similar charter of $100,000 in the usual way. That was granted, but instantly it was granted, they must have applied for letters patent for $5,000,000, because they got the letters patent on the 7th March, 1892. The Government had two warnings of what these people were doing when they issued the supplementary letters patent only in March last, within three weeks of the issue of the original : and I would like to know, but I do not ask for an answer now, some good reason, when the papers are brought down, why the Government allowed this company to acquire these extraordinary and injurious monopolies.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is right in supposing that we are not in a position this afternoon to place before the House the information which he desires, or even to discuss with much light the points to which he has referred. We will be very glad, however, when the papers have been brought down, to give the hon. gentleman any opportunity for discussing the course that he supposes has been taken in the granting of these letters patent. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing several of the circumstances that he thinks occurred in regard to the supplementary letters patent. I think he is mistaken, for instance, in supposing that there was no notice given for the supplementary letters patent. The hon. gentleman's argument is principally based on the assumption that the companies who have had these supplementary letters patent intended to enter on arrangements contrary to the general interests of the people of Canada, and he proceeds to criticise the Government for giving facilities to these companies for so doing. It would certainly be preferable for us on this side—I mean for the members of the Government—before entering into any discussion of such wrong-doing, or of any possible fault in giving facilities to these companies to increase their capital without proper precautions, that we should have better evidence than the statement which has been found in the press that these companies have acquired nearly all the cotton factories in the country. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that, because of that, they would have acquired a monopoly in this country. On the contrary, any other company could enter into competition with them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But if the market is not adequate ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The market will certainly be adequate if the prices are raised, as the hon. gentleman says they will be.

Mr. CHARLTON. But the prices may be dropped again almost immediately.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman's argument is that the article will be produced practically by one concern, and that the prices will be raised to the consumer. There can be no difficulty for the other producers to place their goods on the market, and if it were established, as the hon. gentleman seems to assert, that the tariff was the means of enabling such a company to act oppressively to the consumer, it would certainly not very long remain so. That question was introduced to the House last year in regard to another matter, and the country can have no doubt as to what the general policy is to-day. The hon. gentleman need not have any misgivings as to the friendly relations of the Government with these manufacturers, if what he calls the Montreal Red Parlour has no more tangible existence and no more palpable effect upon the policy of the Government than the imaginary Red Parlour of Toronto. As to the return for which the hon. gentleman has asked, I do not know what this correspondence may be, but, generally speaking, I know the care which has been taken in regard to the issue of letters patent and supplementary letters patent has been generally directed to the point that the persons have ample capital to enable them to engage in the business, and that they are solvent and reputable persons as far as our information goes. If they are solvent and reputable persons and have sufficient capital to engage in business, it is the first time that we have heard that the fact of their having a large capital should be regarded with caution in granting them letters patent. The evidence is always preserved in these cases, because it is taken in the way of depositions, and it will be brought down.

Mr. CASEY. If there is one quality more than another with which the Minister of Justice has been credited, it is that of applying logic to facts. I do not know that we can any longer credit him with this after what he has stated to-day. He has stated that the buying up of all the cotton factories in the country, if that has occurred, does not constitute a monopoly, and that the market is just as open now as before for any one to start a new factory and put cotton on the market. Surely the hon. gentleman

must be exercising his right as an Irishman, and must be joking with the House when he makes such a statement. Every one knows that, when one article is bought up, or the factories which make it are bought up, over the whole country, that amounts to monopoly, because every one else can be crushed out. The hon. gentleman also says that the only thing the Government has to consider in granting letters patent is the amount of capital, and that it is no objection that the applicants have a very large capital. Stated in these words, his position is correct, but, if it is understood, as it was, that this new combination is formed for the purpose of creating a combine in the sense that word has lately acquired, namely, a practical monopoly created by buying up all existing factories, then the Government should not have lent their aid to it, but should have looked at the question of public policy, and not simply at the question of capital, when they were issuing letters patent. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on these two grounds. Either his statement that the purchase of all the existing factories does not amount to a monopoly, must be a joke, or it is very erroneous. His other statement that it was not the business of the Government to enquire as to what the applicants intended to do with their capital, provided they had sufficient capital, was unsound and even unconstitutional. In discharging the duty of a Government, they should enquire what the results may be and what the effects may be upon the trade of the country. On the first point, I repeat that the Minister must be chaffing the House or simply making a special plea; on the second point, he evidently is making the announcement of a policy, and I leave it to the House to consider whether it is not an unsound policy to give letters patent to any company who apply with sufficient capital, without considering the effect which the incorporation of the company may have upon the country.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice contends that notice was given of the applications for these supplementary letters patent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is my impression.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the Minister of Justice is wrong, because, as a matter of fact, it is not required by the statute, and I have found upon an examination of the *Gazette* myself that no notices were given. Now, I cannot see how it is possible that the Minister of Justice can maintain that the control by these two companies of such vast powers, under the circumstances I have related, does not constitute a monopoly. There is the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) sitting behind him; I would like to hear his views, as chairman of the Committee on Combines, as to whether that is not a dangerous and injurious monopoly to this country. Why, Sir, I remember that his committee condemned strongly, and I do not say too strongly, the small combines in watch cases, in eggs, in coffins, in coal, in the grocery guilds; but how weak and unimportant were they compared to this gigantic monopoly that was concluded no later than last Saturday, under the vast powers given by these supplementary letters patent. How much more important is it that the House should appoint a committee, and that the Government issue a Royal Commission, to enquire into this, than it was to discuss those few matters that were raked up by the Combines Committee in 1888. I have got the conclusion of their report here, and I think it was a little prophetic, and I hope the hon. member for West York has not receded from the views which are embodied in the conclusion of that committee's report, namely:

"That the evils produced by combines such as have been enquired into, have not by any means been fully developed as yet in this country; but sufficient evidence of their injurious tendency and effect is given to justify legislative action for suppressing the evils arising from these and similar combinations and monopolies."

Well, Sir, I do not know whether the legislative action that has been taken can reach these monopolies or not; that is another question altogether. We have got to find out what the evils are, how great they are, before we can apply our legislative remedies. I think it would be well worth the consideration of the House whether, if there is any doubt about the application of the present law to a company of this kind, they should not make it clear, and provide that not only the company shall pay a fine of from one to ten thousand dollars—which would be nothing for these people—but that the officers and promoters of the company who had organized a monopoly of this kind, should be personally punished as well.

Motion agreed to.

DREDGING THE OTTAWA RIVER.

Mr. MURRAY moved for:

Statement showing the cost of dredging the Ottawa River (including cost of plant, &c.) between Pembroke and the Des Joachims Rapids, from 1878 up to the present date; also a statement of the names of the person or persons who have performed the work, the amount paid to each; and if the work was let on tender, by contract or otherwise.

He said: My object in making this motion is to ascertain, if possible, the primary reason for having this work done. I can state, for my own part, as a resident of the town of Pembroke for over 35 years, and as one who has done considerable business with the lumbermen and men engaged in boating, that I never could understand why this work was done at all. I never understood the necessity of it. I never heard any complaint on the part of the people who are engaged in navigation that the river needed to be dredged. I know that before any of this work was done, boats could pass from Pembroke to the Des Joachims Rapids, drawing much more water than the boats which have been plying there since. In a former motion I have pointed out the necessity of the Government coming to the aid of the people of the County of Pontiac, and I want to show, when the papers come down, where a good deal of money was expended, as I consider, unnecessarily. I believe the main object of the Government was to give employment to some prominent political friends of the Government of the day; I cannot come to any other conclusion, because I never could see the necessity for this dredging. I am anxious to know, and that the House should know, why this work was done, who did it, and the amount of money that has been expended.

Motion agreed to.

CULBUTE CANAL.

Mr. MURRAY moved for:

Statement showing the cost of construction of the Culbute Canal from its inception up to the 24th March, 1892; a detailed statement of the names of the contractors or others who did the work, including costs of surveys, engineers' plans, reports, &c. Also a detailed statement of the cost of repairs, with the names of the person or persons who performed the service.

Also, a detailed statement of the names of the engineers, lock masters, bridge keepers, and other employés of the Government, in connection with the aforesaid canal since its construction, and the respective amounts paid to each.

Also, for a statement showing the cost of making any dam or dams, or other alterations or improvements on the Calumet Rapids, in the Ottawa River, from 1878 up to date, giving the names of the persons who did the work, and whether by contract or otherwise

Also, detailed statement showing the respective amounts paid, and the persons to whom paid, for lands and other damages from overflow of water, caused by the construction of Government dams on the Calumet Rapids, and also from the construction of the Culbute Canal; also a list of the names of unsettled claimants.

He said: The subject-matter referred to in the motion I consider to be a useless expenditure of a very considerable amount made in the construction of the Culbute Canal. I do not think there ever was any necessity for this expenditure. I consider it was entered upon to help a supporter of the Government of the day. An appropriation was placed in the Estimates as far back as 1872. I forget the exact amount, but the circumstance was used pretty freely at an election which was held in Pontiac at that time. I believed this work was inaugurated during the time Sir John Macdonald was in power, and it was one of the legacies left by him to the Mackenzie Government to carry out and complete. I do not know whether the contract was let or not during the time Sir John Macdonald was in power, but I rather think it was. No less than $500,000 or $600,000 have been expended, which might as well have been thrown into the Ottawa River. Besides, engineers, lock masters, and employés of that kind have been engaged, all adding unnecessary expense. Then there are the Calumet dams. I never heard that any necessity existed for them. I believe a Government engineer reported on the necessity of them, and perhaps I may be wrong in speaking of it, but I am strongly of the opinion that the work was carried out to afford employment for some political friends. At all events, political friends carried on the work, and family relatives of the member who was supporting the Government. All these matters look very suspicious, and as a result of this work large quantities of lands were damaged in the upper Ottawa, some of the claims in connection with which have yet to be settled by the Government. So this work has been not only a great expense to the country and to individuals, but it is one that is not required in the public interest. I trust that as the Government must see that a mistake has been made in these expenditures the fact will not be overlooked, and relief and assistance will be afforded to some substantial undertaking, such, for example, as the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway. In offering these remarks I desire to show that large sums of money are wasted, where, as a small amount wisely expended would place the people of the County of Pontiac in a very favourable position and would make them feel that it is desirable to remain in this country, instead of leaving it, for, undoubtedly, colonization trains are carrying away many of our best citizens, who observe that while great extravagance prevails, necessary expenditures do not receive proper attention. I think it my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the House, and I trust these mistaken expenditures of the past will not again occur.

Mr. HAGGART. There can be no possible objection to the motion of the hon. gentleman, and all the papers and information asked for will be brought down. But when the hon. gentleman states this was a job done for political purposes, and that the expense was a useless one, and that it was carried out for the purpose of assisting some political friends of ours in that section of the country, he is altogether in error. I remember when this work was first brought before Parliament, for I was a member of the House at the time, and I listened to the debate on the advantages of this celebrated canal. There were advocates of the south side and the north side, the member for Pontiac (Mr. McKay Wright) advocating construction on the latter side. However, an impression prevailed in this House and the country that the work was necessary, and there was a vote placed in the Estimates in its favour. But when the hon. gentleman infers that the expenditure was used for the purpose of securing political advantage to our party on that section of the country, he forgets perhaps the contract was let in 1873 and that the whole of the expenditure was made between 1873 and 1878, and if any political advantage accrued, it was secured by the hon. gentleman's friends. I can have no objection to bring down the papers, but I wish to show the fallacy of the statement of the hon. gentleman, that the building of the canal was carried out for the purpose of helping political friends, and that the expenditure was made for political purposes. If the expenditure was for political purposes, it was for the purpose of assisting the hon. gentleman's friends during its construction.

Mr. MURRAY. I state that, in my opinion, such was the case, because Mr. Heath was a supporter of the Government then in power, and by his influence the vote was placed in the Estimates. I was a candidate for the representation of Pontiac against Mr. McKay Wright, and the changes were rung on the appropriation for the canal to my disadvantage. It had its effect politically. Will the hon. Minister say that the Mackenzie Government were not committed to carry out this work inaugurated by their predecessors? Was he not obliged to go on with that work? I refer more particularly to the dams that were constructed at the Calumet Rapids when I say that a relative of Mr. Poupore, who was a member of this House, I believe a son of his, was the contractor for performing that work. These things look as if there were some kind of a political, suspicious ring about them. I think, Mr. Speaker, I was justified in making the remarks I did. And I think that the hon. gentleman cannot but see that a great deal of these things are done for political effect, and in order to assist Government supporters, not only in Pontiac but also in many other places that I might have referred to. You are a political opponent of mine, Mr. Speaker, and when, in speaking on a previous motion, I was referring to the dredging done between Pembroke and Des Joachims, I do not say that that is one of

the political sins that you have to answer for. I do not think you are implicated at all in such a thing, and I want the House to understand that.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Speaker, before you declare that motion carried, I would like to add a word to what has been said by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray). I really believe that this canal, to which reference has been made by the hon. gentleman, and which, as it stands now, is useless and constitutes nothing more than idle capital, could be made one of the most useful and valuable in the country. Already a very large sum of money has been expended upon it, and I believe that if a further outlay were made in order to improve the different canals which it was proposed at one time to construct between Ottawa and Pembroke, then the Culbute Canal could be reached, made useful, and the navigation of the Ottawa would be considerably improved. I am not exactly advocating, at this moment, the Ottawa River ship canal of which we have from time to time heard a great deal in the press and on the platform: but I believe that the day will come when the Canadian Pacific Railway from the west will not suffice for freight carrying purposes, and then this Ottawa ship canal will have to be advocated, and perhaps constructed. Of course, it might occur that this will be again one of the legacies which will be left to the Liberals when the Conservatives are going out of power, just as the legacy was extended of which mention was made by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Murray). A large sum of money has been already expended on the Chats Canal, and the canal has not been completed. Then another short canal should be constructed at Bryson, and also one between Aylmer and Ottawa, and thus we would have continuous navigation from Pembroke to Ottawa, and from Ottawa to the sea. I believe that; and the only way this Culbute Canal can be of service to the country is by the construction and completion of the system of canals to which I have just invited attention. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Murray).

Motion agreed to.

THE TEMPERANCE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

Mr. SPROULE moved for:

Return of all correspondence, papers, complaints or memoranda of any kind in relation to "The Temperance Colonization Society," received since or not included in a return furnished the House in 1890.

2. List of all stockholders of the company, 1st May, 1885, with amounts paid on calls of the shares, whether in cash, land credits, or otherwise each year to date, stating what shares were forfeited, when and why.

3. List of stockholders at date of return, showing when they became such, with dates and amount of shares purchased, with price per share. (*a*) Number of calls on all shares with details, dates, &c.

4. Amount earned in fees by directors each year to date.

5. Amount of money invested each year, and in what. (*a*) Total amount received on account of scrip and land sales to date.

6. List of scrip holders, with post office address, who purchased from the company (scrip issued) prior to 1st June, 1882, and since that date, giving date of issue, amount of land purchased, by each, price per acre, amount paid thereon to date; showing, if cancelled, when and on what conditions.

7. List of all other contracts for purchase of land issued, whether exchanged for scrip, amounts paid to date, whether contract is still in existence, why cancelled and when.

8. Amount and details of land sales now current and for which land is to be supplied by the company.

9. List of all persons whose scrip was located on even-numbered sections in 1883, showing where located, new location subsequently if any, with form of contract of even-numbered location.

10. List of homestead settlers in 1885. List at date (actual residents).

11. When contract with the company and Government expired, with conditions of extension, if any; conditions of final settlement.

12. List of lands to be conveyed to the company under such settlement.

The foregoing information to be furnished, if practicable, under affidavit of the President and Accountant.

Mr. DEWDNEY. All the information we have in the department shall be brought down, and I will endeavour to get what was asked for that is not in the department.

Motion agreed to.

REVISION OF ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. FLINT moved for:

List of all revising officers, and the amount of moneys paid to each for the last revision of the electoral lists; also, a detailed statement of the moneys paid for other expenses in connection with the said revision.

He said: I do not propose to take up the time of the House with any remarks in advocacy of the motion, because I believe it must commend itself to all the members of the House. The subject of the expenses in connection with revising the lists from time to time has, every session since the adoption of the Act, created considerable discussion in this House and throughout the country; and apart entirely from the complaints which have been made in some quarters—not in all quarters, fortunately—as to the conduct of revising officers, a large element of antagonism to this feature of the Franchise Act has been due to the enormous and I believe unnecessary expense in connection with it. I think that any unprejudiced person will agree that the list ought to be revised annually, so that in case of a general election we should not meet the country in the position in which the country was met at the last general election, with lists three or four years old, and a large number of persons equitably qualified under the law, but unable to exercise their act of the franchise. Then, in case of a bye-election at any time, the list would be as complete as possible at any time it came on. The enormous cost of the annual revision of the voters' lists ought, if possible, to be decreased. The amount of money which seems to be wasted in the effort to have an honest voters' list throughout this country ready for an election, is indefensible. I hope that this Government will give us this return at a very early day, in order that this question in its full bearings may be brought before the House before the end of the session.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The information will be brought down as expeditiously as possible; but I am afraid it cannot be brought down as soon as I desire, because a great many of these papers are not yet made up, and cannot be completed until the money for the purpose is voted by the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman would have taken advantage of this motion to complete an answer which he gave a moment ago to the question which was asked, whether it was the intention of the Government to introduce a measure to suspend this Act this year, and thus to prevent the annual preparation of the list. I understood, from the statement

made by the hon. gentleman, that the Government contemplated this year suspending the Act again and not having the annual revision of the lists. For my part, I cannot say that I object in any way to the policy of the Government in this respect, though it is sometimes awkward, if we are to have the present system, not to have an annual revision of the lists, because an election may take place any day in any part of the country, and unless we have the annual revision contemplated by the Act, the election must of necessity take place on the old lists. At all events, the fact that the Government can announce this year that there will be no revision is an evidence that even they are of opinion that the Act is cumbersome, difficult to apply, and expensive. Although, under the terms of the Act, there should be an annual revision, and although the Act has been in force since 1886, there has been no annual revision so far. The first revision took place in 1886, the second in 1889, the third in 1891, just on the eve of the elections. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman should be in a position to announce to the House that it is contemplated to abolish the Act altogether. The Government must admit that it is not conducive to public interest to have an Act which is broken by the Government every year, even though it be with the sanction of Parliament. Their inaction shows most conclusively that in their judgment the Act ought to be abolished, and I would have hoped this intention would be announced by the Minister at present.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The return will be brought down without delay, and then will be a more appropriate time to announce the policy of the Government.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This Act ought either to be abolished or enforced. The revision that took place last year has not yet, in some instances, been completed, the lists in some of the ridings have not been printed, all which is in contravention of the statute. It does seem singular that the revision, which began last June, should not, on the 4th of April in the following year, be completed. There is certainly some defect somewhere which ought to be remedied. I cannot understand how, when the final revision took place in December, the lists of four months after are not printed. It leads to the suspicion that there is something wrong: it has a tendency to cause people to believe that the Government connive at this, and, in the interest of the Government themselves, they should see to it that no such laxity should prevail with regard to the printing of the lists. The other day I went to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and desired the list for the riding I have the honour to represent, and was told it had not been printed yet. This is a state of things which should not exist under the operation of the Act. The Act is explicit, and certainly there is a laxity the Government should see to. It is indeed very cumbersome and cannot be kept in order unless revised every year. There are defects which crept into the revision last year and cannot be got over properly unless the lists are revised each year. An annual revision is so expensive that it is almost impossible to think of it, but I have been told by revising officers, who endeavoured to do their duty faithfully, that it is impossible to have a proper revision unless it be an annual one. The difficulties that arise when there is not annual revision are very great. I could cite some instances which would bear out what I say. Now, an elector whose name was on the list, when revised in 1886, died in April of that year, and the son inherited his estate. The revision took place in the end of 1889. The surnames were not the same, but the son inherited the estate and continued to occupy it until the next revision, and his name was not changed, and when he voted at the elections his vote was challenged and he was suspected of having voted improperly by personating his father who had died three or four years before. Another case arose which came under my notice, wherein two cousins were concerned. One the owner of a farm, and the other the son of a farmer living across the concession. The one had lived there continually since 1886, the other in the beginning of 1885 had gone to the North-West and sold his property, and when the elections came about the elector who had remained and was of the same name as the other went and voted. His vote was questioned, and he was about to be tried for having personated his namesake who was out of the country. The doubt was whether it was he or his cousin who remained on the list. Cases of that kind creep into the Act when the revision is not annual and give rise to great difficulties. There is another difficulty to which I would like to draw the Minister's attention. It is a fact, that many of those on the lists are not resident in Canada. In the township of Normanby, we objected to about 90 names on the list, and of those, 75 were in the United States. Then we had a difficulty striking the names off. They had no real estate: they had been put on by declaration, and we were unable almost to have their names struck off, as we could not bring definite evidence to satisfy a court of law. We could not summon them as they were a thousand miles away, and some of them had to be left on. This brings up the subject again of the desirability of establishing the rule of "one man one vote." That is the only way in which you can overcome difficulties which threaten to continue so long as the present system lasts. It would be fair, equitable, and just if we could only engraft that on the Bill. The Bill would not possess those objectionable clauses it now possesses, and foreign voters, living in a foreign land, who have no stake or interest in the country, would not be allowed to come in, when an election is brought on, and vote. Although they have no interests in the country, they get on the lists owing to the operation of the Act, and because of the requirements the revising officer must have in the way of evidence, it is impossible for us to remove them. Many of those foreigners are on the list and continue to vote and control the destinies of the country. There are a great many features I would like to see changed in the Act, but I do not think it can be made workable unless revised every year, and then the expense is so great the only remedy is to abolish it entirely.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). One of the causes of the delay in the printing of the lists has been the desire of the Bureau to print the reports of the departments in order that they may be laid before Parliament. The printing of the lists is now being pushed forward, and the remarks made by hon. gentlemen will receive every consideration.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The House will receive with gratification the statement of the

Secretary of State that it is the intention of the Government at an early day to bring down a measure dealing with the elective franchise, because I believe the experience of every hon. gentleman on either side of the House is that no measure could be worse than the one which is now on the Statute-book. I never had any doubt in my mind that it would prove oppressive and highly unsatisfactory, and I think the experience of the seven years during which it has been in operation has justified all the apprehensions of those who, when it was first proposed, gave it a most determined opposition. The Government of this country is a Federal Government, and the Federal Legislature has not, and cannot very well have, an effective machinery for the purpose of preparing a voters' list. This subject was very fully considered by the founders of the American constitution. When the subject was under discussion in the convention which framed that constitution, provision was made after full discussion that the qualification for an elector for the election of a member to the House of Representatives should be exactly the same as the qualification required for the election of a member to the most popular branch of the State Legislature. That principle was not embodied in our constitution, but it was embodied in in our statute, was reaffirmed by the statute of 1874, and continued until the election of 1887 as the principle upon which the election of members to this House should take place. The principle is in itself an obvious one. It was based upon the assumption that, in a large country covering a territory so extensive, that it is necessary to introduce the federal principle, the interests will be so diversified and the condition and circumstances of the population in the different parts will be so different from each other that what may be a very proper qualification for the voters for the election of members in one province may not be so convenient or proper a qualification in another. The wealth, the diversified industries of the country, the different occupations of the people may render proper a qualification in one province which would not be proper in another. We have, in this Electoral Franchise Act, discarded in a large degree the principle of giving any representation to a person on account of any amount of personal property which he may possess, but in one important particular we have departed from that rule in the recognition of the qualification of fishermen. We recognize the boats and tackle of fishermen as a basis of qualification for the election of members to this House. I am not going to discuss the question as to what ought to be the basis of qualification. If we revert to the principle that the qualification for the election of members to this House should be the qualification for the election of members of the Local Legislatures, then it would be for us, as electors, to press these matters upon the attention of the Local Legislatures instead of discussing the matter here. The Local Legislatures possess all the machinery necessary to prepare an effective voters' list, and I venture to say you will never have an efficient machinery so long as you undertake to appoint one person to prepare the lists and also to revise them. That is not done in the United Kingdom. There the revising officer is what his name implies, an officer who has power to revise a list, with the preparation of which he has nothing to do. The list is prepared by others, by the parish officials in the various parishes of the United Kingdom. So here the municipal councils of the different municipalities in most of the provinces—at all events, in those provinces where municipal councils exist—were the parties who prepared the lists, and the county judge, until the present Act was introduced, was really the revising officer. He revised the list and heard appeals, but with the preparation of the original list he had no concern. I do not care how well an officer may be acquainted with the population of the electoral district, his knowledge must always be so far from anything like perfection that a very large number of persons without personal application and without special attention on their parts may be left off the list. Either they will have to make personal application themselves or some one who is either a representative or aspires to be a representative must look after the list, if it is to approach completeness. In the original preparation by the municipal council, you have in these councils, in the first place, persons who belong to the different political parties. It is a rare thing to find a municipal council of five persons all of whom are members of one political party. Their elections take place without reference to their political bias or political feelings, and so, when the preparation of the voters' list takes place in the first instance, both parties are represented in that preparation. There is a certain amount of diligence exercised which renders the list comparatively complete from the very beginning, and the completeness of the list as it is originally prepared by the municipal council sitting as a court of revision, saves to candidates, saves to active men of both political parties, a very great deal of trouble and of expense. I trust, when we have the measure which the Government have promised us this session, it will be a measure reverting to the principles which governed the preparation of the lists for the first eighteen years of the existence of this Parliament and this Confederation, principles against which no serious complaint was made, and which were inexpensive—in fact which relieved the Government of the Dominion and this Legislature from all expenses whatever. Sir, I am not going further to anticipate the measure of the Administration, but I believe I state the sentiment on that side of the House as well as upon this, when I say that the present law is found to be expensive, cumbrous, imperfect and oppressive in its character, a measure that imposes a needless expense upon the representatives in Parliament, whether they belong to the one side or to the other, and if it be a year in which an election is not anticipated, in almost every case the party that is unrepresented in this House in a constituency has a very imperfect list at its final completion. That must necessarily be the case, for without some more efficient machinery than that which the present law provides, by means of some local officers who possess the necessary personal knowledge, I think no list can ever be made quite satisfactory. I trust the measure which the Government have promised us will be brought down at an early date, so that we may have time, not only to discuss the principles of the Bill, but ample time to consider, before the Bill reaches any final stage in this House, with the utmost minuteness, the character of its various provisions; for a complete and perfect franchise Act is one in which, not only the members on both sides of this House, but the public at large, have the great-

est possible interest; it is a measure which lies at the basis of our political freedom, it is a measure that ought to be as perfect as it is possible to make such a Bill, because the rights and immunities, the political privileges and the political freedom of the population in this country, and their control over Parliament, depend upon the character of the Franchise law in a large degree. I trust that the measure which has been promised by the Secretary of State on behalf of the Government, will be a measure that will prove satisfactory to the House and to the country. Certainly, the Act upon the Statute-book is as bad as an Act can well be: it is open to as many objections as any measure that, since Confederation, has been passed into law, and it is to be hoped that one fairer in its character, fairer to the Opposition, fairer to the public at large, than this one, will be submitted to the House in the promised measure of the Administration.

Mr. CHARLTON. I presume that no member of this House sitting upon the Opposition side has ever been called upon to face the difficulties, troubles and expense attending upon a revision of the voters' list, under the Dominion Franchise law, without feeling that the hand of political oppression rested heavily upon him; and I presume that no member supporting the Government has ever been placed in like circumstances who did not feel that he was paying dearly for the privilege conferred upon his party by the unjust political advantages secured by this Act. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that the law is as bad as it well can be: it is an oppressive law, an expensive law, a cumbersome law, a law that never has worked satisfactorily, and a law that never can work satisfactorily as it is at present framed. I would be sorry, Mr. Speaker, to attribute to the gentlemen upon the opposite side of the House so low a degree of intelligence as to suppose that they are not perfectly well aware, one and all, that this is an unjust and oppressive law, and that the only excuse for its existence, the only reason for existence, is that it confers upon the Government of the day an undue and improper political advantage. I say improper political advantage, because it is in their power to make an improper use of this law; the officers who make the revision of the list are their creatures, they hold position during their pleasure; the lists made by these officers are printed in the Government printing office here, under the supervision of the Government, and may be tampered with at their pleasure, and the people of this country, those who are aggrieved by their action, are helpless, and can do nothing to redress the wrong. It is in their case a matter of sufferance as to whether they shall have justice or as to whether they shall submit. This is the character of this law. I feel deeply about this. I resisted the passage of this Act, for months, in this House. We predicted all the evils that would flow from it, the evil of great expense, the evil of cumbersomeness, the evil of two voters' lists and two sets of machinery—all these things we predicted. We predicted that the law would work unsatisfactorily, as it has done, we showed them that the motive that incited the Government in the action that it took in regard to this matter, was a desire and a design to secure an unjust political advantage. There is not such a franchise law in existence, outside of Canada, upon the broad face of this globe, not one. They profess to copy the provisions of this law from the British law; they name their chief officer a revising barrister after the officer under the British law. But, as my hon. friend from Bothwell has pointed out, the voters' lists in England are made by municipal officers, by the overseers of the poor; the Government revising barrister has nothing to do with making the lists; while in this country he has autocratic powers with regard to making the lists. In England the lists are made by the overseers of the poor, by municipal officers elected by the people; these lists are revised by an officer who is entirely independent of the Government, who is neither appointed by the Government nor can be removed by the Government, but is a judicial officer, serving in a judicial capacity, and appointed by the courts of the land, and the Government has nothing whatever to do with the making, or the revision, or the publication, of the list used in that country. There is not a British colony, outside of Canada, where any such provision exists; there is not an English-speaking commonwealth upon the face of the globe, where such provisions exist, where there are placed, in the hands of the Government such powers, as are wielded by the Government of Canada in connection with the Dominion Franchise Act now in force in this land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had in Canada, for 18 years, our elections upon the provincial lists. There never was an objection raised to it, there never was an assertion made that they did not work satisfactorily, that they did not work properly, that they did not work in the interest of the public. No, Sir, the change was made, not because of objections to the mode that had been pursued, the change was made because the Government desired to make a change, that would place in their hands powers that they had not exercised before, that would give to them advantages that they did not enjoy under a fair franchise law, and for that reason they enacted this abominable, this iniquitous, franchise law, a blot upon our Statute-book, a blot upon our record as a country, a blot upon the Government that placed it upon the Statute-book, and retains it there despite the protest of the people. Now, I hold that the exercise of the franchise is primarily and properly the exercise of a civil right. The Provincial Legislatures and Governments of this Dominion have control of civil rights. When a member is elected by a riding in a province to take a seat in this House, he comes here to represent that portion of the province from which he comes: he comes here to discharge a civil right in looking after and advancing the interests of this province. If our provincial constitutions were slightly changed, he might be elected to come here by the Legislature of the province; and the whole body of the representatives of the province would be just as properly and just as truly representatives of that province in this Parliament if they were selected by the Legislature, as if they were selected by the people. And it is an improper exercise of the civil rights and an infringement on the rights, privileges and immunities of the citizens of the province for the Government to step in and assume the control of the mode in which the members sitting in this House and looking after the interests of that province and representing that province shall be elected. Reference has been made to the course

pursued in the United States. Certainly the experience of that country, the example of that country, for a period of more than 100 years should be of use to us and considered by us. The people of the United States lived under the articles of confederation for ten years, and in addition to the experience arising from their long colonial existence they had the benefit of those ten years under confederation. In the light of the experience thus acquired, in the light of their colonial experience, in the light of their experience under ten years of confederation, their constitutional convention dealt with this question of the representation and of the franchise, and as to what should be the qualification of a voter who should be called upon to vote for a member of the House of Representatives of the United States or of the President or Vice-President of the States. They considered the question fully for weeks. There were various propositions made. It was proposed that the United States should adopt the course we have adopted and should fix the qualification of a voter and enforce it throughout the United States. It was proposed that State Legislatures should elect members of the House of Representatives. It was proposed that State Legislatures should settle the mode by which they should be elected; and the decision finally arrived at was, that the most popular form of suffrage in every state, or the qualification which was required to entitle the party to a vote in the more numerous branch of the State Legislature, should be the qualification of a voter throughout the United States in the elections for members of the House of Representatives or of President or Vice-President. That law has been in existence for over 100 years, and it has never given rise to dissatisfaction. It never has been found necessary, as it was not necessary in our case, to have the Government of the United States step in and assume the power, and exercise it, of deciding what the franchise should be for its own elections. Those elections have continued to be held on the franchise of the states. Their circumstances differ, as the circumstances of our provinces differ. The qualifications that may be proper and advisable in Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia may not be proper in Manitoba or British Columbia, and each province is the best judge as to the qualifications that is most proper and advisable as to who shall vote to represent their interest in this House. We have the promise made by the Secretary of State that this matter is under consideration. I have spoken of this matter to-day freely. I feel warmly on this subject. I feel that the Act is so outrageously injustifiable and undesirable that the best course the Government can adopt is to wipe it out altogether and revert to the condition of things which existed 7 years ago, and which was conducive to individual and public interests. This would relieve every member of the House from onerous burdens; it would relieve the country of an oppressive and cumbrous system if we returned to the plan we had in force for 18 years, which worked so well both as regards individuals and the Government, for it is the best course to pursue for the public interest and safe government, and it is eminently desirable that we should revert to the original condition of affairs that existed when the Articles of Confederation wer eadopted and which continued 18 years.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not agree with any of the criticisms indulged in by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton,) who has just taken his seat. During my political career I have had ample experience of the working of the Provincial Voters' Act and the Act passed by the Dominion Parliament. I have no hesitation in saying that the Dominion Act is the less onerous on the candidate, and entails less expense in securing a perfect list; and, moreover, when completed it is a list more representative of the people than is the provincial list. We all know that the assessors in the various municipalities are supposed to prepare a list for the provincial voters. But the only duty for which those assessors are paid is that of assessing properties in the various municipalities, and many of them pay no attention to placing on the list those entitled to vote; and accordingly, in the rural constituencies, at all events, many of those entitled to be placed on the list are omitted. In the township in which I reside, at the last revision 100 names were placed on the list after the assessors, the township clerk, and the court of revision had concluded their sittings. What does that mean? The addition of those names requires that you must bring evidence before the court which will be accepted by the court,—not hearsay evidence, or evidence by statutory declaration, as is permitted in regard to the Dominion elections, but evidence that will satisfy the judge, and some of the judges are pretty hard to satisfy, and that cannot be done without great expense and trouble. Under the Dominion list a man does not need to lose his day's work, and travel eight or ten miles to attend the revision, but he may make a statutory declaration, which he can do in the evening before a justice of the peace or a member of the municipal council, and that declaration is submitted to the revising officer, and his name is placed on the list with very little trouble and without any particular expense. In regard to the provincial list no such means of placing a name on it prevails, and those who seek to have their names registered are compelled to attend at their own expense, and frequently lose a day's work to do so. The experience in my riding is strongly in favour of the Dominion as against the provincial list, not only from the fact that the Provincial Governments are hostile to the Dominion Government, but that provincial legislation has been enacted which has had the effect of depriving various citizens of their right to vote. Take Toronto, for example. One third of the citizens are disfranchised. Three members are elected, and a voter is allowed to cast a vote for two of them, the third being made a member by Act of Parliament. The hon. gentleman proposes that we shall adopt this iniquitous system, instead of that of the Dominion Act. I hold that the Dominion Parliament is the proper tribunal to legislate in this matter. The only objection that can be made to the Dominion system is that it is somewhat expensive: but in spite of the additional expense involved, I am strongly in favour of the retention of the Dominion Franchise Act, because it represents more fully than the provincial system the opinions of the people, and it enables every man who chooses to have his name placed on the list, if it has been omitted. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that the Dominion Franchise law gives an unjust political advantage. I would like to know from him how it

does give any such advantage? Those gentlemen who are appointed as revising officers are in most cases the judges of the land. In the County of York, we have two judges and one ex-judge; men held in the highest esteem throughout the county. No man can say that these gentlemen do not perform their duties fairly and honestly. Are we to be told that these men, sworn to do justice, holding the highest positions in the land, and removed from the political arena and party feelings, are likely to give an unfair decision, while the assessors and those other officers who are appointed by the Local Government because of their strong political partisan feelings would make up a fair voters' list? I say, Sir, that both sides of politics will get justice and fair-play from the revising officers appointed by the Dominion Government. In the case of the provincial lists, when a wrong has been done by the assessors or township clerks, to whom is an appeal made to set them right? The appeal lies to these very gentlemen whom hon. members on the other side of the House strongly condemn as revising officers. In some cases it is true we find that revising officers are not judges, but in such cases the men selected are men of high standing and repute in the community, men who have reputations to sustain, barristers of experience qualified to fill the position of revising officers, and in addition to that they are men of probity and rectitude. The results in every case have shown that the work of these revising officers has been well, and carefully and conscientiously done. The member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that the revising officers were the creatures of the Government, but he must remember they are placed beyond the power of the Government, and the Government is not permitted to interfere with them except for cause. The hon. gentleman might as well say that the judges of the Supreme Court, and of all the other courts in the land are creatures of the Government. They hold office, as revising officers do, during good behaviour, and no revising officer, so far as I am aware of, has ever been changed except for cause which could be justified if necessary on the floor of Parliament. The member for North Norfolk also made the extraordinary assertion, that members might be sent to this Parliament elected by the Local Legislatures, and that these members would be as thoroughly representative as if they were sent by the people. I would like the hon. gentleman to bring in a Bill to carry out that idea of his.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said we would have to have a constitutional change to do it.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, Sir, the constitution could be changed if it were necessary, and if this idea of the member for North Norfolk is right, he could proceed still further and try and have the constitution changed and the members of the Dominion Parliament selected by the Legislatures. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that he would not succeed very well in his attempt, and that he would not get a very large portion of even the members of his own party who have been pretty reckless in their policies for the last few years, to follow him in such a wild-cat scheme.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I wish to say that I was merely using that as an illustration of what might be done; and as an illustration the exercise of the provincial power, the sending of representatives here under a changed constitution, who, if they were sent in that manner, would be the representatives of the provinces in this Parliament. I was not recommending it, but merely speaking of it as something that might be done, to illustrate the line of argument I was pursuing.

Mr. WALLACE. It just shows what these hon. gentlemen opposite would do if they had the power to do it. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that this Bill was an outrage and was unjustifiable and indefensible. It is not an outrage, but it is an honest and fair Bill, and it is not indefensible because we have defended it on every platform, and defended it pretty successfully, and, further, we are prepared to defend it again; at any rate, we will defend it as against the iniquitous Franchise Act of the Province of Ontario. If we compare the Dominion Franchise Act with the Provincial Franchise Act, compare the mode in which the work is done, compare the inexpensiveness of the one and the expense necessarily involved in the other, I have yet no hesitation in giving my opinion in favour of the Dominion Franchise Act, notwithstanding the additional expense of it to the Government of Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). In the first place in regard to this Bill, I think there is not a man in this Chamber, if he honestly admitted his own convictions, but who would say at once that the Bill is a cumbrous and expensive one to every man who offers as a candidate for Parliament. I know that in the section of the country from which I come, great difficulty has been experienced by men on both sides of politics in the revision of the voters' lists. The fact is, that a candidate might just as well run an election contest as pay the expenses of a revision of the voters' lists. We know perfectly well, and hon. gentlemen opposite know that, as a rule, the judges have been appointed by the present Government, and we know also that the revising barristers are taken from amongst a number of their most pronounced supporters where revising barristers are appointed and are not judges. We know that these men sit with their eyes constantly open in the direction of securing favours from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am speaking now from the experience of the people in my section of the country, and I know whereof I speak. With regard to myself I admit that I have a very decent respectable man as revising officer in my riding. At the same time, there are a great many names on the list in the constituency I represent that should not be there. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) says that it is an honest law, and that these men can get their names on the list without any trouble at all. In my riding a man made a statutory declaration and sent in the names of fifty young men under the age of 21 to be placed on the list in our township. We struck off in that township fifty-eight names at an enormous expense. We had in some cases to subpœna the fathers and mothers, and in some instances when they were brought before the revising officer, in order to baffle

our efforts they would not state whether they were of age or not.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to make a suggestion to him? He could have summoned the man who made the statutory declaration and he could have got all the information he required, instead of summoning sixty fathers and mothers.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, we could not. I am pointing out the character of the Act in order to show that there are those who are willing to take advantage of its peculiar clauses. There may be in some ridings people who wish to use the Act honestly and for a legitimate purpose; but, wherever our opponents have the opportunity, they take advantage of the Act to do what is wrong. I know that that has been done in the section to which I belong. I hold that the municipal officers should prepare the voters' lists. I do not know a single township in my district which is represented entirely by either Reformers or Conservatives; you generally find that both sides are represented. The members of the council are not elected from one particular corner of the township only, but from all parts. Consequently, when the question arises whether a certain name should be put on or struck off the list, these men are probably well acquainted with the person and all the circumstances, and are able to decide properly what should be done. For these reasons, they could revise the list more cheaply and more efficiently than it can be done by the present method. Even the revising officers themselves in many cases have admitted the cumbrousness of the proceedings under the Act. It opens the way for manufacturing fraudulent votes. I know that the hon. member for West York admires the Act. Possibly, if he searched the bottom incidents of the revision in his district, he would find that he would not be here at all but for the Act.

Mr. WALLACE. I was here under the old Act by a very considerable majority.

Mr. McMULLEN. I contend that the proper course is to appoint a reeve of each township *ex officio* revising officer for the township, making him a Dominion officer if you will, and having an appeal from him to the county judge, as at present. My hon. friend refers to the system established in the city of Toronto by the Ontario Government. Surely my hon. friend knows that the Ontario Act could not be applied to the Dominion affairs. It provides for the minority representation in the city of Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE. It disfranchises one-third of the electors of Toronto.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, it enfranchises one-third, because it gives them representation which otherwise they would not have. If my hon. friend is so fond of British precedent, surely he would not deny the benefit of an Act of that kind which has been in force in Liverpool and in other cities of Great Britain. The system is on trial in the city of Toronto, and though it has not been very long on trial, thus far there has not been a great deal of complaint in regard to it.

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair, I was discussing some provisions of the Franchise Act, and was giving some reasons why we should not continue that Act. In our experience with it so far, a great many difficulties have arisen, and a great many candidates have suffered very seriously from the enormous expenses to which they have been put in order to get anything like a fair revision of the list. As has already been stated, we have a very good and carefully prepared voters' list in the Province of Ontario under our municipal system. I do not know that there is the same kind of municipal system in all the other provinces, but if the municipal machinery elsewhere is in as good a condition for producing a satisfactory list as ours is in Ontario, in my humble opinion we could well and prudently save the country the enormous sum of money which is now being spent under the operation of the Franchise Act. The hon. member for West York, when addressing the House this afternoon, objected to the Ontario Government being permitted to create a Dominion franchise by a statute of their own. In regard to that, when the Franchise Act was introduced in this House, I can well remember the then leader of the Government declaring that one of the reasons for introducing it was to provide returning officers who were not partisans. He stated that a great many complaints were made that the sheriffs and registrars throughout the Province of Ontario, being appointees of the Ontario Government, showed their political bias in the discharge of their duties as returning officers; and in order to relieve the party in power from being hampered, as they said, hon. gentlemen opposite passed this Act, taking to themselves the right of appointing their own returning officers in every constituency. Now, if it was considered unjust to hon. gentlemen opposite to have sheriffs and registrars appointed by the Ontario Government, act as returning officers, why do they ask us to submit quietly and peaceably to their nominating the most pronounced partisans of their own as returning officers? If the argument is good on one side it is good on the other side, and I contend that we should not be subjected to the injustices we have suffered in many constituencies owing to the partisan actions of returning officers and deputy returning officers. There is another feature of the Act that undoubtedly should be changed, if the Act is to continue in force. These omnibus declarations by which a man is permitted to add any number of names to a voters' list in a municipality, by making a statutory declaration that they are all entitled to be put on, is a fruitful source of evil. I hold that if a man is to be permitted to take an active part in putting on other names besides his own, he should be held personally responsible. In my own constituency, one man added from a thousand to twelve hundred names to the list, on a declaration made out by him for each municipality, which he swore to, signed, and executed according to the statute. Yet although he made this sworn declaration, in one of the townships there were no less than sixteen names put on of young men, who admitted under oath before the revising barrister that they were under age. To remove such minors, entails a great deal of expense. In that township we had to employ four

or five constables to serve subpœnas on people whose evidence we required to have those names removed. In some cases different judges take different views of the Act. The first revising officer we had in North Wellington, a gentleman who used to be a member of this House, endeavoured to discharge his duties faithfully and efficiently, and I believe the present gentleman occupying that position has made an honest effort to procure an honest, fair list, but despite their good-will there is a good deal of unavoidable difficulty in having such names removed. These young men to whom I have referred, and whose names were put on by virtue of a statutory declaration, were subpœnaed, but when they appeared in court many of them said they did not know and could not tell, and were not prepared to swear whether they were of age or not. The revising officer said: These men have been put on by a man who declared under oath that he believed them all to be of age, and I must have some evidence that they are not. In order to satisfy the returning officer, we had, therefore, to subpœna either the father or mother or some other person who had personal knowledge and was prepared to swear that these youths were not of age. Now, I hold that it is unreasonable and unfair that men called to discharge the duty of supervising the lists should be put to the enormous expense connected with the revision of the lists, and in order to get over the difficulty, the oath should be altered so that when a young man comes to vote he will be called on to swear that he was of the full age of twenty-one at the final revision of the list. If that change were made, the effort to put men on under age would not be so great as now, because now these people fancy that if they get on the list, an election may not come on for a year or two and by that time they will be able to take the necessary oath. Another thing that should be done, if the Act is to be kept in force, is to have a revision every year. The Act undoubtedly is an enormously expensive business, but if hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to defend the expense under the Act they should be prepared to defend the revision of the list every year. If you leave the revision off for two or three years, it leaves an enormous amount of work to be done by the revising barrister. The changes that will take place in a town or village, or even a municipality, in two or three years, are so numerous that when you come to revise the list, the labour is something enormous, whereas if the lists were revised carefully every year, the amount of work would not be so great on the revising officer, and would also be much lighter on others called upon to take an active part in the revision of the lists. If we are to have it at all, let us have a revision each year. Give every opportunity to those anxious to keep pure and perfect lists. Give them an opportunity every year to see that names which have no right to be there are expunged, and those which should be on, added. You will thus, year by year, produce a better list than we have at present. On the list on which the last election was held in my riding, although the returning officer, I believe, did his best, whether it was through mistakes made in the Printing Bureau or mistakes unintentionally made by the revising officer, many men were struck off the list who should be on and quite a number were on who should be off. I know of some men who have been residents of the riding I have the honour to represent, for thirty years, whose names were not on. I know one man in particular who is the owner of three hundred acres in that riding, who has voted there in every election for the past twenty-five years, and yet whose name was not on the list at the last election at all. It is very much to be regretted that such mistakes should take place, unjustly depriving men of their franchise. I admit that, in the preparation of the municipal lists, such errors might creep in also, but they are more likely to creep in where there is only one revision every two or three years than where there is a revision every year. I believe the time has come when the country is ripe for a change in the qualification of the electors. I believe the time has come when we should have one man one vote. As long as we keep the law as it is now, you are bound to have any number of personations. As long as it remains in its present state, you will have numbers of people who have left Canada completely and become citizens of the United States, returning here when an election comes around—men from Chicago, Detroit and Wisconsin—to give their votes. It is a burlesque to see these men, who have become American citizens, coming back to Canada to vote when they have not one vertige of interest in the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in the enjoyment of all the prestige of office and all the advantages they reap from having possession of the Treasury benches, should be willing to go before the people on fair and equal terms with this side of the House. We have been seriously handicapped. The alteration of the law took this out of the hands of the registrars and sheriffs, and the mode of appointing returning officers left us open to any number of casualties which tend very seriously against members on this side of the House. I have known many cases in which returning officers have been the presidents of the Conservative association of the riding. That is not a fair state of things. Then there are other blind partisans who refuse to accept ballots which are perfectly good, and so manage to get those who support hon. gentlemen opposite returned to this House. I know that in many cases where the judges are appealed to and these ballots are recounted, justice is done, but many men lose their seats because they had not the means of following up a case of that kind. In many cases the declaration has been postponed from time to time, and the result has been that the gazetting has been postponed, and thus one party has had a greater advantage than the other in reference to appealing those cases. I am glad to say that there is now a change in that respect; but, while the Act permits the appointment of the returning officers and the deputy returning officers favourable to hon. gentlemen opposite, and while the voters' list is produced under the eye and in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite, giving them a decided advantage, I venture to say that there is not a constituency in the Dominion in which the list is now a fair list and in which an equitable contest is held. I venture to say that on every list as finally revised there are many names which should not be printed there at all. That is a condition of things which is to be deplored. However we may differ politically and on the great questions which separate us on the floor of the House, we should be ready to go before the electorate of this country on a fair and equitable basis. We only ask a fair field and

no favour, but now injustice is done and we only ask to have the Act amended in order to see that equal justice shall be done, and that we may go before the electors without being handicapped as we now are. There is another difficulty in regard to the Act. It is very well known from our experience that the county judges differ very seriously in regard to the provisions of the Act. We know very well what an exhibition we had in the London election case. The revising barrister held that a notice containing simply the words "not qualified" was vague and was not sufficient in itself to lead him to strike off the name of the voter. On the other hand, other judges held that such a notice was quite sufficient. I think the Act should plainly and unmistakeably outline the notice which is necessary to be given, so that there should not be any technical advantage given to any party to add or take from the list. In my own riding the revising barrister accepted notices marked "not qualified" without requiring the reason to be given, and I think he was quite right. I think the man so referred to should be present and should show that he is entitled to exercise his franchise, if he be entitled to do so. But in the adjoining constituency, in the south riding of Grey, the judge held that you must specify the grounds on which the man was not qualified, though the judge on the other side of the county line held that the words "not qualified" were sufficient. These are some peculiarities of the Act which should be removed if the Act is to be continued. But I cannot see why hon. gentlemen will not accept the provincial lists. The court of last resort is the same in each. If anyone is not satisfied, he can appeal to the county judge and have it settled whether he is entitled to vote or not. In our riding the judges generally take these cases when they are on their division court circuits, and the cases are so few that the work is easily performed. If appeals could be made in such a way for the verification of the municipal lists, I do not see why we should not use the municipal lists and save all the trouble and annoyance and expense which we now experience. Now, with regard to the franchise in the United States, it is well known, as has been stated by the hon. member for Norfolk, that each state makes its own franchise, and in England the franchise is produced in a different way from what it is here. There it is done entirely under the direction of the court. The courts appoint the revising barrister, who performs his work independent of and outside of political influence. If that course were adopted in this country, it would be very much better, because, however honest and well disposed the revising barristers may be, because our county judges, with very few exceptions, have endeavoured to discharge their duties fairly well and without showing any partisanship—still we find that we are subjected to a risk which we should not be subjected to, as hon. gentlemen thought they were subjected to risks when the sheriffs and registrars were appointed returning officers. We have the same fear as they had, and we fear that sometimes injustice may be done in the preparation of the voters' lists. Hon. gentlemen opposite should be on an equality with us in this matter, and therefore we claim that the lists should be prepared by men who are elected by the people themselves outside of political parties, men who have no interest in holding offices or in bestowing office. If you take these men, you will find that, as a rule, they are not in any county all Conservatives or all Reformers. I know the strongest Conservative township in my riding elects a Reformer as member of the county council, and *vice versa*; even the strongest Reform township elects two Conservatives as members of the council, that shows that politics are not the guiding influence in municipal elections, and that men are rather elected for their ability, for their uprightness, for their honesty and capability of performing efficiently the duties of municipal officers. Now, these men would be in a better position to revise the voters' list, to produce a better and fairer list, a list that would be accepted with more confidence of justice by both parties of this House, than a list prepared by any other body of men that you can possibly obtain. For instance, take a judge who does not live in the riding where he is called upon to discharge the duties of revising officer more than once a year, how can he tell whether a man has a right to be on or not? He has to be guided solely by the evidence that is offered, and it may take a great deal of time and a great deal of expense to satisfy that judge that a man has a right to be on. Now, in order to avoid all the expense and difficulties connected with the revision of the list, my opinion is that it should be entirely regulated to the municipalities to produce the list themselves; or, if we are to have a revision at all, we should endeavour to make it as free from partisan colour, and just as fair as we can possibly make it, so that neither party will feel aggrieved in any way it has been produced. Now, I am quite sure that in the recent bye-elections, many of the constituencies have been carried against the Reformers simply because the lists have not been properly attended to. Unfortunately, the duty of revising the list devolves upon the members, frequently, when they are here in their places, and in many cases the revision was not made with that care and attention that it should receive, and the result was that in many cases men were brought in to vote who never should have voted and had no right to vote. Now, I know that during the last revision there were many cases, some in my own riding, where deeds were made out for the purpose of giving men votes. I know of some notable instances, on the boundary of ridings, deeds were made out of portions of farms on one side and then on the other for the purposes of getting men enrolled on the list as electors. I know it was painfully exposed in one case where a man actually went so far as to make the necessary declaration that he was the owner and got his name put upon the list, but after he went before the court he had to admit that it was only for the purpose of voting. Now, that is reverting to the old faggot system of England, against which we should protect ourselves. While it is right that a state should make provision that every man who is entitled to exercise the franchise, may be enrolled and has a right to do so, it should not open the door to fraud and imposition, so that by a little manœuvring a man might be placed upon the voters' lists in several townships, and be allowed to vote in them all. However, if we had the principle of one man one vote, that would largely be done away with. It would not open the door for any injustice of that kind, and I do hope that the law will be altered so as virtually to give to each man that one vote. If we are not going to abandon our

present law and adopt the provincial lists, I say we should have a revision each year and keep a perfect list at all times. What right have the Government of a country to put off a revision of the lists? I understand it has been announced to-day that it was not the intention to revise the lists during the present year. Some great political catastrophe might occur in this country which would necessitate an election next fall. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not control everything, they cannot possibly answer for things that may transpire in the course of three or six months; such changes might take place as would necessitate an election. Now, would it not be a hardship if people who were entitled to vote could not be placed on the list, and if many men were on the list who ought not to be there? If there is anything that should be a sacred trust in the hands of the Government, it is the right of people to exercise their franchise on all occasions when it is necessary they should do so; and no Government have a right to say that men shall not be enrolled if they are otherwise entitled to be enrolled. The lists should be kept complete as far as possible, so that at any moment, if necessity arises for an election, the names of men who are entitled to vote should be upon the list, so that they can exercise their franchise and not be deprived of that sacred privilege. In order to do that we have no right to put off the revision from year to year, and run the risk that we did at the last general election. At the last elections the lists were three years old; many men in this country were left off who had a right to exercise their franchise, and they were deprived of that right. Many young men who had arrived at the age of 21 years and were residents of this country, were not allowed to vote, not from any fault of their own, because they had been put on in the municipal voters' lists, they had taken every step to secure their franchise, but owing to the fact that the Government had assumed the responsibility of making no revision, the result was that these men were not permitted to vote. Now, the Government were responsible for that unfortunate state of things, and the postponement from year to year of the revision of the list was the cause of many men being deprived of their franchise at the last general election. I hope we will not have a repetition of that injustice again, and in order to protect ourselves against it, if we are to have the Act at all, we should have a revision every year.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has given various reasons why the Dominion Franchise Act should be repealed and why we should again resort to the provincial lists for the purpose of our elections. Some of his reasons may have a little merit, but many of them have no merit, and if properly analyzed would afford very strong arguments why the present lists should be maintained. The hon. member says that in his experience, after the revision of last year, many names were on the list that should not have been there. I agree with him there. I was told that of the names that were on without any right to be there, at least some were men who had mortgages against farms and had the name of the mortagee put on the list, while the owner's name was left off, because it happened to suit their own purpose at the time, and, if I am correctly informed, the hon. member for North Wellington is one of those men. The hon. member says that the principle is wrong because the revising officer cannot be trusted. Why can they not be trusted? Because, he says, they are partisans of the Government; and as the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says, because they are creatures of the Government. Why are they creatures of the Government? Because they have been appointed judges by the Government; but the member for North Wellington and the member for North Norfolk forget that for both the provincial and Dominion lists the court of final appeal is the same, they are revised by the judge. If a revising officer who is not a judge does the duty for the Dominion lists and there is any objection to his decision, there is an appeal from him to the judge, and the judge is invariably the revising officer and discharges the same duty for the provincial lists. The hon. member for North Wellington asks: How can a judge know, how can he decide in those cases? Perhaps he only visits the county once a year. Well, surely he visits the county as frequently for the one list as he does for the other; he must know just as well about the Dominion list as he does about the provincial list, or, in other words, he must be as well acquainted with the people in the county for which he revises the provincial list as he is with the people in which he revises the Dominion list. The last court is the same. Now, these gentlemen both raised very strong objection to this Act. I ask them to come down to particulars. Has the hon. member for North Wellington any objection to the revision of the list in his riding? He says no; he admits that the revising officer endeavoured fairly to discharge his duty. Now, I would ask the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin): Have you any objection to the revising officer there? I will venture to say that the hon. member for South Grey will admit that the revising officer in his constituency did his duty faithfully and honestly, and that he has no complaint. Both lists are revised by the judges, but in the one instance the judge for the district of North Wellington decided that the notice "not qualified," was sufficient in all cases where an effort was made to strike off a name whereas the revising officer in South Grey and in North Grey decided that that was not a fair interpretation of the Act, and that particular grounds should be given in the notice why the person was not qualified. We have had decisions given on both sides to the same effect as that of Judge Elliott. I remember that our friends suffered great losses because they gave notice which did not specify the particular reasons why the persons objected to were not qualified; and for this reason they were thrown out. Our friends also were ruled out on the same grounds. Both parties were satisfied that this was a proper interpretation of the law, and both parties suffered less or more from it. But because the judge in London gives the same decision, he is to be impeached in this House as a partisan of the Government. The hon. member for North Wellington stated that the judge in his case held that such a notice was sufficient. Because the judges differ on such a point, is that any reason for saying that any of them are partisans or creatures of the Government, anxious to favour the side to which they belong? The hon. member for North Wellington says that we object to the revising officers and the returning officers

because they are partisans of the Government appointed by the Government. Does he forget that the sheriffs and registrars are appointed by the Ontario Government? He says that it is claimed on our side that the sheriffs and registrars are partisans in the provincial elections. Surely, in all fairness, if hon. gentlemen opposite want partisans on their side, they ought to concede the same right to us. I do not admit that the revising officers are partisans, but if the argument holds good on one side, it is equally good on the other side. With regard to the judges, the same men act in regard to both the provincial and the Dominion lists, and if you admit that they act fairly in the one case, you must surely also admit that they act fairly in the other case. The judges have to deal between the people in many questions, and I think it is admitted that in all cases, except in one or two in which our Reform friends have claimed that the judges act as partisans, there has been no complaint that the judges do their duties other than fairly and equitably. I do not think it becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to talk so loudly against the judges. When the judges rule against them, it is unfortunate that the hon. gentlemen opposite have to complain of them as being creatures of the Government, who do not faithfully and honestly and righteously decide questions between the two parties, because they happen to be appointed by the Government. When the revising officer decides against them, though he may discharge the same duties in provincial affairs, they complain that he is a creature of the Government. Then, it is held that the Franchise Act is a bad Act because one man has more than one vote, and the hon. member for North Wellington expatiated a long time on the great injustice of men coming from the States to take part in an election. Did he or his friends refuse the 600 men who came over by the Grand Trunk Railway to vote for them? If the principle is wrong, did they condemn it by their actions? No: they were as anxious as our friends to poll every vote. Not only were they ready to bring in persons qualified to vote, but they brought men to personate other men who had no right either to be on the list or to appear at the polls. Then, it is said that the Dominion list is a bad one and the provincial list a good one, and that we ought to have manhood suffrage. Is it not strange, however, that if you compare the provincial list when revised with the Dominion list when revised for the same locality, you will find the largest number of names on the Dominion list? It was so in our part of the country, where everyone admits that the Dominion list, when properly revised, is a much fairer one than the provincial list. The hon. member for North Wellington says that a young man should go on the list when he makes a statutory declaration that he will be of age when the list is revised, whereas the Act requires him to be twenty-one years of age when he makes the application.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. What I stated was that the oath now requires a young man to swear that he is 21 years of age on the final revision of the list.

Mr. SPROULE. The only difference is a difference of a few months, whether he is of age at the time he applies or at the time the list is revised. It does not make the Act a bad one, because the oath provides that he shall be 21 years of age when he applies instead of at the final revision. The Dominion Act requires a declaration that he is 21 years of age, but the Provincial Act requires no declaration whatever.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is stating what is not true. It does not require a declaration by a would-be voter that he is 21 years of age. Any one can put a man on the list by stating that he has a right to vote under the Franchise Act without making any declaration as to his age.

Mr. SPROULE. I think he has to state that he is a British subject, that he is 21 years of age, and that he is possessed of the necessary qualifications; and then the opposite side can object that he is not 21 years, and they can make him prove that he is. This has been done in several instances in our part of the country. The hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that no complaints had been made against the provincial list. Is the hon. member's memory so short that he does not remember there were many valid and strong complaints against this list? Does he not remember that complaints were made against the disqualification of employés of the Dominion Government, and that under the provincial law a large number of people who were owners of property were deprived of voting? Does the hon. gentleman not remember that a large number of Indians were disqualified, although they had a perfect right to vote? Does he not remember that the provincial assessors were claimed to be, many of them, strong partisans, and made their lists more favourable to their friends than to their opponents? He does not recollect these matters, but I may remind him that these furnished very strong reasons in favour of a Dominion franchise and why the list should be controlled by the Dominion itself. The next proposition put forward by the hon. gentleman is that the list is printed by the Printing Bureau, which is under the control of the Government, and that, forsooth, they are the creatures of the Government. Does the hon. gentleman forget that after the first revision of the list it was printed at the newspaper offices throughout the country, and the contention then put forward was that it was most objectionable that the subsidized press should print the voters' lists. It was then held that such a list could not be correct. It was asked how we could imagine that we could get a true list made out when it was prepared by a partisan revising officer and printed by the subsidized press. Now, when the subsidized press no longer prints the list, objection is taken because the work is done at the Government printing bureau. In order to do away with any danger it was decided to print the list at the Printing Bureau. Now the contention is raised, and it appears to be a curious one, that the list prepared at the Printing Bureau cannot be a correct one because it happens to be printed at that bureau. This whole transaction reminds me of the old fable of the wolf and the lamb—an excuse must be made. The wolf said to the lamb: You did so and so at such a time, and therefore I will eat you up. The reply is: It could not be so, because I was not born at the time. The wolf then said: You disturbed the water in the stream where I was drinking. The lamb replied: that could not be the case as I was standing below,

and the water was running from you to me. Then the wolf said: You have done something, and I am bound to eat you up. That is about the size of this case. Hon. gentlemen opposite are bound to object to the Dominion list no matter whether their objections are founded or unfounded, whether the arguments are legitimate or illegitimate.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The wonderful sheep from East Grey.

Mr. SPROULE. I should like to revise the pamphlet in which the hon. gentlemen opposite place themselves in the position of goats on the left of the Speaker. I desire specially to point out that the names are more numerous on the Dominion than on the provincial list in our part of the country, and even friends of the Opposition admit that it was a fair list. These are some of the strong objections raised to the Dominion Franchise Act. In every single instance, I believe, the same arguments would apply with equal, and greater force to the provincial law, and it might be condemned on every ground on which the Dominion list could be susceptible of condemnation. The provincial list is a most unfair one. It is a list which, in our part of the country, turns out to be anything but a correct one. Large numbers of names are left off the list and a number of names that should be on it are omitted, as being under age, or not holding the qualifications they were said to hold until they come down to manhood suffrage. Even the manhood suffrage list does not contain so many names as the Dominion list. The trouble was claimed to be that hon. gentlemen opposite went to the election on an imperfect list, and were defeated. Then the list was revised, and they were again defeated. It is our interest that the list should be revised every year, because four times out of five with our present leader and present policy we would be victorious and we could have no objection to the list being revised. In almost every case the same arguments that have been adduced against the Dominion Act could be used against the provincial list.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am satisfied that if political feeling were abolished you could not find two opinions in this House with respect to the cumbersome character and expense of the Dominion Franchise Act. I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen who will quietly sit down and discuss the matter will come to one opinion. I never met a Conservative who discussed it in a friendly way with another person who could support the Act by any argument. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is as well aware as I am that it is an Act which entails large expense not only on the Government but on both political parties in the revision of the list. I have been frequently told by candidates supporting hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that they would like to see some other plan in operation in this country by which they would be relieved of this heavy expense. The system has cost the Government in round figures $1,000,000 since the Act was passed in 1885. It has cost the country as many more dollars through the candidates on both sides. No less than from $300 to $600 is required every time the list is revised from each of the respective parties in the riding. A further expense of $4,000 is required by the Government in order to defray the expenses of the printing and other costs. In view of these facts there was never any necessity for a change from the old system. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that the local lists were revised by the same parties as revised the provincial lists. The hon. gentleman knows very well that this is not the case. The county judge has very little to do with the local list. In nine cases out of ten it is settled without any reference to him. Then we have reason to believe, that the provincial list is properly revised because certain parties are interested in it who are not animated by any political feelings. Trustees are elected on that list, and special attention is given to these elections. This list is also used with respect to passing by-laws, and every ratepayer, irrespective of political feeling, is in favour of only those being placed on the list who are properly qualified to vote. In the elections of municipal councils this list is used, and it is made as perfect as possible. The result is that the different interests contribute to make the provincial list more complete than the Dominion list can ever be made. Then, it is well known that each province has different views as to the persons who should be enfranchised. In Ontario we have advanced so far, and have become so liberal, that we think every young man on attaining his majority has a right to be clothed in the full power of citizenship, and both parties have been vieing with each other as to which should give manhood suffrage. If this list was left in the hands of the provinces they would decide who should be voters, and whether manhood suffrage was the proper qualification or not. In Quebec Province, however, the people are opposed to manhood suffrage, and that province should have the right to decide what qualification should be laid down as regards young men. Under the present Act one province is handicapped on one side and another province on another. Then, again, in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, they have practically manhood suffrage, and they are not able, on account of this Franchise Act, to extend the same privileges that they believe to be right and proper in these provinces, to those who vote in Dominion elections. I believe it would be far better in the interests of all parties concerned, that these lists should be placed in the hands of the provinces to be dealt with as they were previous to 1885. We had the local lists in Dominion elections for eighteen years, and I do not believe there was as much complaint of the local lists for eighteen years as there has been in regard to the Dominion lists for the last five years. It is well-known also that in some parts of the country the preparation of the Dominion lists are in the hands of the determined opponents of the Liberal party. I have no complaint to make in regard to my own riding. I believe that our revising barrister is an honest man, and we have not much trouble in revising our lists outside of the expense which is attendant upon it; but in some cases where there is a strong political partisan as a county court judge or deputy county court judge, we know that there are strong complaints every year from this side of the House. I need not give you an illustration, but you have one in the city of London, and I might give you other instances to show the strong party leanings which guide and direct the opinions and principles of some gentlemen holding that office. An hon gentleman who supports the

Government stated that we find fault with the lists because we are beaten at the polls. That hon. gentleman must remember that there has not been an election since Confederation at which some side issue was not raised which gave the Conservative party an influence in the country. You will remember that at the very first election in 1867 the non-political cry was raised, in 1878 the National Policy cry was raised, and in 1882 the Conservative party was afraid to go to the country without the Gerrymander Act, by which they hived the Grits as they said, and cut the province into shreds and patches and in such a manner did they carve up the municipalities, so that they could not be compared with anything in the heavens above or on the earth beneath. In 1885, the Conservatives resorted to the Franchise Act in order to give them an influence in the country so that they might have an advantage over the Liberals.

Mr. SPROULE. Look at the provincial lists.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman says, Look at the provincial lists. When we are discussing Dominion questions upon the floor of this House it is only begging the question to point to the action of the Local Legislatures. The question before every member of this House, Conservative and Liberal, is whether or not such a law as the Dominion Franchise Act is in the interests of the country, rather than in the interests of the party. If it is not in the interests of the country, it does not matter to me what the Local Legislatures of this province or the other provinces may do. I hold that the Franchise Act has not been in the interests of the country, and that it is not fair to the Liberal party. It has not been equitable, and if the principle upon which we contest the various constituencies of the country are not fair to both, then I hold that the Conservative party is responsible. Even many of the same political creeds as hon. gentlemen opposite have said that it was not right to place the revision of the lists wholly and entirely in the hands of the supporters of the Government, and under the control of persons holding their offices from the Government. Again, I hold that it is not in the interests of the country to spend such large sums of money as we have spent for the carrying out of this law. Last year $150,000 was required, but I find that in this year's estimates that sum is to be supplemented by $60,000 which makes $210,000 taken out of the coffers of this country this year for the purpose of revising the lists. In addition to that we may add a cost of $600 for each political party in the various constituencies, which makes altogether $339,000 which it costs us every time the lists are revised. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that this is altogether too much money to spend for the carrying out of such a law. During the last five years we have only had three revisions, and a large number of the bye-elections, and one general election, were run on the old lists without their being revised. This Act has cost us about $1,000,000, from the Government and about $1,000,000 from both parties who have taken part in the revision during its operation. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite in all seriousness if they believe that such a system is to the advantage of our country. I believe that if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House put their heads together, they could get up a Franchise Act, perhaps a Dominion one, much purer, much more equitable and less expensive than the one at present on the Statute-book. I hope that strong influence will be brought to bear upon the Government by their own friends, as well as by members on this side of the House, so that they will devote their best attention and judgment to arriving at some conclusion in placing the Franchise law either in the hands of the Provincial Legislatures, or by enacting a new and better measure themselves. It is more in the interests of the people of this country, and more equitable and just, that we should have the same chance before the people as the Conservatives have. I trust that some steps will be taken by the Government to repeal if they will or otherwise to amend this Act.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). It has been said by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the same authorities do revise the list for the Dominion elections, as revise the lists for the provincial elections. Such is not the case. In Ontario it is the municipal councils who prepare the lists, through their township clerks, and the judge has nothing at all to say in it. Although my hon. friend has spoken about partisan assessors, I may say that I believe that in the Province of Ontario there are more Conservatives than Reformers occupying that position.

Mr. SPROULE. Do not the judges revise the lists in appeal?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Just sit still awhile and possess your little soul in patience; it seems to be so small that it is always in your mouth. The revising officers appointed by the Government have in the end to take the lists prepared by the municipal councils, and if the municipal councils do not get out the list in the proper way the people have full power to turn them out of power at the next elections. It matters not what kind of a Dominion list is got out by the revising barristers, for so long as it satisfies the Government they retain these officials. Even after the local lists and the assessment roll have been prepared by the township council, the revising barristers of the Dominion Government have to take these lists as the foundation for their lists. Not only that, but the revising barristers in many townships employ the township clerk to get up the lists; why, then, not take the lists he has got out in the first instance, and have them all revised at one time. In my own riding, in the election of 1892, I have no hesitation in saying that there were two hundred or three hundred farmers disfranchised on account of the lists not being revised for a couple of years before, and a very large number who had no right to vote came into the riding and voted. I hold this is one of the great evils, and we should have the law remedied by all means so as to have only one man one vote, and thereby do away with a great amount of this trouble. Why, we find at every polling place strangers coming to vote whose names had been put on the lists by some means, about whom nobody knows anything, and who declare that they are the individuals mentioned. If we had, as in Ontario, one man one vote, and allow a man to vote only in the riding in which he resides, that would do away with a great deal of the personation now carried on. Apart from everything else, the large amount of money spent ought certainly to be a consideration by any Government which wishes to govern the country economically. I hold that the voters'

lists under this Act cannot be got up as efficiently by a revising officer as by a township clerk; and if there be anything wrong, a judge is more likely to give an independent revision in revising the lists of a court below, made up by another individual, than he would be when he got up the list himself, especially if he is a strong partisan.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Grey has stated that the oftener the lists were revised, the better it was for the Conservative party. That is exactly my opinion. That is exactly what we object to in the Franchise Act, that it is so arranged that the oftener the lists are revised the better it is for the Government. Now I happen to know something about the lists in East Elgin during the late bye-election.

Mr. INGRAM. So do I.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the hon. gentleman does, because his brother sat with the revising officer all the time the lists were being revised, and supplied him with the necessary information. Not only that, but I have it on good authority, from the agents of both parties in two districts, at least in the township of Bayham in that riding, that after the lists had been finally revised by the judge and it had gone back from the Printing Bureau, and after the proofs were read by the judge, names were left off and put on before it was finally printed. That is a matter which will require thorough investigation; I merely refer to it now to show what is possible under the Act. The hon. member's brother, not only gave his whole time to the revision of the list in that riding, but sat with the judge at the reading of the proof, and saw the whole thing through. Of course the other side was represented also, and I do not make a charge that the hon. member or his brother did anything unfair, but merely wish to point out that he had special sources of information with regard to the working of the Act. With regard, however, to the other, point, as to names being left off after the list was finally revised, after it was printed and the proof read, I think there is room for suspicion.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has insinuated that myself or my brother had undue advantage in the preparing of the lists. I beg to say that at the time, in the city of St. Thomas, the representatives of my opponent complimented my brother for the fairness with which he had done his work and also the revising officer for the very fair manner in which he had carried out his duty. With regard to the township of Bayham and the two divisions referred to by the hon. gentleman, in connection with which he said that after the proof-sheets came to Ottawa certain names which were on the list were removed and others substituted, I deny that statement and I challenge the hon. gentleman to prove it. Objections have been made also that certain names did not appear on the list after they returned from Ottawa. The revising officer, when he received the proof-sheets from the Printing Bureau, called my brother who represented me and called also the representative of my opponent, and they both went deliberately over the list. My brother, in my interests and that of the party I represented, took care that none of our friends were omitted, as it was his right and his duty to do. But the gentlemen on the other side, not having attended the revision, as my brother had, from the commencement to the end, but having, on the other hand, sent a certain representative to one court and another to another, thus rendering themselves unable to say truthfully that such a name should be left off and such another one should be put on, were at a disadvantage in this respect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say he is now speaking of a period after the list had been revised and printed?

Mr. INGRAM. I say that when the lists were sent to Ottawa, as revised by the revising officer---

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Finally revised?

Mr. INGRAM. No. Then the proof-sheets were sent back in case any corrections required to be made, and after the corrections were made they were to be returned to the Printing Bureau.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And that is the time the hon. gentleman says his brother took care no Conservatives were omitted.

Mr. INGRAM. When those sheets were returned to the revising officer, he called the representatives of both parties to court, and both went over the list with the officer, comparing the proof with a copy of the list sent to the Bureau, and that comparison was made in the presence of representatives of both parties—also from their notes, which, I believe, was quite right. Any names omitted or left on the list by error of the printers, were corrected by the revising officer in the presence of the representatives of both sides. Now, with reference to the dissatisfaction my hon. friend spoke of, I have heard on many occasions friends of the hon. gentleman charge the Conservative party in the East Riding of Elgin with having stuffed the voters' list, but I will tell my hon. friend that by systematic work, by careful attention to the preparation of the lists, we succeeded doing justice to ourselves. I have the names in every polling sub-division, Conservative and Reform. This is prepared systematically. We keep a correct note of every name omitted and added, whether Conservative or Reform, it is not a fact that we stuffed the list or did anything of the kind. With respect to the expense of the voters' list, I quite agree it is expensive, but I do not see that the preparation of the provincial voters' list is any less expensive, while on the other hand much has been said about having the lists prepared by partisans of the Government. I remember a few years ago, when I ran as a candidate for the Local Legislature, I did my best to get as many of the young men put on the list as I could, but I found some of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite trying to prevent those young men from getting on the list, and yet they pretend to be liberal in their views, and to wish to have every one who ought to be on the list placed upon it. As to manhood suffrage, I remember some years ago, when the Conservatives in the Local Legislature of Ontario advocated manhood suffrage and the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite opposed that measure, but finally they were compelled to grant it. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) stated that he believed in the one-man-one-vote principle. I take the other ground. As long as we have a property qualification, I believe that it is not right, but, if we adopt manhood suffrage, I would be in favour of the principle of one man one vote. I trust this will be the last we shall hear in reference

to the Elgin lists, because it is not correct to say that the revising officer in that county acted with partiality.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say that he acted with partiality. I simply pointed out the peculiar process which was followed, that one of the candidates was able to see the proofs of the lists, and that, after those proofs were sent down for printing, they were corrected here.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am very glad to hear that the Government contemplate amending the Franchise Act. Nearly every one who has to do with politics is pretty well acquainted with the Franchise Act of Canada. I would not like to say all I think of it, because I am afraid I would be offensive and I do not wish to be offensive, because I understand the Government are going to amend that Act. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite say they want to have a fair Act, so that every one who ought to be on the list should be on it. The whole thing is that everybody on the Liberal side wants to get every one belonging to that party on the list, and every one on the Tory side wants to get every Liberal on the list put off. This is a partisan measure from beginning to end—there is no doubt about it—and it gives more premiums for party fighting than any measure ever introduced into the Parliament of Canada. I have been thinking about this party spirit. Party is the curse of Canada. Political feeling to-day is the curse of Canada. I do not say that because I happen to be in the minority, but I say it from the experience we all have, that this party feeling blinds us to the best interests of this country, and it muzzles us with regard to our duty in these matters. I think this Franchise Act is a most imperfect Act. In the first place, the authorities you appoint to make up the lists are the least qualified you can possibly imagine. You cannot find a revising barrister who knows anything about the persons who should go on the list except in the locality where he resides. The only way to get at that is from local knowledge, and that local knowledge extends over a very small area. Take the County of Charlotte, which I have represented for many years. I can tell who ought to vote in the parish in which I live, but I cannot tell that in the 15 or 16 other parishes where I do not know anything as to the qualification of the voters. We have a very good revising barrister in that county. He is the county judge. But, when he goes into a part of the county in which he does not live, he does not know the people there, their sons or their daughters. He has to get the information from the people who are there. When he goes into the parish of St. George, he has to get the information from somebody living there, and so in regard to every polling sub-division in the county. It is the same thing all over the Dominion. These revising officers are the least qualified persons who could be found, and you could not get anybody to perform that work properly except some one living in the locality. The best way is the English way, that is to adopt the assessment list. Everyone of 21 years of age who pays the county rates is put on the list, and no one escapes unless he is disqualified for some reason. I am glad to know the Government intend to improve this Act. They can do a great service to the country if they make this Act what it ought to be. It gives the party in power the advantage. I do not mean to say that every revising officer who is appointed does an injustice. Perhaps the majority are disposed to do what is right, but the Government can select any villain they choose—it is in their power to do it—but, no matter how honest a man may be, when you find 15 or 20 polling sub-divisions and find that your opponent does not want you to succeed, though the officers may be honest, they do not want to take a distinct course in your favour. I think the Government can afford to be honest and fair in this matter now. They have a large majority, and they will continue to have it during this parliament, and this Act works hard both ways. The idea that two candidates should have to spend hundreds of dollars each in order to get the proper lists made is a preposterous one. We have heard of some cases where young people of 16, 18, 19 and 20 years of age have been put on the lists. Well, human nature is the same all the way through. You will hear the Tories and Liberals alike talking this way—one says: We got the advantage: and then you will hear the other say: We got the advantage. There should be no such advantage given to either side, and there should be no such burden put on any people. If there is anything that ought to be simple, if there is anything that ought to be cheap, if there is anything that ought to be pure, it is the voters' list, and it ought to be made on the cheapest and simplest and the fairest system that can be adopted. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a party measure. I was here during the long weeks and months that it was being discussed; it was a party measure from beginning to end. I believe that a good deal can be said in favour of a Dominion franchise, and I would not find so much fault with it, although I think a provincial franchise is the best, upon the whole, and the cheapest. If we had manhood suffrage and no other qualification at all as the basis of registration of voters, then very little harm could be done. One party could not take advantage of the other to any great extent. One man one vote is the true principle, in my humble opinion. I said, when I commenced my remarks, that party was the curse of this country. It does not require much intelligence to be a good party man. It does not require any moral principle at all to be a good party man, and this country is getting filled up with party men. I do not mean to say that some of them are not intelligent; but I mean that partyism is cursing Canada, and it is making politics a game, not a game of chance, but a game of bluff and of cheek, from one end of Canada to the other. Men are blinded by party; our legislation takes too much the form of party legislation. Of course, we all want to succeed, there is no doubt about that; but in this age of the world, and in a country calling itself christianized and civilized, there ought to be fair-play, and when we start out in the race, we ought to be men enough on both sides of politics to let every man start fair and equal in the race. We talk that way, but we do not act that way. We are so blinded by party that we do not give expression to our opinion, the electors do not, and party feeling has gone on until Canada is rotten to the core.

Mr. MURRAY. I desire to express my disapprobation of this Franchise Act. I felt the first time

it was placed on the statutes, that it was an unnecessary piece of legislation. I felt it would be expensive, and experience must have convinced everybody in Canada that such has been the result. Now, to say that it has been fair and that it has enabled the people of Canada to exercise their franchise fully, is going beyond the truth. I know in my county during the past election, the list of 1889 was used, and a good many electors were disfranchised. Now, I do not see why, if we are to have a Dominion Franchise Act, we should not have one that would be simplified in some way, that would be less expensive, and give everybody the right to exercise his franchise. There is no question that as the Act now stands, and as the lists are now revised, the people are under the impression that there is too much party connected with it, because these men who are appointed as revising officers are not only paid high salaries for their services but they are supposed to be active partisans. But whether they are partisans or not, such is the opinion of the electors generally. As has been remarked here to-night there are many Conservatives who are honest enough to admit that the Act should be abolished. Many independent papers, even Conservative papers, think that the Act should be abolished. I am glad that the Government intend to change the Act, and I trust they will make it more fair and less expensive. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) made a very practical speech. He said that the Government are now pretty strong, they have a large majority in the House, and they can afford to be just to their opponents. I am of the opinion that this Act is used as a lever to maintain the present party in power. I take the position that it does not enable the people to express their opinion freely upon the National Policy or any other question. I say that it should be removed from the Statute-book as speedily as possible, and we should either revert to the provincial list, or adopt some Dominion Franchise Act that would be more simple and less expensive. There is no question that the Provincial Franchise Act of Ontario is a good one; it is broad and liberal, and it gives young men, farmers' sons and mechanics' sons, a right to vote under a property qualification of $100, whereas the Dominion Act requires a property qualification of $150. I know that in the County of Renfrew alone there are hundreds of men who are qualified under the provincial lists, that are disqualified on the Dominion lists. It is impossible to say that an election on the present Dominion list fairly represents the opinions of the people of this country, as many men are disfranchised by what I call this infamous Franchise Act. At present, candidates or members are put to the expense of going round to attend the revision of these lists. Take the county I represent. One of the gentlemen whom I defeated in the last election, took the trouble to engage men in the different municipalities to go around and see that all his supporters were placed on the list. I had not the time to go and bother with it. I would like to see every man in the country on the voters' list; I do not care whether he is a political opponent or not, as long as everybody is on, I would be perfectly satisfied. You can put a man on the list, but the next question is, how is he going to vote? As the saying is, you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink. I would be quite willing to leave it to the good sense of the electors how to vote, if only they could all be placed upon the list; I would be satisfied with the result, either as a candidate myself, or for the party with which I am in sympathy.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had no intention in taking any part in this debate, because, although I feel the expense attached to the revision of these lists very much, I never felt any great injustice from the revising officer who, in my county, is the county court judge. I do not think that in those counties where the county court judge is appointed revising barrister, injustice is done, as a rule. But I could not help rising after the explanation made by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). I have never been able to understand, when hon. gentlemen behind me spoke of the grievous injustice which was perpetrated on them from time to time by the revising officers, how it could be done; I could not believe it possible that a revising officer would fly right in face of the statute and act in a manner which would make him amenable, almost, to the criminal law. That man is a sworn officer, and if I understand the hon. gentleman aright and the explanations he has made to the House, the conduct of his revising officer is such that I do not think the Government ever should reappoint him again. Sir, the law provides that there shall be a preliminary list, and that, after certain formalities are gone through, that list shall be finally revised. That list has to be finally revised after the revising officer has gone the rounds of his district, and it is to be revised in open court, and when it is finally revised in open court, where parties on both sides have the opportunity of seeing that no injustice is done, then the revising officer makes his complete list out and forwards a copy to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, keeping a duplicate copy himself; and from that moment his judicial function ceases. I understood from the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that this is only by-play, an act in the drama, and that the real revision takes place in secret, long after the proceedings in open court are closed.

Mr. INGRAM. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman need not say "no." I followed him very closely, and I was astonished at his remark; and indeed I asked him whether I understood him correctly or not. The section provides that the revision of the list shall take place by the revising officer in open court at a time and place announced. Having finally revised the list the revising officer is to make duplicate copies. In East Elgin the farce is gone through of sitting in open court and the revising officer making a duplicate copy, which is sent to the Queen's Printer. Then comes in the real work. My brother, says the hon. gentleman, attends every one of the revision courts, and he keeps his notes—not the notes of the revising officer—and when the list comes back from the Queen's Printer, it is amended, altered and added to according to my brother's notes.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not make that statement or anything like it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The leader of the House acted very wrongly in telling the hon. gentleman to sit down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not tell him to sit down.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the Minister of Justice deny that he told the hon. gentleman to sit down, and not to answer?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I most distinctly heard the hon. gentleman interrupt and tell him to say nothing further.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said: that will do.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I asked the hon. gentleman whether that was correct, and he was about to answer me. The hon. gentleman is afraid to let him reply.

Mr. INGRAM. I am quite prepared to take care of myself in the matter of the voters' list or anything else. If the hon. gentleman does not think so, and if he will come to the next revision of our voters' list, I will teach him a lesson.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not doubt that the hon. gentleman is capable of teaching me a lesson I never imagined for a moment that I could go to a revising officer and alter, amend and add to the list finally settled by him. The hon. gentleman could teach a great many lawyers a lesson evidently. We imagined that when this list was finally settled, all the revising officer had to do, when the printed copy was sent to him, was to have a duplicate copy made, but it appeared that the list was not verified by the duplicate copies but by his brother's notes. The advantage that his brother had was said to be due to the fact that he attended all of the revision courts, while his opponent had different lawyers at different courts, and they could not amend the list as well by those notes. That is the statement of the hon. gentleman, and when he reads *Hansard* he will find it to be so. So I do not wonder at the occurrences that take place every year when the revision is made. If the hon. gentleman's views are brought to the notice of the head of the Government that revising officer will not have the duty of revising the list at another time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. What the hon. member for Elgin said was exactly the reverse of what the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) stated. What the hon. member for Elgin said was, that when the revising officer has made his revision, a copy of it, in so far as that statement was concerned, was sent to the Queen's Printer. It was printed; and sent back for correction, and the revising officer corrected that proof in the presence of both parties; but the brother of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram), representing the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, and some one representing the other side, were present and that proof was corrected in the presence of both parties. Out of that language the hon. member for Queen's made the statement that the hon. member for Elgin had represented that the revision was mere by-play, that his brother did all after the proof was revised.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) From his notes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Upon that the hon. member for Elgin rose to contradict the hon. member for Queen's. I thought it sufficient for the time, that my hon. friend Mr. Ingram should say that he had been misunderstood on this point and misrepresented, or whatever else suggested itself to him; and I thought a lengthy explanation would be better later on in the debate. So the hon. gentleman's imputation that I interfered with the hon. member for Elgin is entirely incorrect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It will now be in order for the hon. gentleman to rise and explain in what way I misrepresented him.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will find it in *Hansard*.

Mr. FLINT. I desire to offer a few remarks before the debate closes. When I moved for an Order of the House for this return I did not anticipate the discussion would take so wide a range as it has done, and I considered that when the report was brought down an opportunity would be afforded to discuss the matter with the return before us. I think the few observations I made in opening this discussion have been justified by the remarks that have fallen from members on both sides of the House. It has been clearly shown that the Franchise Act is exceedingly cumbersome and very inconvenient, that it places the candidates of both parties at great and unnecessary expense, and then it opens the door widely to opportunities for partisanship wherever it may exist. I have been gratified, as many members of the House have been gratified, in listening to the statements made with respect to the manner in which the revising officers discharge their duty, especially the county judges, against whom no serious complaints have been made, and, as regards the revising officer of my district, I can award the same praise to him. But, at the same time, we are aware that where the revising officer is a strong partisan, and where parties are pretty equally divided in a constituency, there is too much litigation over the placing of names on the list. Each name becomes the subject of a separate piece of litigation; subpœnas have to be served, witnesses have to be procured and examined, and there is much contention and delay before a name is placed on the list. The late election in the city of London is only a flagrant instance of what can be done when partisanship has reached a particular stage, and where, owing to technicalities, it must always be admitted on both sides of the House, at all events it is admitted by the independent press, that great and flagrant injustice has been committed in connection with that election. There is one matter to which I desire to call the attention of the House, and it is one to which I referred last session, and one in regard to which, I think, in the event of any revision of the Franchise Act, the Government should take some steps to see that a state of things to which I am about to refer, does not take place. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) is aware that I charge that in his own constituency the revising officer is his legal partner, and although I know nothing whatever against the uprightness or capacity of the hon. gentleman's partner, yet as a matter of public principle or policy it is not wise either for him, or the hon. gentleman himself, or his constituents, that the revising officer should be a partner in business and a close personal ally of the Government candidate, or any other candidate. The Minister of Justice informed me that the law made no provision either for dismissing or retaining as returning officer the partner of a member of Parliament or of any candidate, I think that in any revision of the Franchise Act there should be a

distinct proviso that where the revising officer is a partner in the business of the candidate, or of the person who proposes to be a candidate, that it should disqualify the candidate from running in that election, because it leaves the officer open to very grave suspicion, and leaves the constituency open to be very seriously injured in case the feeling, not only of partnership, but of professional business relation should influence the revising officer to any extent. I am aware that the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) informed the House that in this particular case the relation of partner did not exist: but I have in my hands ample proof that it does exist, and I should like to hear from that hon. gentleman what explanation he would make of the open and public business relation which is known to subsist between himself and the revising barrister. I do not make this complaint from any personal reason, but I do so because it has been represented to me by gentlemen in that constituency that they do not deem it fair or right that the partner of the sitting member and of the probable candidate should be the revising barrister. That gentleman is the partner of the present member for the electoral district adjoining my own. I think this can scarcely be doubted, because I have under my hand a copy of an affidavit made by that hon. gentleman in litigation in the Province of Nova Scotia, in which he states that this gentleman is his partner. The affidavit begins in this way:

"I, Nathaniel W. White, of the town and county of Shelburne, barrister-at-law and member of the firm of White & Blanchard, attorneys for the defendants, make oath, &c., &c."

I have also business letters in the handwriting of the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) in which the name of the firm of White & Blanchard is lithographed at the head, and the name of the hon. gentleman himself is signed at the bottom. I have also letter heads of the professional firm to which the hon. gentleman belongs, and in which these gentlemen are both stated to be partners in that firm. I have also a copy of the standing advertisement of that firm published in the newspaper of the town in which the hon. gentleman resides, and in which both these gentlemen are held out to the world as being professional partners. Although perhaps my hon. friend may say he is not to blame in this matter, and that he became a candidate after the partnership existed, yet I say that in justice to him, to his constituency, and to the revising barrister, there should be an amendment made in the law which would prevent any relationship of that kind existing between a member of Parliament and the revising barrister of the county which he represents. The great obstacle as has been said by my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) in regard to our elections is that there seems to be no place in which the strongest partisanship does not exist and that from the making up of the electoral lists to the declaration of the poll, the whole machinery is in the hands of violent partisans on one side or the other. I think that it is the duty of the Government of this country, if they wish to pose before the people as genuine statesmen, guided by an honourable desire to see that the will of the people is equitably registered, that they should amend this Act on the lines pointed out by some of my hon. friends on this side of the House. It is not for us to indicate the details on which this Act should be amended, although many hon. gentlemen have endeavoured to indicate their individual preferences on that point. I think it would be very easy for the Government, if they gave attention to the subject, to frame a Franchise Act which should be fair to both sides, and which would not be open to the charges made against it of being partisan and one-sided, and capable of being made an instrument of tyranny in the hands of those who occupy the Treasury benches. Let us have one place in the wide domain of our political life where partisanship may be excluded. We boast to a certain degree that partisanship is excluded from the bench in this country, but we find that owing to the intimate relations between the electorate and the judiciary, that charges are made with more or less reason affecting high dignitaries. This must be inevitable, considering their relations to the election law. When we register the will of the people we should have that will registered free from partisan bias. In this particular I have called the attention of the Government to the improper relations which some of the revising barristers occupy with reference to elections. I believe that when this return is brought down it will give the House information which will afford hon. gentlemen further food for thought. In opening my remarks I said that the great expense of the operation of this Act has resulted in serious injury to good government. No one can doubt that the enormous expense in revising the electoral lists was the reason we had not a perfect list at the last general election. It was estimated by some statistician, and not seriously denied, that 100,000 voters who ought to have been legally qualified were not able to vote at that election, because the list had not been revised for three years. I know that in one polling section of my county there were 35 names upon the list of electors who were either dead or who had removed permanently from the county, and in that small polling section of about 200 votes 35 or 40 properly qualified electors were denied the privilege of voting. This unfortunate result, as admitted by the Government, is owing to the enormous expense of $500,000 that would be entailed on the country by the revision of the list. I believe that it is high time that this unfair and expensive law should be wiped from the Statute-book, or greatly amended in the direction of fairness, cheapness and simplicity.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I should not have risen this evening to say anything upon the question of the Franchise Act had it not been for the attack which has been made upon me, and upon the revising officer in my county by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). It would have been quite unnecessary for me to say anything upon the franchise, because the arguments we have heard to-night, and the statements to which we have listened from the other side, were only a repetition and a rehash of what we heard last session. Notwithstanding the charge made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), I have but little to add now to the truthful statement which I made last session when the same question was put to me and to which I still adhere. After that answer was made by me, notwithstanding that the *Morning Chronicle*, the Liberal organ in the Province of Nova Scotia, day after day and week after week, had articles in its columns of the most abusive character,

doing everything possible to induce some of my constituents to follow up the slander, I am proud to say that not a single Liberal belonging to the county put anything into the newspaper either over his own signature or over an anonymous one, criticising the statement I made or finding fault with the revising barrister in the County of Shelburne. More than that, Sir, I hold in my hand a letter written to the revising officer by one of the principal Liberal organizers in the county and an uncle of the late candidate against me, Mr. Thomas Robertson. In it he says:

"I have to say that while I am not at all in sympathy with the expensive and complicated machinery known as the Franchise Act, I, at the same time, have no fault to find with the treatment I received at your hands as revising officer during the last revision, either with regard to the applications sent forward by me for others, or in the two courts I attended at Barrington and Cape Island. In both of these courts I think your ruling was the same, and carried out impartially towards each side. In this, Mr. Andrew Robertson, who attended both courts, concurs with me."

Mr. Andrew Robertson is another prominent Liberal, and a near relative of the defeated candidate. I have another letter from Mr. T. W. Covert, a Liberal councillor in Barrington, who expresses his perfect satisfaction with the revision, and his astonishment that any one should find fault with the revising officer or the revision. I may say further, with respect to the county, that not only has the revising officer done his duty there, not only is the voters' list satisfactory to both sides, but the returning officer has discharged his duties satisfactory, so much so that resolutions have been passed at public meetings, moved by the candidates of one party and seconded by the candidates of the other party, expressing their entire satisfaction with the manner in which he discharged his duties. I may say more. One-half of the deputy returning officers in the county during the elections were Liberals and one-half Conservatives, and nobody has found fault with the manner in which those gentlemen performed their duties under the Franchise Act.

Mr. DAWSON. I think that all hon. gentlemen who have had anything to do personally with the revision of the lists must agree with much that has been said on this side of the House as to the expensiveness and clumsiness of the present Franchise Act, the difficulty in securing a just list, and the enormous expense attending the revision. Now, this opinion is not confined wholly to hon. members on this side. During the revision in the county which I have the honour to represent, the Conservatives were represented by a young barrister from Kingston named R. W. Shannon, who is now the editor of the Ottawa *Citizen*, the Government organ at the capital. After the revision, he wrote a letter to the local Conservative paper, which, with the permission of the House, I will read. The letter expressed his views of the Franchise Act, and I suppose they are his views to-day. He writes from Kingston on the 23rd of October, 1891, to the Kingston *Daily News*:

"SIR,—At the present time and for six months past the revising barristers have been engaged upon the correction of the voters' lists under the Dominion Electoral Franchise Act, and in every county in Canada many persons have been devoting time and labour to the same object, for the purpose of advancing the interests of the respective political parties. I believe the consensus of opinion among those who have had such experience of the actual operation of the Act will be that it is complicated, expensive and unsatisfactory.

"There is reason in the contention that the basis of the franchise should be identified for every part of the Dominion, otherwise a representative might be sent to Parliament from Ontario by the votes of men who in Quebec or Prince Edward Island would be disqualified were it not for this difficulty. Were Quebec possessed of a municipal system similar to ours, and were the qualifications demanded of voters in municipal elections the same in every province, it would undoubtedly be a measure of wisdom and economy to adopt for federal purposes the voters' lists prepared by the municipal authorities.

"Many Conservatives fear the results which might flow from leaving their rights as electors to the tender mercy of the Grit assessors. They believe that their opponents are more bigotted and unscrupulous than themselves, that they carry party spirit into all the concerns of social and civic life, and that when appointed to public office they use their position to forward party ends. This belief may not be altogether without foundation: enough instances might probably be found to point a moral or adorn a tale. Yet there is a sense of fair-play in the best of the average man which may be confidently addressed, and may be depended upon to prevent him from becoming incorrigibly dishonest. If every one who desires to see impartial justice practised by public servants will commence by himself taking his stand upon high principle when occupying a public office, and will make it his own concern to treat friend and foe, Grit and Tory, alike, a sentiment must arise under which a partial and dishonest official will become rare. At all events it would be much easier to watch and prosecute conscienceless assessors, and take the necessary proceedings for having their mistakes corrected by the county judge, than it is to operate the present Franchise Act.

"The statute has, it is true, furnished an approximately uniform franchise, but it has failed to secure two other qualities not less important, namely, simplicity and cheapness. The amount of time, labour and expense demanded for the revision of the lists can scarcely be estimated by those who have not been actively engaged in the work, and this cost is but poorly repaid by the uncertain, hurried and haphazard manner in which, at the final revision, the business of the court is despatched without being transacted.

"If the obstacles to the adoption of the municipal voters' lists are found to be insuperable, it will not, in my opinion, be long before Parliament will supersede the present system by the introduction of universal suffrage, with an easy and inexpensive system of registration.

"R. W. SHANNON."

Now, I cannot agree with Mr. Shannon's evident distrust of the municipal assessors. He seems to lose sight of the fact that the Liberals are willing to place their lists at the mercy of the Conservative assessors. The difference between Liberals and Conservatives appears to be this: that while the Conservative principle is a distrust of the people tempered with fear, the Liberal principle is a trust of the people tempered with discretion. Now, we are willing to trust a revision of the list in the hands of the Conservative assessors, and our friends on the opposite side of the House ought to be willing to trust such assessors as may differ from them in political faith. At any rate, I think Mr. Shannon voices the opinion of all on this side of the House, and I am sure, if they would speak up honestly about it, many on the other side who have had actual experience in the working of the Franchise Act. It is clumsy, it is expensive; the net result of it is inaccurate lists; it fails to enfranchise all those entitled to vote. As a matter of fact it enfranchises nobody whose interests are not looked after by his political friends. Young men especially, knowing the intricate machinery which they must use in order to get their names placed on the list, will not take the initiative step themselves; and unless some friend looks after their interests, they will not be on the list as it now stands. I think some amendment ought to be made, and the most practical one is to abolish the present Franchise Act.

Mr. FORBES. I had not intended to make any remarks on this subject, but I have heard so many members on the Government side of the House express pride in the revising barristers of their several districts that I wish for a few moments, to call the attention of the House to the possibility of unfair practices being carried on by these officials. In the County of Queen's, N.S., we have a perfect daisy for a revising barrister. He not only revised the lists to suit himself and boasted of it, but after he had finished he took the public platform and stumped the county against his opponents, my friends and myself. During this last campaign he met the friends of the Liberal party on six or seven public platforms in public discussion. I believe as a whole the Act may be fairly worked, but if you put its working into the hands of improper and unfair men, they may make tremendously bad use of it, and I believe some of them have done so in the County of Queen's. The lists were made up by the revising barrister, and for the first and only time I know of, great use was made of that section of the law providing that the revising barrister may give "reasonable notice." After the list is made up from the assessment roll of the county, additional names are added under the Act. Then the revising officer gets these preliminary lists printed and posts up notice of the holding of the final courts of revision. It then becomes the duty of any elector who desires to have names struck off to give two weeks' notice to the revising barrister and also to the elector whose name he wishes to have removed. I was the only person in Queen's County who got the fortnight's notice. My opponent, the unfortunate petitioner, tried to strike my name off but failed. I am bound to say the revising barrister took advantage of the section of the Act allowing him to give reasonable notice and struck off twenty or thirty names in this way. A man gave him a list of names to be added. No objection was made to the applicants and they did not necessarily attempt to prove their qualification, but their names had been put upon that list by virtue of a declaration solemnly made by their agents on their behalf, they being men engaged in mining and lumbering generally. Within twelve hours and even less time of the holding of his court by means of a henchman of the Tory party, the revising officer caused notices to be served upon those gentlemen who had made the declarations, advising them that exception was taken to these fifteen or more names, and that unless proof was given to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock they would be struck from the list. He gave notice that the court would be held at a certain house and then adjourned the court without notice to another place, where he opened the court sharp at 10 o'clock. The man on whom the notice had been served appeared, and asked for time to enable him to see those persons and obtain the necessary proofs, and issue his subpœnas, but the revising barrister refused to allow him any delay or to accept any excuse, and struck off the names. He claimed this right under the section giving him power to serve reasonable notice. Again, the revising barrister would require extraordinary proof. In one or two cases, men who were on the list on income qualification, and who could not attend in person, sent witnesses to prove their qualification. One or two of the men whose evidence proved the qualification were struck off, because their witnesses were unable to swear they were present at the birth of these men and the officer contended that, although the witnesses could swear they had known the men from infancy to have always resided in Nova Scotia, still that was not sufficient to make them proper witnesses to prove the applicants to be British subjects. Now, I hold that the revising barrister of the County of Shelburne acted unjustly in his position, and I take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Shelburne to-night. Last year that hon. gentleman said: "He was not a partner of that revising barrister," but this year he justifies the action of the revising officer by saying he has done it fairly. How can a man do fairly and honestly when he has committed a flagrant breach of the law, both in spirit and letter? I claim that the hon. member has no right to justify the action of the revising officer in the way he has. Clause 11 of the Act reads as follows:

"The following persons shall be disqualified as incompetent to vote at any election to which this Act applies except that the persons or officers named in paragraph *b* of this section shall only be disqualified and incompetent to vote at elections for the electoral districts for which they hold such offices or positions respectively."

Section 12 says:

"No revising officer for any electoral district, while he is a revising officer, or for two years thereafter, shall be qualified to be a candidate in any electoral district for which, or for any part of which, he has been such revising officer."

Those two sections taken together must surely carry the implication that Parliament intended that no person who could possibly exercise any control over the electoral list should have the right to be a candidate for a seat in the House of Commons. I claim that the revising barrister of the County of Shelburne is a duly qualified partner of the member for that county. I hold in my hand an affidavit sworn to by the hon. member on the 25th March, 1885, in which he says he is a member of the firm of White & Blanchard. I may say here that Mr. Blanchard is the revising barrister. I have here a copy of an advertisement in a newspaper signed W. C. Blanchard, revising barrister. I have also a letter signed by the hon. member for Shelburne himself on a paper headed by himself and the revising barrister for that county as a firm of lawyers. I have further the affidavit of the sheriff of the county, Geo. W. McLean, of Shelburne, making oath, "that Frank Blanchard, the defendant in this cause and the partner in law of N. W. White," called on me, &c. That was after the lists had been revised and at the time the lists were being revised the same condition of things existed. I do not hesitate to say that it was quite possible and very likely the revising barrister acted fairly and justly in the administration of his duty, and I have no hesitation in adding that I believe the hon. member for Shelburne would be above exercising influence on his partner in his position of revising barrister; but I do say this, that the man himself is capable of being easily influenced, not only in consequence of his position but owing to the gifts nature has given him. He is a man susceptible to the slighest degree of influence and is a perfect slave of party. He must know that his association with the hon. member for Shelburne would tend to give and could not fail to influence his judgment, no matter how inclined he might be to act impartially, because it was almost impossible for a man to stand in a position like that and act in an unbiassed manner. When the Act

was put on the Statute-book the intention was to have a fair revision: All those who could possibly be benefited by the action of the revising officer were purposely excluded, not only by the spirit of the Act but its letter as well from being candidates, and I claim that the hon. member for Shelburne should call upon his partner, before another revision is made, to resign his position, and if the hon. gentleman does not, it is the duty of the Government to ask that revising officer to step down and out. Likewise I would ask the Government to call on the returning officer for Queen's to step down and out of his position, though I am bound to say I think he offset the injury he did me on the list by the injury he did his party on the platform. I think that the Franchise Act itself is capable of great possibilities of being improperly and unjustly used by an unfair man, and it is against these things that the Government should guard. They should see that, when the spirit and the letter of the Act are broken, it is their duty to prevent any repetition of such action. Some hon. gentlemen have spoken in favour of amending this Act and preventing these things being done by partisan revising officers. For my part, I would like to see this whole thing wiped out. It is a cumbersome and uselessly expensive Act. In the election of 1891, many young men who were desirous of casting their votes were disfranchised. I think the local lists at present are carefully made up by the municipal councils, who are more directly in contact with the people and who know better who are qualified to vote or not than any revising officer, and I think they would be better qualified to make the lists. I would also like to see manhood suffrage adopted. I would like to see every man of twenty-one years of age have a right to vote, and, under the grand system of education we have in Nova Scotia, every young man understands the questions of the day, and would be rightly entitled to exercise properly the franchise.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all reports and correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Superintendents of the different services of the Intercolonial Railway, in reference to an accident to a train at Truro, in charge of Conductor H. D. Archibald, and his subsequent dismissal.—(Mr. Patterson, Colchester.)

Return showing the number of men employed on and in connection with the Intercolonial Railway during the last year ending the 30th June, 1891, as follows:—The number employed in manufacturing and repair shops, on or in connection with the line, and the amount of wages paid; the number of officials employed on or in connection with the line, including all salaried officers, as well as station masters and assistants, telegraph operators, baggagemen, porters, and all other officials of every kind, and the amount of wages paid: the number of labourers employed, including all trackmen and switchmen employed thereon, and the wages paid.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the total amount of liabilities incurred by the Dominion under any Statutes or Votes of Parliament, whether for unpaid railway subsidies, unfinished public works, or other purposes.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Copy of all correspondence between the Returning Officers and the President of the Council or other member of the Government, or any Departmental Officer, in relation to the elections of Members to the House of Commons or to the conduct of the elections in 1891 and 1892.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 5th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) moved:

That the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to Friday, the 29th inst., in accordance with the recommendation contained in the ninth report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No 59) to incorporate the Ottawa Valley Railway Company. (Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.)

WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. BOWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) respecting aid by United States wreckers in Canadian waters.

Mr. MILLS. Explain.

Mr. BOWELL. I explained the Bill when I introduced it, but I have no objection to repeat it. I would suggest that if any hon. gentleman wishes further delay we will not go into committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Minister has no objection, I hope he will delay going into committee for another day.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection. I know the hon. gentleman takes an interest in this subject, and that is why I threw out the suggestion of postponing the second stage.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have received a communication from a gentleman interested in this subject. I have just returned after an absence of some days, and I was looking into the matter a moment ago. If it makes no difference I would have the case better in hand after a day or two than at this moment.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

THE PILOTAGE ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 10) to amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the object of section 1.

Mr. TUPPER. It simply exempts vessels up to 120 tons, whereas the old Act exempted vessels up to only 80 tons.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Supreme Court of Canada—Additional third-class clerk, three months.....$250

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This amount is to provide for 3 months' salary for the librarian, whose annual salary was passed in the main Estimates.

Exchequer Court—Amount required to complete the payment of printing and binding and distributing Vol. 2 of the Exchequer Court Reports.....$600

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the main Estimates we reduced the usual item of $1,600 for the Exchequer Court Reports to $1,000, but I find that the state of the printing is such that the other $600 will be needed. The item of $25 is to put the Registrar of the Exchequer Court on the footing of a chief clerk. His salary was fixed by statute at $2,000 a year, and the requisite number of years having elapsed which would entitle him to a salary of $2,000 if he had entered at $1,800 a year, we propose to let him go on as chief clerk until he reaches a salary of $2,400.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The other day I brought to the attention of the leader of the House the condition in which the publication of the Supreme Court Reports is. I find in the statement brought down to the House, that it is impossible for the reporters to say when the work in connection with the report will be overtaken. It states that the rate of progress which is now going on, and with the new material going into the hands of the printers, it will take a long time before the printing is disposed of. I do not think this delay is very creditable to the Printing Bureau, and the Minister of Justice will see that it is a matter of very great importance that the Supreme Court Reports should, within reasonable delay, be placed in the hands of the profession throughout the Dominion. I trust that the matter will be brought to the attention of the members of the Government who have special charge of the department, and that we will be informed why it is they are so backward in publishing this report. I do not know whether the Government have considered whether it would be desirable to take the printing out of the hands of the Bureau and give it to private parties, but, on the face of it, it does seem undesirable that we should withdraw any part of the printing from the Bureau which has cost so much money. The existing condition of things is by no means creditable to the Bureau.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The attention of the Secretary of State was attracted to the matter by the remarks made in the House a few days ago, and the result has been that the Queen's Printer has promised to give his personal attention to the subject of expediting these reports. I have reason to believe, knowing his energy and disposition to advance the interests under his care, that he will be successful in completing them at an earlier date than the reporters supposed when they wrote the memorandum to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Miscellaneous Expenditure—Governor General's Warrant.....$6,000

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is a mistake to call it a Governor General's warrant, because we refrained from issuing the warrant, although the money was very much needed in consequence of the large amounts that had to be paid in connection with the investigations which took place last session, and the subsequent prosecutions in the courts.

Salary of Instructor Leclair, St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary (to recoup contingent fund).....$600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does "recouping the contingent fund" mean? There is no contingent fund.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is evidently a mistake, as there is no contingent fund. It must have been charged to unforeseen expenses. An additional trade instructor was required, and I obtained permission from Council to appoint him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it is charged to unforeseen expenses, I should think it would be reasonable enough.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that there was a commission of enquiry held last year in connection with this penitentiary for which the inspector of prisons was paid $250 extra. What was the nature of that investigation?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was no enquiry last year. That $250 was a payment voted by Parliament for an investigation which took place 6 or 7 years ago, and for which the inspector had not been paid. The other commissioner was Mr. Baillairgé, who received $500. The inspector's claim to be paid for his services was left in suspense, and finally it was decided that he should be paid half the amount paid to the other commissioner. The investigation took place before I arrived in Ottawa.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why was it left in suspense?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He claimed the same amount as the other commissioner. That was not thought reasonable, in view of the fact that he was partially engaged in the duties of his office, and he was conceded half his claim.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is too much the case with civil servants, when asked to do something outside of the line of their regular duties, to make a demand for extra pay. We should most persistently put our foot down on such attempts on the part of our civil servants, who are well paid, to get additions to their salaries. Mr. Moylan gets $3,200 a year and his travelling expenses. He is not stinted in any way, and when he is asked to step outside of the line of his regular duties, he makes a demand for $500 more, and is allowed $250. I notice by the Auditor's Report that the number of those in receipt of extra pay for extra services is rapidly increasing. We have now 400 or 500 of them. I think we should resist votes of money for this purpose.

Dorchester Penitentiary—To provide for maximum salary of Instructors Godsoe and Hogan.....$140

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The other trade instructors have all reached their maximum. These men were appointed under circumstances which deferred the statutory increase for nearly two years after their appointment, the Penitentiaries Act providing that it shall not take effect until one year after the 1st of July following an appointment.

As these men are faithful officers, and as the maximum is very small, I thought it well to ask the House to vote the sum necessary to place their salary at the maximum.

Manitoba Penitentiary—To provide for the salary of an assistant accountant and storekeeper from 1st February, 1892, at $700 per annum..... $291 65

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The services of an assistant accountant and storekeeper are very necessary. In addition to the convicts there are a considerable number of lunatics there, whose accounts are all under the care of the accountant of the penitentiary. For years he had the assistance of a convict, but this was found very undesirable: in fact, the convict, although a very fair assistant accountant, made his escape: and as the accountant acts also as storekeeper, we have thought it proper to give him an assistant at $700 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many accountants are there in the Kingston Penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is one accountant, but there is also a storekeeper and a steward. At Manitoba one man attends to the duties of both accountant and storekeeper.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Kingston Penitentiary has two or three times the number of convicts that Manitoba has, and I think that one man ought to be sufficient at the latter place. It may be that the number of lunatics there would necessitate the extra appointment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a good deal more work for the officers at Stony Mountain than those at Kingston, because of the distance of the place from any town. Supplies have to be obtained in large quantities and from a considerable distance, both for the officers and the convicts. The accountant had considerable training as an accountant before he went there, but all the reports I have received from the officers show that he needed help.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is the accountant?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. His name is McGowan. He was removed from Dorchester Penitentiary to Manitoba about five years ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is appointed in Mr. Bedson's place?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Foster is still acting.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Have the Government made up their minds whom they are going to appoint? Last year we had some discussion about the expenditure on the Manitoba Penitentiary, which was found to exceed very greatly that of other penitentiaries. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman intends to take any measures to reduce that expenditure in any way.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The estimates prepared by the acting warden for next year show a great reduction.

Regina Gaol—To provide for salary of the deputy gaoler from 1st March, 1892, at $750 per annum..... $250

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As I mentioned the other evening, the provisions made in the Estimates of last year for this prison were purely experimental, because we did not know what the number of prisoners would be. Very soon after the gaol was opened, however, we found it crowded with prisoners who were formerly sent to the guard-rooms. The result was that the staff was found insufficient: the reports which I received showed that it was very desirable that a person should be put on the staff well acquainted with prison duty; and I sent out at once from the penitentiary at St. Vincent de Paul, a guard who was reported to be one of the most efficient officers there, to act as deputy gaoler, and this is his salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the average number of inmates there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The current year is the first year that the prison has been in operation. We have, I think, 22 prisoners, which is all the prison holds. That number includes two or three lunatics, for whom there is at present no other place of confinement.

Senate—Further amount required for Pages..... $900

Mr. McMULLEN. How many pages are kept in the Senate?

Mr. SPEAKER. My impression is there are five, but I am not quite sure. I am informed there are six.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that money being paid, or is it in arrear?

Mr. SPEAKER. This is in consequence of the length of last year's session. We had three months' session last year in this financial year, and therefore these additional amounts are required to pay the expenses of this session. We had practically a whole session in the financial year 1891-92 last year.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the pay in the Senate?

Mr. BOWELL. The explanation is given in the main Estimates, page 29. There are six pages at $1.50 each. They are paid by salary instead of by the day.

Reporting Debates in the Senate..... $5,000

Mr. CASEY. Was this caused by the extra length of the session?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is practically the same explanation as regards the other matters.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I understood it, the reporters in the Senate are paid so much a session for reporting.

Mr. SPEAKER. In any case, any payments after 1st of July, 1891, would have to be taken out of the appropriation for the financial year 1891-92.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this $5,000 in addition to the amount appropriated for the reporting?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, it is not an additional amount.

Mr. CASEY. The estimate says it is an additional amount. Does that cover this session?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is intended to cover this session.

Deputy Speaker—Salary (revote)..... $1,400

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this an excess of the ordinary sum last year?

Mr. SPEAKER. The session lasted five months last year. $600 of the appropriation for the salary of Deputy Speaker was taken out of the vote of 1891 and $1,400 out of the vote of 1891-92. Now we require to have that $1,400 reappropriated this year, so that the full salary of the Deputy Speaker for 1891-92 may be paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. If we are to have as a revote $1,400 of the deputy's salary, that is $600 out of last year's appropriation. Is the same proportion to be voted in connection with everything else, pages, messengers, and so on?

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly say that the same proportions will be maintained throughout, for this reason, that the proportions for extra messengers, and pages, and other officers of that nature, were based upon the estimate that the length of the session would only be 100 days, and it extended a great many more than that. The Auditor General refused to allow us, although we had a very large sum to the credit of this department at the end of the financial year 1891, amounting to about $25,000, to pay for any services after 1st July, 1891, out of the balance we had on hand at that time; and as a consequence that balance lapsed to the Receiver General, and we were obliged to pay for all the services rendered in connection with the House after the 1st July out of the vote of 1891. As the session lasted three months after 1st July, it is perfectly obvious that a very large proportion of the amount intended for this session was expended during last session, and these amounts were intended to cover the lapsed proportion.

Mr. CASEY. Then a part of these sums are revotes, and a part represent increased expenditure caused by the extra length of the session?

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hardly say that the hon. gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CASEY. Take the sessional employés, the $10,000 item. A part of that is to be revoted because it came out of the appropriation this year, because the messengers and others were given a bonus, were they not?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not at all.

Permanent Sessional Clerks..... .... $1,130

Mr. McMULLEN. Are those paid by the month?

Mr. SPEAKER. By the day, except Mr. Stewart, the chief, and Mr. Taché, who are paid $600 per session. The others are paid at the rate of $4 per day during the session.

Sessional Clerks, House of Commons .. $10,107

Mr. McMULLEN. How many of these sessional clerks are on the list this year?

Mr. SPEAKER. Twenty-nine, including the permanent clerks.

Expresses between the House and the Government Printing Office. $600

Mr. McMULLEN. Is any part of this for the service of the present year?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, this $600 is to pay for the service during this session. There are two messengers who get $3 a day for carrying the express between the House of Commons and the Printing Office. The assumption is that the session will last 100 days, but, if not, the full amount will not be paid.

Sessional Messengers..... .....$10,240

Mr. McMULLEN. How many sessional messengers are kept?

Mr. SPEAKER Forty-five.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the experience of past years shown that there is a necessity for that number?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes: the information I have is that they are fully occupied, that the business of the session requires them all.

Sessional Messengers in the Library..... $275

Mr. McMULLEN. Why was it considered necessary to make this increase grant?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think that this was on account of the length of last session. These messengers were on the same basis as the other messengers of the House, and, while they were to receive $250 for the session, they were given the option of taking $2.50 a day, and I presume that this amount is to make the same allowance to these men that was made to the other forty-five messengers of the House.

Printing paper, printing and binding —Further amount required..... $35,000

Mr. CASEY. Can the Minister tell us from whom this paper was bought?

Mr. BOWELL. It was from the contractors, I think from Barber & Ellis, but I am not sure.

Mr. CASEY. Or from the Canada Paper Company?

Mr. BOWELL. I will find out.

Further expenditure in connection with the Franchise Act—Printing voters' lists, &c..... $60,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this for the printing of the preliminary lists, or the printing of the final lists by the Printing Bureau?

Mr. BOWELL. It must be the final lists, but I will not speak positively on that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Where would we find the cost of printing the preliminary list?

Mr. BOWELL. That would be taken out of the general vote. The vote is taken in bulk, and the cost of printing the preliminary list would be paid out of that vote.

Jamaica Exposition (revote) $6,370

Mr. McMULLEN. How much has this Jamaica Exposition cost us altogether?

Mr. CARLING. The total is a trifle less than $20,000, not including the honorarium given to Mr. Adam Brown.

Mr. CASEY. How much was that?

Mr. CARLING. $2,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. How much has Mr. Brown drawn in connection with these services?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the exact amount, but I think the total amount that he received for services out of the original vote, was between two and three thousand, for all his travelling and other expenses.

Mr. CASEY. And there is two thousand besides.

Mr. CARLING. Yes. Two thousand was voted last session.

Mr. CASEY. So we have expended between four and five thousand altogether.

Mr. CARLING. Including all the travelling expenses.

Mr. McMULLEN. Out of the total sum voted of $20,000 in connection with the Jamaica Exhibition, he has accounted for some $3,000. That leaves about $17,000 as yet unaccounted for. Where has the rest gone? How has that been distributed?

Mr. CARLING. To pay the whole expenses of the expedition from beginning to end, including freights of Canadian exhibits to Jamaica, expenses of the Commissioner and assistants at Jamaica, with their travelling expenses going and coming, their living expenses, and gathering the exhibits from the different parts of the Dominion. The freight is a very large portion of the expense, amounting to about $7,000 altogether.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was any other person sent from Canada with Mr. Brown?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, he had an assistant, Mr. Dimock, of Halifax, a gentleman who had a great deal of experience in exhibitions; he was at the London Exposition, and, I believe, the Philadelphia Exhibition, and is a very competent man. He accompanied Mr. Brown to Jamaica, and remained there until the exhibition closed.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was he allowed for this service?

Mr. CARLING. Five dollars a day and his living and travelling expenses.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 203-B, he will find the particulars minutely set down, the cost of the expedition until the 1st of July last, amounting to $13,000.

Mr. LANGELIER. I understand that a certain number of copies of newspapers were bought and distributed at the Jamaica Exhibition. I would like to know whether it is a fact, how many copies were bought, and how much was paid for them?

Mr. CARLING. I really cannot give the hon. gentleman the information asked for just now, but I will be glad to get it for him.

Mr. LANGELIER. I have information from parties who went to the Jamaica Exposition, that they saw a large number of copies of the *Empire* distributed there. Of course they could not tell whether these papers had been bought and paid for by the Government; and I think it would be of great interest to the country to know whether it is a fact that these copies of the *Empire* were bought and paid for by the Government and distributed broadcast in Jamaica.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On page B-214, Mr. Brown is down for $3,000 allowance for services and expenses. Does that include the $2,000 that was mentioned.

Mr. CARLING. No. I think I stated to the hon. gentleman that his expenses, all told, except the honorarium that was given, was something between two and three thousand dollars. The honorarium was voted by Parliament last session. These payments were taken out of the vote of $20,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not exactly understand how Mr. Brown could be paid for his services in connection with the Jamaica Exhibition when he was a member of this House.

Mr. CARLING. He was not paid for his services, but his expenses were paid in connection with the exposition, and the vote that was given last year was the reward for his services.

Mr. CASEY. He could not possibly have expended $3,000 for personal expenses. This $3,000 is put down as an allowance for services and expenses. There is no doubt that it is to pay both services and expenses, and we afterwards made him a present of $2,000 which the hon. gentleman calls an honorarium. Now we find that Mr. Dimock's services cost $1,695, his living allowances are only a matter of $897. I do not suppose Mr. Brown's living expenses, therefore, could have been more than $1,000. The rest of this $3,000 must have been for Mr. Brown's services.

Mr. CARLING. The allowance was made for expenses, and he drew money from time to time for his expenses in connection with the exhibition.

Mr. CASEY. Personal expenses?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; he travelled from one part of the Dominion to the other, and this was to pay his travelling expenses, railway expenses, the expenses of going to Jamaica, and also his expenses while there.

Mr. CASEY. It would be much more satisfactory if the same course had been followed with Mr. Brown as in the case of Mr. Dimock. Details are given of Mr. Dimock's expenses: living allowance, so much; fares, so much; pullmans, so much; cabs, so much; livery, so much. Details are given of all these expenses, and then he is paid $5 a day for so many days. In the case of Mr. Brown his services and expenses are all lumped together, and you cannot tell, on the face of this statement, how much of this has been paid for services and how much for expenses, and so on. But it is an undoubted fact that on the face of these accounts he was paid for his services. The Auditor General certainly would not put it in that way unless the vouchers showed that some of the cheques were drawn for services as well as for expenses. I hope the Minister will explain how it is that he came to be paid this sum.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot explain any further. The late member for Hamilton was a very efficient man, he was employed over 300 days, and his total expenses was something like $3,000. That would include his travelling expenses, living expenses, and expenses at Jamaica, and of course, anything that occurred there for which he was responsible as the head Commissioner for Canada.

Mr. CASEY. I do not ask the hon. Minister to give us the details now; I ask him to explain how it was that Mr. Brown came to be paid for his services while a member of this House? That is the way it is entered here.

Mr. CARLING. I stated to the hon. gentleman that he was not paid for his services.

Mr. CASEY. The accounts say he was.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that he was paid his expenses for the exhibition.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) must be aware that sometimes errors creep into the Auditor General's Report. One was brought under our notice the other night, which stated that a man had been superannuated three years before he was appointed. There is no doubt that it was an error of the printer.

Mr. CASEY. That was a misprint.

Mr. BOWELL. It might be, still it was so worded, and the attention of the House was called to it, and fault was found with the Government, although it was a palpable printer's error. I think the Minister of Agriculture will see, on reflection, that this word "services" should not be there, because I have a very distinct recollection that when Mr. Brown accepted the position he was given to understand that only his expenses were to be paid, and the vote of $2 000 was asked for by Parliament after he had ceased to be a member of Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. It was a very neat arrangement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, it pleased all parties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to have a detailed account of this revote of $675.

Mr. CARLING. It was chiefly for Intercolonial Railway freight in connection with the steamboat lines.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand it does not include any personal expenses of the sort we have been discussing?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were the reasons? I see some charges here for customs duties and wharfage. I understood that goods sent to the exhibition were to be admitted free by the Jamaica authorities.

Mr. BOWELL. I will enquire and tell you later on.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not think that the amount of $3,000, as allowance for expenses of Mr. Brown, is a misprint. If you compare it with the expenses of Mr. Dimock, you will find that Mr. Brown's, expenses come to a great deal more, and I presume that what was sufficient for Mr. Dimock would be sufficient for Mr. Brown, as they both probably lived at the same hotel. The $3,000 to Mr. Brown must be for personal expenses, because I see that cablegrams and cab-hire are charged extra.

Mr. CASEY. It is certainly impossible for his living expenses and travelling expenses to amount to the exact sum of $3,000. It appears to me that this was a lump sum which was given to Mr. Brown to cover these expenses and to have a little change in his pocket besides. I do not understand how the Government gave Mr. Brown this lump sum when he was still a member of Parliament. It appears to me to be very like a breach of the privileges of Parliament.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) will, from his own experience, know that there is a difference between a man who is sent to take charge of an exhibition of this kind, and the position of the Commissioner who has to receive and in many cases entertain gentlemen coming there. In addition to that it must be understood that Mr. Brown was travelling all over this Dominion for months before he proceeded to Jamaica, in order to make arrangements from Halifax to Vancouver for the transportation of the articles which were sent there, whereas Mr. Dimock proceeded from his home at Truro, I think, to Jamaica. A gentleman in Mr. Brown's position would have to spend more than $5 a day. When it is understood that Mr. Brown was occupied in Canada for months making arrangements for the exhibition, and travelling from one end of the Dominion to the other, it will be seen that the sum of $3,000 was not too much.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think we ought to know whether Mr. Brown sent in a detailed account, or whether it was a lump sum given to him.

Mr. CARLING. There was no lump sum given to him. He drew different sums of money from time to time for his expenses, and it was balanced at $3,000. Considering that Mr. Brown was at work for several months in the Dominion before going to Jamaica, and the position which he occupied in Jamaica, I think that the House will see that the sum is a very moderate one.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think we ought to have an understanding as to whether an account was rendered for these expenses. In the Public Accounts Committee we can get the details of the expenses of the Deputy Ministers and other officials; the only exception to that rule being in the case of the Ministers of the Crown and the High Commissioner in London. I would like to know if Mr. Brown has sent in a detailed account, because, if he is put on the same footing as the Ministers and the High Commissioner, we ought to know it. I have nothing to say against Mr. Brown's qualifications as Commissioner to the Jamaica Exhibition, because I think he was a very efficient gentleman for that position, but, at the same time, we ought to be put in possession of the facts in regard to this expenditure.

Mr. BOWELL. I have just received an explanation of the customs duties which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) called attention to. It will be remembered that there were a number of millers who sent over a large quantity of flour, which was baked into bread and distributed in the exhibition gratuitously by our Commissioner. There was also liquor sent by Mr. Walker and some other distillers. That was also distributed and went into consumption.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Gratuitously?

Mr. BOWELL. I think so. However, I am speaking from a customs standpoint, not in regard to the generosity of the Commissioner or Mr. Walker. On all articles that went into consumption the Jamaica Government insisted on the duty being paid. I am informed by the accountant of the department that out of this $604.44 one hundred pounds sterling was paid for wharfage. I am also informed that the advance made to Mr. Brown was $3,200, of which he returned $200 to the Receiver General, and the round sum of $3,000 was allowed him to cover his expenses.

Mr. CASEY. I was not aware that this Commissioner conceived such a stroke of genius for the purpose of securing a large attendance at the Canadian exhibit. Certainly he could not have struck on a better attraction than free whiskey. That part of the exhibition must have been crowded

from the time it was opened until it closed. But I hope nobody will tell the Finance Minister about it. I understand that the hon. gentleman is not very well at present, and if he heard that the Canadian exhibit had been the scene of free whiskey, I am sure that he would become much worse. But the hon. Minister of Agriculture has not answered the question yet whether Mr. Brown has put in a detailed account of his expenses. We do not expect him to remember that detailed account, but we wish to know whether or not it was put in? I also want him to tell us, if he can, with some approach to detail, what benefits have accrued to our commerce with the West Indies on account of this exhibition, which cost us $20,000 odd?

Mr. CARLING. A detailed account was not sent in, nor was it possible for Mr. Brown to keep a detailed account of his expenses from the time he commenced until the exhibition was over. He is a gentleman in whom we had great confidence, and he made an excellent Commissioner. We did not tie him down to a detailed account of every dollar he spent, but we allowed him to draw money as he needed it to carry out the work entrusted to him. A very excellent report was made to this House by Mr. Brown last session, and if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to read that report, he will see that the Jamaica Exhibition will result very advantageously to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, we have always shipped considerable quantities of goods to Jamaica, but I am enquiring of the Minister whether, to his knowledge, any increase in the trade has arisen from this exhibition? The report merely points out how Canada was advertised, and what good prospects there are for trade. I am asking the Minister whether those prospects have materialized? As to the expenses, it is a most unusual thing not to require a detailed list of expenses from any commissioner who is sent out at the public expense. The hon. Minister says it would be hard for the commissioner to keep an account. Why, Mr. Dimock has given a detailed account of everything paid for him in connection with the exhibition, and there are entries in the general list even for amounts as low as $2.40. Why should not Mr. Brown have kept a detailed account of his expenses? He has simply been allowed to draw $200 or $300 from time to time, saying that it was for expenses, and has been allowed, finally, to lump them all at $3,000 to the end of his job, and he has not been called upon to tell what he did with the money. This is a most extraordinary, uncommon and irregular mode of dealing with a commissioner, especially when that commissioner is a member of this House. He has been allowed to save whatever he could for himself out of this money, and I have no doubt he was able to save a considerable sum out of it. I have every respect for Mr. Brown, but the temptation to save something, when treated that way, would be almost too much for the virtue of any one of us, if we were allowed to draw on the treasury whenever we wished, without giving any account of what we did with the money. I think that before he got the present of $2,000 he should have been required to tell what he did with the $3,000 which he had already got.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think this is a bad precedent to establish, especially in view of the fact that a commissioner will soon be appointed for the Columbia Exhibition at Chicago. We ought to know whether the Government intend to pursue this system in the future. I do not charge Mr. Brown with being guilty of appropriating any of this money for his own benefit; but it is well known that the Government require a detailed account of all expenses of this character from all their officers; and I understand, from the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee, that the Auditor General would not sanction the payment of expenses without being furnished with a detailed account of them. If the Government have adopted the principle with regard to Mr. Adam Brown, the Commissioner to the Jamaica Exhibition, that he may be at liberty to spend just what he sees fit on his personal expenses without rendering an account, why should not the Commissioners to be sent to Chicago be put on the same footing? I think it would be well for the Government in future to insist on a detailed account of all expenses. In fact, I think it is the duty of the Auditor General to see that no such accounts are paid without details being furnished.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not wish to utter a word against Mr. Brown; probably no better man could have been chosen to attend that exhibition on behalf of Canada. The only thing to be objected to is the principle of allowing expenses of this kind without requiring a proper account. While I do not for a moment impute to Mr. Brown any improper action, while I am quite sure he is above it, as far as I know, and I have known him for twenty-five years, it would be very much better in connection with matters of this kind that a detailed statement should be produced, so that no exception could be taken to the expenditure, and so that an expenditure of this kind would not be set up as an excuse for a similar outlay in future years. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Agriculture with regard to Canadian whiskey we sent over there, I am not surprised at it. These people have a perfect right to send their liquor to any part of the world, but that a commission of that kind should be used for the purpose of securing a market in that particular commodity is not, I think, in accord with the general sentiment of the country, and I am certainly astonished that the Minister of Finance, who is indebted in a great measure to his temperance principles for his position before the country, should acquiesce in anything of the kind. I would like in this connection to ask the hon. gentleman if there was any exhibition of ale or beer also?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I understand, the whiskey was given as a gratuity by the distillers.

Mr. CARLING. The Government paid the duty.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. And I suppose the public drank the whiskey?

Mr. McMULLEN. Was there any exhibition of ale or anything of that kind?

Mr. CARLING. I am not prepared to say. If the hon. gentleman will look at the procedure book, he will see a list of the articles. Probably there was.

Mr. CASEY. They were given us free, too?

Mr. CARLING. I dare say.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not making any reflection on the hon. gentleman, but I have not read all the report, and thought the Minister would know whether there was an exhibition of ale or not.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman will read the report he will get all the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, he will not get it all.

Mr. CASEY. I will just call attention to the fact that Mr. Brown's predecessor as member for Hamilton, Mr. Witton, was sent to the Vienna Exhibition in 1873, while a member of the House, and was paid nothing but his bare expenses. That was a precedent which the Government should have followed in this case, instead of allowing Mr. Brown to draw without limit, and not call upon him to give an account of what he did with the money. That is a precedent which should not be allowed, and I think it would be proper for the Public Accounts Committee to demand from the Government, or from Mr. Brown if the Government have not got it, an account of his expenses.

To complete the Census—(Governor General's warrant, $75,000)..... $95,000

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the original estimate of the estimated cost of the census?

Mr. CARLING. It is very difficult to make an estimate of what would be the cost. We expected it would cost fully or about the amount we are asking now. The total amount will be about $520,000, including this vote. I expect this will complete the census, and that all the information will be ready in the course of a month or two, certainly before the 1st of July.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). How soon will the first volume of the census, in its completed form, be out?

Mr. CARLING. I think there are already four or five bulletins issued, and two more will be published in the course of a few days. I cannot say when the first volume will be out. The last time the census was taken it lasted two or three years.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I suppose it will be issued in the same form as before, in volumes, from time to time, with the different sections?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. It seems strange that while the population turned out so much less than expected, the expense should turn out so much more than the estimate, although the payment for taking the census is so much per head.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many volumes will be issued, and are the statistics to be placed before the public in the same form as before?

Mr. CARLING. The table will be made alphabetically this time, and the number of volumes will be about the same.

World's Columbian Exposition..... $5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an important item as regards the possible effect that may be produced on our trade. What plan is it proposed to adopt, and what sum will be ultimately required?

Mr. CARLING. It will be difficult at present to give the actual sum required. $5,000 of this sum is required now for preliminary steps. Professor Saunders, who is chief director of the Experimental Farm and has charge of all the experimental farms we have now, has been appointed Commissioner. He was thought to be the most suitable man for the position, as he has had to do with nearly all the exhibitions that have taken place. He has had to do with the Philadelphia and the Indian and Colonial Exhibitions, and is thoroughly up in agricultural matters. He is appointed without salary. He already receives a salary as chief director of the farm and no addition will be made to his salary as commissioner for the work he performs as chief commissioner. He has already applied to the board of directors for space and has secured a certain quantity, and we are now in communication with the different provinces to get their assistance in making our exhibits a success. I know that it is the desire of the Government, and I am sure it will be the desire of the House, that the Canadian exhibit shall be the best we can possibly make. Our exhibits at Philadelphia were creditable to the Dominion of Canada, and the exhibits at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition did Canada great credit, and I am sure that, under the management of Professor Saunders and with the support that will be given to him, the exhibition at Chicago will be a credit to the Dominion.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in saying that our exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876 was a creditable one, but I doubt whether the exhibition to be made in Chicago will place before the world much evidence of our progress in manufactures since that time. I would ask if it is the intention of the Government to erect a building in Chicago as most of the Southern States and European powers are doing, or whether it is intended to use the buildings erected by the exhibition authorities?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention of the Government to erect a building, as I understand sufficient space has been given us for all the articles that we may desire to exhibit. I think at Philadelphia we had something like 16,000 feet, and we have now from Chicago the refusal of 100,000 square feet.

Mr. CHARLTON. So the expense of erecting buildings will not be necessary?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does the hon. gentleman intend to pursue the same course in regard to Professor Saunders that he has pursued in reference to Mr. Brown? Is Professor Saunders to draw on the Government for what he thinks fit, or is he to receive a fixed sum, or give an account of his expenses? I understand from the Minister that he is not to receive any salary other than that he now receives, and I think we ought to know whether he will have to give a detailed account of his expenses or not.

Mr. CARLING. I think, under the rule of the Civil Service, and Mr. Saunders being a civil servant, he will have to give a detailed account.

Mr. CASEY. The erection of buildings may be a little extra expense, but it tends to advertise the country a great deal more than a mere exhibit in the interior of the general building. If people see a building with the name of Chili or Peru over it, they become interested, and if they saw a building with the Dominion flag over it as distinguished

from the British ensign, they would take more interest in that than if the exhibits were placed in the main building. I simply throw this out as a conversational suggestion. I know that in any exhibitions which I have been present at, these exhibits which were kept apart from the main building attracted more attention than the others.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Government made any estimate as to the probable cost that will be incurred in connection with the exhibition in Chicago? We have here a vote of $5,000, but of course that is only a mere item.

Mr. CARLING. The Supplementary Estimates for 1892-93 will show what we expect in addition to this vote.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I should like to know what encouragement the Government propose to offer for the exhibition of live stock at Chicago?

Mr. CARLING. The intention is to pay the freight charges on the cattle that go to Chicago. The question of insurance has been discussed with the Live Stock Association, and I have promised to consider and discuss that with my colleagues.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I would like to know what system the Government will adopt in the selection of stock which is to be sent from Canada to Chicago?

Mr. CARLING. That question has not been settled. I met a deputation from the Ontario Live Stock Association in reference to that question, and whether we shall make the selection or whether it shall be made by the Provincial Governments is yet to be considered.

Mr. CASEY. Another point is in reference to the appointment of Mr. Saunders as commissioner to this exhibition. No doubt Mr. Saunders will be an excellent commissioner, but he has to look after the experimental farms, and who will perform that duty while he is looking after the exhibition? It will take him nearly a year, if not a whole year. It appears from the statement of the Minister that it took Mr. Brown a year to look after the small exhibition in Jamaica, and certainly it must take Mr. Saunders a year to look after this very important exhibition in Chicago. During that time, he will not be able to give his attention to the experimental farms. It seems to me that this shows the inadvisability of appointing any one connected with the public service to perform any duty outside of his own position. Let every one stick to his own business. No doubt Mr. Saunders would make a good commissioner, but he cannot be an efficient director of these farms and an efficient commissioner at the same time. I think the Government should have appointed as commissioner some gentleman who had no other duties to conflict with this. There are many gentlemen who are as well acquainted with agriculture as Mr. Saunders, or even more so, because Mr. Saunders has been more a horticulturist and a fruit-grower than anything else, and there are others who are acquainted with the manufacturing interests who might have made as good commissioners as Mr. Saunders. Now Mr. Saunders is to be paid for one thing while he is away performing other duties. He is to be paid for doing duties that he cannot possibly perform while he is doing other duties which do not belong to his office. This mixture of responsibilities will certainly involve a loss in one direction or the other. Either he will neglect his duties as commissioner to attend to the farms, which I think is not likely—because the commissioner's duties will be the more pleasant of the two—or he will neglect his duty as director of the experimental farms to attend to his commissionership, which is, probably, the shape the affair will take. I think that the Government have made a great mistake in taking a man who has such important duties to perform in Canada, to represent us at Chicago.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the Minister aware whether any or all the provinces are taking an interest in this matter, as provinces, and have voted a sum towards it? Has there been any communication, informal or otherwise, with the provinces on this point?

Mr. CARLING. The Secretary of State has communicated with the different Provincial Governments, informing them that we have been invited by the United States authorities to take part in the exhibition, and that we have accepted that invitation, and we ask the Provincial Governments to join with us in making that exhibition a success. Professor Saunders has been instructed by me to visit the different provinces and consult with the members of the Local Governments as to what part they will take, and how much they will contribute. It is intended to work in unison with the different Provincial Governments. The exhibition does not come off till May, 1893, and we are already taking the preliminary steps to see what the Local Governments are prepared to do, and I hope to know definitely in a very few days.

Mr. DALY. I have not been able to hear all that the Minister of Agriculture has said; but I may mention that the Government of Manitoba have already made a grant towards representing that province at the World's Fair, and the Legislature of British Columbia have also made a grant. The two provinces united together for the purpose of getting space and erecting a building at Chicago, but, unfortunately, they were told that they could not erect a building as they were provinces of the Dominion of Canada, and that Canada alone could erect a building. I sincerely hope that the Government will not be niggardly in making the expenditure that will be required in order that Canada may make a good showing at the Chicago World's Fair. I am satisfied that the position Canada takes at the fair will do more to promote her welfare than anything that has happened since the exhibition of 1876. I think the Government expended $100,000 at the Philadelphia Exhibition, and I hope they will give even a larger sum for the Chicago Exhibition, because it will be a larger exhibition than that of Philadelphia, and Canada is a greater country now than she was in 1876, and we ought to make a greater effort than we did in 1876 to place the resources of this great country before the people of the world who will attend the exhibition in Chicago in 1893.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not fully endorse the remarks dropped by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey). I do not think a better man could be found than Mr. Saunders to discharge the duty of chief in connection with this exhibition. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). I think we should make every effort to make a creditable exhibition on the part

of Canada. My opinion is that it is in good hands. At Chicago our country will come into competition with every state in the Union, as well as with the South American States. We should spare no effort to make an exhibition that will reflect credit upon Canada, and be the means of bringing before the eyes of the world the commodities we are able to produce, and the advancement that our country has made.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say that a better commissioner could be found than Mr. Saunders, but I said as good a one could have been got who had no other duties to perform at home. What I objected to was the appointment of a man as commissioner who had a very important duty here which he must neglect in order to perform the duties of commissioner.

Quarantine—Cattle disease..... $9,000

Mr. CARLING. The item voted last year for quarantine purposes was really less than it should have been, and was less than was asked for by the department. It was thought possible that we might get along with the amount that was voted. In addition to that, we have had cattle disease in Pictou, N.S., that we were determined to stamp out, and a large number have been slaughtered.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I would like to ask if the Government inspectors had to slaughter a great many hogs last year since the returns were made last July?

Mr. CARLING. Yes. I think a larger number than usual of hogs have been slaughtered in the west on account of hog cholera. We have taken a larger sum this year than we did in previous years.

Railways and Canals—Canadian Pacific Railway — Construction — Governor General's Warrant..... $24,050

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this the cost of the recent arbitration?

Mr. HAGGART. The cost of the arbitration, to make up the award of the arbitrators.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total cost of that arbitration?

Mr. HAGGART. The total amount of the cost of arbitration that is paid up to date, is $160,544.66.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With or without this $24,000?

Mr. HAGGART. No, that is inclusive of the amount paid by Governor General's warrant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total amount of the award?

Mr. HAGGART. $579,255.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of interesting information to the non-legal members of the House, perhaps the Minister can tell us what the Canadian Pacific Railway had to pay their lawyers?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing that they paid as much, or a little more than we paid, and I rather think they paid a good deal more, it would appear, and it is interesting to know, that the total cost pretty nearly equals the total amount of the award.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at St. John..... $1,987

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the trade at St. John increasing so that there is a necessity for this expenditure?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This amount is to compensate a proprietor that was expropriated some time ago. The department was advised to pay the money into court.

Cape Breton Railway..... $43,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this line nearly finished?

Mr. HAGGART. I think this about finishes it.

Mr. CASEY. How near is the railway completed?

Mr. HAGGART. It is completed.

Mr. CASEY. This is the last?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Rideau Canal—Expenses of valuator, settlement of claims, &c.. ..... $600

Mr. McMULLEN. My recollection is that since I came into Parliament we have always had a claim for the Rideau Canal flooding lands. I do not notice it in connection with other canals, and I think we ought to make an end of it here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know how it came to flood in that locality, because that is a locality in which I think the land damages must have been settled forty years ago?

Mr. HAGGART. It does seem to me there should be an end to these claims, but they seem interminable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am surprised that there should be claims of this kind, because I happen to know that the water has been very low in the Rideau Canal for the last 3 years.

St. John Custom House—Clearing away debris of burnt edifice, fencing ground; renting, fitting up and furnishing temporary quarters for public offices, &c... $6,000

Mr. FLINT. Has there been an official enquiry into the cause of that disastrous fire?

Mr. OUIMET. Immediately after the fire took place, Mr. Ewart, one of the architects of the department, was sent down there to make an enquiry as to the origin of the fire, and the extent of the damage done, and also to look for accommodation for the different officers who were engaged in the building. He only returned yesterday and I am waiting for his full report. In the meantime a building has been found to accommodate the different departments, for a rental of $3,000 a year. Immediate steps will be taken to clear away the debris, and I am very glad to say that, according to the summary report before me, we will be able to restore the building at a cost of about $100,000. It originally cost about $338,000. This sum of $6,000 is required to pay for the enquiry, the clearing of the debris, the purchase of furniture for the different offices in the temporary building, and also to pay the rental to the 1st of July.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the building is not entirely destroyed?

Mr. OUIMET. No: the walls will be utilized.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had under discussion once or twice in old times of this House, the expediency, in view of the large amounts we have lost by fires, of doing one of two things: Either to insure these miscellaneous buildings of ours all over the Dominion, which I think could be done on reasonably moderate terms probably in a way that would save a great deal of money; or else make all the more expensive buildings substantially fire-proof. I do not think nowadays that the difference in cost would be very great. Has the Minister given any attention to that subject?

Mr. OUIMET. The question was brought to my attention, and I was told that it had been decided that we had so many buildings, that it would be better for the Government to insure themselves. As to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that all the important buildings to be erected by the Government are to be made fire-proof, the suggestion has already received due attention from the department and in future will be followed as much as possible.

Mr. FRASER. I might ask if the Government, in insuring their own buildings, placed the amount of the insurance money as a fund to meet losses on such fires as this?

Mr. OUIMET. It might be done in that way, but it would only be a matter of book-keeping after all. There is no special fund provided now.

Mr. BORDEN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he can give us any information as to the origin of the fire in the custom-house at St. John.

Mr. OUIMET. I cannot as yet.

Mr. BORDEN. Was there any night watchman in charge of that building?

Mr. OUIMET. There was, and the building was planned to be fire-proof when built in 1877.

Mr. BORDEN. I happened to be at St. John a day or two after the fire occurred, and it was common rumour on the street that there was no one in charge of the building, but that the most reckless carelessness prevailed in regard to it; and it was thought that the matter ought to be very carefully investigated. I was also told that although the building was fire-proof, the iron doors dividing the different sets of offices were not closed, and not the slightest precaution had been taken against fire on the night before the fire occurred. If these statements are true, and I heard them on very reliable authority, some one must have blundered or have been guilty of extreme carelessness and inattention to duty.

Quebec Drill Hall—To complete payments to contractors and architects. $325 76

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of this drill hall?

Mr. OUIMET. This vote is required to pay the contractors the balance which the department acknowledges to be due to them on the contract and on the award that was made to them for extras. The amount claimed by them for extras and damages was $28,000; the amount recognized by the Government was $1,500, and this amount, added to the moneys now in the hands of the department, will make that up. When this balance is paid, the total cost of the building will have been $66,722.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary—Additional amount required..... $14,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this for?

Mr. OUIMET. This amount is necessary to pay for the materials furnished during the year, for which we have no money left from the vote of last year, which, from some oversight, was very limited. It was only $14,000 when it ought to have been $28,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this complete all the repairs which the Department of Justice have asked for at that penitentiary, so far as the stonework is concerned?

Mr. OUIMET. The main building is all completed now. This is towards the construction of the boundary wall, the completion of which will finish the work on the penitentiary.

Ottawa Post Office, Custom house, &c.—To make good damage by fire..... $6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How was that fire caused?

Mr. OUIMET. The fire occurred on the 17th of January last in the upper part of the building, probably through the negligence of some employé. Very fortunately the whole building was not destroyed, and this amount will be sufficient to repair it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose an enquiry was made. Was the employé identified?

Mr. OUIMET. No; our enquiry could not go any further after we found that the fire originated in a special room occupied by several employés.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may say that there was no negligence. We investigated the causes of the fire, and no negligence on the part of any of the employés could be traced. The fire originated in a room, and it is impossible to discover how it occurred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the building supposed to be fire-proof?

Mr. OUIMET. No.

Harbours and Rivers—General repairs and improvements, Maritime Provinces..... $3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this to be expended?

Mr. OUIMET. The amount of $4,000 was voted last year for general repairs and improvements to harbours and rivers. Of that amount, $1,326 have already been expended, and to complete the year a further amount of $3,000 is required.

Mr. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman state the places at which this expenditure is to take place?

Mr. OUIMET. I could not state exactly. There is St. Mary's, West Morden, and a number of other places.

Mr. PERRY. I would ask the hon. gentleman if the Government intend going on blasting the rock in Cascumpec Harbour? They spent already $16,000 there, and do not seem inclined to do anything further. As I said in this House years ago, the plan the Government adopted for blasting the rock was not a proper plan, as after blasting it they allowed it to remain on the bottom. There is a

great deal more work to be done there, and it is not fair that this harbour should be neglected.

Mr. OUIMET. Since the hon. gentleman has drawn my attention to the harbour of Cascumpec I have given instructions to the chief engineer to make a report, and in a very few days I will be in a position to tell the hon. gentleman what the department propose to do.

General repairs and improvements—Harbour and River Works, Quebec... $1,000

Mr. DEVLIN. Has anything been done in connection with the deepening of the Lièvre River between Buckingham town and High Rapids? During the last few years traffic has developed considerably on this portion of the river. A short time ago a large sum was expended in constructing locks, but it was said, I know not whether on the best authority or not, that the locks would not prove as useful as they might be if the river be not deepened between the town and the locks to enable larger vessels to pass through. I trust that an engineer will be sent to report on the work proposed to be constructed last year, and that his report will be acted on.

Mr. OUIMET. I can promise the hon. gentleman that I will take a note of his enquiry and give the required information as soon as possible.

Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick—Additional amount required for dredging..... $5,000

Mr. PERRY. On referring to the return which I asked for a few days ago, which is now on my desk, I see that during the years 1889-90 and 1890-91, $10,414 are allowed to be expended on piers and wharves in Prince County. Out of that we have but the small amount of $5,000 expended. That is what I complain of; I believe that the whole of that will not be expended. In fact, in Prince Edward Island we have only one dredge, and it can only do half of what is required. I think $1,500 would cover all the expenses of that dredge. I am not going to blame the present Minister of Public Works for this. I believe that he will do what is right, but I have known that dredge not to commence work until June and even later, though it should commence early in May. The Minister of Public Works must remember that we are paying the captain of that dredge $90 a month, whether the dredge is working or not. When the ice is away from the straits, he should be ordered to go there at once. I have known the dredge not to commence until the 18th July, and even in one year not until October, while the captain was strutting about the streets of Charlottetown working for the Government candidates. I hope the present Minister of Public Works will not allow such injustice as this to be done to the people of Prince Edward Island. I hope the Government will order this dredge to go there as early as possible, and will also send another dredge there. Perhaps the harbours in Prince Edward Island require more dredging than the harbours elsewhere, but we cannot help that. The Island was not made under our control, and the Dominion of Canada was very glad to get the Island. The Dominion swallowed Prince Edward Island, and they should do what is fair to it, and I hope the Minister of Public Works will do justice to the people of that province.

Mr. PERRY.

Manitoba—Additional amount for dredging..... $3,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is that to be expended?

Mr. OUIMET. At the mouth of the Red River where it comes into Lake Winnipeg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the condition of that just now? What depth of channel have we got?

Mr. OUIMET. The dredges were used from June, 1891, to improve the channel at the west end of the river. This amount is required to keep the dredges at work and complete the work they have already commenced.

Bridge over the Old Man's River at Fort Macleod (revote of lapsed amount) ... $10,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that enough to complete the bridge?

Mr. OUIMET. The bridge was completed last fall. The total cost was $27,800. This is to pay the contractor the balance.

Salaries and rent of office in connection with the inspection of cattle shipments to England. $1,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you give us a little detail in regard to this?

Mr. TUPPER. This is under the Act of last year by which two inspectors were appointed at the port of Montreal, and these inspectors were given a salary of $1,000 each, and the amount we expect to collect from the 2 cents a head rate which has been imposed on the cattle will cover the cost. This is practically to pay for the expenses of the inspectors and the office rent for this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are their duties to be?

Mr. TUPPER. They are inspectors under the Act of last session, to examine and see that the ship is fit and is properly arranged in order to carry cattle from a Canadian port to an English port. In this matter, we are working in accord with the Board of Agriculture in England, and thus we are able to keep up the shipment of live cattle, which was at one time seriously threatened. This provision is intended to make sure that proper stalls are made and that the fittings are all right in order to stand tempestuous weather.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Has a plan been adopted by which each stall is made sufficiently wide for the animal, according to the regulations, 2 feet 8 inches?

Mr. TUPPER. We were not in a position to apply the law until almost the end of last season, but, from the time these inspectors were appointed, I do not think any ships went out without complying with the regulations. At all events those were the instructions given, and no complaints have reached me since.

Fisheries Intelligence Bureau—Certain persons at $15 each for services in comparing and forwarding daily reports..... $420

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the precise duty these men perform?

Mr. TUPPER. They are already in the service, and that is why their names appear here, in order

that we may have authority to pay them. They are nearly all customs officers, and they are on the coast where the movements of the fish occur. They pursue the same service as is performed in Norway, where they send to the central office daily statements as to the appearance of the mackerel on the coast, and bulletins are published so that the fishermen can govern themselves accordingly. As the hon. gentleman knows, the movement of the fish is variable along the coast. This system has been in force now for two years and has been found to be more valuable each year.

Fisheries—To provide for allowances and expenses to commissioners $1,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the commissioners, and what allowances have they been in the habit of receiving?

Mr. TUPPER. They are the commissioners who have lately been holding a very exhaustive enquiry into the fisheries of British Columbia. The names of these commissioners are Mr. Higgins, Speaker of the Local Assembly, I believe, of the Province of British Columbia; Mr. Armstrong, the Sheriff of New Westminster; and Mr. Wilmot, Superintendent of Fishery Culture, of the Fisheries Department. The fisheries of that province are exceedingly important, and at the instance of people there, this Government, a year ago, adopted a system of regulations. But there has been a great deal of friction in connection with these regulations, and the chief point that has been raised by those interested in the fishing industry in British Columbia, was that the experience of almost all the officers who advised the Government in connection with these matters, was gained in the eastern provinces where the habits of the fish were different, and where the circumstances were unlike those on the Pacific coast. After endeavouring, so far as possible, to obtain full information, the Government deemed it expedient to appoint this Commission of two local gentlemen of high standing, associated with an officer upon whose views the Government had, to a large extent, depended in connection with the regulations. They have been occupied about sixty days, and a very large amount of testimony has been taken, which, I have no doubt, will be valuable, and is now ready for consideration. This amount is taken to cover the expenses of this Commision.

Government of North-West Territories —Schools $26,700

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is to complete the cost of education in the North-West, and to pay expenses in connection therewith up to the end of the year. Last year the sum asked for was $119,000. $100,000 only was voted, and it is found that we shall require this amount in order to carry out the obligations of the present Assembly in regard to their schools. Last year I stated that we were under the impression that the amounts paid to the teachers in the North-West were excessive, and that was intimated to the authorities in the North-West during the course of last session. When they received the information it was so late that they were unable to advise the trustees who had engaged their teachers, and therefore could take no means to reduce the salaries. However, during the last session of the Legislative Assembly they passed an amendment to their school ordinance which has reduced the salaries some 20 or 25 per cent. But they were under obligation to pay the indebtedness they had incurred under their former engagement with the teachers, and this is to pay the balance.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is this to pay the teachers in public schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are the schools denominational?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These are public schools, and union and separate schools.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are all the public school teachers in the North-West paid by this Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What system of inspection is there for these schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. These schools are very closely inspected.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is there no revenue raised in the North-West for the purpose of defraying the expenses of public schools other than that provided by this Government?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They have got a general revenue, but the whole of their revenue does not exceed $40,000, although they expect to raise a larger amount in the future. Consequently, this House has to make up the balance which this revenue is insufficient to meet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case we are paying about $140,000 or $150,000, against $40,000 raised in the Territories, as I understand the hon. gentleman. Now, that seems altogether out of the way to saddle on the people of Canada. What is the number of pupils in the schools the hon. gentleman has under his control?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The number of pupils, according to last return, is 3,700.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the total cost is about $200,000?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The estimate of this year will be $123,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But this is an addition.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is an addition to the $100,000.

It being six o'clock, the Committee rose, and the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that the Minister informs us that there are 3,700 pupils in the North-West and that we spent on them last year nearly $170,000. That would be an average of a little over $45 per head for every pupil in the North-West. Can the Minister explain how we spend so much as this?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman makes the amount $170,000; it was only $100,000 last year.

Mr. McMULLEN. What are the number of school inspectors in the North-West ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. At present there are but four, but previous to the last meeting of the Assembly there were two permanent inspectors at a fixed salary of $500 a year and travelling expenses, and others were appointed temporarily and paid so much for inspecting each school in the outlying districts.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are the salaries paid by the Dominion, or do the Territories contribute a portion ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In the vote for the North-West Government is included the expenses for the schools, teachers' salaries, expenses of Board of Education, and inspectors' travelling expenses. The teachers are engaged by the trustees of different school districts, and formerly we paid 75 per cent of their salaries, and the school districts pay the balance. In some districts large and expensive schools have been built by the trustees of the school districts.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are the inspectors required to hold a certificate of qualification ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are experienced men and hold a very high class certificate. Very great care is taken in their selection, and I think nearly all of them held similar positions in Ontario before they went to the North-West. The teachers have to hold certificates similar to those in Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose a man is up there and has no certificate, how does he obtain one ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a board of examiners to examine and issue certifiates in the North-West Territories.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the average attendance at the schools increasing ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is increasing so rapidly that it is difficult to get school house accommodation. The average allowed under the school ordinance of the North-West Territories is very low, and as it has brought about a very large number of schools, I believe they propose to increase it. It is very clear that the low average of five, as at present in a school district, would be a very great burden on the people of the Territories, and they have been told, and I think they appreciate it, that they will be expected to help themselves in that respect more than they did before.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire that every facility should be given to secure education for settlers going in there, but I think the Government should be very careful in the establishment of schools where there are not sufficient inhabitants to warrant them. Are the schools in Calgary, for instance, under the Dominion Government ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are under the school ordinance of the North-West. There are public schools, and I think union schools in Calgary. They have one large school with four or five first-class teachers and some three or four hundred children.

Mr. McMULLEN. What proportion of the sum expended in Calgary do the teachers contribute to the schools ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Heretofore it has been about 25 per cent of the salaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that in a place like Calgary, with a school population as large as they must have now, some change should be made in order to call upon these people to pay more for the education of their children than 25 per cent. In Ontario the people have got to pay at least 75 per cent. for their schools. On what principle can you ask the people of the older provinces, who are educating their children out of their own pockets, to contribute all but 25 per cent of the cost of education in a place like Calgary ? I think the Act should be amended to require the people in such a place to contribute more than they do at present.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I concur in a great deal of what the hon. gentleman has said. But it is very difficult to make different provision for different localities, as they are all under the same ordinance. I may state that the Legislative Assembly, at its last meeting, reduced the expenditure about 20 per cent, which means that in future the people will pay 45 per cent of the cost.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that wherever the population is sufficiently dense to secure a fair school attendance, the amount contributed by the Government should be proportionately diminished. I am glad that the North-West Council has taken a step in the right direction, but I think they should be asked to go further still.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the Minister to say that the total number of scholars was 3,700. Now, it does appear to me that to pay $126,000 out of our resources and $40,000 out of the revenue of the country for the education of 3,700 children is altogether out of proportion and requires further explanation. $40 per child does seem excessive, wholly irrespective of the proportion we pay.

Mr. DEWDNEY. As I said before, this matter has been debated in the House on previous occasions, and the Government have explained that in the early days of the North-West it is necessary to grant more assistance than can be expected when the country becomes more settled and the people more prosperous. We also stated that this assistance to education has a very good effect in the North-West, and has done more than anything else that I know of to make the people content with the country. There is hardly a district or township having any settlement at all which is not able to have a school within reach of the settlers. They have not only contributed about 25 per cent of the salaries, but have taxed themselves for the building of school houses, and in some cases for the sites.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to a very handsome allowance for the purpose of educating children in the North-West, but $40 per head seems to be out of all reasonable proportion. What are the average salaries paid and the average attendance at these schools ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The average salaries have been admittedly very much larger in proportion than the salaries in the older provinces. The school ordinance allowed the salaries to be paid according to the certificates. Some instances were brought to the notice of the Assembly where first-class teachers were attached to small country schools and getting $700 or $800 a year. That, however, has been altered. The last report of the Board of Education shows that there were 163

schools with an average attendance varying from six to seven up to 156. The present ordinance allows a school district to be formed in a locality where there are five children of school age; so that under it, it is possible for a large number of school districts to be formed. There are now 50 applications for new districts.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find, on reference to page D-227 of the Auditor General's Report, that the school grant at Moose Jaw was $2,104; at Prince Albert, $3,148; at Regina, $3,541: at Moosomin $2,666; and at Calgary, $3,680—making $15,140 which this Dominion contributed last year to these five schools, while the people of the older provinces are struggling to pay for the education of their children almost entirely out of their own pockets. It seems to me unjust that this system should be allowed to continue.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where are the headquarters of the Board of Education in the North-West?

Mr. DEWDNEY. It meets at stated intervals at Regina.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the annual cost of that board?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The members of the board get their travelling expenses, which I fancy is all they get. They may get a daily allowance also.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Some of them must travel a considerable distance, because their travelling expenses are very high. Is it desirable to have them so far removed from the centre?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think so. One lives at Calgary and one at Moosomin; these are the most distant. Two of the judges of the Supreme Court are on the board, Judge Wetmore and Judge Rouleau.

Mr. LANDERKIN. On looking at the Auditor General's Report I find that that board costs $10,000 a year. It appears to me a very large sum to pay for that purpose, about $10,000 for the Board of Inspectors. Those who conduct the examinations, and, I presume, make the regulations, seem to have different grades of inspectors. Some are paid $20 and some are paid $10. I notice William Rothwell is down on the Auditor General's Report as inspecting 61 schools at $10 each, $610; expenses, $396.40, and on account of services and travelling $900; so that he gets nearly $1,900. How long does it take an inspector to inspect a school where there are five children? Do they get $10 or $20 for such schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It does appear strange that we should have to pay these amounts. They have the power to tax themselves in the North-West for school purposes, and I do not think we have public schools anywhere but in the North-West. Have we any in British Columbia?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We have heard our eloquent friend describe the riches, fertility and great producing powers of the North-West, but reading this, you would think that the people up there are in a state of pauperdom. I understand it is one of the richest and most fertile provinces in the Dominion, and those who have gone there have gone with a great deal of wealth, like my hon. friend, and are quite able to educate their children without drawing on the resources of the Dominion. If they are not, they should draw more than they do on their own province, and not come to the Dominion, because if they have a right to claim public money from the Dominion, there is no other province which has not the same right, and the other provinces will exercise that right. For the number of schools out there, it appears to me this outlay is very extravagant. Certainly some economy could be exercised in this matter without diminution to the public service or to the public benefits to the people of the North-West. It appears to me this board which sits five or six days in the year, have taken something in the neighbourhood of $10,000 from this service. Here is a teacher who enjoys a salary of $1,800 a year. In a public school in Ontario, or anywhere else, I do not know of any teacher getting that salary. I notice that the travelling expenses of the board are something enormous. No doubt they have good men on the board, but their travelling expenses are exceedingly heavy. Here is one inspector who only got $20 for the whole year, the Rev. A. H. Bigonesse. I wonder what church he belongs to. J. A. Blair gets $20 for each school: J. A. Costello gets $20 each school: the Rev. P. Dommeau gets $20 each: the Rev. James Flett gets $20 each: the Rev. D. Gillies gets $20 each: the Rev. D. Graton gets $20 each: John Hewgill gets $20 each, and so on. That does appear an enormous sum to pay for inspecting a school, particularly if it has only five children. They would have to make an inspection last a long time to earn that amount of money. I think it is about time that a province like that, a rapidly growing and wealthy province, should have a spirit of independence inculcated among its people by the Government and should assume the functions of government among themselves. The time has arrived when responsible government in every form should be given the North-West, and one of the first functions of responsible government is the education of their own children.

Mr. McMULLEN. On looking over the expenses of inspection, I find it amounts to $10,521.42. I find, also, that there are eleven schools in the North-West, supported by the Government at an average expense of $2,525. I do think, that seeing the North-West have, under the Act passed last session, got power to tax themselves for school purposes, they should not call upon the people of this Dominion to continue this expensive service. While, of course, it is right of the Government to aid schools that have passed a certain distance, it is an imposition upon the older provinces to ask them to contribute such an enormous sum to schools in towns and villages of the dimensions of those mentioned in the list here, and I hope that the Minister will find it his duty to stop this drain on the Dominion treasury to the extent now existing for the support of schools in places like Calgary, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert and other such places, which have large populations, whose people are doing well. As the hon. member for South Grey has intimated, that country should be in a position to at least educate their children proportionately well as the other provinces. These eleven schools cost the country $27,525 a year, while the people themselves contribute a mere pittance towards them, and I am surprised the Government have in-

timated their intention, as they have by this vote, to continue this system. As I believe this is now the last year, I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government during this session to alter the law so as to cut down these schools?

Mr. DEWDNEY. We do not make the laws with reference to the schools. The North-West Territories Act gives the Legislative Assembly power to legislate with regard to their schools, which they have done, and in accordance with the ordinances they pay the cost of the teachers and other expenses entailed by the ordinances, and we vote the money every year. Mr. Haultain, the leader of the House, is in Ottawa, and is in connection with the Government on the subject of what provision we shall make in the future and what changes we shall make with reference to the grant of sums for the North-West Territories, and after the 30th of June the matter will be in a better position. The Legislative Assembly themselves will then be responsible for the expenditure on the schools, and will have to cut their coat according to their cloth, and I know they are sufficiently alive to see that those large expenditures cannot be continued.

Mr. McMULLEN In Ontario, I think, a school is to be for every six miles square or less. I think, when there is a population in the North-West in any particular place sufficient to support a school, say with 30 boys, the Government should withdraw any aid unless it is granted on the school system of Ontario. If they adopted that system, when towns and villages were settled, we would not be called upon to contribute $26,700. I think it is an injustice.

Mr. DAVIN. I rather think that my hon. friends are under a complete misconception as to the merits of the question they are presuming to discuss. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) talks indignantly as though some wrong was done to the other provinces by the amount that is paid for schools in the North-West. Now, Sir, in the North-West, as it happens, if you take the population and make a calculation on the basis on which money is paid by the Dominion to other provinces, we are entitled to about $100,000 more than we get.

An hon. MEMBER. Bosh!

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says "bosh," but it is a fact, and, if the people of the North-West wish to spend the money they are entitled to on schools, that is their business, but the fact is that in the past you could not have established the school system, the most efficient school system we have in the North-West, without the Government of those Territories paying a large percentage of the cost. You had to establish schools in sparsely-settled districts, at a distance from the centres of population, and it was only by assistance from the Government that you could get teachers to go there. When letters from Europe come to us asking about the advantages to be found in the Territories, we always find that questions are asked as to what religious advantages and what school advantages are to be found there, and it has been of great value to the settlement of the North-West that we have been able to show that in every place where a population has gone in, there was the schoolmaster. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) points to Moose Jaw, he points to Calgary, and he points to Regina. In both Moose Jaw and Regina the Government own half the town site, and from the increment of value, from the increase in the value of the property of the Government in consequence of the improvements made in these towns by the people, the people cannot get any advantage. We cannot tax the property of the Government. What we get now is but a fraction of what the North-West is entitled to, and in no better way could this money be spent properly than in aiding schools. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) and my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) are taking, in regard to this question, the same attitude that they have taken in respect to other matters. They forget that the money they are voting is money which, if we had full responsible government in the North-West, the Local Government would deal with. Suppose the Local Government of Ontario, out of its own funds, were to give, instead of what it now gives in aid of schools, 30 per cent more, what would that be to this House? It would be the money of the people of this province, as it would in the Province of Quebec, or New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, as the case may be. We do not, in the North-West, administer our lands, but this Government administers them, and I say we are getting less by about 50 per cent than we are entitled to, and I do not think the money can be spent in a more fruitful way, or one more calculated to attract immigrants, than in its expenditure upon schools.

Mr. McMULLEN. Ever since it has become the hon. gentleman's privilege to sit in this House, he has been a pronounced advocate of the expenditure of any money in the North-West, no matter for what. If it were for the purpose of boring wells or for any other purpose, my hon. friend advocates the expenditure, and speaks so that you would imagine that this Dominion was living on the bounties supplied by the North-West. I think the trend has been all the other way and that the North-West owes the Dominion at least one hundred millions of money.

Mr. DAVIN. Not one cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show that. Money has been lavishly spent there, and it is absurd to hear any hon. gentleman say that the North-West is not receiving fair treatment from the Dominion treasury. Every man on each side of the House, who has any thought of his home and his family, will say that it is absurd for us to expend $27,000 in order to support eleven schools in districts in the North-West where they are quite as capable of supporting these schools as we are in any of the older provinces. The hon. gentleman speaks very loudly, but his speech, when it is pricked, is shown to be nothing but wind.

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) I believe that my hon. friend at my left (Mr. McMullen) is in error with regard to this question of public instruction in the North West Territories. We have discussed this question before, and many times. I can say to my hon. friend that I agree with him when he says that certain amounts, even large amounts, have been spent for the North-West. That is not to be denied. This money has been spent on material interests; for we have built at

immense cost, as you know, that great railway called the Canadian Pacific. The Parliament of Canada has voted millions for its construction.

Mr. DAVIN. Who gave the land?

Mr. DEVLIN. (Translation.) I think that the hon. member did not fully understand what I just said, for I am advocating as much as it is in my power to do so, the cause he so devotedly pleaded himself a few moments ago. When it is claimed that extraordinary sacrifices have not been made for the North-West, it is a mistake. Those who like my hon. friend for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) have gone to the North-West, have made heavy sacrifices; they have left countries already settled, and enjoying all the advantages of civilization; full of courage, and moved by a feeling of patriotism, they have turned their steps towards that new land, and I have no doubt that they often found in their path difficulties hard to overcome; but they manfully met those obstacles, and happily succeeded in surmounting them. My hon. friend the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was one of those brave pioneers, and already his efforts and his merits have been recognized by the whole country, since he, a settler, has come back as a member of this House for the North-West. Mr. Chairman, you will allow me to say that I consider it as judicious to authorize the expenditure of money now proposed. And why? Because this money is intended to help educational institutions, both Catholic and Protestant; and we see that in the past, it was distributed in proportion to the population. It is just and right that we help those who have gone and settled in the North-West, because they need our help more than any. We spend money, Mr. Chairman, for ports and harbours in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; for objects much less important than that of the present vote, in all parts of Canada; and it is claimed that we should reduce the little money allotted to an object as noble as that of education! Would the Dominion be the poorer for this expenditure? Not at all. I therefore approve the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and I regret not to to be able to share the opinion of my hon. friend at my left (Mr. McMullen). I most cordially approve the expenditure which is now under discussion, for I regard it as in the public interest, for the general good, for the noblest cause which can occupy the attention of a country—that of the education of its children.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to make some enquiries of the Minister with regard to the character of those schools aided by the Government of the North-West; to what extent these schools are denominational, whether the Government uses public funds in aiding schools of a strictly sectarian and denominational character?

Mr. DEWDNEY. According to the report I hold in my hands, which is the latest I have, there are 162 public schools, 27 Roman Catholic public schools, and 11 Roman Catholic separate schools.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice on page 228–D of the Auditor General's Report, that the grants to schools, Protestant special, are put down at $833; that grants to the amount of $16,740 are given to Catholic public schools; that grants, in round numbers, to the amount of $10,000 are given to Catholic separate schools, and grants to the extent of $3,000 are given to Catholic schools special. Now, it would seem that the disproportion of grants to Catholic schools is very great, and that a very small sum has been granted to Protestant special schools, and a very large sum to Catholic separate schools, to Catholic special schools and to Catholic public schools. Now, I do not know to what extent the Government pursues its policy of giving grants to denominational schools, but I doubt very much whether their policy is a wise one. I do not think the Government should take the responsibility of making large grants to sectarian schools, if it is to aid schools in the North-West at all. The position the Government ought to take, if it is to aid education at all in the North-West, is to aid public schools, without taking the responsibility of establishing and maintaining separate schools of any character whatever.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) did me injustice in saying that I opposed everything that was for the benefit of the North-West. On the contrary, every well-considered measure tending to develop the North West has always had my hearty consideration and support. I do not criticise these items in reference to the schools in the North-West, with any ill-will towards the North-West, because in the North-West I have many of my best friends, and I am as anxious to make the North-West prosperous and flourishing as I am any other portion of the Dominion. My criticisms were made in the interest of the North-West, and I believe in the interest of the whole Dominion. I think the policy of the Government in reference to these schools is calculated to sow disaster and discontent, and enmities in the different provinces. I wish my hon. friend would rise above parish politics when dealing with these public questions.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. Minister ought to explain these payments made to inspectors. As the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) mentioned, one inspector gets $20 a year, others get $10 for each school, and others get $20 for each school.

Mr. DEWDNEY. All these salaries and remunerations are fixed by the Board of Education under the ordinance of the North-West Territories, and we have nothing to do with them. We give them a lump sum, and they expend it as they please.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How many times are these schools inspected each year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think only once each year.

To refund to the legal representatives of the late Hon. J. G. Ross the amount paid by him for timber berth "B," on the Bow River, in the District of Alberta, this berth being situated in the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada.....	$4,050

Mr. DEWDNEY. This was a timber license obtained by the late Hon. J. G. Ross, by competition, in the year 1883, for which he paid the sum of $4,050. Subsequently legislation took place which covered a portion of the license, and in 1887 the whole of this limit was covered by the Banff Park. He never cut a stick of timber on this license, either before or after the legislation declaring it a public park. Before he died he made application for a refund, and the subject was under the consideration

of the Government when he died. Subsequently the heirs applied for it, and this is to repay the amount.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How along ago was this right acquired?

Mr. DEWDNEY. In 1883.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why was it not settled before?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He never made application until a short time before his death, and after he died, it was sometime before the executors came to see us about it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the Minister able to say that the purchase was worth the money that was paid for it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it was a very good limit. The Auclair Lumber Company paid a larger amount for a limit alongside of the park.

To pay Dr. A. Jukes for medical services in connection with prisoners and lunatics confined in the guard room at Regina, N.W.T., from 1st July, 1890, to 30th June, 1892..... $200

Mr. CHARLTON. How large a number of prisoners and lunatics were confined at this place?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I am sorry to say a great number. A great number of lunatics are brought there, and after remaining a short time, are transferred to the Lunatic Asylum in Manitoba. I cannot say the exact number, but a larger number than people have any idea of.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Dr. Jukes is the chief surgeon of the North-West Mounted Police, for which he gets a pretty stiff salary, and why should he get this extra amount? It is just carrying out the system that is growing every year, of giving an officer, having regular duties to perform with a salary attached thereto, other duties to perform and paying him a second salary.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It has always been considered extra work. He has previous to this received $100 a year for several years. His salary is $1,400.

Mr. CHARLTON. Are there any extra allowances to Dr. Jukes besides this extra $200?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. This is another item of the number which I have drawn the attention of the committee to where it is entirely wrong that salaried officers of the Crown receiving good sums annually for their services, should be paid extra for some little duties they discharge. Dr. Jukes has $1,400 a year and his travelling expenses, and I believe a residence at Regina, and the country should not be called upon to pay him $200 extra for some little services performed by him outside of the ordinary routine of his duty. I am sure that the Minister, if he had a servant in his employ who did a few little chores for him outside of the ordinary routine, would not pay him double wages for that. Why should we do with the money of the country what we would not do with our own money? This system is growing worse every year, and we have now four or five hundred salaried officers throughout the Dominion drawing extra pay in addition to the comfortable salaries they receive. Here is Dr. Jukes drawing a comfortable salary, doing little or nothing, living as he is at the expense of the Government, and simply because he is asked to perform a little service in connection with Regina gaol he asks $200 extra, and it is sanctioned by the Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is there any regular physician paid for attending prisoners in the Regina gaol?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Amount required to meet expenditure of Civil Service Commission. (Authority is hereby given to pay members of the Civil Service for services in connection with this Commission, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.)..... $2,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What are the particulars in regard to this vote?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The work of that Commission has been proceeding during the last two or three months, and will be finished, and the report laid before Parliament before the end of the financial year. Some of the persons connected with it in one way or another are in the Civil Service. One of the commissioners is a member of the Civil Service, and without the authority of Parliament it would be impossible to make any allowance to him. The vote is taken in order to provide for the expenses attending the Commission and the printing of the report and evidence. The evidence is now in the Printing Bureau, and part of it has now already been printed.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does the sum include any allowance to salaried officers of the Crown?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Deputy Minister of Finance is a member of the Commission, and there may be one or two employed in inferior capacities, such as reporting and matters of that kind.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the Deputy Minister of Finance to get?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The amount is not fixed yet.

Mr. CASEY. There are two objections to the plan of employing civil servants in this capacity, and paying them extra salaries. In the first place, to obtain an impartial review of the condition of the Civil Service at the present time, you ought to have commissioners who are not connected with it, who have none of its prejudices, and who have not red tape on the brain. I do not say that this particular commissioner has, but when a civil servant has been in office for a long time, he generally comes to regard matters connected with the service from a Civil Service standpoint. What we ought to have is an impartial investigation by gentlemen totally disconnected with this service. In the second place, I hold that all of a civil servant's time belongs to the Government, and it does not matter whether he employs that time in the duties of his office, or in some other duties, he should not be paid extra for such service. I would like the Minister to tell us what points this Commission particularly investigated, whether they have been taking simply the evidence of heads of departments, or examining clerks and subordinate members of the Civil Service apart from their superior officers. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give us a résumé of the method employed by the

Commission. I suppose that when the evidence is printed the report will be laid on the Table?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The evidence will not be laid on the Table until the report is made; the report will be made when the evidence is printed.

Mr. CASEY. Surely the Commissioners who have heard the evidence are in a position to write a report of any kind. I would like the hon. gentleman to give me the particulars in regard to the mode in which the evidence was taken.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the appointment of Mr. Courtney on the Commission, I think that the greatest possible advantages are to be derived from his knowledge of the Civil Service. Granting all that the hon. gentleman has said in favour of the impartiality of those who are to make an enquiry of this kind, it is important that they should bring to their duties a thorough knowledge of the matters they are going to investigate. Mr. Courtney has not only had that knowledge from his long experience as deputy head in one of the most important departments, but his connection with the Treasury Board in which he has more or less supervision over all appointments, and over the theoretical organization of the departments, has given him a knowledge which is very complete and thorough in each department, in reference to the financial interests which are connected with the Civil Service, and which is one of the most important considerations involved. The Commissioners proceeded in the first place by propounding in writing to deputy heads a series of questions, going over nearly the whole of the subject embraced in the enquiry, searching into the sufficiency of the theoretical organizations of each department, and the over-manning of the departments, if such should be found to exist anywhere; also questions calculated to elicit any suggestions the deputy heads might be in a position to give in reference to the service. They also held a number of sittings at which the deputy heads were examined in pursuance of their answers to these questions, and examined at large on any other points that might suggest themselves in connection with the work of the departments or otherwise. I understand that evidence was sought for and obtained as well from other employés in the Civil Service. In addition, the Commissioners themselves visited every department of the service for the purpose of ascertaining, as well as they could by personal observation, the mode in which the work was conducted, the classification of the clerks, and the necessity which might exist for the number of clerks they found there. In every way I think, they have made a very complete and efficient enquiry.

Mr. CASEY. Only in respect to the inside service?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not want to say a single word against Mr. Courtney, who is in all probability the best man who could be got for the performance of those duties. But I submit that the hon. Minister of Justice has not noticed the point raised by the hon. member for West Elgin. A man who accepts a position in the Civil Service of Canada is paid liberally on the understanding that his salary is given for all the work that he can do for the country. I understand that Mr. Courtney will be paid his salary as Deputy Minister during all the time that he is engaged as a Civil Service Commissioner. Now, it is utterly impossible that he can perform the duties of the office of Deputy Minister of Finance and the duties of a commissioner at the same time, and I ask if it is fair to the country that he should be paid his salary for work that he does not do, and be paid another salary for work that he does do? It seems to me that this system is creeping into the Civil Service too much. In the investigation held last session, we found that men were shirking their regular work in order to do work for which they were paid extra. Such a state of things is demoralising to the service and unjust to the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree with the hon. gentleman so far as the mere increase of the duties of a man's office is concerned; but I am not able to agree with him in so far as his remarks relate to asking an officer to discharge duties entirely beyond the scope of the office which he holds. Mr. Courtney receives his salary as Deputy Minister of Finance during the time he is engaged on the Commission; but he discharges the duties of that office likewise. The Civil Service Commission has added very largely to his labours, and I do not think we should be justified in asking him to perform that work, which is entirely beyond the scope of his duties as Deputy Minister of Finance, without remunerating him for it.

Grant to the International Education Association..... $2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this for?

Mr. BOWELL. The International Educational Association is to meet in Toronto during the coming summer, and in connection with it a large number of people interested in educational pursuits are expected to visit this country. Some of those interested in educational pursuits in Canada made application to the Government to grant a small sum to assist in paying the expenses which will be incurred in entertaining those people when they arrive in Toronto, and other expenses which will attend their visit. I am under the impression, but I speak under correction, that the Ontario Government have also given some aid to the same object, as has also the city of Toronto. The object of the association being of such a general character, and a visit of educationists of this character being expected to result advantageously to the country, the Government thought they would be justified in appropriating this small sum for the purpose stated.

Further amount for the International Customs Bureau at Brussels..... $50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the purpose of this small amount?

Mr. BOWELL. An international customs bureau meets annually at Brussels to consider the tariffs of the different countries which contribute towards its support, and these tariffs are printed in the different languages and are distributed to the Governments of the contributing countries. Two or three years ago we were asked for one hundred pounds sterling as our proportion of the expenses, and the House voted $500. The association was not formed in the first year for which the appropriation was taken, and we find that $50 is needed in addition

to the sum we have paid for the last year. We do not propose to give any more, but the broken period necessitates the payment of this much in order that we may keep faith with those interested.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What benefits do we derive from this expenditure?

Mr. BOWELL. The only benefit we can expect to derive is to be furnished annually with the tariffs of the different countries, or whenever any changes are made in them, we in return supplying our tariff, so that merchants exporting to this country or our merchants importing from other countries or exporting to them will know what duties will have to be paid. I think, however, that the one hundred pounds sterling will be very well spent when we consider that we are so often called on to give information in reference to the tariff of almost every country in the world.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do they publish a table of the tariffs of the different countries?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, and in the different languages. Those sent to us are printed in English, but in some cases they send us the foreign tariffs in foreign languages.

To provide for the payment of a gratuity to George Craven, heretofore a warehouseman in Her Majesty's Customs at Montreal, on his retirement from the service on the 1st August, 1891, as per terms of Order in Council of the 21st June, 1891..... $336 10

Mr. McMULLEN. On what basis is this sum arrived at?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Craven has been in the service for seven and one-third years at a salary of $550. His age is 54. He has not been in the service long enough to be superannuated, neither is he old enough, but on account of his becoming nearly blind and otherwise physically unfit—I am now reading the report of the inspector—for the performance of his duties, he should be replaced by some active member of the staff. In fact there was another member of the staff doing the duties which he would have performed had he been able. A new appointment being unnecessary, it was thought in the interests of the service and economy that he should be retired on the payment of one month's salary for each year he had served. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Superannuation Act he will find a provision for cases of this kind. The man had become useless as an official, and it was thought, under the circumstances, he was justly entitled to the gratuity provided.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice he is mentioned as having been retired under the provisions of the Superannuation Act, and of course, under the circumstances mentioned by the Minister of Customs, no exception can be taken.

Excise—further amount required for tobacco stamps owing to taking over stock of the British American Bank Note Company at expiration of contract..... $17,070 58

Mr. COSTIGAN. This was taken over by the department because the contract was about expiring. Tenders had been called for and received, and the question of awarding the contract was under consideration—whether it should be awarded to the old firm or a new one; and the Finance Department advised us to secure these stamps in case of the contract going to some other person and our finding ourselves short. These stamps are available, though of course the amount is larger than required for immediate use, but we did this to protect the service against being taken short, and to prevent the business of the country being blocked through want of stamps.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who holds the contract now?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same parties who had it before, but we could not tell that at the time the tenders were being considered. We were not then in a position, nor was anybody else, to say to whom the contract would be given. A new contract has however, been entered into with the same parties, and the stamps we have will all come into use, and in the regular Estimates for next year a reduction will be made on account of this item.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When was the stock taken over and the new contract let?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The stock was taken over in November or December, and the new contract was signed quite recently.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How long will these stamps last?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The $17,000 would represent, perhaps, a nine months' supply, but of course these stamps are of different classes, and each class will be used according to the demand. Some of the stamps may last through a year while other portions will be exhausted in two or three months, and in fact some of them are exhausted already.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When the contract was originally let, did not the contractors run the risk of having the stamps left on their hands which were not required by the Government at the expiration of the contract? It appears to me as if the stamps were taken from the company just to clean up their old stock.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We did not care to run any risk in case the contract went to another company. In such an event, had we not a stock on hand, they could make us pay any price they asked, because we could not carry on business without the stamps, and it would take months before a supply could be furnished by the new company.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I fancy whoever got the contract would have been able to supply the stamps in a week.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not for three months.

Mr PATERSON (Brant). Still it strikes me that an arrangement might have been made with the parties that, provided they got the contract, they would wait for their pay for these stamps until they were required, or take them back. This would prevent the Government having a large stock on hand which they do not at present need, and for which they have to pay cash.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We did not know who was likely to get the contract at all, and the stock in hand is not excessive, though of course some of the stamps may last a whole year. The regular Estimates will be reduced proportionately.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was the contract let to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes. I speak from memory, but am quite satisfied the cheapest tender was accepted.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me a very peculiar proceeding that the balance of an old stock of stamps should have been taken off the hands of those contractors. In some cases, I fancy, from the little information I have gathered, certain classes of those stamps may not be used for five years.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know of any that may not be used for five years. I have stated that there was not the same demand for some classes as for others, and that some may run over the whole year, and as for the stamps being old, you might as well call bank bills old bills. These are the stamps struck off for next year's business, and we secured them before the expiration of the contract rather than wait after the 1st of July.

Mr. McMULLEN. What I gather is that they were virtually the fag end of the old contract, or the stock-in-trade that remained on hand. These stamps are supplied the Government from year to year, and it was necessary to keep lines on hand; but in some of the lines the company had quantities altogether in excess of the demand, and the Government, by taking the balance of their old stock, put this company in a position to tender at a very great advantage for the new contract. Of course by completely straightening up the old stock, taking stamps that may not be used for two or three years, and paying over $17,000 for that old stock, these people were put in a very advantageous position to tender for the new contract.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman has not all the information. Before the stamps were taken over, we made an investigation in regard to them, saw that they were correct, and then they were transferred to my department. There was no advantage given to the contractor by this transaction, because the instructions to take them over were given long before the contract was made.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But the Government knew the number of stamps that would be required for one or two or three months. If the Government did not want to give the advantage to the old contractor, why did they not take as many as they required for that time, instead of purchasing $17,000 worth of stamps, most of which may not be required for four or five years? It is not a business transaction, and it is not the manner in which any business man would attend to his own business. It is just another instance of the Government favouring some of their own particular friends. It is a parallel case to that which occurred not long ago when the Minister of Agriculture purchased $2,000 of old newspapers from a gentleman in Montreal, and sent them to the old country to assist immigration—old newspapers, pictures and poetry, and so on. It is another job similar to that. The Minister of Agriculture threw away $2,000 in that expenditure, and the Minister of Inland Revenue has given these contractors a great advantage, and has saddled the country with the cost of $17,000 worth of stamps which were not necessary at the time, and many of which will not be used for four or five years. I think every head of a department should manage the department in the same way as if he was managing his own business.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot allow the statement to go on record that this was a job, or that $17,000 worth of stamps were purchased which could not be used for five years.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I did not say that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. What I stated was that the bulk of these stamps were in common use, though some might not be required for some time. There has not been any favouritism in this matter, and if the department is not conducted according to the common-sense views my hon. friend thinks it ought to be, it is much to be regretted that those common-sense views have not prevailed before and that my hon. friend is still sitting where he is.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did you take over the whole of these stamps from the previous contractor?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then there was no selection made as to what were suitable and what were not suitable.

Mr. COSTIGAN. None were taken over but those that were suitable.

Mr. McMULLEN. Were any stamps left on the hands of the contractor?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If there were any that were not suitable they were left.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was it before or after the contract was let that the stamps were taken over?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was before the contract was signed.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was it before the tender was received?

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I said before, it was long after the tenders were received.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister stated that the object was to protect the Government against the chance of running out of stamps. Now he says it was after the tenders were received, and when they might accept a tender at any moment that the stamps were taken over.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. When was it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. All I ask the hon. gentleman is that he will not use his own words and say that those were the words which I used. I said the tenderer had no advantage, because he had no knowledge in regard to this. I said the stamps were taken over before the contract was awarded, because we could not be placed at a disadvantage. If the contract had been awarded to the higher tenderer, the hon. gentleman would have been the first to complain.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not deny that the Government did right in accepting the lowest tender, but the committee were led to believe in the first place that the Government took these stamps because they thought they might run out of stamps, and then the hon. gentleman admits that tenders were asked for and received before the Government took over these stamps. Why was it necessary to take over $17,000 worth of stamps, which would be sufficient for nine months, when the contract was about to be let?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I really think my hon. friend's question should be answered. It has not been answered in such a way as to make

this appear a very clear transaction. As I understand, this $17,000 worth of stamps was not taken over until the tenders were in the hands of the Government and the Government knew that the old company would be the contractors. I must say that, if the Government had the tenders in their hands, and then paid this $17,000, it is a very peculiar transaction.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I had some knowledge of the negotiations which preceded this transaction, and possibly more knowledge than my colleague the Minister of Inland Revenue, because he was not in the city at that time. When the call for tenders was made within two or three months of the expiration of the contract, an enquiry was made in the different departments as to the quantity of stamps which were available in case the contract should suddenly come to a conclusion, as it might, at the end of the term. There was the Inland Revenue Department, there was the Post Office Department, and there was the Finance Department with regard to its treasury notes. Before the tenders were received, the departments concerned were advised of the call for new tenders, they were advised that the old contracts were not to be continued in force unless the old contractor succeeded in getting it by competition, notwithstanding that he desired it should be continued without competition. The departments, therefore, were advised that it would be necessary for them to order a supply of stamps from the contractor, lest, at the expiration of the contract, some delay should take place before the new contract was entered into. It was under these circumstances that the Commissioner of Inland Revenue thought it necessary to order a liberal supply, and the precaution was not wholly unnecessary, for this state of things actually transpired. When the call for tenders terminated, and the tenders came in, the old contractor was not the lowest tenderer. At the period of which my hon. colleague speaks as to tenders having been received, the probabilities were that he would not receive the new contract; but when the person who had made the lowest tender came to realize what was required of him, and the amount of preparation that would be necessary to carry on the work of the contract, he practically withdrew his tender. It was absolutely necessary, under the terms of the old contract, and would be under the new, that he should provide all the cuts and engravings for the bank notes, for all the different stamps required, and that in addition he should perform the work in the city of Ottawa, in a fire-proof building, with vaults made amply secure to prevent any robbery or theft, and that he should carry it on under proper supervision here. He ascertained that the Inland Revenue Department had a great variety of stamps which were not contemplated when he put in his tender, and on making enquiries as to where he could get the work executed best and most promptly, and how he could meet our requirements as regards a fire-proof and safe building, he put himself practically at our discretion and declared that, as regards the stamps at least, he might need extra compensation; and he claimed, if I remember aright, that some months ought to be allowed him to make preparations for entering on the work of the new contract. Although we had in view the fact that delay might possibly occur by a new company taking possession of the work, under the circumstances, rather than fall back on the former contractor at what we thought was a high tender, we made a new call for tenders, and stipulated that a certain length of time should be given from the acceptance of the tender, for preparation for commencing work. On a new call for tenders the former contractor got the contract, and at a very much reduced rate. In that way there was a considerable lapse of time, so much so that although, as my colleague says, the contract terminated in October or November, the new contract has only been signed during the last three or four days. There was that delay, and there was a still greater delay to be feared and to be guarded against of a new contractor, totally without equipment, without even a building in which to carry on the work, possibly being unable to meet our requirements, and unable to complete the preparations for the beginning of the work within the stipulated time, in the mean time we should be at the mercy of the former contractor. To guard against that, the departments were all warned to lay in an ample stock to last them for two or three months if possible.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think it must be obvious to the committee that the Government have not looked after the best interests of the country in the letting of the contract. They must have been aware that this contract was about to expire; they knew this a year ago, six months ago, and they knew the difficulties that would arise with regard to a new contractor taking hold of the work. Under these circumstances it was the duty of the Government, looking after the interest of the country, to give timely notice to the contractor, to ask for tenders for that work at least one year before they expected to call upon the contractor to perform the work.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In other words, before it was signed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You knew when the contract was going to expire, you knew all the circumstances attending the performance of that work, and it was the duty of the Government to ask for tenders a considerable period before the contract expired, so that all these contingencies might not arise, and that every person might have the same opportunity of tendering for the work. As it was, the Government waited till the last moment, when a new contractor would have no opportunity of getting his building ready, or getting the plant necessary to perform the work. Practically, the Government decided by their action that the contract must fall into the hands of the old contractor. There was no other course to pursue, because no other man had an opportunity of tendering for this work, for the simple reason that he could not get prepared in time to perform it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member is mistaken. There was ample time given, something like four months. But the hon. member will see that a year would not have been sufficient to meet the object he has in his mind. The contractor would not make his preparations, until he knew whether his tender was accepted. If you give him twelve months to consider whether he might put in a tender or not, he is not going to put up the building in that time, or to rent or lease one, or to get his machinery or have his cuts made. The whole question was as to the time required to get ready for the work after his tender was ac-

cepted. The facts will show that instead of being taken at any disadvantage, we have let the contract at the lowest price, and have procured a very considerable retrenchment in the expense of getting this work done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister does not understand the point I was making. Suppose the contract now existed and was to expire a year from now. In order that fair competition might be secured for that work, if the Government, knowing that to be the case, would ask for tenders now, and in the course of a month decided upon who should receive the contract a year from now, then the contractor, whoever he might be, would have ample opportunity to prepare to do the work. I think the Minister will see that by pursuing a course of that kind, the public interest would be guarded. If this system is pursued, it must be evident that the present contractors are to be the contractors for all time to come. The moment tenders are awarded, then the new contractor would have an opportunity to prepare to do the work, say six months, or eight months, or a year hence. Then every one would be put on the same footing. But as the matter stands now, the old contractor has the advantage over every one, he has the whip hand in this matter, and unless the Government pursue some such course as I indicate when they want to make another contract, they will be in the same position they are in now, the present contractor will have the advantage, and will undoubtedly secure the contract. I think the Minister will see that my position is correct.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot see yet that it is correct. Any contractor competing is allowed ample time. Three or four months ought to be sufficient, to enable him to get all his plans and to lease his building. Ample time was given to this contractor. If that time is allowed, it by no means follows that the one contractor must go on in perpetuity. As the facts turned out the persons who were competing had not the equipment, had not the building, had not the means, and they could not find the necessary workmen in the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who were the competing contractors?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON, I cannot mention the names. It is not under the administration of my department at all. It is not for want of time that this stock of stamps had to be laid in in the different departments, but it was in consequence of our apprehension that the person getting the contract might perhaps not undertake to make an arrangement within three or four months which was the time allowed him. We wanted ample margin to be perfectly safe in awarding a new contract.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the course indicated by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) had been taken, the Government would be in a better position. If they had advertized eight or nine months prior to the expiration of the contract and decided who should get it, they would accomplish two objects. They would give the man who took the new contract ample time to fill the order for stamps, and protect themselves against a shortage of stamps, and they would not have been called upon to have paid out $17,000, for the balance of the stock in hand. In place of that, the Government gave such a short notice for the tender that they precluded the possibility of any new contractor complying with the terms by providing a building necessary to do the work.

Further amount required for duty paid to Excise officers, so that both may include payments to 30th June, 1892. $2,500

Mr. COSTIGAN. This vote is proposed for the same reasons that a somewhat similar vote was given two or three years ago, and according to the wording of the estimate then, and the Supply Act afterwards, it was limited to the chief officers in the larger distilleries and did not apply to officers similarly situated, and having equal claims to it, in large tobacco manufactories. For instance, any one acquainted with the tobacco manufactory belonging to Mr. McDonald, of Montreal, one of the largest of the Dominion, will know that hours are fully as long for officers there as they are in distilleries. The receipts are very great and the reason for giving this extra pay for longer hours are just the same as those in which the House thought fit to vote an amount to pay the officers in the distilleries. It is not a question of finding additional employment and giving extra pay to construct a salary for a civil servant; but the other civil servants of the country have regular hours in which to perform their duty. These men, and they are few in number in the whole Dominion, and confined to this department chiefly, have to be at the distilleries from 7 o'clock in the morning until 6 in the evening, and as they have to work during these extra hours, Parliament thought fit to vote the money on a former occasion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this for the accommodation of the proprietors of the tobacco manufactories?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The officers are there you may say for the accommodation of the manufacturer although he does not look upon it in that light. When I visited Mr. McDonald's factory, and when I complimented him upon the large amount of capital invested and the employment given, he said: Yes, I have invested millions, but I do not own anything here, your officer takes the key and locks it all up, and I can only get in when your officer wishes to let me. It is to accommodate the revenue of the country and to keep a strict guard over it that we keep these officers there from the time the doors are open in the morning until they are closed in the evening, and they follow every stage of the process of the manufacture of tobacco.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How much did we vote for this in the main Estimates?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This will bring the amount to about $5,000 altogether.

Preventive service—To repay Mr. W. W. Paige costs in *re* the Queen *vs.* Paige..... $83.10

Mr. COSTIGAN. This was a case where an illicit still was found on the premises of a man named Paige. Of course the committee will understand that in our regulations and law affecting the manufacture of tobacco, cigars, &c., we have a good many cases of the violation of our regulations, and while it is necessary and wise to enforce the law reasonably, we have not enforced it very severely in any case except so far as illicit distilling is concerned. There we make a difference.

The temptation is so great, and it affects so directly the revenue that, in all such cases, we have ordered prosecutions and allowed the courts to decide. In this particular case a representation was made to the department that this man was innocent, and that he could prove, that although the still was found upon his premises, that it was put there by an enemy of his for the sake of getting him into trouble. I could not accept that, of course, but I stated that sooner than give an order to keep up the principle of prosecution in all these cases I would sooner proceed against the man, even if I had doubts about his violating the law, and if he established his innocence that I would recommend the payment of the costs. I thought this would be better in the interests of the administration of the law than if I dropped the case. I have an extract from the report of the magistrate who tried the case, who says that he is satisfied that this man was innocent and that the still was put there to get him into trouble. The course which I adopted had, I think, a better effect than if I recommended that the proceedings should be dropped.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know whether the Minister could drop the case under the law, because the finding of the still on the place brings the person within the law.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no doubt of that, but if the evidence shows that it is put there by a third party he would be the one to be prosecuted.

Commission to Customs officers—further amount required $488 08

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this?

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is one of those items which looks to my hon. friend as if they were paid for extra services. As I have already explained, under our law we have authority to ask the services of a customs officer, or any other public officer in some of the outports where we have no officer appointed, and where the receipts would not justify us in appointing a man at a salary, paying the man we thus employ by a percentage of the collections. We require this much more than we have taken in order to meet these percentages.

Mr. McMULLEN. In some of these outports we have collectors of customs receiving salaries of $1,200 or $1,500 a year, in some cases more.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will consider for a moment, he will see that in the large and important places where Customs officers are paid large salaries, we are likely to have officers too. These percentages are allowed in the smaller ports where the customs officers are paid very small salaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. Any person who takes up the Auditor General's Report will find in it a list of officers numbering four or five hundred, some receiving as much as $2,300 or $2,400 a year, who have collected sums of money for some service performed out of the routine of their duties. I think this is a system which should be stopped.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At Winnipeg, where Mr. Hesson is, you have your own officer?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In New Westminster, you have your own officer also?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Hesson is at Brandon, which is an outport of Winnipeg. The only place that would come in the category is New Westminster, where Mr. Clute received a percentage before the business of the place justified an increase in his salary. Outside of New Westminster the highest salary paid to any of these men is $1,200, most of them receiving not more than about $700.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When the Government deserve credit they should get it, and I think they are deserving of credit for this expenditure, which is in the interest of economy.

Weights and Measures—further amount required for contingencies..... $2,000

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I would like to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue if it is the intention of the Government to comply with the prayer of the petition presented from the milk dealers of Toronto asking for a certain size of milk can for delivering milk in the city?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman, I think, refers to the memorial asking for legislation to fix the size or dimensions of the cans used in the purchase and carrying of milk. A delegation came here with that object in view, and had an interview with the Commissioner in my department. He is of opinion that the act as it now stands covers the case, and the inspectors have been notified by the department to deal with these cans, not merely as packages but as means of measuring the contents, and as such they are under the Weights and Measures Act. I may state that the reason for this vote is that the vote of last year was reduced by a little over $2,000 with a view to meet the wishes of the Finance Minister, who is always very desirous to keep the estimates down. We find that we are short that amount, and this vote will keep us within the ordinary expenditure of other years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was the object of advertising in these different papers?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only advertising we had in the department within the last few years is confined to fertilizers and weights and measures. Outside of that, the only advertising we have consists of small advertisements calling for tenders for ferries, and they are confined to three or four insertions in two or three local papers.

Mr. McMULLEN. We spent $556 last year in advertising.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, it runs up pretty quick, I suppose.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I put the question rather to find out whether the Government intend taking any action with reference to a petition sent in last week from the farmers in the vicinity of Toronto. The milk dealers send out cans supposed to hold eight gallons, but they have enlarged them to nine gallon cans, and where they find the old cans are good and sound, but a little battered and punched in the centre, they cut them through the centre and put an iron band around, and stretch them in the middle, so that they will hold a half gallon more, and the milk dealers are only paid for eight gallons, although the cans hold a gallon or half a gallon more. They ask that the cans come under the Inspection Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A delegation came here which represented the case to the department, and went away perfectly satisfied that their interests would be looked to. One of the members of this House introduced the delegates.

Mr. HENDERSON. A few days ago I had the pleasure of accompanying the deputation to interview the Minister of Inland Revenue, and my hon. friend the Minister gave them a very strong assurance that this matter would be attended to. The deputation went away thoroughly satisfied their views would receive every consideration, and in a very short time I feel confident they will have no grievance whatever.

Prince Edward Island Railway..... $50,000

Mr. HAGGART. There is a very large deficit this year for the last eight months. The expenditure has been for those eight months $229,996.11 as against $184,808.22 last year. This is mainly accounted for by the fact that the steamer bringing rails which were to be laid in 1891-92 was lost, and consequently the rails could not be laid that year, and double work had to be done last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were the rails insured?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Lachine Canal..... $19,000

Mr. HAGGART. When the estimates of 1891-92 were prepared, these repairs were not foreseen. They consist of repairs to lock walls, bridge abutments, flumes, banks, &c. There is a long list of details amounting to a total of $18,640.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the total expenditure for canals altogether in 1892?

Mr. HAGGART. I have a statement made and I will be able to give a full statement on the main Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that this will bring the cost of the canal up to an enormous amount and the percentage will be very large according to the returns which we receive.

Mr. HAGGART. The amount of $10,000 for the Cornwall Canal is to be struck out. That will come into the next Supplementary Estimates.

Esquimalt Graving Dock, additional amount for working expenses..... $5,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How does this account stand?

Mr. OUIMET. This is required in consequence of an increase in the maintenance of the dock. The dock has been used much more than we expected, and this additional amount is required to provide for a second engineer who has to work during the night, and for the coal which is necessary, and the increased amount of pumping that is occasioned by the additional use of the dock. It has been used by Her Majesty's ships especially, which were in dock for 94 days, and by other vessels to a larger extent than we anticipated. The amount of revenue last year was $29,000, and this year we expect it will be about $35,000. Our expenditure on the dock is about $18,000.

North-West Rebellion—Militia claims... $2,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What claimants are required to be paid under this vote? Have you a list of their names?

Mr. BOWELL. I have not a list here, but I know that claims are constantly coming in for losses during the rebellion. This item refers to sums that have been paid on this account. These claims are investigated in the department and are then submitted to the Justice Department to see that they come within the provisions of the law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do not plead the statute of limitations.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think that applies. There is scarcely a week that claims are not coming in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But this is a specific vote, and we ought to have the names.

Mr. BOWELL. None of these claims came in since I have been in charge of the department. If the House will allow this to pass, I will get the names and submit them later.

Amount required to cover Unprovided Items of 1890-91 ..... $294,108 91

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister of Public Works explain why such a large amount as $59,000 was left over from last year in his department?

Mr. OUIMET. It is for general services. These payments were not provided for, although some of them were absolutely required.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think they are mostly lapsed balances.

Mr. OUIMET. Probably so.

Pensions—Miss Harriet Fraser, $250; Mr. Roderick Fraser..... $150

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have forgotten the circumstances under which these payments are made to Mr. and Miss Fraser.

Mr. DEWDNEY. These items were placed in the Estimates about three years ago. This lady was the daughter of Mr. Fraser, who, I think, lived in Cornwall, and was the discoverer of the Fraser River in British Columbia. The particulars were placed before the House at the time this item was placed in the Estimates, and I think the House unanimously approved of it.

Probable amount required for Veterans of War of 1812..... $600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many of these old gentlemen are now on the list?

Mr. BOWELL. We are providing this year for only 30. If you will turn to the Auditor General's Report, page 248-B, you will find the list of names. One of them I see is 107 years old, and another 104.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that the pensioner who is 107 years old lives in Massachusetts. Do you get some official there to certify that he is alive?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. I believe the practice is, before we pay out anything, that a certificate shall be produced that they are living.

Board of Customs and outside protective service—to meet expenditure in connection therewith, including $400, salary of Commissioner of Customs as Chairman of the Board.. $23,600

Mr. BOWELL. Before the rearrangement of the officers in the department the salary for Chairman of this Board was $800; we reduced it to $400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister might give us an explanation of how he proposes to use this money. A considerable increase is applied for.

Mr. BOWELL. The principal increase in the Board of Customs, arises from the fact of our having adopted the plan of paying bounties to beet-root sugar makers, and this necessitates the employment of two or three officials during the whole time that they are working in the factories. The contingencies have also been materially increased, from the fact that we have had to pay our proportion of the expense of the steamer *Cruiser* on the lakes in the West. I expect that our expenses in connection with the steamer in the East will be much larger during the present year. As hon. gentlemen are aware, with the $40,000 that was voted last year, we have purchased a new vessel that was constructed for the Marine and Fisheries service in Lake Huron. It was found after it was built, that it drew too much water, and it was purchased by the Customs Department to be used in the protective service in the St. Lawrence; and that will necessitate a larger sum in the way of expenditure to be paid out of this particular vote than has been expended in the past. In fact I am inclined to think that in the Supplementary Estimates an additional sum will have to be taken in order to cover that service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is that steamer to be employed that you are going to use?

Mr. BOWELL. She is to be used in the Lower St. Lawrence for the purpose of trying to prevent the enormous smuggling that has been carried on for the last few years,

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Is it proposed to replace that *Cruiser* you speak of on the upper lakes?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, that will be replaced by another steamer which is being built at Owen Sound for the Marine and Fisheries Department. I do not think there will be any expenses attending that vessel so far as the Customs Department is concerned.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Will the Customs Department be able to utilize that vessel in any way for their purposes?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, by making the captain of the vessel a preventive officer of customs.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I understood the other vessel drew altogether too much water to be serviceable for the fishing service, the one that was used last year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is Mr. Wolfe dead?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was he replaced?

Mr. BOWELL. No new appointment was made. The office was placed under the charge and management of Mr. McMichael, who was the financial inspector.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this detective service, the Minister is aware that there are a good many complaints made as to the mode in which the office is conducted. Has the department altered in any shape the system by which these men are remunerated for seizures, or do they still continue to receive as before the greater part of the sums paid by way of forfeiture? What was the percentage received by officers last year, and how much did the Government receive?

Mr. BOWELL. There has been no change in the regulations affecting the distribution of proceeds of seizures. The same rule prevails, and the same divisions are made under the Order in Council, which was passed in 1875 by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. The question has been discussed repeatedly as to the propriety of changing the whole system, but from experience, I have great doubts as to the advisability of so doing. I am aware that a great many complaints have been made from different parts of the country, but they have principally come from those who have been violating the law. There is not a case that I am aware of where the officers have been complained of, except by those who have had to pay large penalties. There have been cases in which grave suspicion has existed as to improper importations by certain people. The law is inquisitorial, to say the least of it, and where these investigations have been made and no wrong has been found to exist, I have failed to find an instance in which the merchants who have been conducting their business honestly, have found any fault. I need scarcely say to the hon. gentleman how easy it is for a person who has violated the law and is punished, to raise a hue and cry against the officers for, as they would say, having levied blackmail upon them. All kinds of charges have been made in various parts of the country; and in the investigations which I have ordered, and I caused a number of them to be instituted, I have never yet been able to find that they have been in a single case enabled to establish the fact that improper actions have been taken by any of the regular officers. Occasionally some of the minor officers in an excess of zeal to perform their duty will do many things that they probably should not have done, but they have generally been reprimanded, and those who took offence at their actions have expressed themselves as quite satisfied. I might tell the hon. gentleman that I have numerous letters from merchants doing business in all sections of the country complimenting in the highest possible manner the officers for the zeal which they displayed, and the energy they have exhibited in putting a stop to smuggling. It is a disagreeable duty for officers to perform, and unless they receive some remuneration, and I may add large remuneration, it is not at all likely they would expose themselves to the dangers that beset them in endeavouring to enforce the law against smugglers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total percentage last year, and how was it divided?

Mr. BOWELL. The law gives the power to the Governor in Council to establish regulations for the distribution of seizure money, and the regulation that was adopted in 1875, gives one-third of the seizure to the informer, one-third to the seizing officer, and the other third goes to the revenue. In looking at the Auditor General's Report you will see the total amount received, and the total amount paid out, but that does not give you a correct view of the amount earned last year, because many of these seizures remain unsettled,

and the distribution is not made for two or three years. This arises in many cases from repeated applications from the party who has been fined, and from his friends, for reconsideration; and in other cases we have to go into court in order to confirm the decision of the department. Consequently there is a very large amount which appears in the Auditor General's Report as having been paid this year which runs over three or four years.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not approve of the system of offering a bribe to customs officers to do their duty. I believe that every officer should be made to perform the duty devolving upon him without being bribed to go to a man's place, and hunt through his books to see whether he has been violating the law or not. I find in looking over the Auditor General's Report that some of these men have been making enormous sums of money for many years. For instance here is Mr. T. J. Watters, of Ottawa, who has a salary of $2,200 which is a very good salary for him, and with that salary he should perform the duties devolving upon him without any further compensation, yet his share of the customs seizures last year amounts to not less than $6,889 in addition to his salary. Then we find again another gentleman by the name of Mr. Mc Michael who has figured in the Auditor General's Report for many years as drawing $1,600 a year salary, and his share of the customs seizures amounts to not less than $5,248.18 in addition to his salary. Then we find Mr. O'Hara, another gentleman with a salary of $2,000 and he figures for the little sum of $579.74 in addition to his salary, and so on through the Auditor General's Report, we find these gentlemen receiving large sums from customs seizures in addition to their already good salaries. I do not believe in that system at all. If these men will not perform the duties devolving upon them without being paid extra, then there are 10,000 men in this country who would be very glad to have their place, and the Minister of Customs ought to discharge these men at once and give some other men a chance. Besides all that the Minister of Customs may not be aware of the fact that business men are very sensitive on a matter of that kind. Any business man would rather pay a good deal in the way of blackmail than have his books and private papers and invoices gone over by some shark from the custom-house. The system is a most pernicious one and should be abolished altogether. There is no earthly reason for continuing it, and it is simply levying a toll upon the business men of the country. If Mr. McMichael and the other gentlemen I have mentioned desire to prevent smuggling and will not do it for the salaries they get, turn them out and give others a chance. There has not been a year during the last four or five years in which this man Mr. McMichael has not been figuring for $5,000 or $6,000 in addition to his salary. I think it is time the system was changed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister how Mr. Trudel, of Quebec, comes to be down for so large a sum as $9,880.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Trudel is one of the principal detective officers. For the last two or three years he has been on the Lower St. Lawrence, and I can only account for this large sum being paid to him by the fact that he has had an interest in the large seizures of liquors made during that period. This item, however, is not evidence that Mr. Trudel has put all this money into his pocket. The officer makes the seizure, but the department never enquires who the informer is, and we never know who he is unless there is some dispute between the seizing officer and the person giving the information as to the division of the money.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is $9,000 for the informer as well as for Mr. Trudel.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will remember that I stated last year that liquors had been seized to the value of $100,000, and when sold one-third of the proceeds would go to the informer and one-third to the seizing officer. But it must be remembered that these parties are not paid for the expenses they incur in connection with these seizures. In many cases in the Lower St. Lawrence they have perhaps to charter a tug to take them down to make the seizure, the expense of which they have themselves to pay. I do not know that it would be profitable to enter into a discussion of the question raised by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). I quite agree with him when he says that he is opposed to paying a bribe to any one; but I repudiate *in toto* the suggestion that any bribe is paid by the department to any of its officers to induce them to do their duty. They may be given a premium in the way I have indicated after making the seizures. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that if these men will not do their duty, they should be discharged. I should like the hon. gentleman to be placed in a position to decide when a customs officer does his duty and when he does not. If he attends to his office during office hours strictly he does his duty; and if in addition to that he spends the night watching on the St. Lawrence, I suppose that is not a part of his duty as a customs officer. As I have explained, this sum is no indication of the amount received or earned by these officers last year. It covers seizures made two or three years ago, in some cases years ago. I am aware that if a man violates the law, if he has been systematically cheating the revenue for years by false invoices, and the customs officials go into his establishment and demand an examination of his books, and ascertain that he has been committing frauds and has perhaps run away to the States, he is very likely to make complaints and use the language repeated by the hon. member for Kent, that the officers are blackmailers, thieves and everything else that is wrong. But where the books of honest men have been investigated, it being explained to them why this is done, and where no wrong is found, they have written letters, which are in my possession, complimenting the officers on the courteous manner in which their work was performed, and thanking them also for going through the books of other establishments where frauds had been committed and discovered. The Opposition newspapers and those opposed to the system repeat the very language used by the men who have to pay dearly for the wrongs they commit—blaming the officers as blackmailers, thieves and everything else that is vile.

Mr. GIBSON. I have heard complaints in different parts of the Province, from respectable merchants who are doing business in the country and do not require to go to the United States, that though in every custom-house there are appraisers

who value goods, merchants are allowed to pass their goods at certain values, and the customs authorities receive duties thereon; and yet a day or two afterwards an officer from the custom house comes to the merchant who has entered his goods in good faith and tells him that the valuation is wrong. In that way fines are imposed upon legitimate merchants. Now, why should not the correct valuations be put on the goods when they are being passed through the custom-house?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in stating that this complaint is very often made; but the values change so rapidly that it is impossible for an appraiser, no matter how industrious or studious he may be, to keep pace with those changes. Therefore it very often occurs that goods have been entered and passed at a lower price than the market value in the country from whence they are exported, and it is only in such cases that the appraisers, after discovering that fact, call on the importers to amend their entries.

Mr. GIBSON. There is one particular instance I know of, when a very large quantity of sugar was imported at its true valuation.

Mr. BOWELL. Reed's case?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes. A higher valuation was put upon it afterwards, and the customs authorities had to acknowledge their error, but they had no redress at all, because the Government cannot be fined for the acts of their officers. They were relieved, however, of the extra duty.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error. They were not relieved from the duty. There was one case in which the officers put a higher value upon the sugar, and after full investigation that value was reduced, but the price on which duty was paid was greater than that at which the sugar was entered. I have a distinct recollection of the circumstances, because the New York agent, who exported it to Canada, visited me once or twice, and threatened to bring the whole force of the army and navy of the United States to exterminate this little country, if he did not get his redress. After fuller investigation, it was shown that the islands from which that sugar was imported had no market value, because the plantations were owned by two or three Scotch firms, who would sell no sugar to any one, but sent it to their agent in the United States or Canada. Under such circumstances, the law provides that the correct value shall be arrived at as near as possible by the price in the surrounding country whence the sugar was imported, and the most liberal interpretation was put upon that invoice, but they were compelled to pay the full duty.

Mr. GIBSON. But what redress had the importer for the time the sugar was held by the customs officer? After all was said and done, the customs authorities had to reduce, as the hon. gentleman admits, the valuation back to the proper amount.

Mr. BOWELL. His redress was to pay the duty and sell his goods, and then enter an action if he was improperly used.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to these seizures, are all the expenses taken out of the public fund or deducted from the penalty before division? For instance, there are the expenses of Mr. Belton, special agent, $436.23, and Mr. Watters, $526.95.

Mr. BOWELL. When a seizure is made, the expenses are deducted, and the balance is paid to the seizing officer and to the Receiver General. Take the case of Mr. Belton. In one case I sent him to Baltimore to examine into the books of manufacturers of duck there, the Mount Vernon Duck Company, who send large consignments of duck to Halifax. The gentleman representing the firm had a long interview with me, and said that if I would send an officer to Baltimore he would place the books of the company at his disposal, so that the officer could see exactly what his business was, and the prices at which he had invoiced the duck to Canada. At the same time, he admitted that he was unacquainted with the provisions of our law, and had been sending duck to Canada, not at the price at which it was sold, but at a lower price, but he was quite willing to pay the expenses of the trip and also the extra duty it imposed, objecting only to paying any penalty. The expenses would be advanced to Mr. Belton and charged in the account, but the amount would be refunded to the Receiver General out of the seizure made. It is done in the same way as in the case of the officers in Chicago, St. Paul, Tacoma and some other places in the United States to whom I referred the other night. These expenses are all charged, but when the railway companies pay over the money, it is credited to the Receiver General; and although the expenses appear as a charge on the revenue, the country is not at the expense of a dollar.

Mr. SCRIVER. I have listened to what the hon. gentleman has said with regard to the manner in which the custom-house officers do their duty in investigating cases of supposed smuggling, and I agree with him that, as a rule, their duties are performed judiciously and with proper regard for the rights of the parties affected. While this is true as regards the collectors of customs and the regular officers of the department, it is not always true in the case of detectives. I have known of instances where these men acted in a manner very arbitrary to say the least, and I think I might appeal to my confrere from Missisquoi who like myself represents a border county, to endorse what I say. I have known of instances where they have acted in a most arbitrary and unjust manner. Acting upon information they have gone, not to the business places of traders, but to the houses of poor farmers, and told them that because at some time in the past they may have brought a gallon of coal oil across the border or a few bushels of potatoes for seed, and had at that time a horse and waggon or a team worth so much, the officers placing their own valuation on the property, they will have to pay so much for violating the law or be reported to the department. This was done in a number of instances, and I am glad to say that had it not been for the strong sense of justice of my hon. friend opposite, some of my constituents would have suffered wrong. If my hon. friend were in the position which he once occupied, and which I regret to see he has left, I would appeal very strongly to him to exercise his supervision over the conduct of these detectives, and not allow them to pursue the course in the future which they have pursued in the past.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps it will gratify my hon. friend when I tell him, in regard to the detective to whom he referred, that I issued an order that he should be no longer in our service.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am glad to hear that statement, and I should have expected no less from my hon. friend, because I can say from my place in this House that, whenever I have appealed to him to do what was right, I have always found him ready to listen to reason and to do what was right in the premises.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No doubt we can all speak in the highest terms of the hon. gentleman who was lately the Minister of Customs, but I do not think that the answer he gave me is a sufficient answer to the charges I brought. I stated, and I repeat, that a great many of these men are simply sharks—pirates, which, as an hon. gentleman suggests, is perhaps a better word—who are going simply for plunder. The more seizures they make the more money they make, and they often go into the offices of men who are honest traders, who are men who would not be guilty of a dishonest transaction and deal with them as if they were the dishonest traders, guilty of smuggling, to whom the hon. gentleman has referred.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that. I drew the distinction between the two classes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But the complaints often come in regard to honest traders, who enter their goods at what they cost, and you can see that the whole tendency is to levy blackmail. There is no business man, however honest and pure he may be, who cares to have a person from the Customs Department come in and put his hand on his books and papers and say: These are ours for the present. The very name of it injures his credit, and he often does give $100 to hush the matter up and have the man go away. There is no doubt that has occurred over and over again, and it will occur as long as this system is carried on. The statement of the Minister that these amounts which appear in the Auditor General's Report were not for this year is no sign that they were not received this year.

Mr. BOWELL. I said they were not earned this year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Take the case of Mr. Mc Michael, who has been receiving $3,000 to $6,000 every year. Last year I think he received $9,000 according to the Auditor General's Report. In many other cases this occurs, and this is a fair criterion as to what these men have earned. Then the hon. gentleman proposes that they shall bonus officers in order to induce them to do their duty. These men may be lying along the banks of the lakes or the rivers and may not be doing their duty, but it is for the department to see that they do their duty. They have inspectors, and if those they have are not sufficient, they should put on a few more, and see that those men perform their duty.

Mr. BOWELL. The duty of the inspectors is to inspect the offices, not to see what the detectives are doing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If things are being smuggled, you can soon find it out, and can see what your officers are doing. I believe that many of the officers do not earn their pay. In the town of Chatham we have three men: the late collector of customs who was receiving $1,200 a year, another at $800, and the third at $600. The third man did the work and the others drew the pay. There is no necessity for keeping three men there, and Mr. Eberts, the third man, who receives only $600, really does all the work of the office. If the department looked into that, they would find that there is no necessity for three men there, and, if that system prevails in other offices, the reason for the enormous expenditures can be easily seen in regard to the collection of revenue for customs. I believe the proper system is to do away with the sharing of spoils, and, if the officers do not perform their work, turn them out and put other men in their places.

Mr. McGREGOR. I agree with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) and the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) as to these detectives or spies who go the rounds of the country and levy blackmail on the people.

Mr. BOWELL. Can the hon. gentleman sustain or prove his assertion that any of these men levy blackmail?

Mr. McGREGOR. I can come pretty near it.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think it is fair to accuse any man of levying blackmail, which is practically stealing, without being able to produce the proof. If the hon. gentleman can prove one case of that kind, I will see that the man concerned shall be punished.

Mr. McGREGOR. I will give the hon. gentleman a case in point. Mr. Albert Drouillard, who is getting a salary of $550, seized the scow *Mary Alice* on Lake St. Clair in 1891, it being alleged that the scow had been smuggling. It was proved by four persons who were on the boat that she took nothing over to the Canadian side at all. Then they said, we will let her go on the case of smuggling, but she had some repairs done in Detroit. It seems that she crossed over to the dry dock there. We produced all the receipts from beginning to end, and then the department said they had very little claim against the boat. Yet this boat was held over from some time in August until the fall, and then ran down to Windsor. A man was placed on her at the time she was seized, whose wages amounted to over $74. She ran into a bay near Windsor, and $83 more expenses were placed upon her for a caretaker; and yet this poor man, who is not worth $300 in the world, is deprived of his vessel. I am prepared to prove that that officer has gone to one place and said: "You had a harness brought over here a few years ago, unless you pay me $12 I will make you trouble." In the case of Mr. Hackett, in my hon. friend's county, he gave him the $12. He went into another place, Mr. Rumble's store, and said; "Unless you give me $400 I will seize the whole establishment." and the Methodist minister and several other men in the neighbourhood had to raise the $400 and give it to him. And so he has been going the rounds. He gets from this country $550, and from seizures last year he got $750 more, and the year before I understand a still larger sum. Now, we are prepared to pay these men well, to deal with them as they should be dealt with, but the practice of giving them half of what they seize is an incentive to them to do great injustice to many people, espe-

cially along the shores. In our town there is no scarcity of customs officers, men of as high character as any other men in the Dominion. Those are the men who should have charge of that business, instead of employing special detectives for doing such dirty work. I am free to say that the common constables or the police officers would be above acting as some of these detectives have done.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not prepared to take the position of some members and condemn the whole system adopted by the department. I know some of the difficulties that exist, and I agree to a large extent with the Minister that the system does prevent dishonest dealers from smuggling and defrauding the revenue. However, without approving of the strong language used by some hon. members, I still think that the law, as at present administered by these officers, does great injustice to manufacturers and merchants.

Mr. BOWELL. Have you any experience?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not mean my friend that the Minister is referring to, but to others. I will give an instance, without mentioning names, to show how the authority placed in the hands of these men is sometimes used in an oppressive manner. I know a case where an officer goes to a business man and says to him that he has been guilty of an infraction of the law. The man says he is not guilty. Now, very few men who are not business men can realize what it means to a business man to have his factory or shop placed under seizure. It means injury or ruin to his credit. An ordinary business man cannot afford to risk the position in which he may stand with the banks and the merchants with whom he deals, by having his credit questioned through a seizure. In the instance I refer to, the officer, after discussing the matter, said to him: "If you will make a deposit of $2,000 I will have this matter investigated." That may appear fair enough for the Minister, but it is a very serious matter to a business man who may not have that amount on hand. But even if he does, as the Minister well knows, these matters become known to the public almost immediately. In the instance I speak of the manufacturer refused to make this deposit, and after an investigation the whole matter fell through. There is no doubt in my mind that the man was perfectly innocent, and that the officer had no case against him. I think this authority in the hands of the officers is sometimes employed to do great harm to merchants and manufacturers, and it subjects the Government to some very strong statements and charges being made against them. It may be well to give some premium to the officers in order to make them more active and energetic in their work, but I must say that under the present system many people have a just cause of complaint. I am aware that the late Minister of Customs has acquired, after a long experience, rather a hardened view of the character of the business men of the country. However, I acknowledge that in cases brought to his attention he has listened to arguments and reason. But this is the point I wish to make: Although it may be decided, after investigation, that this manufacturer or merchant has not been guilty of an infraction of the law, still he has no remedy for the injustice that has been done him by the injury to his credit. I know personally that some merchants have a grievance in this respect, and I think the department ought seriously to consider whether some other system might be adopted to prevent fraud, or at least whether the authority given to these officers should not be curtailed. At present the fines inflicted upon merchants by seizures appear to them as nothing more or less than blackmail. Before the officers are allowed to threaten a business man and compel him to make a deposit, a report should be made to the head of the department, who should decide whether there is evidence sufficient to justify action being taken.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is one point I think the Minister might explain. Are these special detectives authorized by the department to go to an individual and threaten him in the way we have heard of, and that person, whether guilty or not, must pay him a certain amount of money to avoid further trouble? Are they at liberty to settle cases in that way, and if they do so, do they make a return of the money to the department? In the case my hon. friend who sits beside me referred to, where that has been done, and where the officer was discharged and a refund made to the party of the money that this officer had taken from him, did that officer pay the money into the treasury, or did the country lose the money?

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. gentleman has answered his own question. We could scarcely have refunded money that we never received. The department has not been conducted in such a loose manner as that: no refund of money has been made out of the treasury unless it has first been paid into the treasury. I know of no case in which officers have received money and have not deposited it to the credit of the Receiver General. There may have been cases of that kind, as there are thefts and fraud committed, but we never allow such abuse to occur with the approval of the department. The officers have never received any instructions, either directly or indirectly, nor was permission given them to threaten any man. They have been cautioned against that over and over again, and they have been threatened with dismissal where any case of that kind has come to the knowledge of the department. As detectives receiving information that certain smuggling has taken place, they very often go to the party who is accused, and they may say, as the hon. gentleman has alleged: "You have been charged with doing so-and-so, and it is my duty to seize your horse and carriage or your stock, but if you wish to make a deposit pending the investigation, that will be the easiest way of doing it." Such deposits if made are at once credited to the Receiver General, and a report made to the department and an investigation takes place. In many cases where it has been found that there has been an infraction of the law of the character indicated by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), which would justify the Minister in remitting portions of the duty, it is done. A man may have smuggled coal oil, and that is a very common thing on the frontier, and the horse or the sleigh or waggon may have been seized and a deposit made, in order to prevent its being taken away. He makes a deposit of $50 or $100, and that is credited at once to the Receiver General. The officers have no authority to keep it, and then when we investigate any such case we punish them sometimes with a

penalty of $5 or $10 in accordance with the magnitude of the offence. That is the course which has been pursued; but to suppose that the department would give authority to any officer to threaten merchants or any one else would be to suppose a system of carrying on Government that would be scarcely justifiable. I do not know the case to which my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) referred to just now, although I know that I have had some little dealings with the hon. gentleman where he has been very persistent in trying to get men off, and afterwards acknowledged himself that they were not punished as much as they ought to be. I think he could tell you that I used some strong expletives, and, perhaps, unjustifiable ones, in reference to these men, and they were not political friends of the hon. gentleman either, but political friends of our own. There may be cases where an officer will be justified in going to the merchant and telling him that he is informed that he has been smuggling, and ask him to allow his books to be investigated, to see if the information which he has received is correct. If an informer states that he believes Mr. So-and-so has been smuggling, it is the duty of the collector at once, either to go himself, or to send an officer to make an investigation. Merchants who have not been guilty may feel annoyed, as the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) says, but in many cases where the facts have been explained to them they expressed themselves quite satisfied, because other people had violated the law and had been punished, and the honest importer is always glad to know that his guilty neighbour who has been taking advantage of him has been prevented from doing so in future. I do not remember the case of this scow, but I am inclined to think that if the papers were laid before the House the facts would not be exactly as stated by the member for Essex (Mr. McGregor). I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman received the complaint, but I think he was incorrectly informed.

Mr. McGREGOR. I have affidavits on every point required in reference to that particular case.

Mr. BOWELL. Were there not just as many affidavits on the other side?

Mr. McGREGOR. I suppose there were: I saw them, but they were not as strong or as numerous as the ones I got.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The remedy I would offer to the department is this: A distinction should be made, and the authority given to the officer who makes seizures only to get deposits from parties who may be suspected of breaches of the law in such cases as he mentions of a horse or a waggon that could easily be removed in a few hours or days unless they were placed under seizure. But there is certainly no justification at all for an officer making a seizure upon mere suspicion, to ask a deposit from a merchant or manufacturer with a large place of business or a large stock of goods. I would ask the Minister's attention to that, but perhaps as he has given up the department he does not take any interest in it.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. So far as honest traders are concerned, this asking of a deposit from reliable men is a certain grievance, and if a change were made in the direction I have indicated it would be a remedy that would give great satisfaction. I have already said that it is difficult to offer a mode of procedure that would be an improvement on the present one, although irregularities do exist under it. I think it is of the mode of enforcing the system that we have reason to complain. I would ask the Minister to point out where can be found the total amount which is divided amongst the officers, and what expenditure is charged to the country, or where a record is to be found of the money deposited with the Receiver General?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know of any special entry.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Minister will see that it is important in discussing this subject that we should know where to find whether the amount is deducted from the seizure or paid by the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I have explained that half a dozen times.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not understand that the Minister was satisfied himself that this money had been paid in, although he said that the instructions were given to do so.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's Report he will see four or five pages of refunds, which can only be paid out of deposits.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I refer to the expenses.

Mr. BOWELL. If an officer is going on duty he will get an advance to pay his expenses, and if he did not spend it all he would have to refund it, and that would be re-deposited to the credit of the Receiver General.

Mr. FRASER. I understand that certain judgments against officials of the Government have been paid by the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. There have been judgments rendered against the department which have been paid, but not against officers.

Mr. FRASER. I think there was a case in Nova Scotia in connection with an officer, Mr. Curless, who was doing a good deal of business with the department.

Mr. BOWELL. I have nothing to do with that; that is in the Excise Department.

Mr. FRASER. I think perhaps there are cases in which the Government do not receive all that is collected. But I only rose to say that the discussion to-night and the evidence given by the Minister are only further illustrations of the wretched system we have, and I hope that the Minister will take them to heart by sweeping away this whole system, which should have no place in a free country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand that in all cases where these deposits are made the matter is fully investigated by the Minister or the department?

Mr. BOWELL. All cases are investigated by the department. The moment the deposit is made the duty of the officer is to make a return of the seizure, and the seizure paper shows the amount that is deposited. Then the party from whom the seizure is made is notified, and he has a month within which to put in his defence, and if within that month he puts in no defence, then

judgment is rendered, either remitting or reducing the amount or confiscating the whole.

Mr. McGREGOR. This poor man's boat was seized in August or September last year, and if my statement is correct, I wish to know why it has not been sold or returned?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell. If the hon. gentleman will give me the name of the vessel, I will obtain the information for him to-morrow.

Mr. McGREGOR. The scow *Mary Alice*, seized in September in Belle River, Lake St. Clair.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have not some of the boards of trade pronounced against the system?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has not the Toronto Board of Trade had the question before it and pronounced against the system of seizure?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of. I do not know that it would change matters if they did. The Boards of Trade of Toronto and Montreal have passed resolutions asking for a better system of appraisements in order that the difficulties which arise in fixing values may be avoided.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 6th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY PROPERTY AT ST. JOHN.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked, Whether the Government has purchased or expropriated the property in St. John, N.B., known as the Harris property, for the purpose of the Intercolonial Railway or any other, and what purpose, and what number of square feet are there in the property so purchased or expropriated? If so, has any and what sum been agreed upon or fixed as the purchase money? Was the property valued? If so, by whom, and when, and what was the valuation? Does the valuation or amount agreed to be paid for the property, embrace the lots known as the De Veber lot and the McIntyre lot? Who was the solicitor employed on behalf of the Government in conducting the negotiations for the purchase of the "Harris Property" proper?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, the Government have purchased the property at St. John known as the "Harris Property" for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway, containing about 216,000 square feet; the purchase price is $200,000. The property was valued by Mr. C. R. Fairweather, and also by Mr. Charles E. Everett, as to the land, and by Mr. J. T. C. McKean, architect, and Mr. Edward Bates, builder, as to buildings, in October, 1891. Valuation of Fairweather, McKean and Bates, $313,457; valuation of Everett, McKean and Bates, $349,656. Yes, it does include the De Veber and McIntyre lots. No solicitor was employed.

STATIONERY FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, The amount in value of stationery supplied to the Intercolonial Railway during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1891? Also the amount in value used by the railway during the same time.

Mr. HAGGART. The amount in value of stationery supplied to the Intercolonial Railway during the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1891, was $48,238.06. The amount in value used by the railway during the same time was $57,855.46.

SHEET HARBOUR, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN asked, Who is harbour master at Sheet Harbour, Nova Scotia. What amounts were collected by him for the calendar years 1890 and 1891 respectively, and what remuneration did he receive?

Mr. TUPPER. Malcolm McFarlane is harbour master. Collections, calendar year 1890, $89.50; collections, calendar year 1891, $52; remuneration allowed, $200 of fees collected in any one year. He got all the fees he collected.

Mr. BORDEN asked, What is the total cost of the two Government wharves at Sheet Harbour? Who was the overseer of the work during construction, what was his allowance per day, and for how many days?

Mr. OUIMET. The total cost was $20,056.96. Mr. McFarlane was the overseer. He was paid $2.50 per day for 225 days from the 11th February, 1888, to the 5th of February 1889.

EXPORT DUTY ON SAW-LOGS.

Mr. RIDER asked, When was the export duty removed from saw-logs and other unmanufactured lumber exported from Canada to the United States? What are the different kinds of lumber that have been exported from Canada to the United States, since the removal of the export duty upon the same, up to 1st January, 1892, and how many feet in board measure of each kind of lumber in the log have been so exported?

Mr. BOWELL. The export duty on pine and spruce logs, shingle bolts and cedar logs, was repealed on the 11th of October, 1890, as per circular and proclamation issued at that time, which I hold in my hand, and which the hon. gentleman can have if he desires. The exports of lumber, which formerly paid export duty, have been as follows:—From the 13th of October, 1890, to the 1st of January, 1892: pine logs, 43,032 thousand feet; spruce logs, 27,941 thousand feet; cedar logs, *nil*; shingle bolts, *nil*.

CHARGES AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose it will be the unanimous desire of the House that the motion which I

put on the Notice Paper last Wednesday should be proceeded with, with the utmost dispatch; and if that is the case, I will, with the leave of the House, take this motion out of its order and move it now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot see why it should be the unanimous wish of the House to take any motion out of its course.

Mr. EDGAR. Very well; I shall make the following statement in my place in this House:—

That I am credibly informed and believe that I can establish by satisfactory evidence:

1. That during the years 1882 to 1891 inclusive, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company received by way of bonus from the Dominion of Canada, subsidies amounting to upwards of one million dollars, which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of the Ministers of the Crown.

2. Arrangements were entered into by the said railway company whereby the expenditure of said subsidies was made by a construction company through or in conjunction with one H. J. Beemer, a contractor—and the said Beemer and those who assisted him in financing for the said railway works, received the benefit of the said subsidies.

3. During the whole of the said period from 1882 to 1891, the Honourable Sir Adolphe P. Caron was, and still is, a member of the House of Commons of Canada, a member of the Canadian Government and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for Canada.

4. That the said Sir A. P. Caron was, during the whole, or the greater part of the said period, one of the members of the said construction company, and thus had means of knowledge of, and did know of the dealings with the said subsidies and their destination after they were paid over by the Government to the said railway company.

5. That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and from moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same.

6. That during the said period out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same, large sums of moneys were from time to time corruptly paid and contributed, at the request and with the knowledge of said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

7. That the Temiscouata Railway Company was given incorporation by Letters Patent issued by the Canadian Government on 6th October, 1885, and since that date the said railway company has received from the Dominion of Canada subsidies to the extent of $649,200—which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of Ministers of the Crown.

8. That since the 6th of October, 1885, and while the said Temiscouata Railway was being constructed in part by means of the said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money from the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies.

9. That also since the said 6th October, 1885, the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies, paid and contributed large sums at the request, and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which the said Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

10. That the said sums of money hereinbefore mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 9, as paid and contributed for election purposes, were so used, together with other sums contributed by public contractors with the Dominion Government, and were controlled and distributed by the direct authority and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, in lavish and illegal amounts for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors, and in the general election of 1887 alone, upwards of $100,000 of moneys so contributed were so used for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors in the following electoral districts, that is to say: The Counties of St. Maurice, Champlain, Lévis, Montmorency, Charlevoix, Kamouraska, Témiscouata, L'Islet, Dorchester, Berthier, Portneuf, Quebec, Gaspé, Rimouski, Montmagny, Bellechasse, Beauce and Megantic, and in Quebec West, Quebec Centre, Quebec East and Three Rivers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made that statement, I propose to found on it the motion of which I have given notice, and I would like your ruling whether it is so far a question of privilege that I can take it out of its ordinary place on the Paper. On that point I would refer you to the cases quoted in Bourinot, on pages 377 and 378, and also to the Huntington case which was brought up in this House out of its order in 1873, upon notice having been given by the mover of the resolution across the House previously. I have given notice in the most formal possible way by placing my motion in the Votes and Proceedings two days ago. Then, Sir, there was the Prince Albert Colonization Company case in the year 1886, in which a notice of motion like this was given, and the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Militia immediately took the first occasion to call upon the House to have the matter considered. Of course that was done by the unanimous consent of the House, and, therefore, I suppose it is not a precedent on the question of privilege, though it shows what the House has done. During the same session there was the case of Mr. Hector Cameron, of Victoria, in which the charge made against him was taken up as a matter of privilege. Then, there is Mr. Rykert's case in 1890, the Tarte-McGreevy case in 1891, and the East Northumberland case in 1891. Then, in May, at page 290, edition of 1883, we have a number of cases mentioned where precedence was given to motions on the ground of their privilege. He mentions a case relating to a corrupt agreement between Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Raphael in connection with the Carlow election. He also mentions the case of Mr. Roebuck's motion for a committee to enquire into election compromises. Then, in Mr. Plimsoll's case, even an adjourned debate had precedence over other motions, and a little further on, where the conduct of a member in connection with a joint stock company was in question, though the Speaker held that it was doubtful whether it was a question of privilege, yet, as it affected the character of a member, it was taken up by consent of the House. In 1859, May says: "Other questions connected with election compromises were allowed precedence." I wish to state, as an additional reason why this should have precedence, that, at the first possible moment I had the information in my possession which satisfied me I could prove these charges, I gave the notice. There was not a day's delay. I did it in the shortest possible time, because there are some considerations which affect the question of urgency, apart altogether from the serious character of the charges. There is, for instance, the length of the session, which is a matter affecting the convenience of members of the House, and if there be any delay in referring this question to a committee, the session may be prolonged. I desire to show to the House that when I made these charges, I wanted to have an investigation at the earliest possible opportunity, and I submit the motion can be made by me, of which I have given notice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume, Mr. Speaker, the decision you gave the other day, when you laid down the principle governing matters of urgency which would justify a departure from the rules of the House in dealing with matters of privilege, and which clears the ground in all these cases, governs this. The hon. gentleman had the choice whether he would consider it a matter of privilege and urgency, or whether it should be taken up in its usual course, and decided in favour of the latter, by putting it on the Paper to be dealt with in the ordinary way, and not until this moment, when he can only do so under claim of its being a matter of privilege, and as he made a statement on the subject to the House, has he attempted to treat it as a matter of privilege and of urgency. I submit there is no matter of privilege or urgency in the motion; and the arguments the hon. gentleman has advanced as to the convenience of the House and the length of the session, are not arguments which can be used to support the plea of urgency. With regard to proceedings in former sessions of Parliament, they took place on matters which were dealt with by the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. The first question to be looked into is whether this is a matter of privilege. I submit that anything affecting the character or standing of a member of this House is a matter of privilege. All the books are unanimous on this subject. If this is a matter affecting the character and independence of a member of this House, it is a matter of privilege, and it is of no consequence whether notice was given or not. I will call attention to the words of May, page 291:

"It has been said that a question of privilege is, properly, one not admitting of notice; but where the circumstances have been such as to enable the member to give notice, and the matter was, nevertheless, *bonâ fide*, a question of privilege, precedence has still been conceded to it."

We have had a series of precedents on this question since the year 1873, showing that similar questions have been treated as a matter of privilege, without any notice, and it is in the interests of all that this motion should be heard at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER. We have to consider this question in the light of the rules laid down the other day. In the statement I made to the House on the 21st of March, it will be found that I said: "*Primâ facie*, a question affecting a seat of a member of the House is a question of privilege." We have to consider, first, whether the allegations made by the hon. gentleman affect the seat of the hon. member in question; and, from my point of view, I think it is very doubtful whether it comes under that category, or can be considered a question of privilege justifying the immediate interposition of the House. With regard to the precedents which the hon. member for West Ontario has quoted, I think it will be found that in every one of these cases they were brought up without notice, with the unanimous consent of the House; and while I do not pretend to say that this question could not be brought up with the unanimous consent of the House, yet, I think, having been put upon the Notice Paper and not partaking, to my mind, of the element of urgency, it cannot be taken out of its ordinary place except with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. EDGAR.

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT AND F. CHARLEBOIS.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copy of all correspondence between F. Charlebois, of Byng Inlet, North (Ontario), and the Fisheries Department concerning the payment of a claim for services performed by the said Charlebois for the said department.

He said: I would like specially to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this motion. Mr. Charlebois represents to me that about a year ago he did some work for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and that he was employed by a person of the name of Fraser, who was an overseer of fisheries at Byng Inlet. He was employed by him to draw some nets which Fraser had seized for an infraction of the law. For this he made a charge of $60.50. The amount is not large, but is important to this man. He never received his money, but he applied several times to the department, and I find from the papers placed in my hands that the department communicated with the overseer, Mr. Fraser, who at first, when applied to by this department, stated that he had paid Charlebois, but the department afterwards, I believe, became convinced that this was not true, and that the man had not been paid. I do not know what took place after this, but I understand that Fraser has since not only left the service of the department but has left the country. Under such circumstances, I do not know whether the department hold themselves responsible for the expense which was incurred by Mr. Fraser. I would submit this to the consideration of the hon. gentleman. This man has acted in good faith, and if he has acted under an order of an officer of the department, I think he would have not only a moral claim but a legal claim. It would not be worth his while to go into a court of law for such a small amount, but, if he has a moral claim, it should be for the Minister to see that this poor man should not lose the money he is entitled to.

Mr. TUPPER. On the statement of facts placed before the House by the hon. gentleman, I quite agree in his conclusion that a claim of that kind should be paid. The memorandum placed in my hands is to the effect that this man was employed by Fraser, and, after examination of his charges, a cheque for the amount was sent to the officer to pay the man he had employed. After that Mr. Charlebois wrote to the department saying he had not received the cheque, and the last communication we have is one from Fraser written to the department in October, 1891, in which he states that he had settled with Charlebois. From that time down, I believe we have had no word from Mr. Charlebois. However, from what the hon. gentleman says, it would appear that Mr. Charlebois has not received the money. I will examine into the case, and will see that justice is done.

Mr. LAURIER. Probably, if the hon. gentleman looks into it, he will find that the cheque has come back, and that Charlebois has not been paid. I will send him a letter which will give him some further information on the subject.

Motion agreed to.

THE LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In the absence of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Lister), I would ask that the motion I have on the paper :

That a copy of the petition of Thomas S. Hobbs and others, of the city of London, read and received on Friday, the 1st of April, 1892, by this House, praying that justice may be done with reference to certain judgments rendered by County Court Judge Elliott under the Electoral Franchise Act, and in relation to certain acts of partisanship alleged to have been committed by the said judge, be communicated forthwith to His Honour Judge Elliott,

be allowed to stand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot agree to that.

Motion dropped.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE AT THE COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION.

Mr. CHARLTON. One or two gentlemen on the opposite side of the House desire to be present and participate in the discussion of the motion which I have on the Paper, and, if the Minister of Justice has no objection, I will let it stand ; otherwise I will proceed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman had better proceed.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then I beg to move :

That this House expresses the opinion, in the interest of morality, good government and religion, it is of importance to the civilized world and of special importance to Canada, that the Canadian Department of the Columbian Exhibition to be held at Chicago, next year, should be closed on Sunday.

As I said across the House to the Minister of Justice that, if he did not permit this motion to stand I would go on with it, I will proceed, although perhaps on second thought I should have let it drop for the present. I think it is a matter of importance to the people of Canada that the action contemplated by this resolution should be taken. The question as to whether the Columbian Exhibition at Chicago shall be closed or opened on the Lord's Day has not yet been settled by the United States Government. If it had been settled, and the decision had been that the exhibition should be closed on the Lord's Day, then any action by the Canadian Parliament would be superfluous, but, in the absence of such action and in view of the possibility that the decision of the United States may be adverse to the closing of the exhibition on the Sabbath, I think it is important that the Government of Canada should take action in the matter. Great Britain, it is unnecessary to say, is considered a Christian nation. There are various statutes upon the statute-books of England providing for the observance, under various circumstances and to various extents, of the Lord's Day. Almost all the provinces of this Dominion have statutes of a similar character, and the permission for the opening of the Canadian portion of the Columbian Exposition on the Lord's Day would be contrary to the Canadian record on that subject, and I am sure would be against the feelings and desires of the great bulk of the Canadian population. I do not intend to detain the House long upon this question, and shall refrain from urging at length the reasons why this is contrary to the interests of morality, good government and religion. That this motion is a step in the interests of religion it is not necessary to argue. That it is a step in the interests of morality all experience shows, because the observance of the Lord's Day has proved that it is necessary to the preservation of good morals, and it is also a step in the best interests of good government. We know that in the Christian home, the observance of the Sabbath is the bulwark of our public institutions, and for the sake of the example which our action in this matter would exert upon the world -- and it would be no slight or unimportant example -- for the sake of the influence it would exert upon our own community, for the sake of taking a position which would be defensible before the world, I beg to move this resolution.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Without entering into a criticism of the reasons which are given in the motion itself, in support of the proposition which it puts forward for the approbation of the House, I think we must all recognize that there are reasons which might make it desirable that the spirit of the resolution should be carried out. I think that the course which has already been pursued by Great Britain at the exhibitions in which she has taken part concurrently with Canada, would lead us to support the proposition that our portion of the Chicago Exhibition, in so far as this country is concerned, should, if possible, be closed on Sunday. That was the course which was pursued with regard to the British exhibits at the Paris Exhibition. The exhibition itself was open, but the exhibits that came from Great Britain, from Canada, and probably from other British colonies, were covered on Sunday. The same course was pursued subsequently on another occasion of a like kind. I shall ask the House, however, not to adopt the motion as pledging the Government to any particular course, for this reason : that while that is the disposition of the Government, there may be considerations which would prevent its being carried out, and those considerations we are not yet aware of. Our exhibits will be, to a great extent, under the control of the managing authorities of the exhibition, and our exhibits are, I believe, to be in the main building, and we must conform ourselves to such regulations as we find imperative in that country to which our exhibits are sent, and in which the exhibition is being conducted. Subject to any unforeseen and overriding necessity of that kind, the principle to which the resolution refers is one that the Government desires to carry out. I hope that, after this announcement, the House will not consider it necessary to adopt the resolution, which would bind the Government to any particular course, although we are willing to follow that course, if possible.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am quite willing, in view of the statement made by the Minister of Justice, not to press the motion, although I am of the opinion that it would be better for this House to give an expression of opinion in the matter. I do not think it would embarrass the Government.

CHARGES AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. EDGAR. I beg leave to move :

That James D. Edgar, the member representing the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Ontario in this House, having stated from his place in this House, that he is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence :

1. That during each of the years 1882 to 1891 inclusive, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company received

by way of bonus from the Dominion of Canada, subsidies amounting in the aggregate to upwards of one million dollars, which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of the Ministers of the Crown.

2. Arrangements were entered into by the said railway company whereby the expenditure of said subsidies was made by a construction company through or in conjunction with one H. J. Beemer, a contractor—and the said Beemer and those who assisted him in financing for the said railway works, received the benefit of the said subsidies.

3. During the whole of the said period from 1882 to 1891, the Honourable Sir Adolphe P. Caron was, and still is, a member of the House of Commons of Canada, a member of the Canadian Government and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for Canada.

4. That the said Sir A. P. Caron was, during the whole, or the greater part of the said period, one of the members of the said construction company, and thus had means of knowledge of, and did know of the dealings with the said subsidies and their destination after they were paid over by the Government to the said railway company.

5. That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and from moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same.

6. That during the said period out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same, large sums of money were from time to time corruptly paid and contributed, at the request and with the knowledge of said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

7. That the Temiscouata Railway Company was given incorporation by Letters Patent issued by the Canadian Government on 6th October, 1885, and since that date the said railway company has received from the Dominion of Canada subsidies to the extent of $649,200—which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of Ministers of the Crown.

8. That since the 6th October, 1885, and while the said Temiscouata Railway was being constructed in part by means of the said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money from the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies.

9. That also since the said 6th October, 1885, the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies, paid and contributed large sums at the request, and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which the said Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

10. That the said sums of money hereinbefore mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 9, as paid and contributed for election purposes, were so used, together with other sums contributed by public contractors with the Dominion Government, and were controlled and distributed by the direct authority and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, in lavish and illegal amounts for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors, and in the general election of 1887 alone, upwards of $100,000 of moneys so contributed were so used for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors in the following electoral districts, that is to say: The Counties of St. Maurice, Champlain, Lévis, Montmorency, Charlevoix, Kamouraska, Temiscouata, L'Islet, Dorchester, Berthier, Portneuf, Quebec, Gaspé, Rimouski, Montmagny, Bellechasse, Beauce and Megantic, and in Quebec West, Quebec Centre, Quebec East and Three Rivers.

That the above statements be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to enquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the Committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and all their proceedings on the reference, and the result of their enquiries.

He said: In making this motion I have proposed that the reference should be made to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as that seems to be the Committee which has been favoured by the Government to make enquiries of this kind. On other occasions when Special Committees have been mentioned, amendments have been moved or approved, the reference has been to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. However, I assume that the charges are so serious and distinctly made that the House will, as a matter of course, grant a committee of enquiry, and assuming that to be the case I will simply make the motion without making any comment on the charges at present.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, I desire, in answer to the charges which have been made by the hon. member for the West Riding of Ontario (Mr. Edgar), to make a statement to the House. The statement which I intend to make will be short. I take this, the first opportunity which has been given me, to state to the House that in every particular the charges made by the hon. gentleman are false. I may add that, unsolicited, without asking for them, I have received letters and telegrams from the manager of both companies mentioned in the charges as made by the hon. gentleman, declaring that the charge of my receiving money from those companies is absolutely false. At this period of the proceedings, I consider the emphatic denial which I have given to the charges is all that I should say at present.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am aware that there is a popular impression, that a gentleman in this House who makes accusations of misconduct, impropriety, dishonesty, or other charges of that character against another member of this House incurs a serious responsibility, and may, if the charge is proven unsustained, be expelled from this Chamber. In view of the ground which I shall ask the House to take with regard to this resolution, I beg to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact, that that is an entire misapprehension. A member making a charge against another in this House may, of course, subject himself, as he does in pursuing any line of conduct on any piece of business before the House, to the censure of the House: but so far as his own seat is concerned he may make false charges against other members of the House with perfect impunity. It behooves the House, therefore, to consider with great care how far it shall accede to the request of a member making charges against the personal character of another, to entertain and investigate such charges. The House has been reminded on other occasions, when questions like this came before it, of the fact, that in acceding to such a request we are undertaking to sit in a judicial capacity and to conduct a judicial inquiry upon a fellow member. I am sure that every member will agree with me, that apart from first principles, even, and considering merely views of convenience and ordinary propriety, the House ought to be very careful, indeed, as to the character and the class of charges with respect to which it will undertake to exercise such judicial functions and to pronounce one of its members guilty of misconduct, or not guilty of misconduct. The House will at all times have regard, I am sure,

to the general principles which are necessary, not only to the independence and security of members in this House as regards their seats, but likewise to principles which are necessary, with a view to the dignity of the House and the rights of the constituencies which members represent. I think, Sir, there can be no doubt of the general principles which should guide us upon occasions of this kind. Obviously, to state the abstract principle as well as one can, the House has a perfect right to enquire at any time with regard to the manner in which public moneys have been expended by the departments of Government, or by others to whom they have entrusted public moneys for expenditure. That class of cases in which charges may be made as to the proper expenditure of public money to those to whom it has been voted to administer, or who may have been appointed by the Executive to administer it: that class of cases is altogether aside from the present one. Either of the branches of Parliament which have appropriated the money, has at all times the right, irrespective of any charge of personal misconduct, to enquire into the manner in which its votes of money have been administered from time to time. There is in these present charges, of course, no reference to any complaint of that character. There is no allegation of any public money having been misappropriated or maladministered. I am mentioning that class of cases as one as to which there would be little doubt as to the course which the House would be disposed to take. In the second place, Mr. Speaker, the precedents which have been established, show that the House from time to time will take cognizance of an offence alleged to have been committed by a member of this House in his capacity as a member of this House. Now, Sir, the distinction between a charge of that character and the charge which has been preferred by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), is not only, I think, a pretty plain one, but is one which I submit this House ought ever most carefully to bear in mind. We have not been charged here by the constitution with any right, even, to judge upon the conduct and the private character of any member of the House. I am now arguing the question in the abstract and not making particular reference to any of the charges which are before us. But, speaking of the general principle, we are not charged by the constitution with any right or any power to investigate the personal capacity or the private character of any member of this House. On the contrary, the constitution has provided that the choice of members shall rest, not with this House, but with the constituencies who send members here; and it is only when a member betrays his trust by a breach of his duty as a member of this House, that the House has any right to enquire into his conduct, or any right or any power to affect his status in the House, by any resolution affecting his seat and his right to be here. Let us now enquire, Mr. Speaker, how far the charges which the hon. member desires to have submitted to the Committee of Privileges and Elections come within either of the rules which I have laid down. It is clear they do not come within the first, as regards the administration of public money: because the allegations, grouping them together, and interpreting them as read together, or taking them singly, amount to this: that two companies to which moneys were voted by Parliament on several occasions, and another company which had obtained possession of the money given them for the purpose of expenditure, appropriated a portion of the moneys which had thus been voted, not for the purposes of their own enterprises, but for the purpose of aiding the hon. the Postmaster General in his own election, and in others in which he was interested and in which supporters of the Government were candidates. Now, Sir, before considering in detail what these charges are, or whether they come up to the standard of making an accusation of misconduct by a member of this House in his capacity as a member of this House, I wish particularly to direct the attention of the House to the importance of seeing that that rule is strictly complied with by any person who desires this House to exercise its judicial functions, and to sit and deliberate upon the conduct of a member. It will not do at all to say that some charge is implied, that some charge is put forward which may be capable of one construction, and equally capable of another construction. The House has to see specially, when charges are deliberately framed as these have been, that they bear that plain construction upon their face, and that the member who makes them shall not afterwards be in a position to say that he did not intend to make such a charge, but that he intended to charge some personal and private impropriety, or some breach of the election laws upon the member whom he accuses. Another observation which I would venture to make is, that when accusations of improper conduct are made, even against members of Parliament as such, we ought to consider most carefully whether it is imperative upon the House to exercise its judicial functions, which we so rarely like to exercise, and which we so rarely exercise well, considering the diversity of feelings, of interests, and even of political passions, which are apt to prevail in an assembly like this. We have to consider whether the accusations which are brought forward are accusations which some better qualified tribunal in this country is not clothed with powers to determine. If the constitution has erected a tribunal in the country which has jurisdiction over such matters, and if the laws which govern us all, as well as our constituents, give to these tribunals a right and a procedure to carry on the investigation, it is most proper that the House should, if possible, decline to exercise any judicial functions on its part, and leave to the tribunal which is qualified by the constitution and the statutes of this country, the power, the right and the duty to determine and investigate the complaint, whether it be of a member who desires to make an accusation here, or of any person outside of this House. Now, I shall ask the House to consider carefully what these charges and allegations are which the hon. member for West Ontario has asked to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, prefacing what I have to say on that subject by a re-statement of the position which I assume, that if charges are made involving an inquiry into the expenditure of money voted by this Parliament for public purposes, or if charges are specifically made against a member, of misconduct in his capacity as a member of this House, which would affect his seat or his privileges in this House, I admit that it may be the duty of the House to undertake such an investigation. Now, the hon. member has stated, in the assertions which he has

made to the House, that he is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence that between the years 1882 and 1891 the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company received subsidies, amounting in the aggregate to upwards of $1,000,000, and that these subsidies were voted by this Parliament: that arrangements were made by that railway company whereby the expenditure of such subsidies was made by a construction company, and that the construction company and one Beemer, and those who assisted him in financing these railway works, received the benefit of the subsidies: that during the whole of the period from 1882 to 1891, Sir Adolphe Caron was, and still is, a member of the House of Commons, a member of the Canadian Government, and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for Canada. I may mention in passing—although it may appear a very strict objection now, yet, I mention it now, because it will become important when we consider another branch of the subject—that that statement is obviously incorrect. No person has been a member of this House from 1882 to 1891. There were periods during which this House ceased to have any members, during which it ceased to exist.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Now, Sir, I can imagine nothing more satisfactory for the argument which I am presenting to this Chamber than the ridiculous and altogether too previous satirical cheering which has just come from the other side. I have ventured to submit to the House that when it undertakes to investigate a matter judicially, it does not approach it with feelings which generally inspire great public confidence in the accuracy of the decisions at which it arrives, or in the purity or disinterestedness of the considerations which actuate the views of the tribunal: and when I have drawn the attention of the House to the inaccuracy of one of the statements which we are asked now to adjudicate upon in the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and have told the House that the point, although appearing altogether too strict for the moment, will bear some importance when I come to state why I make it, certain members of this body who desire the judicial enquiry at the hands of this House to proceed with great rapidity, are unable to wait until I shall have an opportunity of stating to the House why I consider the point important, but are prepared with a satirical comment before I am able to state the argument. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go on for a moment and see what the allegations are further. It is stated:

"That the said Sir A. P. Caron was, during the whole or the greater part of the said period, one of the members of the said construction company, and thus had means of knowledge of, and did know of dealings with the said subsidies and thir destination after they were paid over by the Government to the said railway company.

"That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and from moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same.

"That during the said period out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same, large sums of money were from time to time corruptly paid and contributed, at the request and with the knowledge of said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which Sir A. P. Caron was a member."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the House a reiteration of the statement I have already made, that, before we are asked to appoint a committee to try a member of this House, there ought to be some charge made against him of misconduct in his capacity as a member of this House. I assert that, however improper it may be for a member to violate the Acts relating to elections in this country, that is not a matter on which this House will willingly deliberate. We have delegated to the courts of the country jurisdiction over these matters, and I repeat that, when the courts of the country have jurisdiction over such matters, it is unbecoming and improper from every point of view that this House should attempt to resume that jurisdiction and exercise that authority in another way. I know that this House is repeatedly reminded that in giving jurisdiction to the courts over election cases, we have simply given these courts concurrent jurisdiction. I know that every time a party advantage is to be gained, whenever an attempt can profitably, from a party point of view, be made to take back the jurisdiction we have given the courts, and to undertake to exercise the authority of this House or a committee of this House over an election case, an election trial, an election judgment, or proceeding, some members of the House are continually reminding us of our latent power and insisting that we should exercise it again. In every other assembly that I know of where such powers have been delegated to the judges, as the days advance, the feeling grows stronger and stronger in these bodies that under no circumstances ought they to take back that authority and exercise that power, but that they should leave to the courts the investigation of all such matters. That feeling is so strong that I am sure the disposition in the British House of Commons is, if it were necessary to do so, to denude itself of this power in order that it may never be exercised again, by a tribunal so unfit, as the House of Commons must be, to exercise the authority such a tribunal ought to have in trying election cases. I wish to call the attention of the House to a point I mentioned a few moments ago. I submit that it ought to appear clear that the hon. member for West Ontario meant to charge some offence against the Postmaster General in his capacity as member of the House, before he could ask the House to go on with this investigation. And when I remind the House of what I said with regard to the dates between 1882 and 1891, I wish to say that I had in view the emphasizing of this position, that the hon. gentleman who made the charges is not in a position to allege now that these charges may bear the construction of imputing to the Postmaster General acts of misconduct as a member of Parliament, because in paragraphs 5 and 6, the hon. gentleman makes it plain that the misconduct imputed by him was practised in the course of an attempt to become a member of Parliament, and while seeking to aid other gentlemen also striving to obtain election. But irrespective of this inaccuracy, to which I attach no importance whatever as a mere inaccuracy, I wish to impress now upon the House that this is an attempt on the part of the hon. member for West Ontario to investigate bygone elections which have taken place in this country, and nothing

more. Although in the first part of his motion, where he mentions the dates 1882 and 1891, he alleges that the Postmaster General was during all that period a member of the House, when he comes on to paragraphs 5 and 6, it becomes transparent that what he is endeavouring to do is, not to assail the conduct of a member of the House as such, but to investigate proceedings which took place at elections in 1882, 1887 and 1891 and the conduct of the Postmaster General during those elections, including his own elections. The charge in paragraph 6 goes on to say :

"6. That at the request and with the knowledge of said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

"7. That the Temiscouata Railway Company was given incorporation by Letters Patent issued by the Canadian Government on 6th October, 1885, and since that date the said railway company has received from the Dominion of Canada subsidies to the extent of $649,200—which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of Ministers of the Crown.

"8. That since the 6th October, 1885, and while the said Temiscouata railway was being constructed in part by means of the said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money from the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies.

"9. That also since the said 6th October, 1885, the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies, paid and contributed large sums at the request, and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which the said Sir A. P. Caron was a member."

Now, I have to repeat again that if these gentlemen have any charge whatever to make against the Government with regard to the propriety of granting these subsidies, we are here to meet them, and this is the place to meet them. If they or anybody else have accusations to make against the way in which elections have been carried, or attempted to be carried, the courts are open to them, and this House ought not to be open to them, and the House will see the importance and significance of that statement, when I come, as I do now, to paragraph 10, where the statements made are of so vague a character that I undertake to say no representative assembly in the world would entertain them. I say more, I say that if the Act had not been passed giving the judges jurisdiction to try election cases, this House would not adopt any resolution such as that, and entrust to this Committee the power and duty of trying two general elections. That is what it amounts to. Why, Sir, before the procedure was adopted of sending these matters to the courts, we had some decorum, we had some regulations as to the way we would try any member's seat, or conduct. We had formalities for trial by an election committee, a petition had to be presented with specific charges, particulars had to be given, and the members charged with the duty of inquiring into an election, sat as a court trying a specific charge. But here we come to a sweeping allegation with reference to transactions extending over nine years and two general elections :

"10. That the said sums of money hereinbefore mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 9, as paid and contributed for election purposes, were so used, together with other sums contributed by public contractors with the Dominion Government, and were controlled and distributed by the direct authority and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, in lavish and illegal amounts for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors, and in the general election of 1887 alone, upwards of $100,000 of moneys so contributed were so used for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors in the following electoral districts, that is to say : The Counties of St. Maurice, Champlain, Lévis, Montmorency, Charlevoix, Kamouraska, Témiscouata, L'Islet, Dorchester, Berthier, Portneuf, Quebec, Gaspé, Rimouski, Montmagny, Bellechasse, Beauce and Megantic, and in Quebec West, Quebec Centre, Quebec East and Three Rivers."

Then comes the proposition that we shall refer to a committee those assertions, not even framed with the regularity, with the care, and with the precision which would be required in an election petition, if an election petition were to be tried by this House. We are to refer these charges to a committee for the purpose of investigating and trying regularly an allegation of corrupt practices in the elections of some fifteen or twenty counties. I have already said enough to show that the charges do not come within the category of charges which I mentioned, as those in which the House could properly exercise its authority and jurisdiction. I have already assured the House that if any charges are framed which do come within that category, they will be entertained, and there will be no opposition on this side to an investigation. I have already stated, in so far as the Government is concerned, that they are here to meet any accusations which may be made in that regard, but the Government are not before a committee, and it is unconstitutional that a committee should sit to try the Government of the day. I have only to conclude by the statement that of all the accusations which have been made in this House, even the accusation which the House declined to entertain at the close of last session, this accusation is the vaguest that I have been able to find, and it is one which I think the House ought not to entertain in its present shape. I may say, by way of safeguard, in reference to future action in such cases, that, if such charges should come up in any form at any future time, the proposal to refer them to the Privileges and Elections Committee ought to be refused. We had a long experience of that committee's work last session, and I think it was unanimously agreed that the committee is too large for quick and prompt and accurate deliberation, and that, when any charges of this character are to be referred to a committee it would be preferable, with a view to despatch and convenience, to have them referred to a smaller committee, as was done in one case last year. I admit that, in making this avowal, I am taking back what I urged before the House on some former occasions. It was considered that the Privileges and Elections Committee, containing a number of lawyers skilled in investigations would be the best committee to investigate these matters, but, as the number of that committee has been extended to over 40, as investigations of this kind require a long time, the examination of a number of witnesses and of masses of papers, they have to be referred to subcommittees, and consequently it is found that the

procedure before the Privileges and Elections Committee occupies a very long time, as that committee is too large to deal promptly with these matters. However, as the resolution now comes before the House, I shall ask the House not to support it.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, there is indeed, as has been stated by the hon. gentleman in his opening remarks, an impression throughout the country that, if a member makes a charge against a fellow member, he puts his own seat in peril. The House expects from a member who makes a charge against a fellow member that he must have some good and strong reason for making that charge, and it is unquestionable that the common sense of the country would expect that, if any member should be guilty of making such a foul charge against another member, without having strong reasons for making it and good evidence to support it, he would not be fit to associate with gentlemen and he ought to be expelled from this House. There is an unwritten law of Parliament which expects every member of this House to act as a gentleman, and that impression has prevailed from the year 1873, when the late Sir John Macdonald stated, on the occasion that Mr. Huntington made his charges, that he would have Mr. Huntington expelled from the House. If at that time Mr. Huntington had not been able to prove that the charges he made were true, he would certainly have deserved to be expelled from this House; and I say this in regard to my hon. friend behind me that, if he made such a charge as he has made against the Postmaster General without any evidence to substantiate it, if he has been guilty of slandering another member of the House, he is guilty of conduct which should cause him to be expelled from the House, and no one in this House would say anything to the contrary. But I was not prepared to hear from the hon. gentleman opposite the language I have heard from him. The language of the Minister of Justice is far different when he speaks on the hustings and when he speaks on the floor of this House. When the hon. gentleman was before the people of this country, and when the Government of which he was a member was assailed for bribery and corruption, for winning elections by vicious practices, the hon. gentleman was brave, and he stated that he was willing to give a hearing to every man who made a charge against the Government or any of its members, that he was welcome to make that charge and to have it investigated, that the Government was afraid of nothing. When the hon. gentleman is taken at his word, and charges are made, how does he answer? He answers by the merest quibbling and pettifogging ever heard in any court of justice to defend a vicious cause. We have heard a statement from the hon. gentleman that it is not our mission to look after the private conduct of members of this House. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is not the duty of any member of this House to look after the private conduct of a fellow member, but the hon. gentleman will not deny that, if a fellow member is charged on the floor of the House with conduct—not public conduct only, but private conduct—that would disgrace a gentleman, that man should be expelled from this House. Shall I refresh the memory, the defaulting memory of the Minister of Justice, with the example which took place not much more than two months ago, the example of Mr. De Cobain who has been expelled from the British House of Commons for private conduct of a most scandalous nature? Shall I remind him of the case of Mr. Sadleir who, thirty or forty years ago, was expelled from the Parliament of Great Britain for embezzling public money? On this occasion the charges are not alone of misconduct of a private character, but of misconduct of the most grievous kind of a public character as well. The hon. gentleman sees no wrong in the actions which are charged against the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General is charged with having received money from a public company which had been subscribed to that company for a public end, for the public good, and he is charged with having received a portion of that money for corrupt purposes and to have so applied it. Yet the hon. gentleman says there is no wrong in that. Is that correct? The Parliament of Canada is asked for a subsidy to be applied, every cent of it, to the building of a public railway. That is the sanction under which Parliament gives the money, that every cent shall be applied in that way for a company that has not enough money itself to construct that road for the public advantage. Yet the hon. gentleman tells us that that money which was subscribed by Parliament can be diverted from its intended purposes, and that part of it can be handed to a Minister of the Crown for corrupt purposes, to corrupt the electors, and this is nothing wrong, this is a thing the Minister of Justice is bound to acquiesce in and to defend on the floor of Parliament. I did not understand exactly the defence made by the hon. gentleman, whether he defended this on its merits, or whether it was simply because the Postmaster General was not then a member of Parliament. I ask the Minister of Justice if he ever heard such a statement anywhere? The thing is too pitiful to be thought of. Whether or not the hon. gentleman was then a member of Parliament, he does not deny that he was a member of the Government, that he was an adviser of His Excellency the Governor General, and yet he pretends that at that time he could take money from the public treasury, put it in his pocket, and then apply it to corrupt purposes during the elections. Sir, if this is the nature of the morality to which we have come in this country, let us know it; let us know whether the party in power are willing to assent to the principle laid down by the Minister of Justice that there is no moral wrong in money which is voted by this Parliament being used for corrupt purposes.

An hon. MEMBER. Pacaud.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand somebody to shout "Pacaud." This is the last refuge of those hon. gentlemen. Sir, I have to say, that I am not here to defend Pacaud. Pacaud has been judged by the people of Quebec; but, Sir, Pacaud has done nothing which has not been defended to-day by the Minister of Justice. Let us know once for all, whether that is to be the doctrine which is to prevail in this country; if it is, I take direct issue against it. Perhaps the majority of the House may yield to the appeal of the hon. gentleman and endorse that doctrine. Sir, though, in my judgment, the electorate has not done its duty in the last election, still, perhaps the day will come when the measure will be filled up by somebody; and I believe, whatever may be the result of the vote

which will be taken to-day, even though this motion be rejected, that Canada will be saved by the people, if it is to be saved at all.

Mr. TUPPER. It is hardly necessary to reply to the speech just delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition, after he has resorted to the language of the stump to which he referred, and which language he apparently had in mind. I would not rise to speak were it not that I wish to call the attention of this House to the extraordinary position which, so soon in these important and serious proceedings, the leader of the Opposition has ventured to take. Was his language the language of a judge? Did the language of the hon. gentleman indicate that he was in a fit and proper state to sit in judgment upon the character of a member, whether the charge related to the moral character or the public character of a gentleman, who, at at any rate, either in this House or out of it, is entitled to an impartial trial and an impartial investigation? The hon. gentleman so far forgot his position in this House and in this country, and if I may say so, his duty towards the members of this House, that he did not hesitate to charge the leader of the House with having resorted to quibbling and pettifogging when he ventured to dissect this charge and the indictment in order to show, as he did show, how far it fell short of what an indictment and charge should be when dealing with the subject to which it relates. The leader of the House went over these various charges, and the leader of the Opposition was not able to follow him in reference to the particular criticism which he made, except to fling across the House the charge against the leader of the House, of having resorted to quibbling and pettifogging in order to meet the motion. If there was quibbling and pettifogging, how is it that the leader of the Opposition sat down without pointing out to the members of this House wherein that quibbling consisted?

Mr. CASEY. It was too thin.

Mr. TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen show by their excitement, and by their loud jeering, that it would have been a most disgraceful thing, under the circumstances, to remit to them a question as to the character of any member in this House. They are not in a fit condition to make the investigation. The spirit displayed by them is most extraordinary. But the hon. gentleman not only assumed the position that members assumed on the stump during the election, but he ran away to cite a case which was totally inapplicable to the one under consideration. He alluded to the De Cobain case recently before the British Parliament, and I venture to say that no gentleman who has followed that case in the English House of Commons, would, on second thought, endorse the position taken by the leader of the Opposition, if he supposes there is a parallel between that case and the one now before us. The argument in that case tells with terrific effect against the position assumed on the other side, because hon. gentlemen will find, on looking into it, that the case went along for some time outside of the English Parliament, and Parliament took the greatest possible care not to go into the disgraceful and notorious charges against that member of Parliament, until it became evident and indisputable that the member was an outlaw from justice, and fleeing from the courts of the land. Then the House took up the case of that member as an outlaw from justice, as a man who was afraid to stand his trial in the courts of law; and the leader of the House to-day shows that so far as there are charges contained in the different paragraphs of this motion, the courts of law in Canada are open to the hon. gentleman and to everyone else, wherein to make their charges. I say that instead of shouting, instead of jeering, instead of making glib charges across this House, it would be well for hon. gentlemen opposite, since the leader of the Opposition cannot do it, to make some show of defence of the charges contained in these different paragraphs as a reason why it is right, or proper, or becoming to this Parliament that the hon. member should be put on trial. The position taken by the leader of the House to-day is not merely one which concerns the Postmaster General. The Minister of Justice is standing up for the privileges of members on both sides of this House, and all that he claimed this House should insist upon is that when charges are levelled against any member, those undertaking to prefer them and to ask for an investigation, shall show, first of all, that they are charges which render impossible the presence of an hon. gentleman in this House, and that those charges are as clearly and fully particularized as they would be brought before any other tribunal in the country. The leader of the Opposition did not deal, either, with the position taken on this side of the House on this question, touching the delegation of many of the judicial powers of this House to the courts of the country. Surely that is not a matter to put down with cheers and shouts; surely that is a matter that should be deserving, at least, of an attempt to meet it, before any conclusion is drawn upon the question. We know how strong passions are in this House, we have had evidence of it to-day, and for these reasons Parliament long ago adopted the practice of sending to the courts of law to be tried, many of the cases that are involved here. The sting, so to speak, of those resolutions is in the tail. The last paragraph of these resolutions clearly indicates the object of hon. gentlemen opposite: their object is not to prove or substantiate a charge against the Postmaster General alone, not merely to show that he has been guilty of conduct unbecoming a member of this House; but it is a cheap and speedy way of investigating and ascertaining how the Conservative party, all over the enormous portion of country that is defined in paragraph 10, conducted the elections in 1887, and the elections that followed. The secret is disclosed in that paragraph, that is the reason and the object; and if there was a spirit of fairness on the part of hon. gentlemen, if there was merely a desire to purge this House of the presence of a member who is not fit to sit in it, they would not embarrass the case by bringing a charge forward indicating so much party bias, so many party objects, as are disclosed in the resolutions, and contained in these vague charges. A case has been handed to me upon the subject to which the leader of the Opposition first directed attention, and it is an important feature of this case, and made more so by the hon. gentleman's attributing so much importance to the supposed respectability of the member preferring these charges. The hon. gentleman seems to think that, because he has assumed a great responsibility, the House therefore should be guided in the direction which he asks that it should take, and a committee should be

granted. But the Supreme Court, in the case of Landers *vs.* Woodworth in 1878, laid down this opinion through Chief Justice Richards:

"When the member makes his statement, he exercises the right of freedom of speech, and in making charges against gentlemen holding official positions, very great latitude is allowed in the use of vituperative language. If the language used is unparliamentary, it may be taken down, and the House decides upon it. If not called to order, and the House considers it necessary for its dignity to enquire into the matter, it takes the initiative and appoints a committee, or institutes an enquiry, as the case may be. The member has only exercised his right of freedom of speech in bringing the matter to the attention of the House. The member of the Legislature, exercising his right of speech, makes a complaint. If the subject, matter of his complaint turns out on an enquiry not to be true, we have not been shown any authority or precedent where a member can be charged with being guilty of a breach of the privileges of the House for so doing."

Now, I may state, for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, that this was a case where grave and serious charges had been made in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and where that Legislature attempted to expel the gentleman who made those charges, and the case went before the Supreme Court of this country, and the decision was utterly opposed to the position which the hon. leader of the Opposition supposes is the position of the mover of this resolution to-day. So, whether his position is one of responsibility or not, we must recollect the position and responsibility of the person charged, and the position the Government takes is, that the charges should be specific, and be so specific as to afford exact information as to what the object of the mover is, also as to what the exact charges he desires to prefer are: and more than that, it must disclose what this resolution does not disclose, that it is an offence against the laws of the land, or it is an offence that renders unfit the presence of the member attacked in the Parliament of this country. If hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied with the way in which the leader of the Opposition has met the leader of the Government to-day, I feel quite certain that members on this side of the House are equally satisfied with the position taken by the leader of the Government. I do not forget, either, that the leader of the Opposition seems to suppose that the leader of the Government has justified a Mr. Pacaud, and the hon. gentleman's answer as to Mr. Pacaud was that the people of the Province of Quebec had dealt with him. I should like to know whether the people of the Province of Quebec have yet dealt with Mr. Pacaud. I understand he remains yet to be dealt with, as perhaps do some others who figured in that interesting period of history. But what did hon. gentlemen suppose came from the lips of the leader of the Government to justify Mr. Pacaud or any of his colleagues in connection with the great frauds and outrageous wrongs perpetrated by these men, which brought down the denunciation of the Toronto *Globe*, which, speaking of them, denounced them as public thieves and robbers. Does the hon. gentleman approach the consideration of this case, by saying there is a charge of public robbery and public thieving in the resolutions?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. TUPPER. Then, if he believes that—and this is the point of the whole case—let the hon. gentleman take the responsibility of making that charge direct. If he desires to make a charge of public robbery and thieving, let him make the charge, and name the man, and there will be an investigation granted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have had a rather extraordinary line of argument adopted by two Ministers of the Crown, in undertaking to burke the investigation into the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). The Minister of Justice has laid down certain doctrines by which the authority of this House is to be limited, and by which, in the exercise of that limited authority, we ought to be guided, which, I venture to say, he will not find supported by any authority in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman has undertaken by certain propositions to deprive this House of a large portion of that power which it is necessary in the public interest it should retain. The hon. gentleman has, in the first place, stated that we have no right whatever to enquire into or take any action with respect to the private conduct of any member of this House. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, pointed out that Parliament had over and over again on the other side of the Atlantic expelled members in consequence of their private conduct. It was not simply that the House had investigated into their private conduct. That was not the hon. gentleman's proposition. The hon. gentleman's proposition was that the private character of a member was not a matter which should call for any action on the part of the House. My hon. friend met that contention by pointing out that discreditable conduct, conduct that showed that the member was unworthy of being regarded as a gentleman, was conduct which warranted his expulsion from the House, and he cited instances in which that had taken place. But that question does not arise in this case. The hon. Minister of Justice says that the matters contained in the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) are matters which, if investigated at all, ought to be investigated by the election courts of the country. Sir, I deny that altogether. The election courts have nothing whatever to do with the consideration of the matters which are embraced in these propositions. The election courts are constituted for the purpose of enquiring into irregularities connected with the election of the particular person against whom certain specific charges are made. The power of the election courts does not go beyond that. The law with respect to these courts is well understood. Why, I have before my mind a case which occurred not many years ago, where certain charges of misconduct in the administration of public affairs were made against the member on the trial of an election petition. What was the position taken by the court? It was that that was a proper matter for investigation by Parliament, that it was not a matter with which the court had anything to do. That was the decision of the judge in an important case in the Province of Quebec, and the view taken by that court was sustained by the Supreme Court on appeal. So when the leader of the Government and his colleague undertake to seriously argue that this House is denuded of all its power to enquire into the misappropriation of public money for the purpose of corrupting the electors of this country, because the trial of election petitions has been referred to the courts, I take issue with those hon. gentlemen on that ground. The trial of election

petitions is one thing. The use of public money for deliberate corruption of the electors by a member of the Administration is a proper matter for enquiry by this House, and is not in the smallest degree restricted in any way by reason of the trial of election petitions having been referred to the courts. The Minister of Justice has argued that there is nothing in this petition affecting the conduct of the Postmaster General as a member of this House. He says, in effect, that the allegations are wrong, because there are intervals between the dissolution of one House and the election of another, during which there is no House at all, and that as he was not a continuous member without a moment of time having elapsed, there was no House in existence, the statement in paragraph three is incorrect. I am not disposed to answer a quibble of that sort, further than to say this: that legally, the one House is in existence, as defined by the constitution and for certain purposes, until the other is elected, and the dissolution of the House does not in certain emergencies prevent the dissolved House, if these emergencies arise, from again being called together. But, Sir, that is a matter of no consequence. These charges point to a member of this House in his official capacity as a member of the Administration, rather than to his conduct as a member of this House. What, in effect, are the charges here made? They point to the fact that the Crown was advised to appropriate large sums of money for particular purposes, and that these moneys were diverted from these public purposes and placed in the hands of a Minister of the Crown for the purpose of corrupting the electorate in certain portions of the Dominion of Canada. Is not that a proper matter for enquiry? Is it open to a Minister of the Crown to take moneys from a public contractor, who has received these moneys from the public treasury of this country upon his advice, and to apply this money to other purposes than these for which they have been appropriated? Why, Sir, what has the press of the hon. gentlemen opposite said with regard to events in the Province of Quebec where moneys were voted as subsidies to railways and were taken up not by a Minister of the Crown, not by one holding a public position, but taken by a private party and applied for election purposes? What was the position taken there by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by the servant—the obedient servant I will say—of these hon. gentlemen in dismissing the Administration, in dissolving the Parliament and calling into existence another Government? What are there in the events which the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) brought under the attention of this House in regard to the Province of Quebec that are any less important to the whole people of the Dominion of Canada than these present charges? If a Minister of the Crown can obtain over $100,000 that has come from the public treasury—no matter whether a railway contractor or a railway company has intervened or not—and used these means in the party interest, and for the promotion of party purposes in elections, why could not half the money of the public treasury be taken the same way? If there is any value in the argument of the Minister of Justice it is as good against $10,000,000, as it is against $100,000. There can be no doubt whatever of that. There is a statement made here that this hon. gentleman, the Postmaster General, is the Minister of the Crown who advised these subsidies being appropriated to aid these companies. There is a charge that he obtained a portion of the subsidy so voted, or its equivalent, from these companies, and used it for his own purpose in his own election, and in the elections in twenty-three constituencies in this Dominion. That charge is specific and clear enough. It is also stated that after some of these moneys were received by him this same gentleman advised the Crown to grant other subsidies to other parties, and that from these other subsidies, moneys were also obtained. If these matters are not to be investigated, what charge can you make against an Administration which can be investigated? The Minister of Justice has also said that this is a matter which should go to the courts. I would like to know in what respect the courts have jurisdiction over a matter of this sort? Why, Sir, from the days of Edward the Third down to the present hour the Government and Parliament of England have adhered strictly to the principle, and have maintained the right of Parliament to investigate such matters, and they have held that the House of Commons is the sole body that has a right to conduct these investigations. This is not a question for the courts, but it is a question for this House. It is not a question for a Commission created by the Government, subordinate to the Government and responsible to the Government; but it is a question for the High Court of Parliament, the court of the people. This is a misappropriation of the people's money, and the people's representatives in this great Assembly have a right to know what use has been made of these moneys, and whether these charges are well or ill-founded. The Minister of Justice says that Parliament is an inconvenient body for such an investigation. In that contention, the hon. gentleman is attacking our whole parliamentary system. The hon. gentleman is seeking to destroy the power of this House to investigate, to restrain, to ascertain, or to punish acts of such a character as those which are charged in this resolution. I have said that the House of Commons is the only body which has a right to investigate this matter. A Commission has not. Will the Minister of Justice, or will any hon. gentleman point to a single instance where a subject of this sort has been made a matter of either judicial investigation, or of investigation by a Commission appointed by the Ministers of the Crown. There is not in the whole history of England, from the reign of Henry VII to this hour, an instance where such an investigation by such a tribunal has been had. The hon. gentleman cannot find one, and in the very nature of things it is perfectly obvious that that must be the case. Let us take the case of a Commission, for example. A Commission is a creature of the Administration. It is appointed, not to investigate the conduct of the Government, but to investigate the conduct of those who are subordinate to the Government and who are responsible to the Government. If one of these hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches is charged with wrong-doing, can it be for a moment said that they themselves are the proper parties to advise the Crown as to who shall be appointed to investigate their conduct? To whom is the report to be made? Why, to themselves. Who is to advise the Crown upon that report? Why, the very gentlemen who are accused, and nobody else. They are the parties who are

to tell the Crown whether they ought to be dismissed or whether they ought to be retained, upon the evidence that the Commission has taken. Is it not clear that if these hon. gentlemen have the appointment of the Commission by whom they are to be tried, that they will make it, so far as they are concerned, a very merciful tribunal, indeed? Let me say this: That the whole position taken by the Minister of Justice is an attack upon our constitutional system: it is an attempt to degrade the House and to deprive it of one of its chief functions. Here are serious charges made against a member of the Administration. The hon. gentleman goes on the public platform and challenges investigation: he tells the public that if any party has any accusation to make, let him make it, and the fullest and most minute enquiry shall be had. My hon. friend states specifically his accusations, and instead of having them referred to the proper committee for their investigation, the hon. gentleman undertakes to show that they ought not to be investigated at all. He says that this is an attempt to try controverted elections, which have been relegated to the courts, that these accusations ought to have been made during the period allowed by law for the filing of election petitions, and that when that period goes by no trial is to be had. You may take half a million from the public treasury, and if you conceal it for the time being you will enjoy immunity; Parliament has no right to try it. Parliament might have the right if the charge related to any other matter in the world than elections. If misappropriations are made, if a man steals money and puts it into his pocket, possibly you may investigate that. I do not know; there is some doubt whether that could be investigated or not, from the position taken by the Minister of Justice; but if the man applies the money to election purposes, you cannot enter that sacred precinct at all. Unless men interested in the trial of election petitions choose to file a petition, you have no redress. Parliament is perfectly helpless. A wrong may be done in twenty constituencies; half a million of the public money may be stolen from the public treasury and so applied; but if you cannot find twenty men in those constituencies to file petitions, the other 195 constituencies have no redress. That is the position taken by the hon. gentleman. We shall see whether this House supports so unconstitutional and preposterous a proposition as that which the Minister of Justice has put forward. I apprehend that the people of this country will not be prepared to sustain it. They took the Minister of Justice at his word; they assumed that he meant what he said; when he told them that the fullest enquiry would be had, that the Government would court enquiry, the boldness of the hon. gentleman and the frankness of his statement were taken by the public as establishing his innocence. And now the hon. gentleman has kicked down the ladder, climbed into his hole, and he says: There I am prepared to remain. Well, Sir, I think that is not a very courageous position for the hon. gentleman to take. If the Government have, as I think the Public Accounts show, made these appropriations to these railway companies with the sanction of Parliament, and if a member of the Government has obtained from these railway companies, from time to time, a part of the moneys so appropriated, this House is entitled to know it. The country is entitled to know it, infinitely more than it was to know what Mr. Pacaud did with the money he received. If it is right and proper for a committee of the Senate to enquire into the conduct of Mr. Pacaud and to ascertain what he did with the money, not from the treasury of the Dominion, but from that of the Province of Quebec, certainly it is much more right and proper for a committee of this House to enquire into what the Postmaster General did with the $100,000 which he received from those railway companies, and which had been voted out of the public treasury. Why, Sir, a railway company gets, I suppose, $8,000 or $10,000 a mile, and gives $100,000 out of their subsidy. Perhaps the next time they will give $200,000, if you grant them $2,000 or $3,000 a mile more. Where is to be the limitation? Where is to be the restraint? The Minister of Justice says you have no right to make an enquiry here—this is not the proper tribunal. We are the representatives of the people, who vote the people's money; and the law says, the constitution says, the history of the country for three hundred years says, that this is the sole tribunal to investigate the subject, and to ascertain what is done with the money. This House is the custodian of the public treasury. The hon. gentleman who holds the public moneys of this country is a mere agent of this House; and we have a right to enquire, even though the enquiry should extend back to 1882. If a charge of misappropriation of public moneys is made against a man in public life, he is not fit to be there in charge of the public treasury. If he advised the Crown to make these appropriations, and had an understanding with one of the railway companies participating in them that these moneys or a portion of them should go to him, we ought to know it; we are entitled to know it; and, Sir, we are entitled to know it by an investigation conducted by this House, and conducted solely by this House. That being so, this motion ought to be carried, and it will be an admission that there is something wrong, that concealment is necessary, if the proposition is voted down. Hon. gentlemen opposite may cheer a declaration that Parliament has not a control over these matters. They may undertake to say that this a matter which ought to go to the courts: but I say that the courts have no jurisdiction and a Commission have no jurisdiction. The sole tribunal to whom the Ministers of the Crown are responsible is this Parliament; and when a charge is made against a Minister of the Crown, an investigation ought to be had in this Parliament, and a report made as to whether the charge is well founded or not.

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Speaker, the question now before the House is a very important one, and must be approached not with a partisan but with a judicial spirit. Perhaps I am not sufficiently master of the English language to warrant me in taking part in this important debate. But as an hon. member of this House who is a colleague of mine is involved in the charges which have been made under the pretext of vindicating the dignity of the House, by which I believe it is intended to take away that hon. gentleman's honour, I think it is my duty to take part in the debate, and try to answer some of the arguments which have been adduced. An hon. member of this House can be

deprived of his seat in the House only for something that would be considered dishonourable, for some act on his part that would cause him to be adjudged as unfit to sit with the members of this House. In the parliamentary history of England, we see that members have been expelled from the House after, but only after, having been tried and convicted for something dishonourable, or when they were fugitives from justice. Here the only charge made against the Postmaster General is that, while a member of the House, subsidies were granted to a certain company, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway. It is not charged that he was a member of the company. It is then charged that arrangements had been made by that company with another company, called the construction company, of which the Postmaster General is alleged to have been a member. It is charged that he derived some personal profits out of the money received by that construction company. It is charged then that during the elections of 1882, 1887, and 1891, he received moneys from that company or from Mr. Beemer to assist him or his party in these elections. This is the whole charge. My contention is this: that to warrant an investigation against the Postmaster General he must be charged with some offence against the statutes or the unwritten law of honour. He ought to have been charged with having conspired, before the subsidies were granted, with the parties applying for them, to get the subsidies, in order to derive some benefit for himself. This is not charged. Subsequently, when he is said to have derived some profit out of the operations of that construction company, it ought to have been charged that he was a member of that company against the law, and that these profits, if he ever made any, were made in an illegal or unlawful way. This is not charged. It is alleged that he received some money during the elections. Where is the offence in law that prevents a member of this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. Who is ignorant that money is required to carry on elections?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. I have within the reach of my eye people who know it very well, and who have had a very bitter experience of it, and I know very well that I see before me hon. gentlemen in this House who would be very much embarrassed to explain where they got the moneys required.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. OUIMET. It is very well known that there is a legal use to be made of money during elections as well as in any other circumstances of life. If the hon. Postmaster General received some money, it is not charged that he received it by misappropriating public funds of which he had the disposal and control. As has been said, if that were the proposition, nobody on this side would defend it. It has been said that we are defending Pacaud's course. What was the charge against him? The charge against Pacaud and the members of the Mercier Administration was that they had all conspired together in order to have the disposal of these subsidies, that they might, even before anything was done towards the construction of that road, divide among themselves the money and apply it to illegal ends. Neither Pacaud nor Mercier was condemned because in this county or the other he was accused of having spent a few dollars, but because it was shown that during that trip to New York everything was arranged between the Premier of Quebec, the contractors and Pacaud, to appropriate to themselves, in fact to steal, a part of the subsidy. It was because of this that the Liberal, or National, Government of Quebec were wiped out of existence. But here let the hon. member who has made this motion do as the hon. Minister of Justice has challenged him to do. Let him prefer against the Postmaster General a definite charge of having misappropriated the public moneys of which he was the trustee; let him do so in a way as to submit himself to the consequences which must be incurred by any member who makes a false charge against a colleague, and we will be ready then to have an enquiry. But we are not going to appoint a committee to do business which ought to have been done in the courts of justice after the elections of 1882, 1887 and 1891. It seems that the experience of hon. members opposite in the court of justice has not been favourable to them, and they are not inclined to appear again before the courts. They prefer coming here to make a sweeping charge against one of the members of this House, so that they may, if they get the chance to go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, fish for evidence, and try to draw the Conservative party in the mire. To sum up, in this long recital of facts there is not a specific charge, there is not a charge upon which could be founded the trial of any citizen of this country, there is not a charge upon which you could bring any one before a tribunal of justice. We are ready to defend ourselves and our colleagues against accusations of misappropriation of funds; we are ready to defend them against all accusations of acts condemned by the law, not only by the law of the land but by the laws of honour, but we are not ready, at the behest of the hon. gentleman opposite, and on vague and general charges, to submit the whole party to investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OUIMET. We are not ready to submit to an enquiry into everything done in the Province of Quebec in about twenty counties during the elections of 1887; and I am confident the electors of this country will approve our position when we manfully stand up to prevent injustice being done to a member of this House. As I said, let them come with a specific charge and we will be ready to meet them.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have listened with a very great deal of attention to what has been said on both sides of the House on this very important matter, and I feel bound to admit that, upon grounds which perhaps it would hardly be fair to call technical, but which I think have been fairly sustained on the side of the Government and have not been met by the Opposition, the Minister of Justice is justified in saying that this motion, as it is now presented, is not one that ought to be submitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; but, if I thought that this matter was to end there, and if I thought that some of the sentiments which have been expressed on this side of the House were to be binding upon this majority, I would sweep away all such objections and would say that this matter ought to be taken up in the manner

proposed. Admitting for a moment the truth of the statements which have been made and which, I am happy to say, have been so explicitly denied by the Postmaster General, we find this state of affairs existing. I will call the attention of the House to the grounds upon which the Senate entered last year into the case of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. The only justification, as I understand it, for their interference in the matter, was that that company had been supported by Dominion subsidies, and therefore the Dominion authorities had a right to investigate it. If that doctrine was true in that case, certainly this House would be justified in considering whether subsidies which it had given, and over which it had control, had been properly used by the companies now under consideration. If the statements which have been made are true, there has been a gross and outrageous violation of trust. Are these subsidies the personal property of these companies or of any persons forming part of these companies? Nothing of the kind. The subsidies were placed in the hands of these persons for a distinct purpose, for the building of railways, and not for carrying elections. I say that, assuming that this House, following the argument of the hon. the Minister of Justice, thinks the question should not be referred to the Privileges and Elections Committee in its present form, the House should see that this matter does not end with that, for what conclusion can the country come to if they believe, and if experience shows that they are right in believing, that, although the question is refused to be dealt with in the manner proposed and upon grounds which the country will certainly consider to be largely technical, that is to be the end of the business and this House is to refuse to consider the matter because of these particular points which have been taken? I understand the distinction which has been made between the case referred to in Quebec and this case. I think the hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Ouimet) put the question very fairly when he said that there was a corrupt bargain made between the members of the Government in Quebec and the parties who received the money before the money was granted; but on the broad and general ground that Parliament has a right to see to the proper appropriation of the money it gives to these persons, not for their own personal benefit but for a public purpose, it is the duty of this House to investigate the matter and to see whether any such violation of a public trust has been committed. What a commentary it is upon our system of subsidies if the public are led to believe that subsidies are given to companies, not for the trust for which this Parliament intended to give that money, but in order that individuals, whether in the Government or out of the Government, may use those funds for party purposes. It would certainly lead one to come to the conclusion —a conclusion to which I have come long ago— that the sooner this system of railway subsidies is brought to an end the better. But we have been pursuing this system and have voted these moneys for certain purposes, and it is our duty to see that these moneys are properly applied. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite, after all the lessons they have received to-day from the members of the Government, cannot frame their resolution in such a manner as to avoid the objections of the Minister of Justice, they are more stupid than I take them to be.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman state what he conceives the objection to be?

Mr. O'BRIEN. One great objection to the resolution, I think, is its vagueness, and I think it may properly be contended, as it has been by the Minister of Justice, that there is a distinction between one who is connected with the company using public funds, and one who is connected with the company simply as an intermediary, that there was a distinction to be drawn between the construction company and the railway company. There is no doubt that there is a distinction, but how much difference there is I do not say. There is a distinction which may justify the House in considering how far it should deal with this matter. But this should also be considered, that there is such a thing as an accessory after the fact as well as a conspirator before the fact, and, if it should be made clear in dealing with the matter as we can deal with it, if some of these particular facts which are alleged are proved, I should see very little difference between the gentlemen who previously conspired to obtain money out of the public funds, money which had been granted for a public purpose, and the gentleman who, after the funds had been granted, used his influence, either as a member of the House or as a member of the Government, to have these funds used for corrupt purposes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would suggest, as the hon. member for South Oxford is about to speak, that, with the unanimous consent of the House this debate might be continued after 6 o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Of course we cannot do that without unanimous consent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid we cannot agree to that. We propose that this matter shall be very fully discussed. For my own part I could have wished, for the credit of the Parliament of Canada, that the hon. Ministers who have delivered their opinions on this subject had preferred, instead of making the pitiable exhibition they have made of themselves, to order their followers to vote down this motion in silence. They would have done infinitely less discredit to the honour of Canada than by the arguments which for the first time in the history of the Canadian Parliament have been advanced by a man holding the responsible position of the Minister of Justice, to strive, in the teeth of every possible rule of law, of every possible principle of common sense, to convince us that the gravest offence which could be committed by a Minister is one with which Parliament cannot deal. What in the name of wonder is it that my hon. friend beside me has charged the Postmaster General with? He has charged him in no vague language, but in terms, with being guilty of the most corrupt conspiracy, for the purpose of destroying the electoral liberties of the people of Canada, of which any adviser of the Crown can be found guilty. That is the charge, made not vaguely or indistinctly, but with every possible clearness and after every possible notice had been given:

"That during the said period out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same, large

sums of moneys were from time to time corruptly paid and contributed, at the request and with the knowledge of said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which Sir A. P. Caron was a member."

Sir, I say if that be not a grave offence and misdemeanour, if that be not an offence of which the high court of Parliament, and no other, is called upon to take cognizance, of which it is the expressed duty of Parliament to take cognizance, for taking cognizance of which offences Parliament may be said, in the last degree, to exist, I say there is no such thing as an offence by a Minister against the constitution *in rerum naturâ*. For my own part I am glad that the present Government have at last thrown off all disguise, that we know now what we have to deal with. We have to deal with a Government by corruption, existing by corrupt campaign funds got together by these corrupt means. What was the object for which this whole fraudulent system of railway subsidies was initiated? Sir, the subject has been discussed from time to time, and with just reason, by this side of the House: we have pointed out, in the first place, that the vast majority of the hundreds of subsidies which have been granted from year to year under pretense of being for the general benefit of this Dominion, were in terms a violation of the British North America Act, that they were granted by the Government for the purpose either of corruptly influencing influential individuals, or particular constituencies, who had no right to be benefited out of the public treasury, or for the purpose of aiding friends of these identical subsidies in order to obtain corrupt means whereby to influence the electorate and keep these hon. gentlemen in their places. We know now that it was for that purpose the whole system originated. Now, Sir, what is the charge? It is charged that for a number of years a series of corrupt acts have been committed by an influential member of the Government; whether they were committed for his own personal or pecuniary advantage, or whether they were committed for the advantage of the party of which he was a leader and member, with the object, as the Minister of Public Works particularly stated—because no other meaning could be attached to his words—of supplying the necessary funds for election purposes, should be the object of the committee to ascertain. That is the offence charged, and if my hon. friend can make good his statements, it discloses ample evidence of the existence of a great system of corruption of which this railway subsidy system is only one solitary branch.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Niagara Falls and Queenston Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Algoma.)

Bill (No. 55) to amalgamate the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Montreal and the National Loan and Building Society of Hamilton under the name of "The National Mutual Loan and Building Society."—(Mr. Langelier.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. McMillan, Vaudreuil.)

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certified copy of the judgment of said court in the election appeal for the Electoral District for the County of Welland, by which the appeal was dismissed and the judgment of the trial judges in the lower court voiding the election and declaring the appellant guilty of a corrupt practice, was confirmed. In conformity with chapter 9, section 46 of the Revised Statutes, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

REPORTS.

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada, for the calendar year 1891.—(Mr. Carling.)

Report of the High Commissioner for Canada, with reports from agents in the United Kingdom, for the year 1891.—(Mr. Carling.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 61) to amend the North-West Territories Act.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that Bill (No. 2) to secure the better observance of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, be read the second time. He said: The Bill now before the House is the same Bill reported by the special committee last year, with a slight alteration. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who is a railroad man, suggested last year, when the Bill as reported from committee was under discussion, that permission to run one mail train a day on Sunday was not necessary, because no railway in Canada was running a mail train, and that change has been made. Permission to run a mail train has been withdrawn from the Bill, and with that exception the Bill is as it was reported last year from the select committee. The Bill when referred to the select committee and brought under their consideration, was considerably changed. A number of sections were expunged, sections that were held by members of the committee to come more properly under the jurisdiction of provincial authority, and the Bill as reported by the select committee and now presented to the House for a second reading, provides for the closing of canals on Sunday from the hour of 6 in the morning until the hour of 10 in the evening, with the proviso that this provision may be set aside by Order in Council after 15th October in each year. Some criticism has been indulged in by those in favour of the observance of the Sabbath in regard to this concession. It has been asserted that the case has been given away by not insisting on closing

the canals for the entire 24 hours. However, the committee felt that if the canals were closed from 6 o'clock in the morning till 10 o'clock at night, traffic on the canals would not interfere with the quiet of the Sunday, and with the chance to attend religious ordinances on the part of employés, and the permission to have the canals open from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. was one that would not seriously interfere with the enforcement of the principle of Sunday rest. And so the section with respect to canals is drawn in this way. With respect to the provision permitting the Governor in Council to set aside the provisions of the Bill after 15th October, strong representations were made as to the injury that might result to the navigation interests of the country, near the close of navigation, by closing the canals when such might result in disastrous consequences to vessels seeking winter quarters. It was the belief of the committee that the Bill with these provisions would prove to be a satisfactory one.

The first section is one relating to Sunday newspapers. This, I may say, is perhaps the only section of the Bill on which members of the committee had doubts as to its propriety as a part of a law enacted by the Canadian Parliament. The section is as follows:

"Whoever shall on the Lord's day, either as a proprietor, publisher or manager, engage in the printing, publication or delivery of a newspaper, journal or periodical, and whoever shall on the Lord's day engage in the sale, distribution or circulation of any newspaper, journal or periodical shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour: Provided, however, that necessary office work may be performed after nine o'clock in the evening of the Lord's day, for the purpose of facilitating the publication of the Monday morning issue of any daily newspaper."

It was argued that this matter in regard to Sunday newspapers might more properly be dealt with by Provincial Legislatures. It was urged, on the other hand, that the Dominion Parliament has control of all questions in regard to the importation of printed matter into this country, that it has control of the copyright question, and the control, in a general sense, of the publication question, and it was felt to be in the highest degree desirable that any provision with respect to Sunday newspapers should be a uniform provision throughout the Dominion. For that reason this section has been retained, and is presented to the House on its merits, and I hope the House, in view of all the circumstances, will deem the matter of sufficient importance to warrant the adoption of this provision. I may say with regard to this question that in so far as this provision will come in conflict with the importation of American Sunday newspapers, our newspaper publishers find the present law to be a grievance to themselves, and to be a matter that interferes with their business. That is the case, for instance, at Windsor. There are two newspapers published there. The Detroit Sunday newspapers are brought in and sold there, and besides their demoralizing influence on the community, they have a tendency to depress the business of the newspapers published in that town. Wherever we have towns on the border where newspapers are published, the same difficulty arises. It is needless to say the publication of the Sunday newspapers is a demoralizing agency of the gravest character. In the United States, perhaps, nothing has had so potent an influence in the secularization of the Sabbath, and in the breaking down of religious restraint, and in making the Sabbath, instead of being a day of rest, a day with all the characteristics of any other day, as the Sunday newspaper, which is sent by special steamers, special trains, special coaches all over the country, which is hawked about the streets, and which interferes with the quiet of the day, with religious observances, and which tends to keep the minds of those who read it in the ordinary rut of week-day occupation. The Minister of Justice, last session, I believe, expressed himself as having no doubt as to the power of Parliament to pass this Bill as reported by the committee. I do not know that the hon. gentleman gave any opinion as to its propriety or advisability, but, if I am not mistaken, he expressed himself as being of the opinion that power was vested in the House to pass the Bill as presented.

Section 3 relates to railway traffic, and it is a matter in which the Minister of Railways will be specially interested. I may say with regard to this section, that I have invited the opinions and criticisms of railway managers throughout the country. I have had communications from various managers. I have incorporated in this section some suggestions of Sir Joseph Hickson. I will read the section as it stands in the Bill, and point out the provisions that were suggested by the gentleman to whom I have alluded. The section reads:

"Any railway superintendent, traffic manager or person by virtue of whose authority and command railway cars or trains are on the Lord's day loaded at any railway station in Canada, or despatched from such station when loaded, or permitted to continue a journey (except in the case of live stock and perishable goods) with Canadian local freight,—or any person as aforesaid who directs local passenger trains to be run on the Lord's day (except one milk train on each road)."

The following provision in the Bill was suggested by Sir Joseph Hickson:—

"And such special trains as are necessary for the purpose of conveying medical aid and means of relief in cases of accident, or to persons injured or afflicted with sickness, or of conveying persons to visit dying relations, or for the purpose of conveying the means for extinguishing fire to places requiring such assistance, or for other acts of necessity and mercy, or directs empty cars to be moved from station to station within the territory of Canada,—shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour: but through passengers trains each way, with their necessary connections, shall be permitted on any trunk line of Canada."

Mr. BOWELL. What is meant by the words "when loaded, or permitted to continue a journey"? Does it mean that a railway train coming across the border will be stopped at the border?

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not interfere with through traffic. It refers to local traffic entirely.

Mr. BOWELL. Then, if a car leaves Windsor Saturday night, it could not continue its journey after twelve o'clock?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; if it is a train transported on Sunday across the river.

Mr. BOWELL. I mean a local train, leaving Windsor for Montreal.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would not be permitted to continue its journey. It would have to stop at 12 o'clock. The friends of Sabbath observance are somewhat dissatisfied with the provisions of section 3. It is claimed by them that the permission to run through passenger trains—and there is no restriction in that matter and necessarily cannot be—will interfere with the efficiency of the measure.

For instance in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway it despatches one train each way from Montreal and Vancouver on each day of the week except Sunday. But other trains are necessarily proceeding over some part of the line on the Lord's day. On some part of the line there are probably ten through passenger trains running on the Lord's day. It was found impossible to regulate this matter, and permission has been given in the Bill to despatch and run through passenger trains with their necessary connections. With regard to through freight, it was found in examining the question that it would be almost impossible to prevent the forwarding of such freight, because they are necessarily in competition with the American lines, such as the Lake Shore road south of Lake Erie, the Pennsylvania system, and the Baltimore and Ohio system; and in taking freight at Chicago for delivery in New York or Boston, if our own roads are unable to transport the freight on the Sabbath, they would be placed at 24 hours disadvantage in the delivery of their freight, and it would be a very serious matter to them in competing for business.

Mr. BOWELL. It is none the less wicked, is it?

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose it is none the less wicked, but practical consideration led us to think that we must look upon this matter as a matter of necessity in the case of these roads, and we make a provision in sub-section 2 and throw the onus on the American Government. Sub-section 2 says:

"At such time as the laws of the United States shall make corresponding provision, no through freight in transit from one point on the frontier of the United States to some other point on the said frontier, shall be allowed to pass over Canadian roads on the Lord's day, except live stock and perishable goods."

As soon as the American Government will make a provision to prohibit the transportation of freight on the Lord's day, then this Bill makes a corresponding provision; but until that is done we felt it would place our railroads at such a great disadvantage in competing for business, that it could not in justice to them be done. This is the section with regard to railway transportation, a section which I assume is satisfactory to the railway managers, because it has been placed before them for criticism, and the suggestions of Sir Joseph Hickson with regard to the matter have been accepted and embodied in the Bill.

Section 4 of the Bill says:

"Excursions upon the Lord's day by steamboats plying for hire, or by railway, or in part by steamboat and in part by railway, and having for their only or principal object the carriage of passengers for amusement or pleasure, and to go and return the same day by the same steamboat or railway or any others owned by the same person or company, shall not be deemed a lawful conveying of passengers within the meaning of this Act; and the owner, superintendent or person by virtue of whose authority and direction such excursion is permitted or ordered on the Lord's day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanour: Provided that nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit the ordinary carriage of passengers authorized by provincial statute."

These, Mr. Speaker, are the provisions of the Bill: first, the provision with regard to Sunday newspapers, second the provision with regard to the closing of the canals from 6 in the morning until 10 o'clock at night on Sundays except that an Order in Council may set that provision aside after the 15th of October. Third, the provision with regard to railway traffic which necessarily has been confined, so far as the restrictive character is concerned, to local traffic. It permits the operation of through traffic as at present and the despatching of through trains on the ground of necessity. The fourth provision of the Bill is with regard to steamboat and railway excursions on Sundays. These are the four subjects dealt with by this Bill as reported by the committee, with the exception that mail trains which were permitted in the Bill have been stricken out, on the suggestion of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) who is himself a railroad man.

Mr. BOWELL. Could you inform the House what the provincial statute is in reference to the fourth clause?

Mr. CHARLTON. In Ontario it is the same as the provision in this Bill. The other sections of the Bill which I now propose are merely sections introduced for the purpose of making the Bill operative. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose there can be no question as to the power of this House to legislate in this direction. We were informed by the Minister of Justice last session that the power rested with this House. This Parliament has, of course, power to enact that there shall be holidays established. It has established the 1st of July and the 24th May as holidays, and it can extend that power by enacting that every seventh day shall be a civil day of rest. This authority taken by legislatures to establish the Sabbath rest is an authority which is of course based on a higher law. It recognizes religious usages, and the authority rests upon the declaration made in Genesis, 2nd chapter, 3rd verse, when God set aside the seventh as a day of rest. It was re-established when the declaration was published on Mount Sinai by the fourth commandment, when it was said: "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." But the setting apart of the seventh day for rest is not enacted by Government upon religious grounds. It is enacted as a civil ordinance, for the purpose of securing civil and temporal advantage to the subjects of the Government, and while the authority to observe the day rests upon a higher commandment, the authority is not necessarily an authority exercised for the purpose of securing religious observances. In fact that is not the object of the exercise of this authority, because the State deals with it as a civil question. The Parliament of Canada is asked by this Bill to deal with this question as a civil question, and not as a religious matter at all. It is a civil question, because the Bill proposes to secure a day of rest for sanitary reasons, it proposes to secure a day of rest for intellectual and for moral reasons. The setting apart of every seventh day as a day of rest has a tendency to lead to intellectual advancement. It gives the leisure necessary for study, it gives the leisure necessary for attending divine worship, it gives the leisure necessary for attending Sunday schools, it gives the leisure necessary for securing the advantages of educational influences, and so, the day may be set apart as a civil holiday for intellectual and moral reasons as it is. Then it is set apart for the purpose of securing the health and happiness and the prosperity of the people living under the Government by which this provision is made, and it is set apart to secure protection in the rights of conscience, freedom to worship God

and keep his commandments, as the person who enjoys the privileges of the day of rest may wish to do. It does not force religious observances upon the people, but it puts a person who wishes to enjoy religious principles in a position where he can enjoy them, without being forced to work, perhaps contrary to the dictates of his conscience; as he might be forced to do if no such provision existed on the Statute-book. It is, therefore, in this connection, a civil provision, made for a laudable and necessary purpose, in behalf of the best interests of the people.

It would not do, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that civil governments have nothing to do with that portion of the old Mosaic law, the Ten Commandments. A portion of these commandments relate to man's moral state and religious or moral duty. The first commandment does, in forbidding him to have any other God but the true God; the second commandment does, which forbids him to be guilty of idolatry; the third commendment relates to his moral state and his duty to his God in forbidding profanity; the fifth commandment does because it inculcates filial obedience; the tenth commandment does, because it forbids covetousness. These five commandments the civil law has nothing to do with; they relate to man's duty to a higher power. But there are five others of these commandments which lawmakers are obliged to take cognizance of, and must supplement with human laws. The fourth commandment, providing for a day of rest, although resting on religious authority, is one of those commandments, and the Government is the power ordained by the higher power to provide laws to carry it into effect. So with the commandment which forbids murder. It would not do to say that that commandment must be left for its enforcement to the ecclesiastical authorities, and that the secular authority must not step in and supplement it with a law forbidding murder and providing for its punishment. The seventh commandment forbids offences against chastity, but it would not do to say that the Government must never enforce that law or supplement it. The eighth commandment forbids theft, and what Government would refuse to make provision against stealing and for its punishment. The ninth commandment forbids the crime of perjury and the civil law steps in and provides the punishment. All these commandments, the fourth, the sixth, the seventh, the eighth and the ninth forbid practices with regard to which secular law must step in and supplement ecclesiastical authority, providing machinery for the punishment of infractions of these laws. And this fourth commandment strikes me as being one the enforcement of which, by the civil authority, is just as essential to man's well-being as the provisions on the Statute-book with regard to murder, offences against chastity, theft or perjury.

I may be asked whether we have any precedents in British history for the enactment of a law such as the one presented to this House to-night. I would answer that we have not one only, but a great number of them. As early as 1354 the British Parliament under Edward III, enacted laws for securing Sabbath observance. That law was amended and its provisions extended in 1388, again in 1428, again in 1464, again in 1552, again under Elizabeth in 1588, again under Charles I in 1625, again under Charles II in 1661, and again in 1839. I doubt whether there is a single English colony which has not laws with regard to Sabbath observance. I believe there is only one of the 44 states of the American Union, the State of California, which has not laws with regard to Sunday rest and observance. Now, it may be enquired who desires this law, and what classes of individuals are likely to be benefited by it? I would answer that so far as I have been able to learn, all labour organizations desire this law. Perhaps I may be permitted to give the utterances of some of the leaders of these organizations to back up the assertion I make. I gave them last year, and I will repeat them from last year's *Hansard*. Henry George says:

"I believe the institution of the Sabbath is one of the greatest benefits that the human race ever had. I believe in the strict enforcement of the law that prevents servile labour being carried on on the seventh day."

P. M. Arthur, the chief of the locomotive engineers, expresses himself thus:

"I am in favour of any movement looking to the abolishment of all Sunday labour other than works of mercy and necessity. It has been repeatedly demonstrated beyond a question or doubt that all Sunday traffic upon railways can be dispensed with without any detriment or injury to the interest of the railway companies. Had I the authority, I would not allow a wheel to be turned between 12 o'clock Saturday night and 12 o'clock Sunday night."

Mr. T. V. Powderly, chief of the Knights of Labour, makes this observation:

"I believe in Sunday rest. So do the Knights of Labour."

The Committee of the American Federation of Labour, at its session at St. Louis in December, 1888, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, that the American Federation of Labour is in hearty sympathy with any movement inaugurated by the American Sabbath Union, the object of which is to lessen the burden of those who toil."

The Brotherhood of Railway Brakesmen and Locomotive Firemen, in July, 1889, passed the following resolution:—

"Whereas the Sabbath was ordained for man; and whereas all history shows the best state of society and the highest and best civilization when the hours of the Sabbath were devoted to rest and relief from labour; therefore, be it resolved that we, as railway employés, ask of the general public to forego Sunday travel on railways and the demanding or requiring managers of railways to run Sunday trains for freight traffic, to the end that we, who are willing to give six days and nights of our time to the faithful service of the public and to our employers, may have the hours of the Sabbath with our families at command for the great good and comfort to ourselves from being at home with our families, and for church, Sabbath school and other privileges the Sabbath is designed to bring to us."

These expressions show clearly that the labourer is alive to the importance, as regards his own interest, of having secured to him by law the enjoyment of his Sunday rest. It is needless to say that every Protestant church in Canada, with the possible exception of the Seventh Day Baptists, is in favour of a Sunday rest law. There is a great degree of unanimity on the part of eminent jurists, as to the desirability of the enactment of laws to secure to the labourer the Sunday rest. Daniel Webster made use of this language:

"The observance of the Sabbath is the bulwark of liberty, because it is the bulwark of morality."

The Commissioners of the British House of Commons charged with the examination of this subject in 1832, in their report, stated as follows:—

"It appears in evidence that in each trade, in proportion to its disregard of the Lord's day, is the immorality of those engaged in it."

Chief Justice Field, Judge Thurman, Chief Justice Hale, such men as Gladstone, D'Israeli, Shaftsbury, Argyle, Bright, Lincoln and Garfield have pronounced in favour of Sunday Observance and Sunday Rest Bills. Perhaps, I may be permitted to give the deliverance of one or two of the jurists I have named in reference to this matter. I will quote the language of Chief Justice Field, of the United States Supreme Court, an authority of great respectability:

"The Sabbath laws are not so much for those who can choose their time for rest, as for the protection of labour against capital, for the defence of labour's natural right to a weekly rest day. The Lord's day is also the people's day."

"Laws setting aside Sunday as a day of rest are upheld, not from any right of the Government to legislate for the promotion of religious observances, but from its right to protect all persons from the physical and moral debasement which comes from uninterrupted labour. Such laws have always been deemed beneficent and merciful laws, especially to the poor and dependent, to the labourers in our factories and workshops, and in the heated rooms of our cities; and their validity has been sustained by the highest courts of the state."

Judge Thurman, of Ohio, has expressed himself as follows:—

"All agree that to the well-being of society periods of rest are absolutely necessary. To be productive of the required advantage these periods must occur at stated intervals, so that the mass of which the community is composed may enjoy a respite from labour at the same time. They may be established by common consent, or, as is conceded, the legislative power of the State may without impropriety interfere to fix the time of their stated return, and enforce obedience to the direction. When this happens some one must be selected, and it has been said the round of the week presents none which, being preferred might not be regarded as favouring some one of the numerous sects into which mankind are divided. In a Christian community, where a very large majority of the people celebrate the first day of the week as their chosen period of rest from labour, it is not surprising that that day should have received the legislative sanction, and, as it is also devoted to religious services, we are prepared to estimate the reason why the statute should speak of it as the Lord's day, and denominate the infraction of its legalized rest as profanation. Yet this does not change the character of the enactment. It is still essentially but a civil regulation."

Now, I have given here the opinions of the leaders of the labour organizations, the opinions of the jurists, the fact that the Protestant churches of this country and of all countries where Protestant churches exist, are in favour of Sabbath observance. Now, I proceed to present what, perhaps, is the most important of the authorities I have to present to-night, and I solicit for the quotations I am about to make the attention of my French-speaking friends, both Liberal and Conservative, in this House. I am aware some degree of opposition has been manifested towards this Bill by gentlemen from the Province of Quebec, and I think, perhaps, they may find food for reflection in the quotations I am about to read. I am sure they will respect the authorities I shall quote. I shall quote utterances of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII, Cardinal Taschereau, Archbishop Fabre, the Bishop of Buffalo, Cardinal McCloskey and Cardinal Gibbons. Pope Leo XIII says:

"The observance of the sacred day which was willed expressly by God from the first origin of man, is imperatively demanded by the absolute and essential dependence of the creature upon the Creator. And this law, mark it well, my beloved, which at one and the same time so admirably provides for the honour of God, the spiritual needs and dignity of the man, and the temporal well-being of human life. This law, we say, touches not only individuals, but also people and nations, which owe to Divine Providence the enjoyment of every benefit and advantage which is derived from civil society. And it is precisely to this fatal tendency, which to-day prevails to desire to lead mankind far away from God, and to order the affairs of kingdoms and nations as if God did not exist, that to-day is to be attributed this contempt and neglect of the day of the Lord. They say, it is true, that they intend in this way to promote industry more actively, and to procure for the people an increase of prosperity and riches. Foolish and lying words! They mean, on the contrary, to take away from the people the comforts, the consolations and the benefits of religion; they wish to weaken in them the sentiment of faith and love for heavenly blessings; and they invoke upon the nations the most tremendous scourges of God, the just avenger of His outraged honour."

If anything could be more emphatically calculated to endorse the position this Bill takes as regards the necessity for Sunday rest than the language of his Holiness Pope Leo XIII, I have not found it in all the range of Sabbath literature with regard to the observance of the Lord's day. The next deliverance I will read is from Cardinal Taschereau, who said on the 26th of April, 1880:

"We mean, O dearly beloved brethren, those pleasure excursions made on Sundays and feasts of obligation, on steamers, on the railway, and sometimes in a long train of vehicles. Experience proves that they give rise to such disorders of intemperance and immorality that we feel obliged to prohibit absolutely, and under pain of mortal sin, pleasure excursions on Sundays and feasts of obligation. * * * Wherefore having invoked the holy name of God, we rule and ordain as follows:—1st. We forbid under pain of grievous sin, the faithful of this diocese, to take part, on Sundays or feasts, in pleasure excursions, on railways, on steamers, or in vehicles, even when the profit of those excursions is intended for a good work. It is not our intention, however, to condemn the pilgrimages made on those days, provided recollection, piety, and good order be observed,"

Then Archbishop Fabre has placed himself on record as follows:—

"After mentioning the duty devolving upon him to protect the spiritual interests of his flock, the Archbishop quotes the commandment which makes the due observance of the Sabbath a divine law and mentions the chastisements referred to in Leviticus for the transgressors of this precept. The letter then goes on to say that the Sunday rest does not mean idleness, but positive acts of worship towards God, and adds that if to idleness are added profane and dangerous amusements, then God is most seriously offended and His wrath is aroused against man. Further on, the Archbishop refers to certain abuses which have been introducing themselves in our midst, and says: 'We denounce again and absolutely condemn the clandestine liquor traffic on Sundays, the entering of taverns, and the more or less numerous gatherings in which young men and fathers of families, victims of the gambling passion, pass long hours, forgetful of their duties, their souls, their God, and exposing themselves, besides, to lose their peace of conscience and their honour. We forbid, in the same manner, on Sundays, those pic-nics and pleasure excursions, organized for the public for speculative purposes, and which, as experience shows, are nearly always occasions of debauchery, drunkenness, altercations and licentious conversations. We particularly deplore that kind of amusement recently introduced into this city of Montreal, in which by announcing inoffensive concerts and promenades, the crowd are invited, by lavish advertisements, to throng to a public place, to witness dances, perilous feats, and performances contrary to morals, in a word, what is seen in the least modest circuses. Not only have those sights been unscrupulously given on Sundays and holidays, but even during divine service hours, so as to keep the people away from churches, and make them lose all spirit of meditation. It is time to oppose these disorders by the check of a formal prohibition, which has for its motive the sanctity of the Sabbath, and the obligation which rests with us to watch over the preservation of public morals.'"

Here are three deliverances, two by prelates of the Province of Quebec and one by His Holiness the Pope. Now I want to quote three utterances from Catholic prelates in the United States. The first

is from the Bishop of Buffalo, who gives the following charge :—

"'Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day,' is God's own command. * * We must not only rest from all unnecessary servile work, but we must hear mass and spend the day—or, at least, a good part of it—in the service of God and religious duties. * * Ours is not, as we have said, a Jewish or a puritanical Sabbath, nor do we measure its obligatory observance by a sectarian standard or any American or national idea ; yet we would be sorry to see the respect in which our separate brethren hold the Lord's day weakened or discredited. God grant that we may never see the Sunday profaned here in our own country as we have seen it in other lands."

Cardinal McCloskey in 1882 said as follows :—

"We wholly denounce and absolutely forbid excursions or pic-nics on Sundays, or after dark, all moonlight excursions, and all Sunday pic-nics, and we exhort our good people who love their church to abstain from any participation in such scandalous, unhallowed and disgraceful practices, and to use all their influence to suppress them."

Cardinal Gibbons, in 1888, made this deliverance in reply to a letter which was written to him by the Rev. Mr. Crafts :

"My Dear Sir,—I have to acknowledge your esteemed favour of the 1st instant, in reference to the proposed passage of a law by Congress against Sunday work in the Government mail and military services, &c. I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are contending against the violation of the christian Sabbath by unnecessary labour, and who are endeavouring to promote its decent and proper observance by legitimate legislation. As the late Plenary Council of Baltimore has declared, the due observance of the Lord's day contributes immeasurably to the restriction of vice and immorality, and to the promotion of peace, religion and social order, and cannot fail to draw upon the nation the blessing and protection of an over-ruling Providence. If benevolence to the beasts of burden directed one day's rest in every week under the old law, surely humanity to man ought to dictate the same measure of rest under the new law."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if anything can be more convincing, more satisfactory, more unmistakable than those deliverances from the Catholic prelates and from the head of the Catholic church, from the head of that church in Quebec and from the cardinals on this continent, I have failed to find it, and, if any Catholic can find any ground for acting contrary to that, his view of his duty is different from my view. An hon. gentleman says I am very kind, but I am justifying this by the authority of Catholic prelates whose authority cannot be questioned by those who believe in their supremacy. The labour organizations are strongly in favour of this measure, the Protestant churches are also in favour of it, the Roman Catholic Church, if it is properly voiced by its prelates and cardinals, is in favour of it, eminent jurists favour it, and I think reason favours it.

It may be asked, notwithstanding all these authorities, are Sunday laws consistent with human liberty and human rights ; can you properly put a law on the Statute-book which will interfere with human right and human liberty ? I answer that laws are necessary to restrain human passion, and that liberty is one thing and license is another. You must restrain license in order to promote liberty. Although a law in regard to the public health may interfere with the license which would otherwise be granted to a man, it is necessary in the interests of liberty, and a law for Sabbath observance will promote the public health. Laws which promote public morals may interfere with the action of some men, but they will promote morality and will promote human liberty. We have to compare the condition of affairs in lands where the Sabbath is observed and that in lands where the Sabbath is not observed, and we will find that the morals in those lands that observe the Sabbath are far better than in the lands that do not. Then, the Sabbath rest is an educational agency. It is not in accordance with liberty that a child should be compelled to go to school. In many cases the State steps in and supplements the duty of the parent in this respect, but the Sabbath rest gives an opportunity to educate the child, and thus it becomes an educational agency. The church and the Sabbath schools are educational agencies of the greatest importance, and, if a law securing the observance of the Lord's day secures these educational agencies, it is consistent with every principle of human liberty. Then the Sabbath law is consonant with liberty, because it protects and blesses the home. There is no reason why nations should rise and fall or empires should come and go except that morality is not properly observed and that people fall into licentiousness and become debased. There is no reason why a nation should not exist for ever if it obeys God and keeps his commandments, including that with respect to the Sabbath ; and any law that protects the home, that give purity to the home, the very foundation of society, the very foundation of state, is a law that does not interfere with human liberty. Then it is consistent with the principles of human liberty because it is calculated to prevent crime. No other agency is so potent as this in the prevention of crime. Anything that will prevent crime, that will make society purer, that will lessen the necessity for gaols and the necessity for criminal legislation, any agency that will do this, is an agency working in the highest sense for human liberty and human well-being. All these things, a law of Sabbath observance, a law providing for the respect of the Sabbath, and for a weekly day of rest, will accomplish. It ministers to the highest needs, the highest wants, the highest purposes, and the highest good of the state and of the nation. Then it is a law consistent with the principles of human liberty, because it promotes the prosperity of the individual and the prosperity of the state. Nothing can be clearer than that the God-fearing, honest, sober, industrious man is more likely to be a prosperous and self-respecting citizen than a man who is brought up under the influence of Sabbath desecration with all the attendant circumstances of vicious company, drinking, &c ; and in this respect, as well as in others, it is consistent with the highest principles of human liberty. Old King David himself has expressed the truth in a few words when he said : "In the keeping of thy statutes there is great reward." There is great reward to a nation, there is great reward to society, there is great reward to every individual in the observance of these commandments that have come down to us with the authority of God. They are calculated to benefit humanity ; and the best moral condition of a people and their industrial prosperity are always found to be inseparable. Compare England, Canada and United States, with such countries as the South American States, with Mexico, or Italy, or Russia, or Turkey, and this assertion is borne out.

And now, Sir, with regard to the economic conditions surrounding and attending upon this question. Now, labour organizations have striven for the mitigation of the demands of the em-

ployers in seeking for a ten-hour law, and they have obtained it. They are now demanding that eight hours shall constitute a day's work; I suppose they think that would be a boon to the labourer, and no doubt it will, if it is granted. Now, I would ask if six days out of seven for labour is not a boon to the labourer, instead of seven days out of seven.

Mr. AMYOT. What about the Jews?

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, Moses was the first labour reformer. The Jews went down into the land of Egypt and they had no Sundays there; they had not only to make brick without straw, but to work seven days in every week; and when Moses led them out of the land of Egypt and promulgated the law from Sinai, he enacted the first great labour reform when he said: "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work."

Mr. AMYOT. That is not an answer.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, it is a perfect answer. Now, Sunday labour, looking at it in its economic aspect, means over-production, and it means lower pay for the labourer. An attack upon Sunday rest is an attack upon labour. Sunday is the poor man's day. Paley, who is an old authority, says:

"The addition of the seventh day of labour to that of the other six, will have no other effect than to reduce the price."

John Stuart Mill, who was not troubled very much with the religious aspect of this question, says:

"Operatives are perfectly right in thinking that if there were no Sunday rest, seven days' work would have to be given for six days' pay."

There is no doubt about it. Sunday labour proves the employers' greed, and it proves that the labourer is a vassal, because the labourer never willingly labours the seventh day, especially if he understands that the result of that system of labour is over-production and a reduction of pay. Now, public sentiment may be all right on the labour question, all right on the Sunday rest question, this sentiment may be all right as we find it is in this country; but this is not sufficient unless it is backed up by legal enactment, because the power of capital, the tendency of capital, the necessities of the labourers, put in the hands of the capitalist a power that must be restrained by legislative enactments, or the labourer is placed, in a sense, at his mercy. Now, as regards Sunday railway labour, over 40 railway superintendents of the United States have declared that Sunday railway labour is unnecessary; but the difficulty with them is that one cannot act independently of the other, there has got to be concert of action, and as concert of action cannot be secured, the only thing that will provide a remedy is legislative enactment. If legislative enactment existed in this respect why, then, the matter could be arranged. Now, I have here the report of the Committee of the Senate of the United States, in 1889, on the Sunday Rest Bill. Various parties were examined by this committee, and this report furnishes a vast amount of useful information bearing upon this question. The *Railway Age* of Chicago, in an editorial with reference to a letter written by Mr. Ledyard, Superintendent of the Michigan Central System, remarks:

"Mr. Ledyard's conviction that he and other railway managers are all committing a fearful mistake in allowing the continuance and rapid growth of this Sunday labour is held, we believe, by the great majority of railway officers, and it is to be hoped that in their perusal and public consideration of the great problems of railway management they will give that serious attention to this subject which its importance demands."

General A. S. Diven, who has been superintendent of the Railway Erie System, in January, 1888, said:

"(1.) The traffic will be substantially the same per week whether moved in one hundred and sixty-eight or one hundred and forty-four hours. (That is in seven days or six.)

"(2.) It can be moved in one hundred and forty-four hours.

"(3.) The extra cost will be fully compensated for by the improved service.

"(4.) There is no public necessity requiring Sunday service."

In a recent letter this same authority says:

"There is no valid excuse for railroad traffic on Sunday, either for mails, passengers, or freight. Why should not traffic on our railroads rest with all the other business activities? None of the other great interests are paralyzed by resting one day in seven, nor would any follow the suspension of railroad traffic. Is the transmission of mails a necessity? The best and most successful business men I have ever known never open their letters on Sunday. If there ever was a necessity for the Sunday mail service, it ceased with the telegram. If ever there was a necessity for moving perishable articles on Sunday, it has been removed by the refrigerator car. My article in the *Christian Union* was intended as a challenge to railroad managers to justify their management. When that challenge is accepted I believe it can be successfully met by men of practical experience."

Hon. Carroll D. Wright, who is a very high authority on the labour question and Commissioner of Labour Statistics in the United States, says that the only railroad men who want to have work done on Sunday are those who do not the work but only pocket the dividends. With respect to this question of Sunday observance, we all know what is the character of a continental Sunday. But it is a remarkable fact that on this subject a reaction has manifested itself in a very marked manner in Europe. There is a reaction in regard to Sunday rest in Germany, Austro-Hungary, Italy, Belgium, Holland, France and even Russia. In 1885, Austro-Hungary enacted a law which emancipated toilers from Sunday work. In 1876, after the Swiss commissioners had visited the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, they pointed out, on their return, the great advantage American labourers derived from abstinence from work one day in seven, as a day of rest, and they attributed to that the advantage possessed by American labourers in ingenuity, energy and ability to perform a great amount of work in a given number of hours, and they strongly urged on their fellow-countrymen the propriety of adopting the Sunday rest measure in force in the United States. In 1886, a thousand carpenters petitioned Bismarck in respect to Sunday rest, and an extract from their petition will, I think, be of interest. It is as follows:—

"Prince Bismarck: You have declared that you would not legally forbid Sunday work until convinced by the voice of the labourer that they demand rest on that day. Here then is their voice. We declare explicitly that we desire a law which will grant us protection in the enjoyment of freedom from work on Sunday. Sunday labour leads to misery, crime and vagabondism."

This demand for Sunday rest is even voiced by Socialists in Europe. At a socialistic conference held at Ghent, in 1886, one of the chief demands was for Sunday rest. The British workingmen have, in order to prevent an infringement

with respect to Sunday rest, opposed the opening of the British museum, or places of amusement. If we are in this country to adopt a free continental Sunday, the result will be disastrous.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. This may not be a matter of great importance to hon. members in this House, but it is a matter of importance to the toiler, and to the future of this country, and the treating of this question with levity by men who are called upon to deal with it in the public interest is not seemly. What is the character of the free continental Sunday? It is free from rest, free from religious influences, free from elevating, moral, social influences, free from mental culture, free for the employer to keep the employé at work like a slave seven days in every week. But so far as true freedom is concerned, the true interests of the people, a free Sunday is in no sense desirable.

I will conclude my remarks by making a brief reference to Sunday excursions, which are dealt with in clause 2 of the Bill. The argument is presented that under this Bill the poor toiler of the city will be unable to get country air unless permitted to go out on a Sunday excursion, and that it is for his physical well-being that he be permitted to do so. The truth is that the tendency of Sunday excursions is just the reverse of restful, that they tend to impair the moral and physical well-being of the labourer. The Sunday excursion in San Francisco has been discontinued by the railways as a nuisance. The California hoodlum pic-nics terrorize the suburbs; men and women in a condition of drunkenness return at night on the trains with the lights turned down. This is the character of Sunday excursions in San Francisco. They are debasing, demoralizing, and in nine cases out of ten, instead of causing Sunday to be a day of rest, Monday is required to recover from the consequences of Sunday. The Catholic sugar planters of Louisiana in 1886 petitioned the Legislature for a Sunday Rest Bill, because Sunday excursions deranged their business, for their employés came back and required Monday to recuperate. The sober, church-going man is ready for work on Monday. The pic-nic devotee requires Monday to rest. One of the largest employers of labour in the United States, Mr. Studenbaker, the owner of the great waggon works at Toledo, says:

"My observation is that clerks and mechanics who spend their Sabbaths in church and Sabbath school work are best fitted for the duties of the shop and office on Monday morning."

Colonel Fairbanks, the owner of the extensive scale works, says:

"Those who attend church and Sunday school on Sunday are the most valuable in our business. I can tell the difference between them and others by their work in the shop."

The general testimony is that Sabbath observers and church-goers, including labourers, mechanics, merchants and professional men, are in better condition for work on Monday than those who spend Sunday even in comparatively innocent pleasure. Then, why should Sunday excursions be prohibited? (1) Because they rob one class of workmen of their Sunday rest, to minister to the leisure of others. (2) Because such excursions are fruitful of disorder, vice and crime. (3) Because such excursions invade the Sabbath quiet and the morality of the places to which they go. (4) Because they secularize Sunday, and by breaking down its sanctity prepare the way to deprive people of their Sunday rest.

In conclusion, I may point out to all who may oppose this Sunday movement, that they may consider it a respectable thing to do, but with whom are they associated? They are associated with the anarchist, they are associated with the infidel, they are associated with loafers, they are associated with the hoodlum, they are associated with the prostitute, they are associated with the drunkard, they are associated with the profane. These are their associates. You find the people of these classes sympathize with the men in this House and the men out of this House who cast a stigma upon this movement. This movement is one that is calculated to benefit labour, to ennoble labour, and to ennoble the labourer. This is a movement in the interest of the employer and the employé. It is in the interest of the employer to have a clean, intelligent, healthful man to work for him, and it is in the interest of the employé to be that kind of man. It is in the interest of society to have the population of the country lifted up to a higher plane, and this can be done more readily by the influence of Sabbath observance and religious ordinance than by any other agency. This is a Bill and a movement in the interest of the State, because it is in the interest of the State to have a virtuous, industrious, intelligent and sober people, and nothing will produce that result more certainly and more readily, than the enactment by the State of laws securing the observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest, and the honouring of the ordinance of God. It is a Bill and a movement in the interests of humanity, and of course it is a Bill in the interests of religion. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, in believing this Bill to be what I represent it to be, I submit it to the favourable consideration and to the favourable action of this House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the motion that this Bill be read the second time, but I would like to call the attention of the House, and especially of the hon. gentleman who has moved the Bill, to the observations which I made last session when, at a late period of the session, the House was in Committee of the Whole upon the Bill. The House thought proper during last session to read the Bill a second time, and to send it to a select committee, the result of which was that a number of provisions which the Bill had contained were removed from it, I think with the approval of the hon. gentleman himself, as being provisions of doubtful utility, and in consequence of their being to a great extent almost identical with provisions adopted by some of the Provincial Legislatures. The observations which I then made upon the Bill are equally applicable to the measure now before us, in its present shape, and I do think it would be very desirable that the Bill should again have the care and attention of a select committee for the purpose of considering the manner in which it is framed, as well as some of the particular provisions for it. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is quite right in saying that I expressed the opinion that this Parliament has jurisdiction to enact the provisions which are found here. Although the opinion is not entertained by some members of the House of eminence in their profes-

sion I have no doubt that we have power to deal so amply with all matters relating to the criminal law, that when we undertake to make anything criminal we have jurisdiction to do so. When the House was considering the matter last year, the first clause of the Bill relating to the publication of Sunday newspapers was one which we might with great propriety and safety, we thought, leave to the Local Legislatures to adopt if they saw fit. It is a matter relating peculiarly to the convenience of the inhabitants of the provinces themselves, and the legislatures no doubt will adopt restrictive laws whenever they think the time has arrived for doing so. In connection with matters of that kind, I think it is going too far for this Parliament to step in and say, that nowhere in Canada shall work be allowed on newspapers within certain hours. I called the attention of the committee last year, to the fact of the canals being entirely open to regulation by the Governor in Council, without a statute at all, if the pleasure of the House should be signified in that way. I presume that remark holds good now. There are restrictions imposed by Order in Council and if the public convenience will not be interfered with materially, these provisions may be extended; but it is never necessary in relation to any public work which is under the control of this Parliament to pass a statute restricting the time and manner in which it shall be operated. If the hon. gentleman refers to sub-section 2 of section 3, in regard to railway trains, he will notice that it is entirely indefinite in this Bill at what time its provisions will come into operation. The time when the provisions will come into operation as regards the running of freight trains, is such time "as the laws of the United States shall make corresponding provision." It would be impossible for an ordinary individual to ascertain whether the law of that country had made corresponding provision or not. I suppose that what the hon. gentleman had in view in drafting the Bill was more complete than he had expressed. The expression "the laws of the United States" would only apply to some federal enactment, and I presume it is the hon. gentleman's wish that if the running of freight trains through a state that borders on Canada were prohibited by state authority, that should likewise be prohibited in Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. That would all have been regulated by the Inter-State Commerce Law.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not necessarily. That could be regulated no doubt by the Inter-State Commerce Act, and the subject could be legislated on by the federal authority I admit, in so far as trains passing from one state to another is concerned; but even if the Inter-State Commerce Act should be repealed, as we sometimes hear it may be, the subject could be fully dealt with by state authority. Besides that, I presume that the hon. gentleman had in view trains which might not come under the provisions of the Inter-State Commerce Law, but which would be passing from some part of, for instance, the State of New York into Canada on Sunday. If the hon. gentleman's wish and the wish of the House is, that it should only come into force when there is a federal statute on that subject, well and good. The Bill, however, is framed in such a way that a person, to be affected by the provisions of it, must enquire what the federal laws of the United States are, before he knows whether he is breaking the laws of our country. It would be better, I think, if that part of the Act should only come into operation by proclamation when such legislation is adopted by the United States. I merely speak now as to the way in which the Bill is drafted, and I am leaving entirely open the question of the principle of the measure, for the House itself. It seems to me that the provisions of the 4th section, which prevents excursions by steamboat or railway or boat on Sunday, are to a great extent very materially weakened by the proviso at the end which practically allows that which we declare to be a misdemeanour, to be authorized by provincial enactment at any time. If I have comprehended the provision, the Bill goes on to declare that excursions on the Lord's day by steamboats, and so on, —

"Shall be unlawful and the owner, superintendent or person, by virtue of whose authority such excursions are permitted or ordered, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour."

There is a proviso that nothing in the section shall be deemed to prohibit the ordinary carriage of passengers authorized by provincial statute. So that if, for example, at any time a provincial charter should authorize the daily carriage of passengers between certain points, that would be valid, notwithstanding that a previous Act of this Parliament has declared it to be a misdemeanour.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may explain, in reference to that point, that the question was raised as to the transporting of passengers over such routes as from Toronto to the Island. Regular lines of ferry boats run on the Sabbath, and they carry passengers who might be considered excursionists. It was considered it would hardly do to prohibit ferry boats making regular trips, even though excursionists might go upon those boats. That is the reason this provision was inserted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am speaking of the mode in which the Bill is framed. I call attention to these matters, not for the purpose of interfering with the second reading of the Bill, which the House indicated on the former occasion it preferred to have read a second time, but in order that before we proceed to another stage, these matters may be considered. In the mean time I have no objection to the second reading being taken to-night; and the Bill may then be allowed to stand till to-morrow so that we may consider whether it would not be well to send it to a special committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad that the hon. leader of the House has expressed his willingness to have this Bill read a second time and sent to a committee. I think it well that this House should take a step in the direction indicated by the Bill. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in my humble opinion, deserves the thanks of this House, and I am sure he will receive the thanks of the christian denominations outside of this House, for the very able manner in which he has introduced the Bill into this House. He introduced it last session, and although it went through one or two stages it did not become law, and his persistency in again bringing it before the House is creditable to him. We live on the border of a country which is not too ready to respect the sacredness of the Lord's day. The unfortunate war in that country some years ago was the occasion of the introduction of Sunday papers and the running of trains on that day, and the people have never been able to get rid

of them from that time to the present. I think our legislation should be in the direction of strictly observing the Lord's day as a nation as far as possible. I quite agree with one of the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Justice. It is hard to say where the line is to be drawn, but if this Bill is sent to a committee and that committee tries to put it into a shape to meet the necessities of the case and the general approval of this House, I am quite sure it will secure the united thanks of the christian people of this Dominion, and be legislation in the right direction.

Mr. CHRISTIE. It gives me great pleasure to see that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has again introduced this Bill to secure the better observance of the Sabbath. I believe that this question of Sabbath observance is one of vital importance to the well-being and prosperity of the Dominion: and this Bill, if enacted, will be a great boon to thousands of employés who are now deprived of their Sunday's rest, that rest which is necessary to restore their wasted and exhausted energies, and to fit them for the efficient discharge of their duties during the remaining six days of the week. That is not all; this law is necessary in order that they may enjoy the privilege of attending divine worship and receiving religious instruction. We were told last session that this Bill was unnecessary, that the Local Legislatures had dealt with the question, and that some provisions of this Bill encroached on the domain of provincial rights. Now, I think we have not to look far to see that notwithstanding all that has been done by the Provincial Governments, and all that has been done by this Government, there is still a great deal of unnecessary Sabbath labour and a great deal of Sabbath desecration. There is still ample room for Sabbath reform. I do not care whether we look to our railways, our canals or our Post Office Department. It is true, this Bill in some particulars does not go quite so far as I could wish. I would like to see the sanctity of the whole day preserved. I think we have a right to ask that the employés of the Government in every department of the public service should be protected in the enjoyment, not of a half Sabbath, or any portion of the Sabbath, but the whole twenty-four hours' rest; and trust that this House and the mover of the Bill will see that it is amended in that direction. The first section of the Bill is, I think, one of very great importance, prohibiting the publishing and delivering of newspapers on Sunday. It is true, the evil has not spread very far in Canada, but it has obtained a foothold, and no doubt it will spread unless prevented by timely legislation. From what I have seen in the United States, I believe it is impossible to overestimate the amount of evil which results from Sunday newspapers, and I trust that this section will be enacted. With reference to the last clause of the section, I am not quite satisfied that there is any absolute necessity why the printers should be permitted to begin their work at nine o'clock on Sunday evening. I think the printers and publishers would be all the better for the whole Sunday's rest, and I would like to see the Bill amended in that particular. The same remarks apply to the second section, which has reference to the closing of our canals from 6 in the morning till 10 at night. No doubt that would be a great boon, but it would be still better to close them for the whole 24 hours. I will not further trespass on the time of the House, but simply express the hope that this Bill, amended in the direction which I have indicated, will be enacted by the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the motion is passed, I wish to say two or three words upon it. I am not going to oppose the second reading of the Bill; in fact, I am very glad that the hon. leader of the House has consented to its being read a second time. However, I wish to put in a saving clause. I wish to say that there are certain amendments which I deem necessary in the Bill before I, for one, can vote for it. I indicated a year ago to the hon. mover of the Bill what these were. I told him that unless the Bill was changed in that respect, I could not support it. The hon. gentleman has not seen fit to change it, and I now say that unless these changes are made, I do not see how I can support the Bill. I listened very carefully to the hon. gentleman's speech to-night, and I must say I hardly think he showed his usual candour. He insisted very strongly that the Bill is simply and solely in order to protect men in their civil rights, and that it has no religious aspect. I take up the Bill, and the first thing which catches my eye shows that is not a correct interpretation. The hon. gentleman may say that is only the preamble of the Bill. Well, we all know from experience that the hon. gentleman is strong on preambles, in fact we had his opinion once that the preamble is the strongest part of the Bill. Does the preamble of the Bill say a word about protecting men in their civil rights? No; it gives as the reasons for which the Bill is introduced: "Whereas it is desirable in the interests of religion, and morality, and the public welfare that this Bill should be passed." I need not tell this House that the public welfare can be promoted in the best way by religion and morality, so that the whole motive of the Bill is religious and moral; it is to force men to become religious and moral. If you ask me why I object to that, I say that, as a legislator, I have no mandate to legislate in any such way. I have tried carefully to examine into the matter, and I have nowhere found that it is my duty to seek to promote and pass laws to compel men to be religious. I read the command, as it was given by the Master, to have been given to the church and not to Parliament: "Go ye into all the world and disciple all nations;" and until the hon. gentleman can show me his mandate, until he can show to me that the church has declined to carry out her commission, until the church declares herself powerless to do it, until she declares she has no faith in the promise of her Master, "I am with you always to the end," until she does that I, for one, object to attempting to compel men to become religious by act of Parliament. It seems to me that the history of the christian church ought to convince any man of ordinary enlightenment and intelligence of the utter futility, not only futility, but the disastrous consequences, of trying to promote religion by legislation or by the sword of the civil magistrate. I need not tell hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the facts of history, that the palmy days of christianity were during the first three centuries, when the religion of the cross was not only not promoted by legislation, was not only not protected by the sword

of the civil legislature, but when every effort of these was made to destroy it. And it was only at the end of three centuries, when the church had become strong enough for governments to patronize it and try to make use of it, that the civil power stepped in and passed laws for its protection. What was the effect of that procedure? I need not tell you; it was disastrous to the church. Why, for long years after that there was no end of legislation, there was no end of edicts and ordinances, and of penalties to enforce these edicts and ordinances and to compel men to be religious. And what was the result? It was the enslavement of the human mind; it was the depriving of men, not only of their civil rights, but their religious liberties. And if that view of the case be correct, if it be correct that the State is bound to promote religion by legislation, the State has also the authority to prescribe a penalty to enforce obedience to its mandates. The result was that the human conscience was trampled down, the civil and religious rights of men were trampled upon, until we find the culmination in the inquisition of Spain. Now, the promoter of the Bill will perhaps tell me that was before the Reformation. How much better was it after? Is not the fact known to everyone in this House that if the same things were not perpetrated, it was because men would not submit to them? There was just the same disposition to tyrannize over the human conscience and compel men to conform to the State's religion by Act of Parliament. I have only to refer to that law we heard a great deal about during the last two years, the first of Elizabeth, which we heard lauded to the skies, with its accompanying Act of Uniformity, and the infamous Star Chamber, modelled on the Spanish inquisition, to carry out their desires and enforce their penalties. What was the object of these and to what use were they put? Simply to compel Catholics and dissenting Protestants to become religious according to the ideas of the State and Act of Parliament. In view of all these facts, I think I am justified in insisting beforehand that the preamble of this Bill shall be changed. I have no intention whatever of imposing upon my fellow-countrymen a yoke which neither we nor our forefathers were able to bear. Let me ask the hon. gentleman to be logical. A principle cannot be right if you cannot carry it out to its logical conclusion. He says it is in the interests of religion and morality that Sabbath legislation should be passed. In other words, that men should be compelled to observe the Sabbath. Will the hon. gentleman take the next logical step? We all know he is a man who keeps the Sabbath strictly. He is a devout church-goer, and I have no doubt he believes it is in the interests of religion and morality that men should attend church. If he has the right to legislate that they shall observe the Sabbath in the interest of religion and morality, he has the right to legislate that they shall attend church on Sunday. Not only that, but we all know that the hon. gentleman who proposes this Bill is a devout Presbyterian, and no doubt believes in his innermost soul that it is in the interests of religion and morality, that every man, woman and child should attend the Presbyterian church. I submit that if we have the power and right to legislate that a man should keep the Sabbath, we have the right to legislate that he shall attend church, and my hon. friend has the right to go the third step and see that they attend the Presbyterian church. Now, if you ask me why I support the Bill, I can tell you in a few words. We know that science, and experience, and observation, all teach that it is absolutely necessary for every human being to have one day of rest in seven. I believe there are no two opinions on that point. Now it follows, as a necessary consequence, that if it is a matter of necessity, every man, woman and child shall be protected in the enjoyment of that right, and, until we have laws to protect them in that Sabbath right, those rights will most certainly be infringed upon. That is the sole reason why I support this Bill, and the only ground on which I will support any such legislation. You may say there are certain kinds of labour in which the Sabbath cannot be observed. Railway traffic has been instanced, and yet it is a fact that some of the most influential, some of the most skilful railway men on this continent and all over the world have declared that Sunday labour, as far as the railways are concerned, is not at all necessary, but that on the other hand it is a positive disadvantage. I have here in my hand evidence taken before the Senate of the United States on the subject of Sabbath legislation, and among other evidence was that given by Mr. Ledyard, the president of the Michigan Central Railway system, one of the largest railway systems on this continent. He declares positively that a company would lose nothing either in traffic or in profit by ceasing to work on Sunday. He gives it as his firm conviction that it is a great loss to a railway company to compel its employés to work on the Sabbath day. He wrote a long letter to the *Railway Age*, and that paper says editorially in reference to Mr. Ledyard's letter:

"Mr. Ledyard's conviction that he and other railway managers are all committing a fearful mistake in allowing the continuance and rapid growth of this Sunday labour is held, we believe, by the great majority of railway officers and it is to be hoped that in their perusal and public consideration of the great problems of railway management they will give that serious attention to this subject which its importance demands."

Some may say, you have no right to coerce the employés of a railway company, that it is a matter of bargain and sale between them and their masters, that, if they do not choose to work on Sundays, they may leave their position. They cannot leave. The livelihood of themselves and of their families depends upon their work, and, if they do not conform to the rules of the company, they will have to leave their employment. There was a petition of 450 engineers of the New York Central presented to Congress pleading for a Sunday rest. They say:

"This never-ending labour ruins our health and prematurely makes us feel worn-out like old men, and we are sensible of our inability to perform our duty as well when we work to an excess."

The discussion all through this book between employers of labour and railway officials shows that men will do better work in the six days than they can in the seven, if they are permitted to rest on the seventh day. They point to the customs of all civilized nations, and they pledge themselves that, if this boon is granted, provided they are only to work six days, they will do more and better work than if they had to work seven days. For this reason I give the Bill my hearty support except in

regard to those clauses which I shall try to have amended. I say to the leader of the House that I hope this time he will not allow this Bill to be burked, because, if it is the right of every man, woman and child to have a day of rest, if the Sabbath right is interfered with, this House is bound to protect the individuals in the enjoyment of that right. Another amendment which I intend to propose is of a different kind. You know very well, Mr. Speaker, that there are some people who say that we do not keep the right day, that the Divine command was that "six days thou shalt labour and on the seventh day thou shalt rest," while we keep the first day of the week instead of the seventh, and they are not satisfied that that is correct. The hon. gentleman may say that, for certain good and sufficient reasons the day was changed. Those reasons satisfy his mind and they satisfy mine also, but there are men in this country who are in no way inferior to the hon. gentleman or to me, who hold that there is no warrant and no reason for the change of the day. I propose to have a saving clause inserted to protect these people, so long as they do not interfere with the rights of others, and I think they have a right to be protected.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

COMPULSORY VOTING.

Mr. AMYOT moved second reading of Bill (No. 46) to make voting compulsory.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The House had a discussion upon this Bill after the second reading, last year, and after I had made some observations which I intended to be against the Bill, it was supported in two or three places as deserving of further consideration. I cannot say that I have much changed the opinion I formed upon it at the time; and I thought there was a great deal, also, in the arguments that came from other gentlemen after I had addressed the House against the principle of the Bill. I recognized the wish of the House as then expressed, that the Bill should be more fully considered; but understanding that the hon. gentleman proposes that this Bill should go to a select committee, I think it would be well that it should have its second reading—of course on the understanding that we are not necessarily committing ourselves to the principle of the Bill, but desire to have it further examined.

Mr. LAURIER. I think myself with the hon. gentleman that it is quite proper the Bill should be referred to a select committee, but I do it also with the reservation that I do not, for my part, express approval of the principle of the Bill, but reserve my judgment upon it for a future occasion after hearing the report of the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. AMYOT moved:

That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Tupper, Wood (Brockville), Flint, Earle, Brodeur, Skinner, Fraser, Weldon, Landerkin, LaRivière, and the mover.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply (1st April).

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

L. C. Pereira..... $183 87

House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	LaRivière,
Bain (Soulanges),	Lippé,
Baird,	Macdonald (King's),
Baker,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Barnard,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bennett,	Macdowall,
Bergeron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bowell,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Boyle,	McKay,
Cameron,	McKeen,
Cargill,	McLean,
Carling,	McLennan,
Carpenter,	McLeod,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Cochrane,	Madill,
Corbould,	Mara,
Corby,	Masson,
Craig,	Miller,
Curran,	Mills (Annapolis),
Daly,	Northrup,
Davis,	Ouimet,
Denison,	Patterson (Colchester),
Desaulniers,	Patterson (Huron),
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Pelletier,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Putnam,
Dugas,	Reid,
Dupont,	Roome,
Dyer,	Rosamond,
Fairbairn,	Ross (Lisgar),
Ferguson (Leeds & Grenville)	Savard,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Simard,
Fréchette,	Skinner,
Gillies,	Smith (Ontario),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Stairs,
Grandbois,	Stevenson,
Guillet,	Thompson (Sir John),
Haggart,	Tupper,
Henderson,	Turcotte,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Hutchins,	White (Cardwell),
Joncas,	Wilmot,
Kaulbach,	Wilson, and
Kirkpatrick,	Wood (Brockville)—86.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Gillmor,
Armstrong,	Guay,
Bain (Wentworth),	Innes,
Beausoleil,	Landerkin,
Béchard,	Langelier,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Borden,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Bowman,	Lister,
Brodeur,	Livingston,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Carroll,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Monet,
Charlton,	Mulock,
Choquette,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Perry,
Dawson,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	Rowand,
Fauvel,	Sanborn,
Featherston,	Scriver,
Flint,	Semple,
Forbes,	Somerville,
Fraser,	Watson,
Frémont,	Welsh, and
Gauthier,	Yeo.—61.
Gibson,	

Item agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has not voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am paired with the chief whip on the other side. The hon. member for

Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), and the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) have not voted.

Mr. GIROUARD. I am paired with the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Préfontaine), otherwise I would have voted yea.

High Commissioner for Canada—To meet expenditure for rates, taxes, insurance, ground rent, &c., of the official residence and income tax on the High Commissioner's salary..... $1,200

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When this item was under discussion in Supply, the Minister of Finance promised to bring down certain information with respect to it. This item is being voted twice for this particular year, and it is quite evident that the money voted must have been in some way or other improperly paid, otherwise this $1,200 would be available for the service of the present year as voted. The Minister of Finance, when the matter was under discussion, declared that he would make full explanation on concurrence as to how the lapse occurred. If the Minister of Justice, or the Minister of Militia, has no explanation for the item, it had better stand over until the Minister of Finance is here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Minister of Finance, through illness, is unable to be here to-night, and he alone can give the information. If the information is insisted on the item will have to stand, but the effect will be that we cannot pass the Bill. But if the item is allowed to pass now, the information will be given on the Bill, if that is satisfactory to the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case I will not press the point, and you can give the information to-morrow. But it is well to understand that we want to know in what year the money was first irregularly appropriated.

Further amount required for Miscellaneous expenses—Governor General's Warrant $6,000

Mr. MULOCK. In this resolution are a number of items that are the subject of Governor General's Warrants. At an early stage of the session I obtained an order from the House for the production of the reports upon which all these warrants were issued. I have once called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the reports have not yet been laid before the House, and I think they ought to be laid before the House before the Supply Bill is passed. At what stage will these reports be forthcoming? Certainly they should be laid before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the return was brought down.

Mr. MULOCK. Then it must have been within the last day or two.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Three or four days ago. If it has not been brought down, it will be brought down this week. My colleague the Minister of Militia informs me that it has not yet been brought down.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I am not asking anything unreasonable when I urge that these reports should be brought down before the items are finally passed. I asked for these documents in Supply. Indeed, they were moved for at the commencement of the session.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make enquiry and see how far the Clerk of the Executive Council has succeeded in copying them, and, if possible, lay them on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not press the matter further at this stage, but I shall ask that the Bill be not passed before these reports are forthcoming.

Further expenditure in connection with Franchise Act, printing Voters' Lists, &c $60,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the voters' lists, I wish to ask the Minister of Justice, or whoever has that department in charge, who retains custody of the various original documents supplied to the Secretary of State by the various revising officers?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has charge of the original documents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose he retains in all cases the original documents and furnishes a copy to the printer.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I believe that is the rule.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not know that of his own knowledge?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). Not of my own knowledge.

Mr. MULOCK. The Franchise Act only requires the revising officer to send one list, viz., the official return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and there is no provision in the Act for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sending a copy to the Queen's Printer. Accordingly, the original revised list signed by the revising officer, is the only document that goes to the Queen's Printer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the statement made by the Secretary of State is correct, because the hon. gentleman will recollect that in the London case the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery immediately produced a copy of the list sent up by the revising officer, in obedience to the Order of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I think on investigation the Minister will find that my statement is correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is important that this matter should be determined, because the original list should be carefully preserved, and in the custody of our own officer. I should be glad to learn whether my hon. friend or the Minister of Justice is correct as to the matter of fact, and as to what is the practice, and where the original document is to be had. I suppose the Secretary of State will let me know to-morrow?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I will give the hon. gentleman this information with other information in connection with the revision of the list.

St. John Custom House Fire $6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have tenders been asked for the new public buildings at St. John, New Brunswick?

Mr. OUIMET. Tenders will be called for, but the plans are not ready yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand the custom house is not entirely destroyed and the greater part of it would be available for the new building.

Mr. OUIMET. The "greater part" might be saying too much. When the architect makes his report we will be able to ascertain if the walls are all right.

Amount required to provide for payment of claims in connection with Militia services, rebellion North-West Territories, 1885.....$2,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this item no details were given in the Committee of Supply, and the Minister was to give explanations of it now.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the item ought to be $2,109.41. The details which I promised the hon. gentleman are as follows:—To pay Lieut.-Col. Jackson for cab-hire at Winnipeg in 1885, while chief pay and supply officer and commissioner on war claims, $76.50; to refund to the same officer the amount paid to Brigade-Major Aylmer, of London, as his allowance at the rate of $500 per annum for performing the duties of Deputy Adjutant-General of Military District No. 1, while Lieut.-Col. Jackson was employed on the war claims, $148.96; to pay expenses of the Medical Board of Toronto, in 1889, in examining parties who had made claims, $10.95; P. B. Cleland, for loss of mules in 1885, $475; J. Walker, for loss of waggon and team hired, $835. These two claims were submitted to the Department of Justice, which, after examining them, reported that the Government was liable for the amounts. For advertising in the Manitoba *Free Press*, $13; legal expenses in connection with above claims, $550.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Were these legal expenses incurred for the two particular claims mentioned?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are on these claims, some of which were entered in the Exchequer Court. After investigating them, the department advised that they should be paid.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1891, the sum of $887,812.74 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution reported, and read the first and the second times and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 62) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. OUIMET.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 7th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The members are, no doubt, anxious to know what adjournment will take place at Easter, and I think it is desirable that it should be settled to-day. I, therefore, move:

That when the House adjourns on Wednesday next, it do stand adjourned until the following Tuesday, at three o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, additional papers respecting the Fisheries on the Atlantic Coast, including the separate arrangement proposed to be entered into by Newfoundland with the United States, and also the enforcement by the Government of Newfoundland against Canadian vessels of the Newfoundland Bait Act.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 7th April, 1892.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if these papers contain the despatches to which I called his attention the other day?

Mr. TUPPER. They do not, although they cover a good deal of the ground. I expect soon to be able to bring down these papers.

POSTMASTER AT KENTVILLE, N.S.

Mr. FLINT (for Mr. BORDEN) asked, When was the postmaster at Kentville, N. S., suspended? Has his successor been appointed? If not, why not, and when will an appointment be made? What is the salary of the Kentville Post Office? By whom have the duties been performed, and what is the total cost of the administration of the office in salaries and otherwise since the date of the suspension of the postmaster?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The postmaster of Kentville, N.S., was suspended on the 6th of February, 1891. His successor has not been appointed yet. The salary is $840 per year, and the duties have been performed by clerks from the Halifax Post Office, namely: W. C. Harris, salary $400 per year; Miss Eaton, who is paid $5 per week as assistant; and $100 per year is paid for rent of the post office.

LAND PURCHASE IN QUEBEC CITY.

Mr. FRÉMONT asked, 1. For what reasons, and at whose request, did the Government put up for sale a certain piece of land leading from Grande Allée, in the city of Quebec, to the Quebec Skating Rink, and shown in the plans as forming part of a public street, the said piece of land being situated on the east of lot No. 2, on the south side of Grande Allée, in the said city? 2. In what newspapers, and for what length of time was the said sale advertised? 3. Who was the purchaser? 4. Have the Government given a definite title to the purchaser? 5. If the Government have not as yet given a title, is it their intention to give it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The strip of land, 10 feet in width, referred to by the hon. gentleman, was sold to Dr. W. A. Verge at the doctor's own request. The piece of land adjoins the lot already owned by Dr. Verge, and was fenced in by him some years ago. The land in question does not form part of a public street. Though called First Street on the plan prepared by Surveyor Tremblay, it was never opened as a street or given to the city. 2. The sale in question was advertised six times in the *Morning Chronicle*, *Le Matin* and *L'Evénement*, being the full number of insertions of an advertisement which any department may order without getting a special Order in Council in that behalf. 3. The purchaser was Dr. Verge, who paid $625 cash. 4. Patent has not yet issued to the purchaser. 5. It is the intention of the Government to issue a patent to Dr. Verge.

ISSUE OF WRITS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like the Minister of Justice to state when we may expect the information which was promised the House some time ago; that is, the reason of delay in the issue of writs after the warrants were received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will lay that on the Table immediately after our vacation.

LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to remind the Government that on the 21st of March an Address to His Excellency was passed for papers in connection with the London election. Sixteen days have gone and those papers are not yet on the Table. It is very desirable they should be placed on the Table at once. The hon. member for South Oxford called the attention of the Government to it the other day, and the Secretary of State informed the House that they were being prepared. I would like to know when they may be expected.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know the question was asked the Secretary of State the other day. I do not know what is in the *Hansard*, but I remember his reply being to this effect: that application had to be made for them to the revising officer and that other papers were in his hands and were being prepared, but there will be no delay after the papers have been received. They will be brought down the next day or two, but if they have not been received the delay will be owing to that fact.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if that return ordered last session with reference to the expenditure in different constituencies will soon be brought down?

Mr. OUIMET. I will take a note of the hon. gentleman's question and look into the matter.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 10) to amend the Pilotage Act (Mr. Tupper) read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. BOWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 62) granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service. He said: I have laid upon the Table a return of the warrants and the reports of the different Ministers upon which the Governor General's warrants were issued. In answer to the question put at the last sitting of the House, as to the final disposition of the voters' lists, I am informed that the lists are sent by the revising officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and by him are sent to the printer. The printer sends them to the judge, who revises and corrects the lists. They are then returned to the printing office and then sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in whose office they are filed and where they can be obtained at any time. The Finance Minister will make the explanation he has to make with reference to the $1,200 voted for the High Commissioner's office.

Mr. FOSTER. We had some discussion the other night about the item of $1,200 appearing in the Supplementary Estimates this year for the contingencies of the High Commissioner. I stated at that time that the object of putting this sum in the Supplementary Estimates this year was to have the appropriation even with the liability, instead of having it one year in arrear. The vote in last year's Estimates was to pay for the preceding year. The first vote was in 1887-88, $1,200 for contingencies for this purpose, and was only partly expended. The reason why it was not all expended was, that Sir Charles Tupper came out to this country and only spent a part of the year in London. In 1888-89, $1,200 was voted again and expended. In 1889-90 that amount was voted and expended; but in 1890-91 it was left out of the Estimates by error, and the error was only discovered in the latter part of the year. As I brought in the Estimates last year, the House will find that the vote reads in this way: "To authorize the payment of an over-expenditure in 1890-91, on account of contingencies." Having dropped out of the Estimates in 1890-91, it was over-expended, and the amount voted last year was to cover this over-expenditure. Last year, also, by error it was not included in the vote for 1891-92, and this supplementary estimate for $1,200 is to cover that. There is no irregularity in making the payment out of the vote for that year, because it was expressly stated that it was to cover the amount for those years. A question was asked by the hon. gentleman as to the amount we paid income tax on for

the High Commissioner. We only pay on the salary he receives, $10,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then this is really left as two distinct votes?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote taken last year, 1891-92, was to pay the over-expenditure of 1890-91.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under item 21, page 9, the amount is stated as $1,200 for contingencies, &c., evidently intended for 1891-92. I think the hon. gentleman ought to alter the reading of one of these votes, because it appears to be double for the year 1891-92.

Mr. FOSTER. No; it was not doubled for 1891-92.

Bill read the third time and passed.

WRECKING IN CANADIAN WATERS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 8) respecting aid by United States wreckers in Canadian waters.—(Mr. Bowell.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CHARLTON. Some of the parties who are interested in Canadian wrecking plant have questioned whether it will be possible under the provisions of this Bill for the American authorities to restrict the operations of this law by preserving to their own vessels the right of wrecking on the coast, while preventing Canadian vessels from wrecking on the American coast. I would ask the Minister whether it is possible that that difficulty can arise under the provisions of this Bill?

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the interpretation which we put upon the Bill, nor is it the decision arrived at when discussing the matter with the Secretary of State in the United States. The intention of the Bill is to give the freest possible latitude to vessels of Canadian register in American waters as well as to those of like character of American register in Canadian waters. The letters the hon. gentleman did me the honour to send me from one of the tug owners who has wrecking plant in the west, were replied to by my answering that the interpretation we put on the law was that Canadian vessels would have all the rights and privileges to wreck in American waters that American wrecking vessels would have in Canadian waters. The question was also asked whether Lake Michigan, being an inland water of the United States, would have this law applied to it as well. My interpretation of the Act, and of the understanding we had with Mr. Blaine, was that it would apply to Lake Michigan also. Those who opposed the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Frontenac last year, and the year before, was principally on the ground that no provision was made for towing wrecks in foreign waters after the wrecks have been raised. When that difficulty was pointed out to Mr. Blaine, he frankly admitted that, without that right, the privilege of wrecking in foreign waters would be useless; and he promised that, if a Bill similar to that passed in the United States Congress were passed here, an order would be issued giving the same privilege to Canadian vessels to tow wrecks as was given to United States vessels. Provision is made that this Act shall not go into operation until the United States give the same rights to Canadian vessels in American waters as are given to American vessels in Canadian waters; and, if at any time that privilege is withdrawn, we will withdraw the rights and privileges which we are giving. There are one or two words which I propose to add to this measure, suggested by the letter which was written to the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Mr. CHARLTON. I feel it incumbent on me to state to the House some of the objections which are considered by those who own wrecking plant to apply to this Bill. At the same time, I frankly confess that the course proposed by the Government may be said to have been partly forced upon it by the state of public opinion on the subject. It is, however, proper to present the objections that those interested in Canadian wrecking plant urge against the measure. It is urged that in making this arrangement, or more properly we might say, this concession, to the American Government, we are not getting a *quid pro quo*, because we have exceptional advantages, as the law has hitherto stood, and it is believed that these advantages might have been used for the purpose of securing further concessions. The advantages are briefly these: About nine-tenths of the tonnage upon the great lakes is American tonnage; probably, at least, nine-tenths of the wrecks upon the Canadian coast are American wrecks; and under the law as it existed—and for the condition of that law the Americans themselves are responsible, for they first introduced the policy of restriction—under the operations of the law as it existed, Canadian wrecking plant had advantages over American wrecking plant, in the fact that there were nine times as many American wrecks upon the Canadian coast, on an average, as there were Canadian wrecks upon the American coast; and while the American wreckers were debarred from nine wrecks, the Canadian wreckers on the American coast were debarred from succouring but one. This was an important advantage enjoyed by the Canadian marine companies and Canadian wrecking companies, and that advantage, of course, this Bill surrenders. I do not say that it is not proper to surrender it, but I do think that the Government might have used the surrender of this great advantage enjoyed by the Canadian wrecking companies for the purpose of securing some additional concession—in fact, they secure no concession in this matter, and they surrender an important privilege. The Canadian wrecking companies, so far from enjoying an advantageous position, will now be placed at a disadvantage.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. What concession do you expect?

Mr. CHARLTON. I had reason to expect the concession of the abrogation of the coasting laws entirely upon the great lakes, and the opening up of the coasting trade for the marine of both countries. That, I think, is something we ought to have insisted upon, because, in the position in which matters stood, we had a decided advantage over the Americans. Now that the change is to be made the position may be represented as follows: The Canadian wrecking companies will be placed at a disadvantage in their competition with American wrecking companies, for the reason that underwriters and insurance companies on the great lakes, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, will place their

business in the hands of American wrecking companies. Canadian wrecking companies will scarcely stand a chance to get business at all. Then the Canadian wrecker is placed at a disadvantage when the field is open, as it is by this Bill, in the greater cost of much of his wrecking plant, which he is obliged to import and pay duty upon, and in the greater cost, in many cases, of his coal, upon which duty must be paid. He is handicapped by these extra charges, and he is, I repeat, placed in a position where he will receive scant justice in the matter of fair-play from insurance companies, and will find himself at a disadvantage in securing that business; and, as a result of this measure, I look for the wiping out of the Canadian wrecking interest, and the loss of the capital invested in this business. With regard to the expression here, "waters contiguous to the United States," I am glad to hear from the Minister who has the Bill in charge, an assurance that this will apply to the waters of Lake Michigan. I suppose, of course, if it is held not to apply to the waters of Lake Michigan, our own Government would not open the waters of the Georgian Bay to the operations of American wreckers, because the Georgian Bay is as much a Canadian water as Lake Michigan is an American water. Now, with regard to the policy pursued by the Government hitherto in this matter, my hon. friend the Minister knows as well as I do the entire want of foundation for all charges made by the American Government or by vessel owners that they had been oppressive and exacting in their ruling. He knows that there really existed no particular necessity for this law, and that the Government never denied American wrecking companies the right to operate where Canadian plant was not at hand, and that, so far as the marine interests of the two countries is concerned, it was not placed in jeopardy, and it suffered no loss from the operation of the law. In fact so liberal were the interpretations of the Government with regard to the matter, that Canadian wrecking companies, in many instances, deemed themselves aggrieved by the readiness of the Government to grant permits to the American wreckers.

These, in brief, are the objections urged against this Bill by wrecking companies; they urge that under the operations of the old law, for which the American Government was responsible, they were placed in an exceptionally favourable position, that nine-tenths of the wrecks upon the Canadian coast were American wrecks, and that in opening up this question and giving reciprocity in wrecking, we are voluntarily giving an important advantage which we enjoy, and an advantage which was thrust upon us, if I may use the term, by the American Government; and I doubt whether it would not have been worth the trial to secure from the United States some concession for this surrender of what was an important advantage placed in our hands. I do not propose to object to the passage of the Bill, but I am sorry that we have not got a little more to show for what was an important advantage, that we are having in the provisions of this Bill as presented to the House.

Mr. EDGAR. I have a distinct recollection that in 1888, when a Bill like this was under discussion in the House, Sir Charles Tupper, who then spoke for the Government, opposed the Bill which was introduced by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirpatrick), on the ground that we should hold it back until we could get reciprocity in coasting privileges from the United States. Now, I would be glad to learn from the Minister of Militia, who has charge of it at present, and who has recently been visiting Washington with great effect, how far he has made progress in securing reciprocity in coasting privileges with the United States. I remember, too, that the Minister of Militia then spoke of the destruction of our wrecking industry that would be caused by this Bill. I am glad he has changed his mind. I did not agree with him then, and I am glad he has come to our way of thinking, and of course I am glad he supports the Bill. I am sure this is the hour of triumph for the member for Frontenac. This is one of the few things in which he agreed with the majority on this side of the House, in policy, and he has succeeded in forcing it upon an unwilling Government, and I congratulate him. We on this side of the House, of course, not knowing much about it, have rather been looking from time to time to see the hon. member for Frontenac promoted a little higher up along the front ministerial benches; and the only way we can account for his great merit not being recognized is that there was a serious difference of opinion between him and the Government on an important question of policy, and this was the only question of policy in regard to which we knew there was a difference of opinion. Now that that has been removed I have no doubt we will see the promotion which we have been long expecting to see on this side of the House. But, Sir, there is the hon. the Secretary of State, what has he got to say to this question? Why, Sir, he bitterly opposed it before, and it appears that the member for Frontenac, outside the Government, has been able to impose his policy upon the Government, and the Secretary of State has had to swallow his policy, and has got a seat in the Government in consideration for it. Now, this is part of our policy of reciprocity with the United States, and we are glad to congratulate the Government upon taking a step in the right direction at last, and I hope the Bill will receive the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am, of course, very glad that this Bill has been brought down and is not only likely to pass the House this year, but to pass through the other Chamber and receive the Royal assent and become law. For several years I have endeavoured to get it placed upon the Statute-book. I have given what I thought at the time were good reasons for the passage of the Bill, and I acknowledge that I received hearty support from hon. gentlemen opposite, with the exception of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has to-day repeated his objections to the measure. The measure is practically the same as I introduced last year. This is practically accepting the offer of the United States Government for reciprocity in wrecking. It is true that the Minister of Militia, who has charge of the Bill, has introduced a clause stating that the wrecking and salvage is to include the necessary towing. Well, it may be necessary for some people to have that particularly stated in the Bill, but I conceive, if we give American citizens the right to come into our waters for wrecking and salvage purposes, that implies and covers the necessary towing to

take the vessel to a place of safety. Those words are, therefore, put in, I presume, merely to make it appear different from the Bill I introduced. I must say this, the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said that when the Government opposed this Bill previously they did so because they said they wanted to endeavour to make some arrangement with the Government of the United States by which we would secure reciprocity in the coasting trade. But Ministers went to Washington, and found there were insuperable objections to securing such concession, and they very properly gave way and took what they could get. They believed this was a proper law to go into effect even by itself, and even if no concession was made on the other side of the line. On the ground of humanity they held that on the waters of our inland lakes there should be ready means for saving life and ample appliances for assisting in wrecking. All this is very desirable, but it is more desirable that this measure should pass, because our marine interests on the inland waters unanimously asked for it. They said it was necessary that vessels should have the right to telegraph to the nearest port, whether in the United States or Canada, and obtain the assistance of wrecking appliances, without incurring the unnecessary delay of telegraphing to Washington or Ottawa to obtain the permit which has hitherto been needed. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the Minister of Militia knew very well that this permit had never been refused by the Canadian Government. If it has never been refused, what objection could there be to this Bill being placed on the Statute-book? Even if this permit was always granted, there were delays of hours and sometimes a day was wasted in telegraphing to secure it. And in the same way it was necessary, before Americans came into Canadian waters, that they should telegraph to Washington and get authority there. The time lost in forwarding these messages was of vital importance, and the delay often resulted in death to some lives on board and a disaster to the vessel of which the seamen were in charge. A case occurred in which a vessel saw a wreck, but was obliged to pass by on the other side.

Mr. BOWELL. No lives were lost.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Some men were found dead on the vessel when the rescuers did go there. All the wrecking companies in this country, except one, that of which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has always had charge, and in whose welfare he has always shown such an interest, are desirous of securing the passage of this Bill. From Lake Superior to Lake Ontario all the persons interested in wrecking appliances have asked for this measure. From Lake Superior I had a communication stating that if we could not hold our own with the Americans in this matter, those engaged in the business were ready to go under. From towns on Lake Ontario there have come communications in favour of the passage of the Bill, and expressing anxiety to engage in the wrecking business in Canadian waters.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the company to which the hon. member refers as the only one that has not desired a change in the law is that at Kingston, he is mistaken.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Will you name another?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Militia has a letter from a firm in Port Colborne; a firm at Amherstburg has also opposed this Bill.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The Board of Trade at Port Arthur, and a Mr. Marks, who is one of a firm owning tugs and wrecking appliances, are in favour of the Bill, and have asked that it be passed. I believe this Bill will be accepted with gratitude by the ship-owners and sailors in the inland waters. When the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) argues so strongly against placing a Bill of this kind on the Statute-book, unless some other concession is granted by the American Government, and when he pleads so anxiously for the interest of this Canadian wrecking company, why does he not at the same time think of persons who have other interests in the country, when he argues and speaks in favour of unrestricted reciprocity? He argues against reciprocity in this matter, but in other matters he wants reciprocity, no matter whose interests are injured. But this is a case where the trade interests desire the adoption of this measure, where the ship-owners desire it, where the mariners desire it, and where in the interests of humanity it should be granted. I am very glad the Government have brought down the measure, and I shall be glad to see it become law.

Mr. McGREGOR. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) it is quite true that some years ago a large number of Canadians were in favour of reciprocity in wrecking. But the hon. member must remember that some citizens of this Dominion have incurred a heavy expense in providing themselves with wrecking appliances. At Amherstburg, a very large amount of money has been expended on tugs and other wrecking outfit, and the proprietors will lose a large portion of their investment if this Bill should pass. A company has also been established at Windsor under the belief that the Government would retain the law now in force, as they have adopted a stringent policy with respect to wrecking laws. They have also incurred a large outlay; and, in fact, they feel they have been very badly used. It is true it may be asked why should we not have reciprocity in this matter when we advocate reciprocity in other matters? But this is only one plank of the reciprocity platform. If we had coasting trade rights in the United States, if we had one vessel as compared with 1,000 owned by the Americans, it would be different. They have large insurance companies which control a very large number of vessels, and when wrecking is to be done the work is given to their own wrecking companies. They have the full management of the working of their wrecking companies. Under the present law the Canadians possess the sole right of wrecking in our own waters; and the adoption of this measure will destroy the trade and will cause our companies to lose large sums of money.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Militia, when this subject was under discussion before, informed the House that he was ready to support a measure of this sort, if it was not a one-sided measure, and he favoured reciprocal free trade in the matter of coasting trade of the two countries. The hon. gentleman went to Washington. It is to be presumed that his view on the whole subject was presented and discussed, and the House is entitled to information on the subject. The Minister has

brought down a proposition in his capacity as a Minister which he has hitherto opposed and hitherto regarded as one-sided. I think this is a fitting opportunity for the hon. gentleman to tell us what success he has had, and to lay on the Table any papers that may relate to this subject, the subject as he understood it, the subject embracing all that he thought ought to be embraced in it, in order that the House may see how it was that the hon. gentleman did not succeed in attaining his object. We are entitled to any memorandum or papers upon this subject, and to the report which the hon. gentleman has made, as well as some defence of the position which the hon. gentleman now takes.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Chairman, it would be folly on my part to say that I did not anticipate the remarks which have been made by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), as well as the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and also by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). My objection, speaking for myself individually, and speaking on behalf of the Government, in the past was, because the offer which had been made was one-sided and impracticable, apart altogether from the principle at stake. We would much rather have entered into mutual arrangements, including the coasting trade both on the sea coast and on the inland waters. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that we have made a surrender without asking for any return whatever, and he would like to know whether this question was discussed or not. It was discussed fully, and one of the first demands we made upon the Secretary of State of the American Government, was that it should be considered. The question was asked us at once: Do you propose to extend that to the sea coast as well as to the inland waters; and our reply was, that we were quite prepared to give it the fullest possible interpretation to enter into arrangements by which there would be free coasting, not only on the sea coast, but also on the inland waters. That was objected to. Then we proposed to confine it to the inland waters, and the arguments for some little time *pro* and *con* were on our part in favour of it, and on their part against it; Mr. Blaine gave many reasons to show that they did not feel inclined to surrender a right to any other country which they considered to be in the interest of their ship-owners. When we found that it was impossible to obtain the freest reciprocity in this coasting and wrecking, then the suggestion was made to the American Secretary of State that they should so change and alter their law as to give the fullest rights and privileges to Canadian wreckers and wrecking plant in their waters, including towing and other rights, which this Bill gives them; and if that were conceded we were prepared to accept it, although it was not all that we wanted or all that we should like. In reference to free coasting in the inland waters, it was pointed out to Mr. Blaine, that the United States should not be afraid of Canada with it small population and its comparatively small tonnage, as compared with a country of 60,000,000 of people and the enormous tonnage that they have. Notwithstanding that argument they declined to make the concession. The question then arose as to whether we should enter into mutual arrangements by which life and property should be saved, giving the fullest and freest intercourse and entry into their waters, as they would have into our waters; and adding to it—that which we contended on this side of the House should be conceded, and which my friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) thinks amounts to nothing, and which remark was cheered by the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar)—that unless that privilege were given it would render negotiations nugatory. Mr. Blaine acknowledged that unless these rights and privileges were conceded the Bill would be of no use. So far as we could press the question of coasting upon the Secretary of State it was pressed, and when we found we could not get it we consented to accept the Bill containing the provisions now before the House. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was, I think, quite correct in the statements he made in explanation of the remarks of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). There is no wrecking company in Canada that has asked for the repeal of the laws as they exist to-day, other than that which has its headquarters in Kingston; but on the other hand I do not know of a single ship-owner from Port Arthur to Montreal, and particularly those engaged in the grain trade, who has not demanded most earnestly the concessions which we are now giving in this Bill. It is somewhat amusing to those who have given this question any study, to hear members on the other side of the House, and particularly the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and the member for Essex (Mr. McGregor), lecturing us upon a change of opinion, when it is known that the first orders to prevent American vessels from assisting vessels wrecked or in distress in Canadian waters, and that too of a most restrictive character, were issued by the gentlemen now occupying the Opposition benches in this House, when they were in power. The first order closely restricting wrecking in the inland waters of Canada, was issued by my predecessor in the Mackenzie Government. I have no doubt at the instance and with the approval of his colleagues, in 1875. That Order in Council had the same force as if it were an Act of Parliament; and had it been carried out literally, not only the difficulties, but the dangers to life and property would have accrued, to which my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) referred. There has not been a single case of a character, which has ever come to my knowledge, similar to that which was mentioned by the member from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), of life and property having been destroyed owing to a refusal on the part of the Canadian Government to grant the concession to American wreckers under such circumstances.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I did not say it was owing to a refusal.

Mr. BOWELL. Because they did not get it.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, I will go further and say that during 13 years I have had the management of that matter in my department, and consequently every telegram and every letter affecting a wreck, or applications for permission for American vessels to save property, has come under my notice, and I know of no case similar to that which my hon. friend has referred to. I was very glad to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) state that in no instance had there ever been a refusal on the part of the Canadian Government:

but, on the contrary, the Government had been so liberal, as almost to render the law as it stands on the Statute-book nugatory. There was a case in 1875, if my memory serves me right, in which representations were made to the department that owing to a refusal on the part of the late Government to permit American vessels to go to the relief of wrecked vessels, that lives had been lost. Upon full investigation it was found that there was not one word of truth, or anything pertaining to truth, in the complaint which had been made. A vessel had been wrecked, but those who were alive on board were rescued by Mr. McCallum, now a senator, and there was nothing done on the part of the Administration of that day which led, either to the loss of one dollar's worth of property, or to the loss of life which occurred. I hope that the predictions made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, that the wrecking companies in this country will be wiped out of existence by the passage of this Bill, will not be fulfilled. We hear continually from that side of the House that Canadians are as enterprising, as pushing, and as capable of competing with the Americans, as any other people in the world. This measure is an illustration of the truth of this statement; and the hon. gentleman, who has made this declaration over and over again, and is quite sure that other Canadian industries would not be wiped out by American competition, will surely not expect us to believe that this is the only case in which the Canadian people are unable to compete with their neighbours. I have a better opinion of Canadian sailors than that, and I sincerely hope that the hon. gentleman's predictions will not be fulfilled. I do not know that I need say anything further on this question. If there are any other points on which members desire information, I shall be happy to give it; but I wish the House to understand that whatever the opinions of the members of the Government, and my own individually, may have been in the past, I do not belong to that class of people commonly termed Bourbons, who never change. I am quite willing to advance: I am quite willing to surrender opinions which I may have held in the past, if I find on maturer reflection that the interests of the country demand a change; and if any man occupying the important position of a Minister of State does not do that, the sooner he vacates his position the better.

Mr. CHARLTON. There must be something quite seductive in the atmosphere of Washington.

Mr. BOWELL. Is that the reason you go there so often?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that I have been there so often as my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, and if I have been, I have not been put so strongly under somnolent influences. The hon. Minister talks quite differently to-day from the strain in which he has talked on this subject hitherto. The Government, I suppose, still profess to protect the interests of Canadians. They adopted a policy with regard to wrecking, which called into existence a large amount of wrecking plant, and caused the investment of a large amount of capital, under the tacit assurance given by the Government that such investments would be protected. A number of wrecking companies have been formed, which have invested money in tugs, steam pumps, diving apparatus, hydraulic jacks and all the paraphernalia for carrying on wrecking operations; and when the business has developed under the fostering care of the Government, they suddenly withdraw their protection altogether. The action of the Government in this matter is inconsistent with their position in caring for the interests of the Canadian people.

Mr. BOWELL. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain what inconsistency means, and then apply it to himself?

Mr. CHARLTON. I may have been inconsistent, but I do not propose to be inconsistent to-day. The hon. gentleman gives us a verbal account of his interview and discussion with the American Secretary of State. He tells us that the Canadian Commission discussed this question with the American Secretary. They first proposed that the whole coasting trade of the seaboard, and that of the inland waters, should be thrown open, including wrecking. That being declined, they next proposed that if the Americans would open the whole coasting trade of the inland waters, we would give them reciprocity in wrecking, and the Secretary of State declined the proposition.

Mr. BOWELL. No: I said reciprocity in coasting.

Mr. CHARLTON. I refer to the proposition made first, of coasting on the sea coast and then on the lakes, both of which were denied. The Minister of Customs tells us that they got all they could get, and what was it? If the result of their visit to Washington was to surrender an important advantage which we had hitherto enjoyed, I do not think it is one on which they need plume themselves very greatly. As the hon. gentleman has admitted, we occupied a position very advantageous to ourselves in regard to wrecking. On the waters of the inland lakes there was a large commercial marine, nine-tenths of which belonged to a foreign power; we possessed one-half of the lake coasts where wrecks were liable to occur. We had, in the action of the American Government, done before the hon. gentleman occupied the position of Minister of Customs, precedents for the course we pursued. They first adopted the policy of restriction; and the order to which the hon. gentleman alludes as having passed under the Mackenzie Government, was in retaliation for the order issued by the American Government, and was in the line of the policy adopted by that Government. We were placed in this position, that on our coasts nine-tenths of the wrecks were American vessels; and following the precedent set by the American Government, we were entitled to enjoy the advantage of salvage and wreckage on our coasts. The policy of the Government has called into existence several wrecking companies, the investment of large sums of money, and a large quantity of plant and material for carrying on this work. The facilities provided by these companies were ample for all the wants on our coasts, and if they did not prove to be ample, the Government were at all times ready to grant permits to wrecking companies from the United States to come in and assist. Now, the Government through the Minister of Militia informs us that having discussed this question at Washington, and having been unable to obtain reciprocity in the coasting trade either on the inland waters or on the sea coast, they gave away the wrecking privilege, the very privilege which the Minister time and again has asserted to

be of great advantage to Canada. They could not get anything, so they gave away what we had. They gave away the very leverage we possessed for forcing from the Americans some concession. That is not the kind of reciprocity which I have been advocating. If we have anything in our hands which we can use for the purpose of securing an advantage for ourselves, it was legitimate on our part to use it. No interest had suffered in consequence of our enforcing this privilege, and our commissioners in their trip to Washington have stultified their record, they have gone against their own professed principles, and they have surrendered an important advantage without a *quid pro quo*. They went to Washington and the Yankees outwitted them. The Minister says they got the privilege of towing thrown in; but that is the very thing necessary to any wrecking at all. They went down to Washington, and they simply got reciprocity in wrecking. They surrender the advantage we have in possessing one-half the coast, in possessing one-tenth the mercantile marine, in having one-half or more of the wreckage in our own control, and in having created companies to attend to it. They have stultified their own record, they have gone against their own principles, they have sacrificed an interest created by their own policy. So that, while I do not say that this thing they have done is nothing perhaps in the interest of humanity, it is not consistent with their previous record. They have surrendered an advantage and got no equivalent, an advantage we ought to have retained in our hands until the Americans were willing to give us something. A concession the Americans should have made is the coasting trade on the inland lakes, and they probably would have given us this if we had stood out in the matter. The Minister of Customs says he has every confidence in Canadian ability to compete with the Americans. But, Sir, we are handicapped. It costs more for us to create wrecking plant, we have to pay duty on steam pumps, hydraulic jacks and various kinds of plant imported, which the American wrecking company gets free of duty, and we have, in many cases, to pay duty on coal. Then we have the underwriting influence of the great lakes against the Canadian wrecking companies, which cannot get fair-play, and the business will go to American companies, whether they do it cheaper or not and whether they have greater facilities or not. Consequently, the Canadian companies which, relying upon the good faith of the Government, invested their money, supposing the Government would protect their interests, are placed in this position, that their capital is completely wiped out and we have secured no advantage whatever in return. The Government have always denied that, so far as the interests of humanity and commerce were concerned, there was anything in the demand made that there should not be protection to wrecking. They have surrendered the rights and advantages they had in their own hands, and they have got nothing in return. I do not think now, in the light of their own report, and their own press, and the position they have taken in this matter, they have anything to congratulate themselves upon in the result of their visit to Washington.

On section 3,

Mr. BOWELL. There are certain provisions which prevent coasting and also salving goods that are wrecked. This is to provide that the Customs Act shall not interfere with the operation of this law. It was necessary to do that in order to stop a Customs official from preventing, in the exercise of what he might consider his duty, coasting by American vessels in saving vessels or goods.

On section 4,

Mr. BOWELL. The section reads in this way: "When the Governor in Council is advised that the privileges of aiding any vessel wrecked or disabled in the United States." I propose to make it read: "Aiding any vessel or property wrecked, disabled or in distress in American waters." That makes it in accord with clause No. 1.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that by arrangement with the Secretary of State, this would include the waters of Lake Michigan. I suppose it will also include the waters of Lake Superior, at the head of the lake beyond the Canadian boundary line. How would it be with Saginaw Bay and Georgian Bay, also under our own exclusive jurisdiction?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman did not read my remarks right. I did not say that I discussed the question of Lake Michigan with Mr. Blaine. What I said was that the understanding between us was that it should apply to all waters contiguous to either country, and that would include Michigan as well as Georgian Bay?

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. BOWELL. Except what might be termed inland waters. We have the right, under the Treaty of Washington, to navigate inland waters, and have the same rights in Lake Michigan as they themselves.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). For ten years.

Mr. BOWELL. For a length of time. If those rights were denied by the United States, under the interpretation of their Act, we should at once, I take it, repeal the Act we have passed, authority being given for that purpose under this Bill to the Governor in Council. I cannot conceive it possible, under the understanding we have had, that the American Government would attempt to restrict the operations of Canadian wrecking plant in Lake Michigan or any other waters they could reach. I am sure we should not do so under this Bill, with the understanding we have. If they put a stricter interpretation upon the Act, depend upon it the Canadian Government will, in duty bound, pursue the same course.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman say that I was under misapprehension in supposing this matter was understood. I doubt very much whether the American Government will consider Lake Michigan, or even Saginaw Bay, as waters contiguous to the boundary line of Canada. Lake Michigan is entirely within American territory. It does not approach the Canadian line at all; and if the Government intend to insist upon the right of wrecking for Canadian vessels in Michigan, I apprehend the measure will be wrecked at the outset. I do not know that their refusal to admit our wrecking vessels into Lake Michigan would necessarily be an injustice which would warrant the Government in proposing to take a corresponding step with regard to Georgian Bay and other waters of Canada which are not contiguous to American waters. If, however, the Govern-

ment insist upon access to Lake Michigan, I trust they will bear in mind also that in Saginaw Bay, the arm of Lake Huron, at the head of which are situated the large cities of Bay City and Saginaw, with their enormous lumbering interests, is one of the most important points on the lake, and they are justly entitled to possess the right of wrecking and towing. I am sorry this matter is not more explicitly defined. I am sorry that in this Bill there is not some definition of what the waters are that shall be covered by the operation of the Bill. I am sorry that the thing is left indefinite, and that there is necessity for interpretation of what is meant by the phrase contained in the Bill. There may be a great difference of opinion, for I question whether the Americans will considere Lake Michigan a body of water coming under the operation of the Act. However, under the provisions of the Act, we have simply to leave the protection of Canadian vessels in the hands of the Government, as they take power to refuse to carry the Bill into operation until, I suppose, satisfactory arrangements are made with the American Government.

Mr. BOWELL. The Bill itself states that.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill gives the power to the Government, but we do not know what are the views and the intentions of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. It is very hard to satisfy the hon. gentleman. I have given the committee every possible explanation and have stated that we put the widest possible interpretation on this language, and that, unless these rights are conceded to Canada and to the Canadian wrecking plant, we will not give these rights to the Americans, and that includes Lake Michigan. Lake Michigan is a water as contiguous to Canada as our northern waters, such as the Georgian Bay, are contiguous to the United States, and if this term "contiguous" does not apply to Lake Michigan, it does not apply to our waters on the north shore. This Government will look closely after the rights of Canada in this matter.

Mr. McGREGOR. The word "towing" is of very little use unless you include Saginaw Bay. If our boats cannot go into Saginaw Bay and up to Bay City and Superior City, you might as well do without the law altogether. Lake Michigan is 250 miles long and 80 miles broad, and it is not contiguous to our country. If we do not have the advantage of towing up the straits, we might as well do away with this law.

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not considered the question involved in this Bill. He is discussing the question of towing, which is about the same thing as coasting. A Canadian boat can go into American waters as an American boat can come into Canadian waters, and can take vessels in tow which are going to the American shores as the American tug can take vessels that are coming to the Canadian shore, but they cannot tow vessels from port to port. This Bill only applies to vessels engaged in wrecking or salving.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not see that we are getting any advantage by this legislation, but we are simply giving away what we already have.

Mr. BOWELL. I am glad to see there are so many protectionists on the other side.

Mr. CHARLTON.

On section 5,

Mr. CHARLTON. The assurance given by the Minister in regard to the carrying of this into effect, I think, we are bound to consider sufficiently satisfactory. The difficulty is that he is giving away a very important vantage ground and has not got a consideration for it. I hope the Government will watch our interests keenly. If they can secure entrance to Lake Michigan and Saginaw Bay and can go to Superior City, that will be an advantage.

Mr. BOWELL. It might be well for me to read the memorandum and agreement entered into between the United States Government and those who were negotiating with them. It says:

"It is understood on the part of the Government of the United States that under the Act of Congress approved 24th May, 1890, relating to vessels wrecked or disabled in the waters conterminous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada, the aid and assistance provided for in said Act includes all necessary towing incident to said aid and assistance, and that nothing in the coasting and Customs laws restricts the salving operations of such vessels and their appliances. Should the Canadian Government enact legislation similar to the Act cited, the Secretary of the Treasury will issue the necessary instructions to secure the privileges above stated."

I think, from the reading of that memorandum which was accepted by both parties, it will be seen that all the objections made to the Bill by the hon. member for Norfolk are covered except in regard to the general principle.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

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

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I am about to submit to the House a motion of very great importance, a motion which, in my opinion, the House would be wanting in its duty to the country if it fails to support. I am about to ask the House to declare that the time has come when commercial treaties, in the interests of Canada, should be negotiated by persons who are responsible to the Government of Canada and for whose acts the advisers of the Crown in Canada should be held responsible to the House of Commons. We have often, within these walls, had drawn for us bright word pictures of our immense area, telling us how we spanned the continent from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, and how we stretched from the fertile regions of the temporate zone far into the regions of perpetual frost. We have had presented to us glowing word pictures of the teeming millions who, at no distant day, are to fill the waste places, and to turn what is now a solitude into fruitful fields, dotted with towns and cities, filled with a busy and prosperous population. But after these delightful anticipations are realized, even our national powers are to remain the same as they are at present: are to remain stationary, our political disabilities are to continue, and our political life and actions are to operate within the limits fixed by the events and by the conditions of a period long since passed. Though the country may grow to the thought, feeling and stature of manhood, there must be no constitutional growth corresponding with the general progress in wealth and population of the country. I repudiate this doctrine; I maintain that it is one inimical to our progress and opposed to the genius of our institutions. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the

gentlemen on the Treasury benches ought to deal candidly with the House; they ought to make their position on this subject of commercial treaties, perfectly intelligible to the House and to the country. If I rightly understand them, it is their contention that our foreign trade relations must, as long as we remain a part of the Empire, continue in other hands than ours, so in their opinion we must choose between British connection and self-government beyond that measure of self-government which we already possess. We must consent to leave for ever the regulation of our foreign trade in other hands, or we must submit to being put out of the British family and left to protect ourselves from foreign encroachment. I do not know whether, if this alternative was the necessary result of the proposition which I maintain, that it would seriously menace our future prospects; but I deny altogether that any such alternative is before us arising out of this subject. That such an alternative is involved has been often asserted, but no attempt has ever been made to sustain this contention by rational argument. When representative government was demanded by the people of this colony half a century ago, the same assertion was made, the same kind of argument was used, against the demand which was then thought reasonable. It was asked, how a governor could be controlled by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and at the same time follow the advice of a Colonial Administration? The demand, it was said, was incompatible with the unity of the Empire, and so the Reformers of that day were stigmatized Republicans in search of a pretext for putting an end to British authority on this continent. Such, Sir, was the contention of that period. No doubt the connection was endangered, not, however, from acquiescence in the proposed reform, but from the resistance with which that reform was long met. We had reached a state of maturity when it was no longer possible to keep the people of the country in leading-strings, it was no longer possible to persuade them tamely to submit to the perpetuation of the political abuses against which they at that time protested. Our fathers were told, as we have been told, of the greatness of the parent state, the advantages of its protection, the wisdom of its statesmen, the duty of implicit obedience, and the wickedness of discontent. They were urged to venerate the old flag, to uphold the old system, and to stand by the old families. The advice sounded amazingly like the advice which, with equal disinterestedness and with equal patriotic devotion, was, a little more than a year ago, proclaimed from the rostrum and reiterated by the newspapers of hon. gentlemen who now sit upon your right. But in spite of this defence of the ancient system, it was overthrown. The demands for reform were conceded, and the constitutional changes which were long sought by the leaders of the Reform party, were brought into practical operation. Every one in this country, whether in the House or out of it, knows with what effect these changes were brought into practical operation. None of the evil consequences which were confidently predicted, came to pass. Instead of the disorders such as we were told would arise, there was contentment; the bonds of union between the colony and the parent state were strengthened, the affections of the people everywhere took the place of military garrisons. Nothing perished but the ascendancy of those who had subordinated the general public interest to their own pecuniary or personal advancement. No doubt the men who, for a long period of years, had become acquainted with, or had become habituated to, a certain official routine, to the exercise of a certain kind of authority, were loth to give up that authority; they had confounded themselves with the political institutions of the country. Such men do not well see how the machine of government is to be worked without them. They are like the hangman in "Barnaby Rudge" who, when he was condemned to death, asked that he might be spared for the sake of the constitution. These men did not see how the affairs of the Government could be carried on in their absence. Now, these gentlemen do not say they are the state, but they do regard themselves as a necessary part of its governmental machinery. Our trans-atlantic officials who, in the progress of the colonies, are from time to time deprived of a portion of their authority, and who are, therefore, opposed to change, do not, nevertheless, exhibit the same ardour or the same fervour in opposing the constitutional reforms that are demanded, that are sometimes exhibited with less excusable reasons by hon. gentlemen on this side of the Atlantic. They do not employ very strong arguments in support of the ancient regime; they do not use the old man, or misuse the old flag, nor think they may successfully resist those who are using their best endeavours to adjust the institutions of the country with the requirements of their time, and who assiduously labour to prevent the functions of government from being perverted to the service of unworthy objects. Now, Mr. Speaker, I affirm that we have once more outgrown the limits of the authority with which we have for a long time been content. Communities, like persons, have their periods of infancy, of youth and of manhood. Nations are not formed in a day. The attributes which go to make a people into a nation cannot be assumed at will. The sovereignty of states is not a matter of legislation, or of official determination. States grow up by slow degrees from the condition of dependency to that of a sovereignty. They are not legislative contrivances called into existence by the unscrupulous ambition of one class of public men or by the patriotism of another and a different class; they are bodies of organic growth. From the dawn of their political life they have vital forces operating from within and environing influences operating from without, which, as they progress in wealth and in population, give them an ever-increasing degree of complexity and create an ever-increasing necessity for an extension of their administrative, their executive and their legislative authority. They enter the society of nations whenever the time comes that they feel the want, and are prepared to undertake the responsibility which international obligations impose. It is not the intellectual capacity of the people, it is not a high degree of intelligence on their part, it is not high culture, it is not the strength of their moral fibre, it is not their industrial habits alone, or all these together, that determine whether a community is entitled to sovereign authority or whether it is not. These are important factors, no doubt, in determining the use which a state will make of the authority which it claims, and with which it is invested. But government is

a practical want, and we have no assurance that the powers of government will be wisely used any further than the necessity for those powers actually are felt. These powers are limited in various ways: by the pecuniary condition of the population, by their physical circumstances, by their industrial progress, by their external relations, political and commercial. Where there is little wealth accumulated necessity compels people who exercise political power to use their resources in the direction of their most pressing wants. Those which are most severely felt are those which are usually first provided for. We do not, nor ought we to seek to claim for a political community power without responsibility. I need not stop to point out the abuses which would be certain to arise if one government were to decide on the measure of expenditure and another government were required to provide the means by which these obligations were to be met. If government be a matter of growth, it is sufficient that the powers we possess should be such as to enable us to meet by practical legislation, and by executive authority, all our wants and all our necessities. It is out of these phases that a state grows in power, as it grows in the extent of its interest, and that there arises the difference between a territorial and provincial government under our constitution. It is out of these phases of political growth that the difference between a territorial and a state government arises under the constitution of the United States. These distinctions grow out of the circumstances of the population and are recognized but are not created by law. What is proper at one time in a community may have been improper at an earlier period, and it is because of this increasing degree of complexity, and the corresponding extension of authority which ought to accompany that complexity, that we say that one colony of the Empire may rightly claim to be entrusted with authority which cannot be fairly claimed by another colony. One of the best known maxims of the English common law is that a colony of British subjects carry with them into a distant portion of the Queen's dominions so much of the law of England as may be suited to their circumstances. No matter how well informed the members of that community may be, they do not carry with them the whole body of the English law. There is much of it they have no use for. There is much of it that is the necessary accident of the historical growth of the parent state. There is much of it that grew out of the conditions of early government which do not prevail in the parent state in modern times. So these features, these provisions of the law, are not carried with the colony. There is no constitutional rule which withholds from a colony of British subjects any particular power or authority which they may reasonably claim, and which they may claim as necessary for the promotion of their interests and the protection of their rights. There may be conditions and circumstances in a new colony of Englishmen or of British subjects so different from anything that exists in the parent state, that there is nothing in the body of the law which they carry with them, there is nothing in the law which they left behind them, which will adequately meet their wants. But they are not left, under the English constitutional system, helpless. They carry with them not only certain provisions of the law which are suited to their circumstances, but they carry with them as a part of the common law the power to call into existence the machinery by which that law may be amended, by which it may be supplemented, by which it may be adjusted to their wants and their circumstances. The common law is said to be the perfection of reason, and it would fall very far short of this if a British subject did not carry with him into a new colony that part of the law which confers on him the rights and privileges of a freeman, freedom from taxation without his consent, the right to counsel his Sovereign either personally or by representation, the right to give his consent to any change in the law of the province by which he is to be governed. The common law in the United Kingdom does not confer on the Crown in the colony by settlement any greater authority than the Crown has over the subject in the parent state. What the Crown cannot do in the parent state without the aid of the legislature the Crown cannot do in the colony without like aid. The Crown cannot impose a tax alone. It cannot do so by the aid of the Legislative Council; it can only do so by consent of the party personally or by his consent through representation in Parliament in the colony assembled. In the very nature of things there are immense fields within the limits of which the colony does not legislate. It makes no attempt to legislate, not because the power has been withheld under the authority of the common law, not because power has been taken away by any Imperial enactment, but because it is shut out by its local and peculiar circumstances, by the simple character of its wants and by the interest of the population. If you look, Sir, at the condition of the colony, you will find that the administration of civil justice largely relates to matters that are of a simple character and are easily understood. You will find that the expenditures on the objects of government are in the first instance mostly municipal. There are roads and bridges to build, harbours to protect, the education of the children of the community to provide for, courts of justice to establish, the navigation of rivers to improve, roads connecting the different settlements of the interior with each other and with the coast, to make. These are usually the matters which first occupy the attention of a colony of Englishmen; not because in a new country their rights are more limited than they are in the parent state; but because they have fewer political interests. We see in a colony, the state in the process of formation, and the public duties, and the public functions of a higher order are of a later growth. There are a hundred things which the sovereign state is called upon to deal with, but with which the colony has for a long series of years no concern. Now, this power of government increases with the necessities of the population. Power and responsibility, under the English constitutional system of hand in hand, and the same thing may be affirmed of power and necessity arising from the growth of a colony towards nationality. The first of these is evoked by the parent state for the purpose of upholding and maintaining its superintendence over the Empire; the second, the power arising from necessity, the colony invokes for the extension of its authority and for the rational adjustment of its freedom in accordance with its wants and with its interests. Power, at the first age of colonial existence, is often wisely exercised by the parent state, which at a later period, if serious abuses are not to grow up,

must be transferred to the colony itself, as a part of the power which is necessary to the maintenance of the principles of self-government. The boundary line between the authority of the parent state and the colony under our constitutional system, is not a fixed limitary line, but a varying line which alters its position in proportion as the wealth and population of the colony increases, and as the circumstances of the colony are altered. The political horizon of a colony in its infancy is necessarily very near, but as the colony advances in civilization, in population, and in wealth, the political horizon recedes, the area embraced within the authority of colonial legislation and Government is increased, and the authority of the parent state over the colonies is proportionately diminished. In other words, the Imperial Parliament and the administrative officers of the parent state, are by the necessities of the colony relieved of a part of their trust. That is the position. Where the colony had no interest at all in the subject, or where it had no interest distinct from that of the parent state, the parent state may without injury, or inconvenience, or any sense of oppression, and without any danger of friction, exercise such authority. But, Sir, in the growth of colonies the time comes where the way parts; and a colony may take one road in its interest, and the parent state may continue on the other. It is perfectly clear that whenever that condition of things arises that the colony can no longer afford, with regard to that particular matter, to allow the authority to remain with the parent state, without having its interests subordinated and sacrificed to those of the superior authority. Therefore, if you examine, Mr. Speaker, the progress of colonial government under the English constitutional system, you will find that in every case where representative government has been established, the theoretical principle which I have just stated exactly corresponds with the historical facts. There is no exception; it is a necessary consequence of growth under our system, the freer that system is, the less interference there is, the more promptly concession is made by the parent state to the wants of the colony, and the more clearly they are laid before the parent state, the less will be the friction, and the stronger the bond of union between them. Now, Sir, no one would venture to argue before a judicial tribunal that when a person comes to a point where his interest and his duty are on opposite sides, that he may be safely left to go against his interests in discharge of a duty. The rule which has been recognized as an elementary rule in the principles of jurisprudence is equally applicable in the administration of public affairs. Every one knows that gross abuses would spring up if that rule of law were abolished. Now, this rule, I say, is equally applicable to the conduct of the administration of the affairs of the state. Experience shows that the rule of fair dealing is more readily applied in private than in public affairs, and that the public conscience is less sensitive than the individual conscience. This is the necessary result from the fact that the individual stands alone against the whole community, and in matters of public interest it frequently happens that one-half the community, in political ethics as well as in questions of public policy, stands against the other half; so that rules of upright dealings are more readily applied as between one individual and another than between any individual and the state, or between one state and another. Public opinion always comes more promptly to the support of the public as against the individual, than it does in one state against another. Take the case of some matter in which an imperial officer is undertaking to act for a province. Is it not perfectly clear that in such a case there is in the first place a disposition to maintain things as they are? But, under disinclination to change and that strong interest which the parent state has in maintaining things as they are, a public wrong is often shielded by the ignorance, by the indifference, by the self-interest, by the false political maxims which have become current in the community with regard to the particular subject which is regarded as a grievance. In the case of one entrusted with authority in the parent state, there comes to the support of that official the public opinion of a very numerous community—of a community who undertake to maintain the existence of the office and the functions of the officer upon the ground that they have existed for a long series of years. And so we frequently find that the best interests of a province are held in check by the maintenance of the authority of some imperial officer whose functions ought to come to an end, and whose duty should be superseded by some other in authority. An official of the United Kingdom, in the discharge of his duty abroad, can never be able to give more than a subordinate place to colonial matters which are not also matters of great imperial concern. But, Sir, we are met at this point by the objection that the external relations of all parts of the Empire must ever remain in the hands of Her Majesty's advisers at Westminster; that no other rule can be reconciled with the unity and stability of the Empire. This, Sir, it seems to me, is simply begging the question in dispute. I deny it. Were the contention well founded, it would only prove this, that the destiny of the British Empire is that its colonies shall reach a period of maturity, and that the Empire shall then fall to pieces. The doctrine of imperial supremacy and of imperial superintendence was stated about a year ago with great force and precision by Lord Salisbury. In discussing the action of the Imperial Government towards Newfoundland in its dispute with the Government of France, Lord Salisbury made these observations in defence of interference by imperial authorities. He said:

"We give them (the Newfoundland people) unlimited power in respect to their internal affairs because they will be the people who will suffer if they make a mistake. Therefore it is right that they should be in such matters independent. But if they make a dangerous mistake in this matter, it is not they who will suffer. It is we who run the whole risk, and they hardly any risk at all. I do not suppose that in case of war with France, the French would take the trouble to invade Newfoundland. And this being our risk, the whole burden and responsibility falling upon us, we should have the necessary power to defend our interests and our fellow subjects, and also to comply with international law, to fulfil international obligations, and to satisfy the pledged word of the country."

Now, I accept this statement as a true ethical and constitutional basis for imperial supremacy and imperial superintendence. It is a partial statement of the conditions under which that supremacy may give place to colonial sovereignty. It may be superseded, on account of local dangers or local interests, by local authority. The circumstances under which this transference of authority takes place from the Imperial Parliament and imperial

officers to the officers and authorities in a dependency, I shall undertake to state later. When, Sir, we first set out to give practical effect to our claim to self-government, we confined our demands to our domestic affairs; we limited those demands by our local interests. We did so because these were sufficient at that time to meet all our governmental wants. They are not such, however, as to meet the wants of a community such as we have now become. We have many evidences of this. Why, Sir, what meant that attempt at negotiation with France by the Government of this country a few years ago? What meant the abortive negotiations of the Government of Canada with the Government of Spain? What meant the demand on the Imperial Government by the Government of this country recently, that in the appointment of a commission to negotiate with the United States on the subject of our fisheries, our commercial relations, and all other matters of interest existing between the two countries, which were of common concern to us and to them, the Government of Canada should be represented. I say, Sir, that these things show that we are no longer a colony such as we once were, that we are no longer an infantile community, but a state possessing the instincts and interests which belong to a people who must be regarded in some respects as a sovereign people. Do they not show, Sir, that we believe ourselves to be the best guardians of our own interests? Do they not show that in respect of all those matters in which we have external relations, we believe that we can do more for ourselves than others can do for us? Sir, what meant the excursion of the hon. Minister of Finance to the West Indies sixteen months ago? It may be that the hon. gentleman accomplished nothing; but he hoped to accomplish something when he set out. It may be that the strength of the hon. Minister of Finance does not lie in the field of diplomacy. Whether the hon. Minister went to the West Indian Islands of his own free will, or whether in a moment of weakness he yielded to the pressing demands and importunities of his colleagues, I do not think it is a matter of much consequence to enquire. However this may be, the Minister of Finance set out on his voyage for the purpose of dealing with the relations between this country and those West Indian Islands. If those relations are not very intimate at the present time, the hon. Minister of Finance and his colleagues, at whose instance he went, must have thought that it was desirable that those relations should be more intimate. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in going upon that journey, with the approbation of his colleagues, assumed that the commercial relations of Canada with other countries were matters that properly fell within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada, and he acted upon that assumption. It is true that the countries which he visited were British possessions; but, Sir, if it was proper to go to the Island of Jamaica or to the Province of Guiana for the purpose of extending the trade of this country, it would have been equally proper to have gone to Mexico, to Colombia, or to Brazil. It was with the external relations of the country that he undertook to deal. It was not political affiliation that he was seeking in his visit to Jamaica, but wider markets. It must be assumed that in those visits he sought to promote the interests of the people of Canada, to contribute to their prosperity, and to add to their wealth. What the Minister aimed at, he did not accomplish. The action of the Government proved, however, another proposition besides the one which I have immediately before me; it proved the further proposition that Canada has not become a self-contained country, capable of consuming all that it can produce, and of producing all that it can consume. This was one of the promises hon. gentlemen made in connection with their fiscal policy, and this promise has not been redeemed. It has, on the contrary, signally failed. I pass by that, however, for the present, and simply call the attention of the House to the fact, that the story of the wanderings of this Minister, who sailed over the sea and then sailed back again, has not yet seen the light. This silence is suggestive and ominous. It shows that the Minister feels his political excursion did not bring the Government glory nor the country gain. The Ministers have shown that they did not want closer trade relations with the neighbouring republic. They did not, in the interests of Canada, desire that our people should look to the United States for anything. They hoped that this West Indian voyage would enable them to promise such an extension of trade as would quiet the mutterings of discontent which, previous to the elections of last year, were being heard. The hon. gentleman would have preferred negotiations with Russia, China, Timbuctoo, or any other country on the globe rather than with the country on our immediate borders. Before his wanderings began, the whole Administration, or a large number of them at least, paid a visit to the Maritime Provinces. They knew before they started that there was discontent: they knew there was distress; they knew there were the mutterings of complaint which precede a coming storm. And so the hon. gentlemen pondered these things in their hearts, and in their eastern observations felt called upon to consider what measure of relief, other than reciprocity with the neighbouring republic, they could offer the people of Canada, which would enable them to retain the confidence of the country. They were anxious to discover a solution, no doubt, but a solution other than that which most obviously presented itself; and so, after this eastern excursion, after viewing the ground upon our eastern border, the hon. gentleman set out upon this West India voyage. He visited the Leeward Islands, the Windward Islands, and, if I remember rightly, also the mainland. Everywhere he failed in his negotiations. The authorities in these West Indian provinces did not like the proposition of the hon. gentleman. They thought, perhaps, that the hon. gentleman was too much like Cassius; he had a lean and hungry look; they thought, perhaps, that he offered too little and wanted too much. The matters, after his explanation, were even more mixed and muddled than they had been before; the prospects diminished of treaty arrangements with the West India Islands, which, if fulfilled, would have saved the hon. gentleman the terrible humiliation of three journeys to Washington and also relieved them from the necessity they felt under of indulging in a good deal of not very candid talk about the traitors who are seeking to dismember the Empire by lowering taxation on the

products the people consume. The hon. gentleman failed in his West Indian mission, and from hour to hour after he had visited the country the news that came here indicated that failure. There has been up to this time, so far as I know, no attempt to lay upon the Table of this House a full statement of the hon. gentleman's visit to that country in the interests of the public service; and I have no doubt that if that correspondence and those propositions had been laid upon the Table, it would be seen that the visit of the hon. gentleman to the West Indies was really a burlesque upon negotiations. Sir, had the hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches any assurance whatever that there was a semblance of success in this excursion, the fire which burned so brightly upon the Conservative platforms in the beginning of the election campaign would have continued to glow until the day of the election; but the hon. gentleman was unable to hold out any hope of success, and so the defence of the National Policy, with which the campaign was opened, was not the subject-matter of discussion on the part of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and supporters when that campaign closed. If the hon. gentleman had succeeded with a single West Indian province, we would have heard nothing during the campaign of the march upon Washington after the battle, but we would have heard a great deal of the magnificent achievements and bright prospects flowing from the hon. gentleman's visit to these happy isles. There would have been predictions, vast and vague, about the unity of the Empire, about the propriety of an imperial tariff, framed specially to exclude the Gentiles from the imperial market and to put them on a footing of inequality, or at all events a tariff specially directed against our Samaritan neighbours. But from time to time, the news came that the West Indian officials were opposed to the hon. gentleman's proposition. From time to time, it was announced, first, that one and then that another of those officials were opposed to the schemes of trade which the hon. gentleman had submitted to them. When the hon. gentleman set out, he must have forgotten that the admiration for the policy of protection, which, no doubt, he sincerely entertained, and which was entertained by his colleagues, was a highly artificial habit of mind. It was like the worship of the toads and the lizards in ancient Egypt, and it was not a condition of mind likely to be met with in men trained in the principles of political economy, men who imbibed their notions of commercial policy from the mother country. It was not likely that such men would view with other feelings than those of disgust and repugnance that policy of mutual protection which the hon. gentleman sought to extend over the West India Islands. Before the elections were over, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues ceased to sing paeans in praise of the National Policy. They assured the people, in some instances, that it was a means to an end, that it was a temporary and coercive policy entered upon for the purpose of bringing Congress to its senses and of securing from the United States a wider market and freer trade. So what was called the national policy was superseded by what was claimed to be the old policy, the larger policy, the policy which was the end towards which the national policy was but the means, and so we find that these gentlemen half persuaded their followers that this old policy, as it was called, meant Canada for the Canadians, that it meant the National Policy, that it meant anything that any class of the community might think they would like to have as a commercial policy, and so, during the progress of the electoral contest, it was announced that there were to be immediate negotiations with the President of the United States, and with the Congress after the elections were over. What for years had been pronounced an impossibility was declared to be of easy attainment, and so, immediately after the elections were over, a treaty of reciprocity was to be an accomplished fact. The 5th of March was to be a great day of victory. The Opposition were to be swept out of existence. The old party, under the old flag, accepting the old policy and led by the High Commissioner, were to march into Washington and these negotiations were to be undertaken: the farmer, despite Mr. Colby, was to have reciprocity in natural products; the manufacturers were to have protection, and trusts and combines were to be left in the care of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace); the producer was to get better prices for his goods, and the consumer was to pay less, and so the electors were asked to stand by the old policy. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the old policy contained in the resolution of 1878, which, after some years, was brought out to do duty on this occasion. I am not going to show the incompatibility between that resolution and the subsequent policy, but what I wish to press upon the attention of the House, and my reason for mentioning these matters, is that I may bring specially before you the fact that the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were disposed to undertake the work of negotiation. They did not trust to the regular officers. They knew that England had an ambassador at Washington, an ambassador who was jealous of any interference with his functions, and, believing that what these gentlemen undertook to do fell within his exclusive domain, felt perhaps that he had a right to object to the American Government against any persons interfering except those who were specially authorized by Her Majesty's Government. Why, then, were these negotiations undertaken? Is it not a clear admission on the part of the Government that this country has grown and has acquired such dimensions and its foreign relations have acquired such a character that its interests are likely to be injured if they are not dealt with directly by representatives of the Dominion? If that is not the case, why did the hon. gentlemen undertake these negotiations? There may possibly be another explanation. If the Ministers were to speak frankly, they might say that the farmers of Canada were too much in earnest to permit them to palter with this question of reciprocity. A condition of things had been reached when bananas for children and cheap raw sugar for refiners would not satisfy the great mass of the people. A condition of things had been reached when, to use the language of a former Minister of the Crown, it was useless to say that it would be detrimental to the agricultural population to have free trade in natural products with the United States. Consequently the hon. gentleman felt that they must adopt the principle of reciprocity with the United States or they would never reach the shore without disaster. So they were compelled to abandon the National Policy, to talk reciprocity, to make their memorable visit to

Washington, and then they said, this is not enough. We must proclaim our friendliness to the policy of reciprocity, and we must declare that we are prepared immediately to negotiate with the United States, and we must say that the United States have invited us to negotiate with them, or all the influences which have been used in the past elections will not be sufficiently potent to enable us to reach the shore in safety. This was the condition of things. The founders of the National Policy superstition were wise in their generation. When the day of wrath came, they were ready to throw down their altars, where they had called on all patriotic Canadians to bring their offerings and their sacrifices for the past thirteen years. I deprecate the motives which have been alleged for this change of policy. If hon. gentlemen had been honest and sincere in endeavouring to secure reciprocity, they would never have returned to Canada empty-handed. We say that if Canada is to succeed in this matter, she must act for herself, and not by another. No matter how friendly the British ambassador may be, he acts for another country, and another Government than this, and he can never forget that the parties to whom he is responsible have different notions from ours, and the subject may not present just the same aspects to them that it does to us, and that he is not impelled to master the subject which most concerns us, nor is he compelled to consider it from our standpoint. He is not familiar with our circumstances, and never can feel as one of our own people would do. He is never in touch with the public opinion of this country, and there are barriers in the way of his ever being so placed. His want of information, his personal indifference, the absence of responsibility to us, his knowledge that mistake and failure will entail upon him no serious consequences, render him morally incapable of exercising in the highest degree that ability and skill which our interest calls for at his hands; and those things which most deeply concern us and which affect our material well-being must always be subordinated to the general interest of the Empire for which he will be held to strict responsibility. Now, the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada do not take exactly the same view of disputed questions. Take, for instance, the disputes of the Imperial Government with the United States. What they most want is the early disposition of a disagreeable dispute; they want to have it disposed of, they are ready to make large concessions to attain that end. What we want is a permanent recognition of our just rights; and that being so, it is of the first consequence that we should appoint the parties who are to have charge especially of our commercial affairs. I say this because I think that the conduct of the hon. gentlemen, whenever those questions have arisen, shows that in practice, whatever they may have proclaimed from time to time, theoretically, on the the floor of Parliament, they have admitted the soundness of the proposition for which I contend: If that be so, if the imperial officer is not competent, not qualified, from the nature of his position and the nature of his responsibility, sufficiently to care for our interests, we see why it is the hon. gentlemen constantly insist, so far as the British representative at Washington is concerned, that his labours shall always be supplemented and efficiently supported by representatives of the Government of Canada. But no matter for what reason, the fact remains that the Ministers sought to enter into direct negotiations at Washington with the Washington authorities; they did not trust to the Embassy, and by their conduct they have affirmed that the present constitutional machinery is not adequate to the requirements of a colony such as this.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Under the circumstances which I have mentioned as to the practice of the Government in the past, I would ask whether it is not now too late longer to oppose the principle embodied in the motion which I am about to submit to this House. If it were in order to address myself to the Ministers on the Treasury benches I would say, that hitherto you have opposed, by your speeches, the principles embodied in my motion, but you have again and again practically, though fitfully, recognized the soundness of that principle. You were compelled to choose between acting on the principles suggested by this motion, and accomplishing nothing beyond preparing a Minute of Council for His Excellency to forwarded to the Colonial Office. Sometimes the old course has been adopted, and a despatch is written upon which no action is taken. It is left to mould in the shadows of the Colonial Office, where traditional prejudices against every kind of change, are necessarily very strong. Sometimes a venerable official who may have survived from a former generation, wonders why these meddlesome colonies are anxious to take charge of part of their own business which has long been entrusted to that department, and which in his opinion they will discharge far less efficiently, and with far less skill, than the business has been managed by the officials of that office. If these gentlemen of routine have their way, there never would be any change, but all things in relation to the government of the Empire and the powers and duties of colonies would remain as they are now. Sometimes where urgent solicitation is made on the part of any colony with reference to foreign matters, the Colonial Office communicates with the Foreign Office upon the subject, and a despatch is written to the British ambassador of the country with which the colony has indirectly some business. That despatch is read to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in that country, and a copy of it is left with him. It may be made, to some extent, the subject of a discussion; but the British Ambassador in all these matters is usually so ill-informed that minute discussion is well nigh out of the question. He abstains from making any suggestion lest he might commit some blunder of which the colony will complain, and the matter never assumes a practical or definite form, there is nothing approaching a settlement or a basis of settlement arrived at, and in time the whole subject drops out of sight. Now, Sir, I would ask from hon. gentlemen in this House, why we should constantly importune the Colonial Office with reference to matters that specially concern ourselves and of which we ought to have charge? If they are ever to be satisfactorily attended to, if the matters are to receive a proper solution, one that is required by the merits and circumstances of the case, we ought to take charge ourselves. I think, Sir, we ought not to be

suppliants in these cases where we ought to be masters, and where we ought to be masters because we are the parties chiefly concerned. This principle in no way differs from the principle of domestic self-government which has been recognized wherever responsible government is established in the colonies from the time of its first introduction. A British ambassador in a country abroad has so much to do for which he will be held to the fullest measure of responsibility, that he does not willingly add to his labours and to his public cares. Care and laborious study are necessary to master the problems which await solution even in this country, with respect to our external trade and with respect to the relations of this country with our immediate neighbour. An officer, who is responsible to another Administration, and who is under the supervision of another Parliament, whose interests are regarded as paramount and whose authority is claimed to be such, is never likely to give to the interests of a dependency, to its external relations, that attention and that care which are absolutely necessary. I am of the opinion that those who have most carefully considered this matter will be least likely to dissent from this view. The ancient doctrine, that a colony ought to be known only through the parent state and ought only to speak through the organs of that state, is, no doubt, strong, so far as the external relations of the colonies are concerned, but it is the remnant only of a political system which for the most part has perished. We live here for ourselves and not for the parent state. It is the well-being of this country of which the Parliament of Canada has charge; we are not charged with looking after the interests of the United Kingdom; we are not called upon to exercise a parental supervision, or to specially concern ourselves about the affairs of other portions of the Empire. It is the well-being of the people of Canada which specially interests us, and when the people of Canada have interests which extend beyond our territorial limits, when our people have so grown and so far approached the conditions of a sovereign state as to come in contact, commercially or otherwise, with sovereign states, then it is just as necessary for our well-being that those matters, according to the well-settled principles of self-government, should be under the control of this Parliament, as that our domestic concerns should be under its control. The Imperial Parliament has no more constitutional right in the nature of things, according to any principle of political ethics, to claim in defence of or for the maintenance of its own sovereignty the control over these matters of domestic concern than it has a right to claim interference with our internal concerns. Sir, it is necessary that we should have control over the negotiation of treaties relating to matters of commerce. It has been hinted that such a policy would lead to separation from the mother country. I do not think so. On the contrary, I believe it would have the very opposite effect; at all events, it would be at least a measure of delay. It is no doubt another step in the process of political evolution. It is no doubt a step which carries us forward still nearer to the condition of nationality. It is as necessary to our well-being to-day and the maintenance of self-government in our country as the concession of responsible government with regard to our internal affairs was in the days of our fathers. We have reached a point of material growth, of political progress beyond which we cannot satisfactorily get on without a larger measure of political autonomy than has up to this moment been conceded. You cannot put an end to the demand for this power by undertaking to point out what will be the political consequence of its possession. You cannot argue with a view to weakening or destroying it in the minds of the people of this country by saying it would lead to such relations. You may, by that line of argument, succeed in weakening the ties which bind us to the mother country; you may by that line of argument convince a certain portion of the population that you are right in your contention; but the vital force which has given rise to this demand, the surrounding circumstances, the industrial growth of the country which presses this demand upon us will not be weakened by that contention or by any conclusion at which you may arrive. All I ask by the motion which I am about to place in your hands, Mr. Speaker, is that we shall give full play to those vital forces in our constitution which on account of our material growth and the increasing complexity of society, will impose on us the necessity of a larger power of self-government than we have, up to this moment, seen proper to demand. I have heard it said that if we were to make this demand the Imperial Government would never consent to be held responsible for treaty obligations to which it had not been a party. This is a very specious contention, and it is one that requires some consideration at our hands. We have, at the head of our executive authority in Canada, as in every other dependency of the Empire, the Sovereign, who is also the Sovereign head of the Government in the United Kingdom. If treaties are negotiated upon the responsibility of Ministers of the Crown here, and who for these negotiations are held responsible to this Parliament, those negotiations will be conducted by the same Sovereign. There will not be in the form of such a treaty or in its essence any difference from a treaty negotiated, exchanged, and ratified upon the advice of the Ministers of the Crown in the United Kingdom. If we look for a moment at the political relations which arise concerning foreign affairs we shall see that this demand is not an unreasonable one on the part of our colonies. Suppose a war were to occur between the United Kingdom and a great eastern state, between the United Kingdom and Russia. That war might be one which we thought might have been avoided. It might be that, in our opinion, it ought to have been avoided. It might be that a full investigation of the subject would convince us that peace might have been maintained with honour. But does the absence of any political authority on our part, of any voice in the conduct of our public affairs, in any way lessen or diminish our danger in consequence of that war? Why, the British Government might protect our commerce by her fleet on the high seas, but it would only be a general protection, such as would be afforded to the merchant marine of any portion of the Empire upon the high seas. The defence of our ports and harbours would depend upon ourselves. We would be required to erect fortifications, to equip them and to man them. If there were invasion we would be required to take all necessary steps to repel it. We might be put to very great expense, if a war, growing out of the consideration of matters over which we have no control and

in which we have no special interest, took place. I am not complaining of this. I am not saying that this is any reason why our obligations should be lessened so far as that particular matter would be concerned; but hon. gentlemen, if they are asked to-day by the Imperial Government to erect fortifications at Nanaimo or at Victoria or at any other point on the Pacific, are not asked to do so because of any difficulties that might arise with the neighbouring Republic. If those demands are made it is in consequence of the conflict which is constantly looming up on the horizon between the parent state and the great Empire of Russia. And so in matters in which we have no immediate concern, we have devolving upon us very serious responsibilities. I say I do not complain of that, because of the rule laid down by Lord Salisbury, in the paragraph in which I quoted the chief responsibility rests with the parent state. That being so, the principal authority with regard to such matters must continue there, but, Sir, that does not apply to every foreign relation that may arise. There may be cases in which the colony is the party chiefly concerned; there may be cases in which the interest under discussion is a colonial interest and not an imperial interest; and surely where that is the case, it is not unreasonable to say, that with regard to such matters the negotiations are to be conducted upon the advice of the Ministers of that colony, who are responsible to the colony which is chiefly concerned. We say that we trust to imperial authorities in all imperial matters. We do not question their authority, we do not say that where the chief responsibility and burden devolves upon them, that we ought to over-rule their views or to interfere with their authority. But surely if we trust them they should trust us. This should be a matter of mutual trust, and the Imperial Government ought to be as prepared to stand by and to uphold a treaty relating to our civil and commercial matters and negotiated by us, and relating to matters in which we are chiefly concerned, as we are, as every other portion of the Empire is, to uphold the exercise of its unquestioned authority in these matters which chiefly concern itself. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has come when the power to act must, in the case of all the large colonies, accompany the interest. That, I think, is a safe rule. I think that mistakes are much less likely to be made and difficulties are much less likely to grow up, and ill-feeling is much less likely to be engendered, where the sovereign responsibility rests with those who are chiefly affected. The sovereign power to treat and to bind may be exercised by the appointees of the Crown upon the advice of Ministers responsible to the community which is chiefly interested. The external relations of the Empire might remain unchanged if this principle be fully recognized. I repeat that I accept the rule which I have quoted from Lord Salisbury, namely, that the party who is chiefly affected is the party who has the right to exercise the sovereign power. Now, let me, by way of illustration, suppose that war, out of some matter of dispute, should arise between the United Kingdom and the United States. Who would be the party who is chiefly concerned? Would it be the United Kingdom that would be likely to be invaded or would it be Canada? Can there be a doubt that Canada would be the party who would chiefly suffer from any conflict that might arise; and Canada being the party having the largest measure of responsibility, the largest interests involved, she is the party that ought to determine what these relations should be, and what negotiations should be had to secure a fair and a just settlement. Sir, this, it seems to me, would in no way interfere with the relations which have existed between the colonies and the mother land. The constitutional development of the colonies no doubt must bring about a change in one respect in the relation of the dependencies to the parent state. That relation is no longer the relation of lord and vassal. It is the relation of friends standing upon a footing of equality, not equal in strength but equal in rights, and the dominant influence of the mother country ought to depend upon its superior wealth, and its superior numbers, and not upon any assertion of sovereignty over us with regard to matters specially concerning ourselves. The union of the Empire in the future must be a union based not upon the assertion of legislative, executive, or military supremacy. The permanence of the union and the strength of the union depends on the absence of coercion and of restraint. The strength of that union depends largely upon the language, upon a common literature, upon a common system of jurisprudence, upon a common system of constitutional government, and upon the common hopes and aspirations of the people of the various communities with regard to their progress. These, Sir, are, in my judgment, far stronger and far more enduring elements of union than the mere possession of superior legislative or military authority. It is an essential condition of progress that we must grow into a broader freedom, and become possessed of a greater measure of power, and have greater authority devolving upon us and greater responsibilities. In the nature of things this must be so, unless we, by our follies or by our vices, put an end to our progress. It is only by ceasing to be a progressive people that we can cease to grow in the direction of a larger measure of authority than we have up to this time possessed. Let us look, Sir, for a moment at some of the recent phases in the relations which the different parts of the Empire have towards each other. Has any one forgotten the assertion of Australia a few years ago that she ought to possess the power of acquiring new territory. Australia insisted upon the acquisition of New Guinea for the purpose of protecting and promoting her future interests? The demand was a novel demand; it was a new experience to the Colonial Minister, and Lord Derby who was Colonial Secretary at the time, replied: That Her Majesty's imperial advisers must be the sole judges as to whether Her Majesty's imperial dominions should be extended or whether they should not. But Australia contested that principle. She said: That rule is all very well in the great majority of instances; but she maintained that cases might arise when the interests of the colony are paramount, and where that is the case it was the colony that should guide the parent state and not the parent state that should determine what were the interests of the colony. The colonists pointed out that they had upon their northern border an immense island containing nearly 300,000 square miles, and they could not be indifferent to the occupation of that island in the future. They said: The islands in the southern seas are within the

sphere of our dominion; we are opposed to their acquisition by any European state; we cannot afford to have established upon our border by a great military power a colony which would entail upon us serious burdens to prevent our liberties being menaced, which would not rest upon us at all if these acquisitions were not had. They impressed on the Imperial Government their views, and Lord Derby ultimately gave way; but he did not do so until the Empire of Germany had acquired 60,000 square miles, more than one-fifth of the area of the Island of New Guinea. But this discussion which took place between the Imperial Government and the governments of the Australian colonies shows the direction in which the greater colonies are growing. It shows that they cannot be indifferent to their external relations, that they are anxious to watch their opportunities, and that they have hopes that at no distant day those colonies will become united and grow into a great commonwealth; they are the aspirations born of freedom in the midst of great opportunities, and no one that follows that correspondence can fail to sympathize with the Australian colonies, and to believe that they were altogether in the right. Well, Sir, France acquired the islands of New Ireland and the New Hebrides, and undertook to establish penal settlements there. The colonies protested. They presented their views to the Foreign Office, and the Foreign Office became the mere instrument for the pupose of giving effect to the views of the colonies in regard to these matters. Then, look for a moment at the discussion which took place between England and Germany with regard to the respective spheres of influence of those nations in southern Africa. Cape Colony became interested in the discussion, and its Government and the press insisted on their right to be heard with regard to that matter, on the ground that it was one affecting the future interests of that colony, even more than it affected the interests of the parent state. All those discussions, like the action of the Government here—although they formerly opposed this principle—have again and again made it clear that the larger colonies have outgrown the principle of local self-government confined to mere domestic affairs. They have reached the very border line of such authority. Their interests are extending beyond that; and now the time has come when they must assert their claim to a larger measure of governmental authority in order that they may adjust the functions of the Government to the new circumstances which have arisen. Sir, it is in this way that the Empire is growing; it is in this direction that the authority of Colonial Government is being extended. Now, I know that there are some hon. gentlemen in this House who subscribe to the doctrine of imperial federation, and who are looking forward to that as a solution of some of those difficulties which are pressing themselves upon the attention of the governments of all the larger colonies. I may say, after having given that subject the best consideration that I have been able to give it, that I do not think it is in that direction that the solution of the relations of the different portions of the Empire to each other will be found. On the subject of an imperial federation applied to communities so widely separated from each other as those which constitute the British Empire, there is such an absence of general knowledge with regard to matters of a sovereign and large character, but an acquaintance with which is in the nature of things local, that there will always be wanting some of the essential elements to anything like a systematic and well-organized federal empire. Sir, the relations between the different portions of the Empire are being worked out by its exigencies. The necessities of each part are working and will continue to work out, when not seriously hampered, a solution upon altogether different lines. There is not a systematization of a centralized system for the whole Empire. There is a tendency to a division of the sovereign authority between the different parts of the Empire, all being bound by the principle of mutual trust and mutual obligation to assume that that sovereign authority exercised by the portions specially affected will be wisely and properly exercised. Why, Sir, let us suppose for one instant that we had an imperial federation, and that this question of the extension of the rights and the authority of the Empire in the vicinity of Australia were raised; how would the whole Empire, united in a representative body or any executive body, be better qualified to decide what would be best to be done in that matter than the people of Australia themselves? Why should not the whole Empire take the solution which the people of Australia would ultimately, after due reflection, determinate upon, without insisting upon an unwieldy and cumbrous organization, the majority of the members of whom must always be ignorant of what is proposed to be done by each particular section. There is no doubt, Sir, that the Empire is undergoing, it may be slowly, nevertheless it is undergoing, transformation. So far as the great colonies are concerned, it is assuming the form of a voluntary federation, the members of which are simply held together by that voluntary union. As the colonies increase in wealth and population, they will have in a large and still larger degree distinct external relations springing up; and in my opinion everything points to this solution, that these external relations must be left to be dealt with by the parties chiefly concerned. It is in this way, and not by a federal union, that the different portions of the Empire are likely to maintain their continued relations to each other. The legal relations may long remain as they are; but the conventional government must undergo change. It is, as we know, yearly undergoing some modification; and the changes which take place must be adapted to the actual circumstances of the Empire. These new phases are evoled by, and they are the natural and necessary outcome of the vital forces which act on the imperial system. The facts of which I have spoken are evidences of this vitality, and so long as there is no undue interference, no attempt to force upon the different portions of the Empire some preconceived notions, these vital forces are likely to prove sufficiently strong to adjust the constitutional government of every section to the necessary wants of the population. Now, speaking for myself, I say that I confidently trust to the strength of that vitality for the wisest and best solution, and I ask the House by this motion to give free play to this principle as applied to our own requirements. I readily admit that the public officials of the parent state, who are long habituated to the administration of certain departments of the Government, may not willingly surrender any portion of the power with which they have been long entrusted; and so you may

look for opposition to this proposition. But it must not be forgotten that concession is not always made to conviction; it is as often made to get rid of importunity and its necessary worry, as justice was done by the unjust judge mentioned in the Gospel. The vital growth of our national Government cannot be impeded by institutions which have survived the circumstance upon which their utility depended, it is necessery that a new arrangement in this particular should be established, and, once it is established and adjusts itself to its environments, the governing of the Empire will, no doubt, be more satisfactory than it is at present. There will be fewer frictions, and everybody will be ready to admit that the condition of things introduced is superior to that which it has supplanted. I ask the attention of the House, for a moment, to the importance of commerce in the eyes of English statesmen. See the number of costly appliances which the British Government maintain all over the world for the protection and extension of their trade and commerce. There are coaling stations, forts, docks, ships of war, and all these things, mainly for the protection of that commerce. Consider the consular system, now a branch of the Foreign Office, collecting information that may be necessary for the maintenance and further extension of commerce. You have consuls and vice-consuls upon whom duties are imposed and labours of a very important character which they are required to perform. The information which they are required to collect and report is of the first consequence to the manufacturers and merchants. They make known the character of the trade of every port and every consular district. They inform the British public of the kind of goods that enter into competition with British manufactures and British products in each particular locality. They inform them of the directions in which trade may be extended. Their reports are filled with suggestions as to the way in which the products of a particular industry may be enabled to maintain their place in the markets of the world. This is the road upon which we must enter as far as our interests require and our circumstances will warrant. It is by making our people acquainted with the world's wants, and by undertaking to supply them as far as they advantageously can, and not by higher taxes, which will enable them to plunder and devour each other, that this country can be made to grow and prosper. The first step to be taken to this end is to have the right to negotiate commercial treaties on our own behalf conceded to us by Her Majesty's Ministers in Westminster. And so, with the view of obtaining the opinion of the House and this country upon this question, I beg to move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "it is expedient to obtain the necessary powers to enable Her Majesty the Queen through Her representative the Governor General of Canada, upon the advice of his Ministers, to appoint an agent to negotiate commercial treaties with other British possessions or with foreign states, subject to the prior consent or subsequent approval of the Parliament of Canada."

I use the word "agents" because I wish to use as broad and comprehensive a term as possible. It will cover every species of government representative abroad, whether he be a commercial or political agent, whether he be a person holding the rank of a permanent official or embassador or whether he be a plenipotentiary extraordinary, specially appointed for a specific purpose and the accomplishment of a particular end, and so with these explanations as to the character of my motion, I beg leave to put it in your hands, Sir, seconded by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Laurier).

Mr. FOSTER. I shall promise in the first place not to take up at any very great length the attention of the House to-night, while I attempt to notice some few of the remarks and conclusions of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The motion comes up in a different way from that at first intended by the hon. gentleman. There was it seems at first some few traditions of open and honourable battle floating in that hon. gentleman's mind by which he allowed himself to be so far seduced as to determine to put his motion before the House, not in the shape of an amendment to Supply but as a substantive motion, and submit it to the House as the contribution of his thought and his expression of the consideration he had given the subject, with the idea of having adopted what in the end should seem to be in the best judgment of the whole House, the best course for the Government and Parliament to take. That which the hon. gentleman gave notice of, not as a motion in amendment to going into Supply, but as an open motion, which could be fairly discussed without partisan bias, without being open to the objection of negativing the motion of the Government, and so being very nearly tantamount to a vote of want of confidence, was in a position where it could have been amended if, in the judgment of the House, the hon. gentleman's conclusions were not the best and the wisest for the country at large. However, he did not persist in his first idea but withdrew it from that field of open and honourable criticism where it was subject to amendment by the good sense of the House acting upon it, and he has thrown it before the House in a position where it must pass or must be rejected as it stands—a right of the hon. gentleman, which I have no intention to deny, but one which I should judge to be not the most statesmanlike proceeding for a person who wished, honestly and openly, to arrive at the wisest conclusion of this matter in the best interests of Parliament and of the country. The hon. gentleman has chosen to make his motion in amendment to the proposition to go into Committee of Supply, and it is now before us in that shape. I have listened to his address in its three different phases. For the first half hour he read an elaborately prepared and closely written essay—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that I did not read.

Mr. FOSTER—in which the statesman was altogether lost in the pedant. He gave the House some very important information, some very novel statements, some truths that had not been previously known, two of which especially struck me, to the effect that nations are not formed in a day, and, further, that colonies, when they leave the mother country, do not necessarily take all the laws of the mother country with them. In the second half hour, the hon. gentleman left the scholarly style which he had previously pursued and branched out into a disquisition on some of the acts of the Government, and one of the strongest points he made was in reference to the personal characteristics of the Minister of Finance. Well, I hope I shall never be so much

at a loss for something to say as to have to take up the time of the House and my own time in criticising the personal characteristics of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The third half hour has been devoted to the evolution of the vital principles which are at work in an Empire such as that of Britain, as affected by certain local and external characteristics in its several aggregations widely differing from each other, but, in the whole hour and a half that the hon. gentleman has spoken, he has not addressed himself to the practical consideration of the question he has essayed to bring before the House. He has not addressed himself to the practical difficulties that stand in the way, he has not carried out to practical conclusions the premises he has laid down, and which must certainly carry him in the last analysis just as strongly and logically to the conclusion that the Dominion of Canada should have full arbitrament in regard to the question of peace or war, as it would in regard to the arbitrament of treaties between the colony and the Empire or the colony and outside nations. What is the hon. gentleman's grievance? Nobody doubts that the Dominion of Canada as it exists to-day, made up of the different provinces which existed a quarter of a century ago, nobody doubts that this portion of the Empire has had its growth, has had its continuous evolution, has had its share of progress and development. The hon. gentleman states that, and he takes many words in which to state it. That is known to every student, even to the most casual student of Canadian history. The hon. gentleman argues that, because there has been growth, because there has been evolution, because there has been development in the past, at this time this spirit cries for still further embodiment, and that the vital forces of Canada to-day are in a condition of dire limitation, straining for the clothing and embodiment which they do not have and which he thinks they ought to have. Where is the grievance? Where among the commercial or industrial or agricultural bodies, is the cry for a further development of the powers of our country in the line of treaty making; where is the demand that this country should assume the supreme direction of its relations with ex-external countries in reference to trade treaties? It cannot be found. It exists in the mind of my hon. friend and he discusses it in an academic way, in a way that shows that even in his own mind there is no practicability in it. If we are a debating school here, if we are to deliver learned essays upon these questions *pro* and *con*, it may be interesting, but it cannot be proven that there is to-day in this country a grievance on this line, a grievance that requires the solution which the hon. gentleman has proposed in the motion before the House. We have had our growth and our development. In 25 years there was witnessed a wonderful evolution in the provinces which were then colonies of Great Britain. In a short time they grew from Crown colonies to self-governing colonies, and then to a Dominion, which has practically the supreme control of its own internal affairs. Not only that, but they grew up to exercise the power of settling to a certain extent the relations which this country should hold to other countries in the matter of trade, by enacting what should be the tariff upon imports coming into this country, what should be the duties collected on imports from different countries, and to that extent they settled what should be the relations existing between this country and external countries in regard to trade and commerce. They went even further than that, and this Dominion of Canada has legislated not only in reference to uniform relations with external countries as far as tariff duties are concerned, but it has legislated in the way of a differentiation of duties upon lines which had been previously settled in treaties or in trade negotiations with emperial consent, and the tariff laws of this country of 1868, 1879 and 1888 bear the marks still of that differentiation, and so Canada has grown up in these respects, until to-day, as I stated, she is practically a free and self-governing power, not only having the management of her internal affairs, but also, to the extent that I have mentioned, having the power of determining what shall be the commercial conditions between herself and the countries with which she carries on trade and commerce. Now, Sir, there is only one thing left, there is only a single power left, which would show the difference between Canada as she is to-day, and a complete and absolute sovereignty, and that is the power, the imperial and absolute power, of making treaties with other countries, subject to no conditions and to no control except her own interests as shown through her Parliament and through her Government. But, Sir, when that position is reached, I think you come to the position of an absolute and independent power, and you are face to face with a change of political condition, a change of political status, to which hon. gentlemen may shut their eyes, but which, in the logic of events, is as sure to follow as night follows the setting of the sun. Now, comes the practical question so far as this debate is concerned, although it is a question which does not cause the least commotion in this country, but if we are to debate it and to settle it by a vote of the House, the practical question is this: Are we prepared to take that other step with all the consequences which inevitably follow it? Is there a sufficient motive, a sufficient necessity, a sufficient reason for us to ask for that power and to face those consequences? Now, in the first place, and to take them up in their order, is there any present reason why Canada should, on the behest of the member for Bothwell, ask this power and press it to a conclusion? If the imperial power to-day made treaties with other countries which materially and detrimentally affected Canadian interests, and forced them on us *nolens volens*, there would be a reason why we should take some action; there would be not a reason for asking that which my hon. friend has asked, but there would be a reason for Canada making her voice heard and placing her position fairly and squarely before the imperial authority in that respect. But does that condition exist? It does not, the very opposite exists. Time was when Great Britain made treaties irrespective of the wishes or the interests of her colonies. Those times are gone, never to return, and we have issues enough to-day, without going back a hundred years to find a basis upon which to rest a demand for to-day. The time has been since that Great Britain has formed treaties with outside nations which materially affected Canada, and which, in the opinion of the British Government, affected Canadian interests wisely and to her bene-

fit, but those treaties were ratified without asking the consent of Canada. Some of those we are bound by to-day. We had a discussion in the last Parliament with reference to some of them, discussions have been raised, in the British Parliament with reference to some of them, but even that method of imperial action is not now, and has not for years been, persisted in; and since 1878, not to go further back, Canada has not only been in possession of the fact, but in possession of the diplomatic expression of the fact, that from that time forward Great Britain does not propose to include the colonies in any treaties without the consent of the colonies thereto; so that if a trade treaty is formed between Great Britain and any other country, Greece, Italy, Roumania, a South American country, any country in which the colonies were included or can be included, before the colonies are bound by it, their consent is to be asked by the British Government, the treaty is to be put before them, the question is to be asked them: Are your interests in the direction of your being included in this treaty? If so inform us of it, and you will be included; if not, inform us of it, and you will not be liable to the terms of the treaty. So that since 1878, to go no further back, Canada has been as free as her own sweet will in so far as she is affected by being included in treaties made by Great Britain with other countries. But, Sir, Great Britain went even further than that, illustrating this growth in sympathy between the mother country and the outlying colonies, illustrating the power and force of representation of the life, and feelings, and wishes of the colonies in the central power at Great Britain, illustrating the better and more cordial relations existing between the home country and the outlying colonies. From that time, a step in advance of what I have just related has taken place, and if to-day Great Britain desires to enter into negotiations for a treaty with any country, her colonies are advised of her intentions, and they are asked what representations they have to make in the matter as to their interests, their desire to be included, and under what terms and conditions. So that at the present time Canada is, as far as her relation to the mother country is concerned, in the position of having the fullest and freest representation of her interests made to the mother country, so that no treaty, and no single clause of a treaty, is carried into effect detrimental to Canada, and under which she is included, without her own consent and free will. But more than that has taken place. It is one thing for the British Government to say: We will conclude no treaty without the consent of Canada as a party to that treaty, but it is quite a different thing for Great Britain to say: When we are negotiating a treaty, or if the people of Canada wish to have a commercial treaty negotiated, we will allow one of their representatives to be accredited on equal terms with our own Minister at the court of that country, where, in conjunction with the British Minister, he shall conduct the negotiations. So that we shall have in the future, as we have had in the past, just what the hon. gentleman was so long and so earnest in saying we should have, that is to say, a man who possesses the knowledge of his country, who has the interest of the country at heart, but is not bound by the trammels of old country officialism, a man who represents from the heart the interests of Canada in the negotiations, a principle co-partner, a principle co-actor, in the negotiations, looking after the interests of Canada and embodying in the terms of the treaty what shall be for her benefit and what shall be for the extension of her commerce. Now, I say these are great advances over the olden times. Canada is placed in a position as good as she wishes to be, as good as she can be, as a colony. I make that statement absolutely, that it places her in the best position she can be, unless she wishes to make the demand which will lead inevitably, as it does logically, to a change of political status, to a condition of absolute and complete and sovereign independence. These are the steps in advance in that growth and progress which has taken place of better feeling and greater community of interest between the mother country and her colonies. These are steps in that advance, and this is the position which to-day Canada occupies. What are the advantages of this position? I think they are many. I think it is an advantage that as British commerce goes everywhere and makes its entrance into every port of the world, and has in every port its mechanism of interchange, its active influences in consulships, in official representation of the Home Government; in all those different ways it is of great moment that the commerce of the colonies should be British, that the ships of the colony should be British ships, that the prestige of the mother country should be to that extent the prestige of the colony as well. It would be a consequence, to be very carefully weighed before we incurred it, as to whether we should take a step which would sever colonial commerce and colonial ships from the great body of British commerce and British ships. Again, it is an advantage which this country possesses that Great Britain, with its trained system of diplomacy, with its prestige and power at the court of every country in the world, trained and used to the ways of diplomacy, from long centuries of evolution grown into the peculiarities, grown to know the conditions and the sympathies even of these different powers—it is of great moment that whatever Canada has to press, as she may to-day press, by her own accredited envoys, may be pressed with the aid and under the prestige and influence of that trained diplomatic body which Great Britain to-day has extending over every part of the world. That is an advantage which is not a light or a small one, and it is one we should carefully weigh before we enter upon a course which would deprive us of that advantage and throw us back upon our own diplomatic resources entirely. I am not mentioning here the question of expense. That question would undoubtedly come up; but if the advantages would be paramount, the question of expense would have to be subordinate. It must, however, be borne in mind that if Canada assumes the position, is allowed to assume the position, of a treaty power, she will have to be responsible for her own diplomacy, she must possess her own diplomatic corps trained for that purpose, with those incidental expenses which necessarily attach to it, and which are by no means small. These are some of the points which will arise when we discuss this question as to whether we will take the independent stand of negotiating our own treaties, or whether we will proceed in the manner we are pursuing to-day. I was amused when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was making his

remarks, when in the middle portion of his speech he spoke about my trip to the West Indies, about the expedition of the Ministers to Washington on two or three different occasions, about the attempts at negotiation that had been made with France and Spain by the Canadian commissioner, accredited with equal power with the British ambassadors at those courts, and which the hon. gentleman said had been abortive, and at the conclusion to which his argument tended. On the one hand, he was contending that the officials of Great Britain are too entrenched in their ways, that they are too generally ignorant of this country, that they are too much disinclined to put themselves out of the way for the sake of outlying colonies, that they have too high an appreciation of the paramount interests of the mother country to make them in any way fit to carry on a negotiation for the extension and trade of Canada. And yet, in every instance where the sons of Canada, the citizens of Canada, accredited direct from Canada, made those attempts at negotiations, some of which, as the hon. gentleman stated, were abortive, so far as results were concerned, the hon. gentleman was led to this conclusion: that about the worst men you could possibly send to conduct those negotiations were Canadians, natives of the soil, who were accredited by their own country, and who, consequently, ought to be thought to know the interests of our own country best. I suppose the hon. gentleman would meet that by saying that the wrong men were sent from Canada, men of the wrong party, sent by a wrong Government, and that all this would be cured by placing another Government in power and sending a different class of men. But the hon. gentleman's argument tended to destroy what in another part of his argument he was endeavouring to sustain, that Canadians were best calculated to look after their own interests. I entirely agree with the assertion that as to the commercial interests of Canada, in seeking to enlarge these interests, in seeking to have favourable trade relations established with the different countries of the world, no men know better what is needed than do Canadians themselves, and I go strongly, fully and absolutely for the fullest representation of Canadian interests and Canadian requirements in every treaty which is negotiated, in every treaty which is concluded. Under the present system we have secured that result. Under the present system this very day, Sir Charles Tupper, our High Commissioner, is accredited as co-plenipotentiary to the Court of Spain at Madrid, there to conduct part of the negotiations for a new treaty, which it is hoped will be framed, between Great Britain and Spain and Great Britain's colonies and Spain in the interests of Canada, with a full knowledge of her requirements and in full communication with the Government in Canada. That carries out what I have stated, that to-day we have the fullest power of representation it is possible to possess. I desire to ask the House to consider for a moment one more point which strikes me at this time. It is this: The hon. gentleman by his resolution asks that we shall have the sole power to initiate and negotiate our treaties, and that they shall be ratified by our Parliament, by statutory Act I suppose, and that this statutory Act shall, as all statutory Acts do, pass the review of Her Majesty's representative here, and, if necessary, submit to the veto of Her Majesty's representative here, or of Her Majesty at home. As I understand the resolution, that is the *modus* which he proposes. Now, I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen to the difficulty which will immediately occur. Do we not know that so long as the British Empire is a British Empire there must be a seat of sovereign and absolute power somewhere, and that seat can not reside in the colony nor the dependency, but in the Home Government of the mother land. So long as that Empire is bound together as an Empire there must be that one seat of sovereign and absolute power, and that seat must be as I have said in the mother land. If there is one principle which has been held to by the British Government—and I believe held to in the interests of the Empire at large—it is this: That while the British Government is willing that its colonies shall have the freest management of their internal affairs and the freest possible control of their commerce and trade, yet, the doctrine has been laid down in the Cape, in Australia, in Canada and in every one of the British dependencies, that in the making of these conditions there are imperial interests which are to be looked at as well as local interests; and that whatever freedom in the making of tariff laws and in the making of treaties, through and with the co-operation of the British Government, have been granted to these different colonies, it has always been laid down as a principle, that discrimination against British goods in favour of the goods of foreign countries will not be allowed; and it has not been allowed at the will of any colony. There have been cases in which Great Britain has, in conference with this or that colony, allowed treaties to go so far as to enforce certain tariff regulations which might look like discrimination, but that has been allowed simply because, in the line of articles which were included, the good to the colonies was considered to be great, and the discrimination or want of compensation to the mother country was considered to be reduced to a minimum. One or two of the Australian colonies in 1871 made a demand for power to regulate their own intercolonial tariffs and to discriminate, if need be, against British goods, and a long diplomatic discussion ensued between Lord Kimberley and the Australian colonies, in which Lord Kimberley laid down—not for the first time, but in that quarter of the world afresh and anew—the doctrine that the imperial power could not grant to the colonial power such authority as would enable it to discriminate against British goods, even where the colonies alone were concerned, and still less where external countries were concerned. As an outcome of that discussion, the Legislature of that colony almost unanimously passed a resolution in which it affirmed the safety of the principle laid down by Lord Kimberley; and as a result of that, the Australian colonies have ever since subscribed loyally to that doctrine as being not only in the interests of the Empire as a whole, but in the interests of the colonies themselves. While they asked for and while they received the power to form commercial treaties among themselves as they thought fit, and to arrange their own tariffs as suited them best; yet under an Act of the British Parliament passed not long since, looking towards the federation of these colonies, and conferring upon them very large powers with reference to their tariff legislation, the principle of non-discrimination against British goods has been borne in mind. So it has been in

all diplomatic correspondence which Canada and the other colonies have had with Great Britain. But how are these things arranged to-day under the present system? To-day Ministers sent by the Governor General of this country as the representative of the Queen, go to Washington, go to Madrid, go to Paris, go to the West Indies, go to Brazil, or go to any other country, and being in communication with the British Minister who represents the Home Government, they carry on their negotiations. In the course of these negotiations articles are discussed by the Canadian delegate, by the British Minister, by the Canadian Government, and by the Home Government if necessary, and before any decided action is taken or agreement reached, that agreement is assented to by all parties, and when it is ratified there is no heart-burning or no clashing of authority. It may be that the colonies might have to give way in some respects, or it may be that the British Government gives way in some respects; but they do it by conference one with the other while the negotiations are pending, and an agreement is reached before the treaties are ratified and approved of by the Parliament of either country. Take the other method which is suggested to-night. Claim to yourselves and have that claim allowed, that Canadian commissioners shall have sovereign rights, without any communication with the British Government, to go to a foreign country, to make a treaty having solely in view the interests of the colony without any regard to the interests of other colonies or of imperial interests. Let that be agreed to between the commissioners from Canada and the representatives of power they are making the treaty with. Let it be ratified, if it can be ratified, and let it be brought down and adopted by the colonial legislature, the Parliament of Canada for instance, and put in the form of a law; then and then only can the objections of the Home Government be made, and then and then only can it be made after the Parliament of Canada has committed itself to a course, to recede from which would be considered a humiliation and a denial of interests. There you have a chance for difficulties just at the most acute point, and if the Home Government thought that the colonial legislature was prejudicial to imperial interests and could not be allowed, the contest would be set, the battle would be placed in array, and it would have to be carried to the bitter conclusion by the colonial Parliament insisting upon what it had done, no matter what the consequences might be. Now, Sir, the consequences that might be, and would be in my mind, would be these: Every British colony having that power, every British colony who would exercise that power, would be within ten years in an acute state of dispute with the British Government on account of these wider and more diversified and larger interests; a dispute which could end only in one way, and that would be in the absolute separation of the different colonies from the mother land and the consequent practical dismemberment of the Empire. I think there is no getting rid of that conclusion in any practical way. I am not going to read despatches of later date, but I could read despatches under my hand, not a year old, which have occurred in the Newfoundland discussions, despatches which state explicitly the doctrine which I have just laid down, that neither with Newfoundland nor with any other colony can the British Government allow it to go undisputed and as agreed to, that that colony can make whatever arrangements it likes in the way of a treaty, indifferent to the larger interests of the Empire, or to the smaller interests, it may be in some cases, of component parts of the Empire, sister colonies lying near at hand. There is no doubt about that doctrine. Now, Sir, I think that is a dangerous thing. If it is as I hold it to be, let us have no deception about the matter. Let us have no more of this doctrine preached by my hon. friend opposite, that if you see a dime in the distance, and it is to your interest to pocket it, pocket it, let the ethical and other considerations take care of themselves. If you think the exchanging of poultry, eggs and other things between us and the United States would be to Canada's material benefit, for the time being, get the benefit, carry out the arrangement, no matter what may take place in reference to our allegiance, or the political status or future of the country. I do not subscribe to that doctrine; neither does the Dominion of Canada subscribe to it; neither did that hon. gentleman's trusted and much lauded leader subscribe to that doctrine, when he severed his connection with his party, even though, from long ties of affiliation and sympathy he smothered his letter for the brief space of thirty days until they could gain the paltry advantage that they begged of him. In that letter he told them to their face: You went to the country with a deceptive cry; you had a mask upon your foreheads; you said to this country, it is simply improved trade relations we want, the pivotal point of which was a different political status and I refuse to be a party to that deception; if we are to canvass this question, we will canvass it on the basis of a change in our political status, and in its true colours. To-day, Sir, the same operation is going on. To-day the gentleman from Bothwell is put up here in the name of his party—what to do? To get, Sir, what the leader of the party gave us his sign manual, and pledged his word before a Boston audience and the American Republic to gain, as the very forefront, watchword and battle-cry of his party. Sir, these men are not masquerading surely. We must take them seriously; when they speak they must mean something. They claim to have a party behind them and to speak for that party. I take them at their claim, and the gentleman opposite spoke for the Liberal party when he satisfied his Boston audience, and the gentleman from Bothwell spoke for my hon. friend and the Liberal party when to-day he took the first step in that programme to which the hon. gentleman pledged himself before his Boston audience. There is logic in the position these hon. gentlemen take. Whether they see it or not, the country sees it, and I propose that this House and the country shall see just a little bit of that now. The hon. gentleman after the last elections, and after the long session of Parliament was over, went down to the city of Boston, as he had a perfect right to do; he spoke before a select audience there, as he had a perfect right to speak, and into the ear of the American people, as he had a perfect right to do; and to-night I have a perfect right to put side by side some of the things he said and some conclusions that I propose to draw from them. What was the first thing that the hon.

gentleman did? The first thing that he did, an unnecessary and gratuitous thing, was to summon his native country and the mother country before a foreign tribunal to prefer a false charge against them, and to condemn them before a foreign audience and a foreign people on that false charge. He stated that the conduct of England and Canada during the Civil War of 1861-66 was a "disgrace to the civilization of England and of Canada." Sir, when the hon. gentleman said that he said it with the records of Canada staring him in face, with the archives of the United States telling him that he was giving utterance to what was not true, with the archives of Great Britain bearing full and plain testimony to the unveracity of his charge; and there are to-day, Sir, in the archives of these countries, the published thanks of the Government of the United States of that day to the Canadian Government and the Canadian people for the wise, prudent, neutral and conservative course which they took during that civil war. The hon. gentleman had no need to make that accusation, except for one purpose, and for that one purpose I must conclude he brought it. For what purpose? To ingratiate himself with that portion of the American people who for twenty years have been harping upon the disgraceful and unneighbourly conduct of Canada and England during that civil war. But, Sir, he then went a little further, and declared before that same audience and in the ear of the American people, that "it is a great, a fatal mistake to make allegiance, British allegiance, the basis of trade." That was one step more leading to the conclusion that his auditors would draw, whose sympathies, rightly from their standpoint, had been for many years entirely enlisted in the direction of the exclusion of British influence from the North American continent. That statement was a grateful one to those people, and they said, and had a right to say: Here is the leader, and yonder is the party for us, for they do not believe that British allegiance is the basis for trade. He went still further, and in the next place he promised to those people in the name of himself and his party soon to be victorious, that when they came into power, they would give to the United States of America unrestricted free trade; thus carrying out the hon. gentleman's doctrine that it was a great, a fatal mistake, that British allegiance should be the basis of trade. He went still further, and said what was grateful to that same audience, when he asserted that "the present position of Canada cannot last, that even at this day England and Canada have interests totally apart, and that the time will come when in the very nature of things separation must take place." That was another step in the gradual unfolding of his purpose and mind, the purpose and mind of his party, as understood by his audience to eliminate British influence from the North American continent. And, Sir, if you wish further proof, let us take another of the hon. gentleman's sentiments which followed:

"I am a subject of the British Crown, but whenever I have to choose between the interests of England and of Canada, it is manifest to me that the interests of my country are identical with the interests of the United States of America."

Sir, one step further was taken after raising those hopes, after making that promulgation of his faith, he then let out to the people, and in hearing of the American nation how he proposed to bring this all about, and it was in this way. He declared it to be the elementary and primary step in his programme, that Canada should insist upon and obtain the privilege and power of negotiating her own commercial treaties. There is the means he proposes to use. If we get the power to make treaties in this country, irrespective entirely of conference with or dependence upon the British Government, and if his party obtain office, he will go straight to the United States and give them unrestricted reciprocity, involving, as it does, discrimination against British goods. He must then settle the question, which will be raised in one moment, as to whether we remain any longer a colony of Great Britain and discriminate her goods and her trade. And when that question is raised and settled, as it can only be settled in one way, when they have committed themselves and the country to that principle, then the last trace of British influence on this country will pass away, and the American Munroe idea will have full force from the North Pole to the Gulf of Mexico. So I say, that if those gentlemen are not masquerading in their sentiments, if they mean anything, their programme is unveiled, and it becomes us to consider whether or not the demand for these powers from these gentlemen is one which ought to be acceded to by this Parliament or country. There is still more to show that that is the trend of opinion, not only of my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, but of others in that party. Let us look at matters here at home. To-day the Toronto *Globe* is the gospel of the Liberal party. I make the assertion here to-night that an unprejudiced person may read through the columns of the Toronto *Globe* for the last three years, and he will find, in almost every edition, argument, insinuation, open assertion and appeal, all with the purpose of undermining the feeling of this country in favour British connection. And the *Globe* to-day has for its brains and its inspiration, Farrer, the self confessed traitor, and Sir Richard Cartwright, the financial leader of the Opposition in this Parliament. Go to the Maritime Provinces, and the staunchest paper and the brightest editor they have on their list is Mr. Ellis of the *St. John's Globe*, and Mr. Ellis, one of the foremost men in the ranks of the party, is an out-and-out avowed annexationist; and scarcely an issue of his paper is sent out to the public that does not by way of insinuation or open argument or appeal, teach separation from Great Britain and union with the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. What about Sol White.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me call the attention of my hon. friend who leads the Opposition to another fact. If there is one paper in the Province of Quebec which is entitled to be called *par excellence* the Liberal organ, the Rouge paper, it is *La Patrie*, which within five days has come out flat-footed for annexation; and there are on the hon. gentleman's side to-day men who have come out-and-out in the same *rôle*. I have in my eye one hon. gentleman here to-night, who, if the papers have not belied him—and this is too important a thing in which to allow himself to be belied without contradiction—has affirmed his full faith and belief in annexation, not only as a necessity but as a pressing and present issue, and there are others of the hon. gentleman's supporters of the same strain and

opinion. My hon. friend from Queen's, and the hon. gentleman who generally sits beside him, showed in speeches during this session that it was not a remote idea of their own nor a remote possibility, that they would rouse the country, if possible, with the cry of annexation, and put the blame upon the misdeeds and *méches* of the Tory party and the Government. But the logic of their position is the strongest evidence. Hon. gentlemen have taken as their political faith that there is no salvation in trade and commercial matters for this country except in unrestricted reciprocity with the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not deny that. The hon. gentleman who says "hear, hear" adds his opinion to the mass. It is the opinion of the Liberal party stated over and over again that unrestricted reciprocity is the only salvation for Canada. They admit, those of them who are honest, that there can be no unrestricted reciprocity without discrimination against Great Britain. There is no dissent from that. Even the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), who in a moment of independence and candour—I will not say it was of weakness, I think it was a moment of strength—stoutly denounced discrimination against Great Britain; even that gentleman has relapsed into a chronic state of lassitude and despondency and does not even summon up the courage to give his vote against discrimination with the old country which he so eloquently denounced. Though believing it all the time inwardly, hon. gentlemen opposite never confessed until now, when they are forced to do so, that we cannot have unrestricted reciprocity without discrimination against Great Britain, and the logic of their position forces them to this policy of discrimination against the mother county. Now I do not bind hon. gentlemen opposite to my view. They may have their ideas, but in my mind, and in the mind of most hon. members on this side at least and in the mind of the great majority of the country, the two questions of discrimination against Great Britain and severance of relations between this colony and Great Britain lie side by side and are inexplicably united, the one with the other. Then, if unrestricted reciprocity with the United States is the only way in which Canada can be saved, and if these men are pledged to the commercial salvation of Canada, the logic of the position of hon. gentlemen drives them thoroughly and absolutely to this course: that, should the opportunity be ever given them, and this motion result in the achievement of treaty-making power, they would use this power to make a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, which would discriminate against Great Britain, and in so doing would raise at once the question of relations with the imperial power. On this ground alone, it becomes this House to take into account the statements and the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, the statements of their published political faith, the statements of this as their propaganda for carrying it out, and to ask ourselves, in all earnestness and seriousness, whether we ought at any time, and more especially at this time, to move one step forward in the direction they desire. I have taken up the time of the House longer than I intended. I have made, I hope, some practical remarks; I have at least set out some things for hon. gentleman to think about. I have not declared, as a brilliant and freshly formulated truth, that nations are not formed in a day, or that colonies, when they come from the mother country, necessarily carry all the laws of that country with them, but I have discussed some few practical points in this matter. I might take occasion to refer to strictures made by the hon. member for Bothwell upon the movements and methods of the Ministers in various negotiations which have taken place, but I do not, simply because these explanations have been made, these positions have been controverted over and over again and it is not worth while taking up the time of the House in controverting them again. The general accuracy of the trend of the hon. gentleman's statements on those points may be judged by the fact that he stated that no papers in regard to the West India trip were brought before the House, or, if they were, they would show the utter unreasonableness of our propositions. The whole of those papers were brought before the House, and have been under the view of the House now for twelve or thirteen months.

Mr. LAURIER. When some few moments ago it was my pleasure to listen to the hon. gentleman while he was piling up argument after argument, or perhaps he will pardon me for saying sophism after sophism, the scene came back to my mind of the installation of Sancho Panza as Governor of the Island of Barataria. After a hard day's work, he was allowed to go to dinner, but then he saw a man of sombre garment and still more sombre mien, with a whalebone wand in his hand. Sancho Panza was blessed with a good appetite, but, when the first dish was placed before him, the whalebone wand touched it and it was taken away; so of a second, of a third and of all, were taken away. Then the solemn man explained that he was the court physician and that he had the health of His Excellency in charge, and that he could not allow His Excellency to touch this dish or that dish because his stomach was not sufficiently strong. He could only allow him a few wafer cakes and a few slices of quince. Sancho Panza at once commanded that this man should be removed or he would crack his skull. The people of Canada are treated to-day something in the same way as Sancho Panza was treated by the court physician. The hon. gentleman has been piling out argument on argument to show that the Canadian people cannot be trusted to deal with their own affairs, that the Canadian stomach cannot digest such strong food; whatever is offered or suggested for the people of Canada must be taken away by the movement of the whalebone wand. The doctor said that this was too strong, or too hot, or too cold, or too spicy, and it is so in this case; but Canada is growing, and, as has been shown by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the legislative and executive powers of Canada must grow with the growth of the country. The hon. gentleman has tried to make some fun out of the statement that nations were not made in a day, and he says there is nothing very new in that. I admit there is nothing new in that, but the hon. gentleman would imply that nations are never formed at all. He speaks as if Canada was to remain for ever a colony, but I say that Canada is not always to remain a colony. Light as our dependence may be on the mother country, that dependence is not to remain for ever.

If we were to admit that, if we were to say that we were always to remain in a dependent condition we would be the scorn of the world, and it would be scorn well deserved. My hon. friend this afternoon compared the life of a nation to the life of a man, and it would be a truism to say that the life of a man is a series of never ending changes. Changes are going on in the life of man from time to time, from one period to another, and with each period in life new burdens have to be assumed and borne. What is true of the individual is true of the aggregation of individuals who form the community. We have a population in this country, not as large as it ought to be, not half as large as it ought to be, or as it would be if we had followed a wiser course, but a population larger than that of Switzerland, almost as large as that of Belgium, almost as large as the population of Norway and Sweden combined, and equal to the population of many other nations. We have self-government, we have a constitution of our own, we have interests which are separate and distinct from those which we hold in common with the Empire of which we form a part, and our energies must seek wider fields abroad. Perhaps the next step may be said to be complete independence, but there is no desire to have complete independence in Canada to-day. Even with those who, like myself, look to independence as the supreme goal, there remains a love for the motherland and a desire to remain in connection with it, but in the nature of things, as I said in the speech which the hon. gentleman has done me the honour to quote, our relations must be compatible with our interests. The hon. gentleman stated there was no grievance felt in any part of the country. I take direct issue with him on that point. While no one desires to change the allegiance which exists at present, there is a great and growing feeling, not only amongst Reformers, but even amongst Conservatives that the colonial relation must be changed because at present it is unsuited to our wants and is an impediment to our progress. There is no desire to change our allegiance, but the conditions of our relations with the Empire must be changed. What I assert now has been clearly proved by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mills). But I intend to prove furthermore—not by anything emanating from the Liberal party, because that would be met by the ever serviceable cry of disloyalty—what I assert I will prove by the deeds and words of members of the Conservative party, and of course anything emanating from the Conservative party cannot be qualified by the epithet of disloyalty. What I assert I will prove by the organization to which my hon. friend referred a moment ago, the League for the Federation of the British Empire. I believe the hon. gentleman himself is a member of that organization; if he is not himself a member of it, several of his colleagues are, and most of the prominent members of his party are also members of the organization. Well, if the hon. gentleman chooses to close his eyes to the unmistakable manifestations of public opinion, I am sure he will not be blind to the lessons taught by a movement of which, if he is not himself a party, several of his colleagues and many members of his party are. Now, I affirm that the very idea which underlies this organization for the federation of the British Empire, is, as I have stated, the feeling, the knowledge, the consciousness, that colonial citizenship, such as it is to-day, is inferior to British citizenship. There is an hon. member of this House—I am sorry to see that he is not now in his seat—who is one of the most prominent supporters of the administration, who is one of the most conservative of all Conservatives, one of the most unbending of all Tories, I mean the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Every friend of imperial federation in this House will admit, I am sure, that no one in this country has spoken with greater authority than the hon. member for North Simcoe of the aspirations of the imperial federationists of the motives which animate them. I have endeavoured to follow the utterances of that hon. gentleman whenever he has spoken upon this subject, and if I have gathered his views correctly, the underlying idea in his advocacy of imperial federation is this very idea that our colonial citizenship, as it is to-day, is inferior and must be reformed. Speaking at Peterborough in the month of January, 1889, the hon. member for Simcoe is reported to have said:

"He contended that Canada had a right of access to the imperial councils. Canada was growing out of childhood and it was time it should share the burdens of manhood. Imperial federation was not impracticable, but its consumation, like the growth of the British constitution, would necessarily be slow. He wanted—no matter how it was done—to have all Canadians admitted to the full duties of British citizenship."

"Full British citizenship," this is the ideal which is shared by the hon. member for North Simcoe and those who think with him; therefore, in the mind of that hon. gentleman and those who think with him, colonial citizenship at present is inferior and must be improved, as he terms it, to the extent of full British citizenship. If that hon. gentleman had been in Parliament 40 years ago, or even 25 years ago, he would not then have held the language which he used upon this occasion; he would not have been satisfied with our citizenship as it then existed, he would not have considered it suitable to the wants and requirements of that date. But as the hon. gentleman observed on that occasion, Canada is growing, Canada is developing, and having reached this stage of progress, he and those who think with him, believe that the citizenship of Canada should be improved even to the extent of full British citizenship. This is the opinion, I may say, which is shared by the flower of the Conservative party in this country. While it is not my good fortune to agree very often with the member for North Simcoe, upon this occasion I am glad to say that I altogether agree with him in his premises; I agree with him that our colonial citizenship at the present moment is inferior and must be reformed. But I do not agree with him in his method of securing that reform: I do not believe in imperial federation. Now, it seems to me that that hon. gentleman and many of his friends in this House must admit that, even if the Canadian people were ready to go to the extent of full British citizenship, whatever that implies, the English people would not grant them that advantage, if advantage it be. The imperial federationists have always contended that they had two things in view, an economic as well as a political reform. As to the economic reform, their hope, I should say their dream, has been that Great Britain would desert the policy which she adopted fifty years ago, that she would abandon freedom of trade and adopt protection, and while adopting protection, that she would discriminate in favour of colonial produce,

and the colonies would discriminate in favour of British produce. Sir, it seems to me that those who hold that view certainly have the strangest conception of the English character. No one who has a true understanding of the British character can hope that Great Britain will go back upon her free trade policy. The English people are slow to move, but when they have moved they never go back. It is not on record that the English people ever went back upon a principle adopted once for all, and those who hope that she will reverse her policy in this respect, seem to me to be very short-sighted. As to the political reform, I have already quoted the words of the member for North Simcoe. What was meant by the phrase "full British citizenship" is further illustrated by that hon. gentleman in the same speech from which I have quoted where he said :

"He said that we in Canada claim a connection that all should easily understand. He wished to have a voice in the councils of the Empire the same as an Englishman, Irishman or Scotchman."

Upon another occasion, in a speech delivered in Toronto in the month of December previous, he made use of the following language :—

"As he puts it: What I desire and aspire is to become a subject, with all the rights and all the privileges of a British citizen, equal to the man who lives in London, and not feel when I go to London that I am a mere colonist."

Well, Sir, with regard to these sentiments I have no fault to find whatever. I dare say that when a Tory colonist, whose heart is brimful of loyalty, which he has proclaimed on every occasion, in season and out of season, who has thrown it at the head of his opponents as his final argument in every discussion, goes to London and finds that no attention is paid to his loyalty, who finds when he walks the street that no one turns his head to take a look at so much Canadian loyalty, I can understand that that gentleman may feel that indeed colonial citizenship is inferior, and he must wish that there were some place, some rock in the sea, where he could proclaim his loyalty with some chance of being heard. I have no fault to find with such sentiments, but the consequences are grave. If colonists are to be represented at Westminister in the same way that Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen are represented, then, of course, colonists must assume the duties and responsibilities which are borne by Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, to carry on the wars in which they are almost perpetually engaged throughout the civilized and uncivilized world. I think these are consequences before which the people of Canada will recede. I will not, however, go further with this view of the case. I want to come down to this practical conclusion, which I enunciate at once, and which I stated a moment ago, that even the English people would not grant this so-called privilege if the colonists wanted it. Every imperial federationist in this House knows that the conclusion which I now enunciate is the conclusion enunciated by Lord Roseberry at a meeting of the league which took place in the Mansion House, in the month of November, 1889. He then stated that every scheme of imperial federation which had been proposed, had been found impracticable, because it had been found to clash with these three insuperable obstacles.

"1. That the extreme slowness with which public opinion in the United Kingdom moves towards any organic change;

"2. Our institutions, rooted in custom and tradition, are not suited to any sudden introduction of a new element; and

"3. The natural colonial jealousy of paternal interference."

Now, this was the general conclusion as to the scheme which has often been debated, sometimes on the floor of this House, and to which the hon. gentleman gave his countenance, and to which, even this year, he held out the hand of hope. This is the way Lord Roseberry speaks of this scheme for discrimination by Great Britain in favour of the colonies and by the colonies in favour of Great Britain. Lord Roseberry added :

"A zollverein, or customs union, is not practical, inasmuchas the doctrines of free trade are far too deeply rooted in this country to have hope for any general assent."

Lord Roseberry concluded by declaring that the scheme of imperial federation which could be considered was simply that of periodical conferences, renewed from time to time, and based on the model of the conference of 1887, clothed with a mission not to make statutes, but with the mere platonic power of passing resolutions. I commend this to the sober judgment of the imperial federationists in this House. Lord Roseberry gave the last blow to the scheme in these words :

"You may be perfectly certain that, whatever your views and whatever your exertions, imperial federation in any form is an impossible dream."

This is the result—this is the proclamation by the President. Now, therefore, every man must admit in this House that the policy of imperial federation is no remedy whatever for the inferiority of our colonial citizenship on so high a place as was intended at one time. It may be that there was a possibility some few years ago of obtaining the adoption of a plan of imperial federation. But, whatever progress had been made before, when Canada adopted a policy of protection, it deliberately killed any proposition for imperial federation. If we had adopted a policy of freedom of trade, if it had been possible for us to give free entrance to British products while those products met in the American markets with the heavy duties of to-day, we could thereby have opened the door to England and found markets for our trade there, because trade begets trade. But, as I said a moment ago, Canada deliberately killed the scheme. Instead of adopting the trade policy of Great Britain, we adopted the American system of protection. We have modelled our tariff after the tariff of the American people, and, therefore, in England, the same laws which apply to American trade must necessarily apply to our trade. I am not of those who oppose it, though I never was an imperial federationist, but I always looked with respect at the idea of imperial federation. Certainly there was grandeur in the idea of uniting the colonies and the mother country into one grand body. I agree with Lord Roseberry that this system is not practicable. I have still a greater one than that. It is the destiny of the colonies to become nations, as it is the destiny of a child to become a man, and while no doubt the idea of separation from the mother land causes a pang in the heart of every one, yet there is not a child who leaves his father's house who does not do so without a pang, if his heart is in the proper place. There is a grander idea yet. John Bright truly said that England is the living mother of nations, and we may yet hope to see

British communities dotting the earth's surface, which I hold to be a grander idea than that of welding together a gigantic British Empire on the face of the earth. For my part, that is the view I favour. I say, as I declared in Boston—but the hon. gentleman did not quote that portion of my speech—that I should like to see a commercial alliance of all nations sprung from England. This is the policy I have favoured. But the fact remains, however, that our colonial citizenship is inferior and must be reformed. We on this side of the House proposes a reform. We propose a reform, in the wild realms of fancy, not to take place at an indefinite period in the future, but we propose a remedy, immediate and complete, the clothing of this inferior citizenship with power, which, if granted, would be of immense advantage to our plenary citizenship, which would be perfect in its nature, immediate in its results, which would open new fields for Canadian ambition and would give us a station among foreign nations and meet the proper requirements of this country. For, in the opinion of all—and I do not think there will be a dissenting voice on this point—what Canada wants at this moment is foreign markets. This young country must find somewhere a field for our surplus energies. We propose to the judgment of the House that our citizenship should be improved just so much as is necessary to give us a standing among foreign nations, which will facilitate our obtaining foreign markets. We do not propose to do away with British citizenship, but to remain within those limits, while at the same time we propose to improve and elevate our position as a colony. I was well aware even before the Minister of Finance spoke, that this idea that a colony shall have power to make commercial treaties always was a terror in the minds of old-fashion Conservatives, but I did not know that the hon. gentleman was so much an old-fashioned Tory. I thought he had some elements of progress in his composition; but he has shown he has not, and that he stands just where his party was fifty years ago. We want to improve this citizenship. And why should we not? It was stated, that the power of making treaties is a sovereign power and it would not be compatible with our colonial dependence. I have no doubt, whatever, that the idea of vesting a colony with power of negotiating commercial treaties, is a marked departure from the old accepted doctrine which prevailed in former times, respecting the relations between the parent state and the colony. But, we commenced to revolutionize those old doctrines of fifty years ago, when we obtained the power of self-government. I claim that the power we seek to obtain to-day is simply an evolution of the movement inaugurated fifty years ago. At all events—no, not at all events, but surely—the power we claim to-day is not so wide a departure from the old doctrines as was that power claimed and allowed fifty years ago. The occasion demands that we should break away from the old rusty chains of parental rule, that we should strike out now a bolder course, that we should strike with enthusiasm for higher ground, as Columbus sailed away for lands unseen by himself but confident that beyond the mists, and beyond the limit of vision of his men, there were new and solid lands. This country is young and undeveloped; but I am glad to say, this country has a history. I once heard the remark made by Sir John Macdonald that the history of Canada under the French regime read like a romance. And everybody must admit that this is true. There are few pages, whether in fiction or in history, or in reality, which are of more thrilling and absorbing interest than the pages which trace the history of Canada from the time that Jacques Cartier and the colonists of France sailed up the St. Lawrence with the flag of France at the mast head, until the French troops forever sailed away. The regime which followed was very different, an advance exhibiting a series of successive leaps towards the development of colonial government on the lines of constitutional freedom, which had never been seen before, never dreamed of before. When Canada framed and obtained power of Government by an executive responsible to the people of the colony and not to the Government of the mother country, this was a new departure in the history of nations. This was a reform which filled with fear the souls of all Conservatives and not a few Liberals. When Canada a few years afterwards at one fell swoop disposed of the feudal regime by reclaiming the rights of the landlords, and paid them an indemnity based upon a judicial arbitration, this was a new departure in the history of the world: and, Sir, when Canada and the other British colonies were united in a confederation with the approval and with the consent of the mother land to form a nation, this was also a new departure in the history of the world. Again at the present day when we claim this power of negotiating our own treaties, this also was a new departure in the history of the world. No doubt at this moment, it excites alarm, as every such movement excited alarm before the event, but it will be as other great movements have been, a cause of admiration when it is completed. There is not a country on the face of the earth with ever achieved its independence, except at the cost of blood and war and enmity with the parent state. I hold out to my fellow-countrymen the idea of independence, but whenever the day comes, it must come by the consent of both countries, and we shall continue to keep the good feeling and the good-will of the mother land. If we are true to our record, we will again exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees, and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree. Fifty years ago the powers of self-government which were granted to us were adequate to our wants and requirements of that day, but now I say, we have advanced in progress and we must have larger powers. Our wants and requirements are no longer confined within the borders of our territories. We must have fields abroad, we must have scope for our energy and enterprise. This is a principle which is not admitted by all in words, but which is admitted by all in fact. What is the meaning for instance of the numerous delegations which have been sent from this country to distant countries, to Brazil, to the West Indies and to the United States? There was but one object in view: It was to obtain a wider field for Canadian energy, it was to obtain markets for Canadian products: and yet at the same time when we were sending in every direction delegations to negotiate treaties, we had not the power to negotiate these treaties. Could there be a greater anomaly than that? We send delegations upon a mission which they

had not the power to perform. That is the reason, Sir, and that is the conclusion of the justification of the policy which we now advance. The hon. Minister of Finance reproached me a moment ago, that I had stated at Boston that the Canadian people had commercial interests different from the British people. Sir, I said so at Boston, and I say so now on the floor of this House. Will the hon. gentleman deny that the Canadian people have interests altogether at variance with the interests of the mother country? Why have we a different tariff if we have the same interests as the English people? Why have we not the same policy as the English people if our interests are the same? Why have we adopted protection when the English people have adopted free trade? Why? It is because the fact must stare every man in the face that our interests are different and cannot be served by the same fiscal policy. What is true of our internal policy is also true of our external relations. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that we had the benefit of English diplomacy and the benefit of the treaties negotiated by England. Sir, we had the benefit of treaties negotiated by England, and at one time it was a benefit when we had almost the same policy as England, but the moment that we adopted a policy of protection what had been a benefit to us became the reverse of a benefit. Take the case of the Belgium and the German treaties. These treaties were passed in 1862 and 1865. No complaint, so far as my memory goes, was ever made by the Canadian Government against these treaties until the year 1881. From 1865 to 1881, no complaints were made, but in 1879, we had adopted a different fiscal policy, we had adopted protection and then we find that these treaties which had been negotiated with a free trade nation were no longer suited to the Canadian people, and forthwith we asked to be relieved of these treaties. We have been asking this for almost 10 years now without any result whatever. Our High Commissioner made remonstrances, but they were not heeded. The Canadian Government made remonstrances, but they were not heeded, and last year Parliament adopted a petition to Her Majesty, at the very instance of the hon. gentleman opposite to be relieved from the effect of these treaties and he has not to this day received an answer. I say this just to show, Mr. Speaker, that our interests are so much at variance with the interests of Great Britain, that the time has come when we must ask the power to negotiate our own treaties and decide for ourselves what is best for us. The hon. gentleman has told us in a casual way, however, that if we adopted the power which is now claimed, we would be relieved of the services of British diplomacy. Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy. What has been British diplomacy to us, Sir. British diplomacy, so far as Canada is concerned, has been a record of failure, and of surrender and sacrifice. British diplomacy has sacrificed our lake frontier. British diplomacy has sacrificed our Oregon territories. British diplomacy has allowed the State of Maine to indent our own country. British diplomacy has sacrificed our Fenian claims, even though at that time the services of British diplomacy had a Canadian negotiator. It is well known, and I will repeat it, that I have no very great confidence in hon. gentlemen opposite, but I would rather have a Canadian Tory than an English Liberal, for the negotiation of a treaty with a foreign country in the interest of Canada. Those gentlemen opposite are really too timid. They cannot expect that Great Britain will always do their business. These great strapping young men cannot expect that they will always hang on by the skirts of the old parent. Let them be men and ask the power of men, and assume the duties of manhood. The Minister of Finance referred a moment ago to what I said at Boston. Sir, at Boston I said, as I have just stated, that the interests of Canada were different from the interests of Great Britain and had to be treated separately. I said further at Boston that the interests of Canada should be dealt with by the Canadian people and not by English diplomats. Now, Sir, in so saying I was perhaps a traitor in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite. But I must say with all candour that I said something more: I said that allegiance could not be the basis of trade. My hon. friend takes exception to that. He pretends that allegiance ought to be the basis of trade, that business is not to be the consideration, but that the consideration is to be the blood between the two countries. The hon. gentleman no doubt would prefer an English shilling to a Yankee dollar: but for my part I am differently constituted. I am ready any day, whether I am charged with annexation or not, to take a Yankee dollar in preference to an English shilling. That is the extent of my annexation. Of course hon. gentlemen opposite are too loyal to subscribe to any such false doctrine as this. The hon. gentleman states also that Mr. Farrer is the editor of the *Globe*, and he concludes that I am an annexationist because Mr. Farrer is one. Sir, if I were an annexationist I would say so. I would not be so mean with myself as not to hoist my own colours. That is my feeling as an honest man. I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in due course of time. But it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman opposite to tell me that I am an annexationist because there happens to be annexationists in the ranks of my party. Do I accuse him of being an annexationist because there are annexationists in his party?

An hon. MEMBER. The Prime Minister.

Mr. LAURIER. The Prime Minister, an hon. gentleman says. At one time, when I saw that Mr. Farrer was an annexationist, I thought of writing to the *Globe*, requesting his removal from the office: but it occurred to me that perhaps he was destined to become the Premier of Canada and the leader of the Conservative party. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman stated that *La Patrie* was my organ, and that it was Rouge of the Rouges. Sir, I think, that those who know me know that I have been more Rouge in my younger days than I have been in later days. I do not claim to have been always of the same mind that I am to-day. I have made some progress; I have altered my views; and I have no hesitation in saying that there was a time in the hot days of my youth when I was more of a Rouge than I am to-day. But I am a Liberal of the English school, as I have stated again and again, and on this platform I stand.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that?

Mr. LISTER. You were a Liberal yourself nine years ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman stated also that at Boston I had said that the conduct of Great Britain and of Canada during the American civil war had been unworthy of British civilization. Sir, I would not have been guilty of making that statement in a foreign country if I had not made it again and again in my native land and even on the floor of this House. In the year 1889, I stated in the presence of the Government what I stated in Boston, that in my estimation the conduct of Great Britain and the conduct of Canada had been unworthy of the civilization both of Great Britain and of Canada. I stated the same thing at Boston—why? Because the conduct of Canada had been the cause of the abrogation of the treaty of 1854. Mr. Blaine had stated that the cause of the abrogation of that treaty was the fact that Canada had been unfriendly to the Americans at that time. But I stated also that if such were the feelings of the Canadian people at one time, they were no longer their feelings. I thought it my duty to make that statement, and to add: Whenever Canadian commissioners go to Washington to negotiate a treaty, do not remember the old sores, but rather look to the fact that you have in us at the present time a brotherly and a friendly nation. I spoke at Boston, Sir, and why? Because in my judgment it is most important that the most friendly relations should exist between Canada and the United States. I stated at Boston, what I repeat, that patriotism does not rest upon hatred. I am a Canadian above all things, but because I am a Canadian above all things, I want to be friendly with my neighbours on the other side of the line. Do hon. gentlemen opposite oppose this policy? Sir, from every consideration we ought to adopt the resolution proposed by my hon. friend, and I hope it will be adopted. The hon. Minister of Finance has not forgotten that this motion has been made in this House before, and if he remembers the arguments made on that occasion by his colleague, the present hon. Minister of Public Works, perhaps he will feel that after all there is some truth in the movement, and that it ought to receive some consideration of a more friendly character than he has given to it. I say we must adopt this policy, because it is a duty to improve our citizenship; because in my judgment it is of the utmost consequence to open new channels to national activity, new and wider fields to national ambitions, new and higher aims to national enthusiasm. What is to-day, I ask, the position of Canada? Who does not concede that the system of stagnation and inaction in which the Government are dwarfing every proposition to satisfy national aspiration, is mining away the very basis of Confederation. Where is the national spirit, the national enthusiasm which we ought to have? Where, I ask, is the pride of the Canadian name? I vainly ask for it and seek for it through the length and breadth of this country. In every part, from ocean to ocean, I find pride of race and creed, but nowhere pride of the Canadian name, which ought to be supreme and paramount in the breast of every Canadian. The activity and energy of this young nation are frittered away in useless and even dangerous bickerings of race against race and creed against creed. Sir, for this fatal state of things there is but one remedy: it is to elevate the standard, to show to the young and hopeful that there are nobler aims and purposes, that Canada has a future, and towards that future steadily to advance, with faith never wavering, with enthusiasm never flinching.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with very great diffidence that I venture to say a word in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken with that eloquence which we all admire, but which few of us can imitate. I would not venture to say a word had he not devoted a large portion of his speech to the subject of imperial federation. Now, I do not pretend to say that of all the members of this House who are members of the imperial federation League, I am the one best qualified to undertake a reply to the hon. gentleman on that subject. There are other hon. members of this House, especially the hon. gentleman to whom the last speaker made special reference, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who, if present, would much better fill that position than it is possible for me to do. But, Sir, I would not like it to go abroad to the people of this country, who have heard so much on the subject of imperial federation, who have taken so great interest in it, and who I think so thoroughly and widely appreciate it, that after it was discussed on that side of the House as it has been by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, some member of that association however humble his position in the country or in this House, has not risen to say a word in its defence Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman is fond of literary allusions, and I think I am not doing him an injustice when I compare him to one of the greatest characters in modern fiction, Don Quixote. Don Quixote with all his eccentricities, was one of the noblest characters, and I think among the attributes gaining him the highest applause the hon. gentleman is not unlike him. But on the present occasion the hon. gentleman has done what Don Quixote did on a certain occasion: he has set himself to tilting against a windmill. Now, although not afraid or unwilling to discuss the question of imperial federation, I should like to know by what process of ratiocination the hon. gentleman has arrived at the conclusion that the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell now before the House afforded a fitting and proper occasion for the discussion of that very important subject. As regards the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell, I think the answer of the hon. Minister of Finance was as complete and as thorough an answer as it is possible for any man to give. I only take exception to the speech of the Minister of Finance in one particular, and that is that I think it unfortunate that in our debates it almost seems impossible for us to eliminate the personal question: and had the hon. gentleman avoided what is the one blot in his speech, I think that not the slightest exception could be taken to his answer to the hon. member for Bothwell, and I believe that the hon. gentleman who last spoke did not in one particular succeed in meeting the objection which the Minister of Finance put forward. But with reference to imperial federation, the only subject on which I propose to say anything to-night, I would like to point out the vast difference there is between that proposal and that which the hon. gentleman holds out as the *ultima thule* of the Canadian nation. In olden times, the proudest boast a man could utter was "Civis Romanus sum." In

modern times, the highest ambition and hope a man can have is to say "I am a British subject." Well, imperial federationists, admit, of course, as all must admit that the colonial condition must inevitably be a condition of transition; they admit that the colonial condition in which we are is not as high a status as that of a British subject; that is to say, that while we have all the rights and privileges and are entitled to call ourselves British subjects, while there is nothing in the political or civil status of a British subject in any respect which we are not entitled to assume, yet there are privileges and powers and national responsibilities in which we do not at present share. But what the imperial federationists say is: we desire to share those privileges and those responsibilities to the fullest extent, and in accepting the privileges we are prepared to assume the responsibilities; whereas the position of hon. gentlemen opposite is this, that they are prepared to give up all the privileges which attach to the position but yet are willing to assume the responsibilities. They are prepared to lower the status of the people of this country by causing them to cease to be British subjects. I am glad that the hon. gentleman spoke of imperial federation in the respectful terms he did. He could not fail, with his mind, to grasp, as he evidently does, the grandeur of the idea, but he dwells on the impossibility of ever carrying it into effect. Now, I say, without fear of contradiction, the course of history in this country shows that imperial federation, in some form or other, is every day coming nearer and nearer, and that the day is not far distant when the people, whether they like it or not, will be compelled to take the question of imperial federation in some way into consideration and adopt its principles, because in no other way can they possibly continue to exist. Take an example at this moment. We have all seen a reference in the London *Times* to the Behring Sea question, in which it was asked: What do the people of England care about a few seals in the Behring Sea? What difference does it make whether they are caught by Canadians or Americans? Why should the people of Great Britain be taxed for the protection of Canadian interests in the Behring Sea fisheries, when Canadians do not show us any favour in their markets, although, ours are open to them. That statement may have been put in unnecessarily strong language, language not pleasant to read, but, nevertheless, who can deny the truth of the proposition, that England, in this case, is standing up not for any particular advantage to her people, not for any commercial advantage, but for the honour of the British flag borne in those seas by forty or fifty Canadian fishermen. Is this a fit time to raise the question brought before the House by the hon. member for Bothwell, when we know that the whole power of of England is standing at our back to protect us, not for any great imperial interest, not for any special interest of her own, but because a few Canadian fishermen find it their interest to catch seal in the Behring Sea under the protection of the British flag? This is not a time to discuss this question, but is eminently the time when we should feel most deeply the advantages we derive from imperial connection. The main difference between federationists and those who look to the independence of Canada is this, that we seek to raise our status to the highest any man in the country can occupy; and in seeking that status with all the privileges that belong to it, we assert our readiness to accept all the responsibilities. That is imperial federation in a nutshell. As to the trade question, I have only to say this, that speaking for myself, and speaking for very many in this House, I think, and in this country, the time has come, as foreshadowed by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech the other day, when this country should alter its commercial relations with the mother country by a reduction of tariff in all those special lines in which we deal with the mother country; and I for one, differing in some respects with some of my friends on this side, do not desire to approach this question in a spirit of bargain or sale. I do not wish to go to England and say: Give us preference in your market and we will give you a preference in ours. But I believe it would be in the interests of the country to-day to go to England of our own spontaneous notion, and in dealing with our tariff let the people of England understand that we appreciate the immense imperial advantages we may derive from the imperial connection. I believe that is the true and proper course for us to pursue. The hon. gentleman sitting behind the hon. member who has just spoken has put a resolution to that effect on the Paper. It is faulty, as I shall show when it comes up for discussion, but in its main issue it is one in which I heartily agree; and I think the time will come when, with due regard for the finances of the country, we may show, and in so doing take a further step in the direction of federation, that by lowering our tariff on British goods, consistent with the meeting of our own obligations, we shall be doing what will be of immense benefit, not only to the material but to the political interests of the country. So far as the National Policy is concerned, I say this, that protection is not a thing to be desired for itself alone. I am not a protectionist in the sense that it is a god people should set up and worship as they do free trade. I say that protection, in whatever shape you have it, is a means to an end. It was so devised in the first instance, and as soon as it has answered that end, we can deal with it as we like. The hon. gentleman said something about the Canadian name, that the Canadian name was unknown. The hon. gentleman must be strangely blind to the signs of the times. He can hardly have looked back to the time of Confederation, because if he had, he will see that an enormous progress has been made since that time under the name of Canadian. At the time of Confederation, one or two provinces were absolutely hostile to the idea of confederation. I believe many of the people of British Columbia scouted the idea of being called Canadians, and I think some Nova Scotians, some of the colleagues of the hon. gentleman or members of his party, if they had been converted to the ideas he now advocates, are recent converts, but at the time of Confederation, although we were bound together by a constitution, we were scattered provinces with scarcely any intercolonial trade or national sentiment. Is that the case to-day? Confederation is not so very old, and the union which has been brought about between the different provinces, not only in matters of trade but also in matters of sentiment, is simply wonderful in view of the short period which has elapsed. I do not think that any one, looking to the future and judging by the past, has any reason for apprehen-

sion even if our present position continued to exist. The hon. gentleman's aspirations towards Canadian nationality form one aspect of the question to which we are all bound to pay a great deal of respect and a great deal of consideration. We have three alternatives. I fully admit that we cannot always remain in our present position. A change will come whether we like it or not, but it is our duty so to guide the destinies of the country that, in spite of what we may say or do in this House, we should direct opinion in the way which is best for our material, moral and political interests; and imperial federation is advocated as the best means of preventing the falling asunder of the Empire and the formation of a closer union, not by the breaking of the bundle of sticks and bringing the Empire back to a state of weakness, but by an idea so great that some people regard it as impossible because of its greatness, to make a complete union of all the parts of the Empire politically, commercially and otherwise. That there are difficulties in the way no one will deny, but that these difficulties can be overcome every one should believe. Greater difficulties in the history of nations have been overcome time and again, and it is saying little for the honesty and talent of the people of the British Empire to say that, having such a great common object in view and having such an idea as one worthy of consummation, it would be impossible to find means to carry it out. Every day this view is growing nearer. The very fact which has been mentioned to-night that a Canadian commissioner is united with a British ambassador in negotiating a treaty is a step towards imperial federation. What more can we expect than that our commissioner in England should be associated with a British ambassador in different courts of Europe? We cannot see exactly the way now, but, as years go on, the path will be opened, the step will be taken, and I am as confident as that I stand on the floor of this House that, if the people of this country show that they desire imperial federation and support it as the people of England are supporting it, it will come about. Then, as to a trade federation, hon. gentlemen say it is impossible. They have not watched the signs of the times. They have not seen that the pressure of the tariffs in foreign countries against Great Britain, in Germany, in France, in Africa, have made the people of England look to the colonies as the legitimate outlet for their trade. When we look over the trade returns, as I have looked over them with a view to this subject, I find a remarkable fact which will probably come out in some further discussion, that, of those articles which we get from England, we get almost none from the United States. There is almost an absolute line drawn between the articles we import from England and those we import from the United States, and those which we import from the United States are articles which we ought to import from them and upon which we require protection because the countries are very much the same and their lines of manufacture run very much in the same direction as ours. We therefore require protection against the country which most closely competes with our manufacturers. Looking at the present temper of a large portion of the English manufacturers, looking as they do to the colonies and especially to Canada as the great outlet for their trade, I think that one of the great obstacles to imperial federation is overcome. The question of the tariff is a very small matter in this regard. If we treat the country which gives us a free and open market as the country which it is our interest as well as our duty to trade with, one of the great obstacles to imperial federation will be overcome and the public feeling in England to-day shows that it has been overcome to a large extent. As I stated before, I had great diffidence in addressing the House for the imperial federationists in the absence of those who were much better qualified to speak on the subject than I am, but I repeat that great economic causes are working towards imperial federation, and I have no doubt whatever, difficult as the path may be, it will be surmounted before many years are over.

Mr. DEVLIN. Before a vote is taken on this subject, I would like to read a word or two to the Finance Minister in regard to what he said to-night about a portion of the population with which I am allied to a certain extent. Sir Charles Tupper was invited to speak at a dinner in London, England. I am quoting from a report in the *Citizen* of Tuesday, 5th April, and I find that he said this:

"Mr. Pembroke Stephens, in his eloquent but too complimentary speech, has just told you that a quarter of a century ago, I was Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, and had taken a leading part in the confederation of British North American Provinces, and in binding them together by a great transcontinental line of railway. Let me say, that I owed that position to the support I obtained from Irishmen, and that in whatever I have been able to accomplish for my country I am deeply indebted to them, I need not say, therefore, how heartily I sympathize with the godlike work of benevolence in which this society has been engaged for more than a hundred years, in aiding the destitute and opening up the pathway of knowledge to Irish children."

Further on in the same speech he said:

"When I visited some of the most congested districts of that unhappy country, I could not but come to the conclusion that Irish poverty was at the bottom of Irish discontent, nor could I avoid reflecting what change would be effected by transferring these people from their wretched surroundings to the Dominion of Canada where we give 160 acres of the best agricultural land in the world to every emigrant of eighteen years of age.

"There is no country where Irishmen have been more successful in every walk of life as agriculturalists, machinists, tradesmen, contractors and merchants they have been signally successful, while they have adorned all the learned professions and reached the highest positions in the States. They thus contribute to the national wealth, and at the same time to become loyal upholders of British institutions. The most discontented Irish emigrant finds himself in a country where no grievances could be found. He is his own landlord, enjoys the most complete Home Rule, and easily becomes independent. The result of all this has been shown in the recent elections in Canada, where Catholic and Protestant Irishmen have, with great unanimity stood shoulder to shoulder in sustaining the policy of British connections and no discrimination against England as opposed to a policy of free trade with the United States and the prospect of union at no distant day with that Republic."

No doubt Irishmen—because the hon. gentleman referred to them in his speech in a sneering manner—no doubt Irishmen throughout the country will have reason to feel complimented in view of the reference which he made to them. He referred to them, I think, as a disturbing element in the United States and as the cause of the difficulties with which England meets when she endeavours to bring about treaties of reciprocity. I do not recall the exact words which he uttered, but, nevertheless, there was a sneer in those words, and we know perfectly well that he was brave here to-night when

the people against whom he levelled his sneer were far away. It was a cowardly thing to do, and, Sir, I take it upon myself, to-night, to defend those whom he attacked. I would recall to him the words uttered in the capital of England by his own leader and master, Sir Charles Tupper, pointing to the loyalty of the Irish people. Loyal they are in whatever country they may be settled: and if because they were cast away from Ireland on account of the laws prevailing there, on account of pressure, on account of persecution, on account of tyranny, and were driven from that country into the United States and found there a home, it is no wonder that they should be loyal to that home, loyal to the flag of that country, loyal to the interest of that country. Here they are loyal, too, because they have found the protection here that was denied them at home, and when the hon. gentleman sneers at those across the line, he sneers at those who live here, and who have that respect for our brethern across the line that one brother should have for another.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Mills, Bothwell):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Innes,
Armstrong,	Landerkin,
Bain (Wentworth)	Langelier,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Bowman,	Lister,
Brodeur,	Livingston,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Carroll,	McMullen,
Casey,	Mignault,
Charlton,	Mills (Bothwell),
Choquette,	Monet,
Christie,	Mulock,
Davies,	Paterson (Brant),
Dawson,	Perry,
Devlin,	Rider,
Edgar,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	Rowan,
Featherston,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Scriver,
Fraser,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gibson,	Vaillancourt,
Gillmor,	Watson,
Godbout,	Welsh and
Guay,	Yeo.—62.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	LaRivière,
Bain (Soulanges),	Lépine,
Baird,	Lippé,
Baker,	Macdonald (King's),
Barnard,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bennett,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bergeron,	Macdowall,
Bergin,	McAlister,
Bowell,	McDonald (Victoria),
Boyle,	McDougald (Pictou),
Burnham,	McKay,
Burns,	McLean,
Cameron,	McLennan,
Cargill,	McLeod,
Carignan,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Carling,	Madill,
Carpenter,	Mara,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Masson,
Cleveland,	Miller,
Cochrane,	Moncrieff,
Cockburn,	Montague,
Corbould,	Northrup,
Costigan,	O'Brien,
Craig,	Ouimet,
Curran,	Patterson (Colchester),
Daly,	Patterson (Huron),
Davin,	Pelletier,
Denison,	Pope,
Desaulniers,	Pridham,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Putnam,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Robillard,
Dewdney,	Roome,
Dugas,	Rosamond,
Dupont,	Ross (Dundas),
Dyer,	Ross (Lisgar),
Earle,	Ryckman,
Fairbairn,	Simard,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Skinner,
Foster,	Smith (Ontario),
Fréchette,	Sproule,
Gillies,	Stairs,
Grandbois,	Stevenson,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hodgins,	Tisdale,
Hughes,	Tupper,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Ives,	White (Cardwell),
Jouças,	White (Shelburne),
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kirkpatrick,	Wilson and
Langevin, (Sir Hector),	Wood (Brockville).—106.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Corby,	Sir Richard Cartwright,
Mr. Dickey,	Mr. Forbes,
Mr. Mills (Annapolis),	Mr. Flint,
Mr. Amyot,	Mr. Frémont,
Mr. Turcotte,	Mr. Fauvel.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FLINT. I did not vote because I was paired with the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills).

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) has not voted, neither have the hon. members for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), Victoria, B. C. (Mr. Prior), York, N.B. (Mr. Temple), West Northumberland (Mr. Guillet), St. John, N.B. (Mr. Hazen), and Vancouver Island (Mr. Gordon).

Mr. DICKEY. I paired with the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Forbes), otherwise I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. McNEILL. I may say, as my name has been mentioned, that I would have voted against the amendment with very great pleasure.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Committee reported a resolution.

ELECTION FOR NORTH PERTH.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the election appeal for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Perth, by which the appeal was allowed and judgment of the trial judges in the lower court reversed, and the election declared void. In conformity with chapter 9, section 46 of the Revised Statutes, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

REPORT.

Report of Militia and Defence.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 8th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga) presented the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates:

The Committee recommend that Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, stenographer, of Lévis, Que., be appointed to fill the vacancy on the staff of the Official Reporters caused by the death of Mr. F. R. Marceau.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Murray.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Corbould.)

REPORT.

Canadian Archives, by Douglas Brymner, Archivist, 1891.—(Mr. Carling.)

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 8) respecting aid by United States Wreckers in Canadian Waters.—(Mr. Bowell.)

SUPPLY.

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

Mr. LAURIER. I will take this opportunity of asking information from the leader of the House with regard to two Bills, first of all the Criminal Law Amendment Bill which has been long on the Paper but has not yet been printed and distributed, and then as to the Redistribution Bill. We are now in the sixth week of the session, and perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us when we may expect these measures.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As to the Criminal Law Bill, I introduced it with a number of amendments, as I explained at the time, and the printing has not been completed, although the officers of the House and the officers of the Printing Bureau have done all they can to expedite it. I am informed that it will probably be ready for a second reading on Tuesday, and then I intend to propose its reference to a select committee, composed of a considerable number of the members of this House. As to the Redistribution Bill, I think it will be brought down very shortly after the Easter recess, and the information which has been asked for will be ready by that time, but, I fear, not before, although an ample staff has been engaged in preparing it.

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

(In the Committee.)

Department of the Interior..... $95,414

Mr. FOSTER. When we were going through the Civil Government estimates, we allowed this item to stand until the report of the Committee of the Privy Council was before the House. That has been down for a considerable time, and has been discussed on the Supplementary Estimates, so I suppose there will be no objection to pass this item now.

Mr. McMULLEN. We want to have an explanation as to the increases in this department.

Mr. DEWDNEY. They are simply the statutory increases.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that, when papers are moved for in this House, it has been the practice in the different departments, if there is but one paper of those moved for upon the file, on which there may be thirty or forty papers, to copy the whole file. This adds enormously to the expense though it may be to the advantage of those who have to do the work. It seems to me that is a practice which should be corrected.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is difficult sometimes to find out exactly what papers are required, and, if the Minister takes the responsibility of selecting he may not bring down the particular paper which is required.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But if there are forty papers on the file and two are required to be brought down, the selection had better be made before than after the papers are brought down.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention of the Department of the Interior to still keep on the force at Winnipeg that they have had in the past?

Mr. DEWDNEY. As the hon. gentleman knows, the estimates in regard to the force at Winnipeg is not now before the House, but the vote I shall ask for this year is a trifle less than that which I asked for last year, but the force is virtually the same.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman inform the committee whether the Civil Service Commission are about to make a report in regard to any material alterations in his department?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That would be impossible for me to say. I have only had a few moments' conversation with the chairman of that Commission, who stated that he had been through my department and was astonished at the amount and variety of the work done there. He made no indication as to what he proposed to recommend in regard to it, and what remarks he did make were made in a casual way.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the staff been increasing in the last few years?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; since I have been here the staff in Winnipeg has remained about the same. The staff at headquarters has been decreasing. Within the last two years the cost has decreased

by $17,600. This year there is a decrease of $3,600, and last year there was a decrease of $14,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to ask if the work now performed in the Interior Department is not considerably less than it was three years ago?

Mr. DEWDNEY. On the contrary, I think the work has been constantly increasing, but the means we have taken to do the work has resulted in a decrease of the number of clerks. For instance, we have employed a large number of typewriters, which has immensely decreased the amount of clerical work, and that is one cause why we have been able to dispense with so many extra clerks. We have now had in hand for about six weeks a phonograph, by which we hope to be able to decrease still further the number of officials, if that instrument works as successfully as it now promises to do.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has had in his department a man named Cross, who is not now in the department, I think. Who has taken his place?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Cross was a temporary clerk and was dispensed with. He was one of those who are represented in the decrease of $14,000. No one has succeeded him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It seems to me, in looking over the expenses in connection with the different departments, that amongst them the Interior Department does not rank high for economy; in fact, it would not be going too far to say that it takes a high place for extravagance. I think, in the year 1882-83, when they went clean mad in that department, and when certain statements were brought down by officers in the department showing that they were acting under the impression that the receipts from the Dominion lands would be so large as to cover nearly all the expenses of the Government, they inaugurated a system of expenditure which was consistent with their then expectations. Well, it was no use in those days talking about economy; nobody talked about it, anybody who did talk about it was laughed at. But there has been a growing disposition on both sides of the House, of late years, now that we are nearly at the length of our tether, to lop off useless extravagances in all the departments. I would call the attention of the head of that department to the fact, that while they launched out into this extravagant system in 1882-83, they have not yet applied the pruning-knife, there has been no retrenchment whatever. Now, everybody knows that the work in that department is not as large as it once was, nothing like it. I see the sales of land in the North-West are very, very small, not one-fifth, or one-tenth, part of what they were expected to be. The hon. gentleman told us, I think, last year or the year before, that he was enabled to reduce his staff somewhat, but I do not find—I am not going through all the little items of expenditure—that there is any reduction. Take, for instance, the item of newspapers. You have two branches in that department, and you have $300 paid for newspapers in one, and nearly $700 in the other—$1,000 for newspapers in the Interior Department. Of course it is a very small sum, but it is indicative of the system which prevails in the department. I have gone through all the contingent accounts in the Auditor General's Report, and it seems to me they are all on a par, there does not seem to be any desire to economise. A few years ago the House was shocked at the tremendous amount of travelling expenses which many employés of that department incurred, and which were paid out of the public expenditure. In that regard there is somewhat of an improvement, although I think there is room for still more. But it does seem to me, when we compare the expenditure of that department to-day with what it was in 1878, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit there was nearly as much work being done as there is now, that it is out of all proportion, and evinces an absence of economy to be condemned. I think we have a right to expect something better from the hon. gentleman; I think the scale to which the expenditure in that department was raised some years ago, when these extravagant expectations were indulged in, should be reduced, not by lopping off a little cheese-paring here and there, but by applying the pruning-knife deep into this expenditure.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the work in the department has greatly increased, and that if there was any chance of reducing the staff still further I would be only too glad to do it; because I have made it my business to look into the matter and have endeavoured to make a reduction wherever possible, and I think I have done it to a great extent, not only in the cost, but in the number of the employés. Of course the Interior Department and the Government will be guided, to a great extent, by the Report of the Civil Service Commission; and I shall be astonished if that Commission, after the very close examination they have made into our department—they have gone into every branch of it, and into every sub-branch—I shall be very much surprised if they report in the direction of cutting down the staff to any great extent. If they do it, and if they can show that we can make any further reduction in the number of employés, I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. FRASER. What proportion do the receipts bear to expenditure in your department?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that will be better discussed on the main vote. I have not the information now, but I will have it then.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the hon. gentleman has got a man named H. H. Turner in his department. I would like to know when Mr. Turner was appointed, what his salary is, and what he is doing?

Mr. DEWDNEY. H. H. Turner was appointed in 1885 or 1886, I do not recollect which at the moment. He has been connected with the Accountant's Branch as one of the assistant accountants.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the hon. gentleman able to say from his own personal knowledge that he is an efficient accountant, that he discharges his duty efficiently?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, I understand he is a most able man; one of the most able clerks we have in the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was he doing before he was appointed to the department, and by whose influence was he put in there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understand that he was a school teacher somewhere in Ontario, but I do not know where.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been informed that he was put in by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and that his abilities are of such a character that he has had a never-ending battle to keep him there. My impression is that Mr. Turner is getting a great deal more than he is able to earn. I observe that his salary was raised $50 last year, and that he is now receiving $900 annually. We can easily understand that a Government, either Dominion or Provincial, is subject to be pressed very strongly by those who have personal interests to serve, and friends to serve, to take people into the departments in order to provide for them. It is the duty of any Opposition, whether here or in the Provincial Legislature, to see that these men are not permitted to draw salaries for which the country receives little or nothing in return. I have some little inkling that this is one of these cases. This man was crowded through the doors of the Interior Department, and has been kept there because there is a member of the House anxious to find him something to do.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I only know that I found Mr. Turner in the department when I took charge of it, and that he had been in the department some years previous to that time. I do not know under what circumstances he entered, but the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) stated in his place in this House some days ago that he was a friend of his and that he had known him several years. On every occasion when Mr. Turner's name has been brought up, he has received the very highest testimonials as to his competence and character.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hope the Commission on the Civil Service will recommend some means of preventing the crowding of men into the departments. It is desirable that some change should be made in order that a whole lot of officials whose services are not worth what the public pay for them should not be retained in the Civil Service until they are superannuated under the present law. I hope the Commission will bring in a recommendation that will relieve the Government of the day—I do not blame hon. gentlemen opposite more than any other Government—from being bored in this way, and being almost compelled to admit unnecessary clerks into the Civil Service.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has made a statement that he has been informed that Mr Turner is a very inefficient officer. I challenge that statement. I challenge that hon. gentleman to produce a statement from Mr. Burgess, or from the chief accountant, or any other leading officer of the department, to that effect, for they will declare that the assertion is contrary to the fact, and that Mr. Turner is one of the most efficient men in the service. I make that statement here, and I will guarantee that every chief officer in the Department of the Interior will agree with what I say. Mr. Turner was a school teacher before he was appointed to the department, and he has proved himself to be one of the best accountants and one of the most efficient officers; and if the hon. gentleman has been informed, as he has intimated, to the contrary, all I can tell him is that his information is not correct, and that he did not get it from any officer of the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. The committee will notice that the hon. gentleman does not deny that he is responsible for Mr. Turner having been placed in the department. Of course, if he were an efficient servant, it would be all right; but I have learned that Mr. Turner has been kept there by the persistent efforts of the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) because he is a personal friend, and a friend of his constituents. I merely cite this as an instance of the wrong manner in which officers are forced into the departments and remain there, and I hope the Civil Service Commission will suggest some method to alter the entire system, and prevent the Dominion Government being compelled to retain officers in order to satisfy hon. members of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. What number of agencies are established, and has the number been increased during the past year?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Does the hon. gentleman refer to land agencies in the North-West?

Mr. CHARLTON. Land and timber agencies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The land agencies are the same as they have been for some years. There have been agencies established for the summer months at the Red Deer district, where one of the clerks of the Winnipeg office has been detailed in order to assist settlers, who went in there in large numbers last year. There has been no increase of agencies, so far as my memory goes, during the last year or two. I have not made any new land agencies since I came into office.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to enquire from the Minister whether it is consistent with the views of the department, or is it a fact, that officers of the department are interested in mining and mineral lands in the North-West which come within the purview and control of the department? If so, who are the officers? Has the hon. gentleman's attention been called to this matter, and is he able to give any positive answer in regard to it?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I may say that up to a few hours ago I never heard any intimation that any of the officers of my department were interested in any way in public lands or in mines in the western country. But I did hear a few hours ago that an anonymous letter had been written to a member of this House stating that Mr. Burgess was interested in a silver mine in Keewatin. I do not believe there is a silver mine in Keewatin, for I never heard of it. I can venture the assertion, on the responsibility of my position here, that Mr. Burgess is not, and never was, and I do not believe single officer of my department is, or ever was, interested in mines in the North-West.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Since the hon. gentleman has mentioned the subject, I may say that I understand a number of prominent officers, speaking now merely from rumour that is current abroad, and that ought to be contradicted if not well founded—that the most prominent officers in the inside and outside services of the department are interested in coal and other lands lying between Calgary and Edmonton. The public believe, no doubt, that the statement is well founded. It is an equally well-founded opinion that any such interest, if it exists, is incompatible with the proper discharge of the duties which these parties owe to the public service.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right in bringing a matter of this kind to

the attention of the House, and I may say for myself that I have never heard the rumour that such is the case. If there is information on this subject obtainable I should be only too glad if it were brought to my attention, but I do not believe there is a single case of the kind. All the dealings by public servants in public lands since I have been in charge of the department—and they have been only with respect to public lands—have been cases where officers have asked permission, which can be done under the Dominion Lands Act, to purchase a piece of land in the public domain. There have been one or two applications for small pieces of such land, but that is all. The matter referred to by the hon. gentleman has never been brought to my attention. I have never heard of the charge that a single officer of my department is interested, directly or indirectly, in coal lands or timber lands.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister further, for I do not think his explanation and denial cover the whole ground, whether, in the companies which have been formed in connection with mining lands between Calgary and Edmonton, or in any timber limits, he knows that prominent officials in his department are members of these companies?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have never heard of the slightest intimation that any one of my officials were in any way connected, either directly or indirectly, with any companies in Calgary or Edmonton, or in any part of the North-West.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What position does Frank Nelson now occupy, and what salary does he get?

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was reduced to $1,100 a year, the minimum of his class.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that the result of the investigation?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Expenses in connection with *Patent Record*..... $8,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there is a very desirable reduction here. Will the Minister give some explanation of it?

Mr. CARLING. The contract entered into some years ago has expired, and the work is now done by the Queen's Printer. We find we can do the work as efficiently as it was done under the contract and save $4,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. This bears out the contention which has been made from this side of the House for years past, that the price paid for issuing this record was exorbitant. Will the same number of copies be issued, notwithstanding the reduction of $4,000?

Mr. CARLING. The same quantity is issued as before. One thousand copies were formerly printed, but it is now intended to print 2,500, and to sell them if possible.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are there any fees received from sales of the *Patent Record?*

Mr. CARLING. In future we expect to make something out of it by selling copies in addition to those that are distributed free.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it sold to any one who desires to buy it?

Mr. CARLING. Anyone who wishes to become a subscriber at $2 per annum can have it.

Preparation of Criminal Statistics..... $4,000

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is in charge of this branch?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. St. Denis, who was also head clerk of mortuary statistics, which we have done away with.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is any information of a practical kind derived from the publication of these statistics?

Mr. CARLING. I think so. They are published annually in accordance with an Act of Parliament brought in by the late member for West Durham some years ago. The information is returned by the clerks of the courts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Are these statistics gathered from the cities alone or from the rural districts as well?

Mr. CARLING. They are obtained from the clerks of the courts all over the Dominion, who are paid a fee for furnishing them?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do they appear in the hon. gentleman's report?

Mr. CARLING. No, in a separate document; an appendix to the report.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do they cover summary convictions as well as indictable offences?

Mr. CARLING. The information which has been prepared for me states that the returns are received from clerks of the courts for indictable offences in one schedule and for summary convictions in another, $1 being paid for each schedule and 5 cents for each name. There was expended last year altogether, $3,086.

Mr. FLINT. It has struck me, and I fancy it must have struck other members, that the work, much of which I believe is very valuable work, in connection with gathering these statistics, is not appreciated by the public as it ought to be, and I think the department should invent some means for bringing this information more promptly and more frequently before the public. I very much fear that a large amount of the money and time spent in the preparation of these returns is, for most practical purposes, wasted. If bulletins were issued, say every two months, giving well digested statistics for the previous two months, and distributed to the press of the country, the information might be made useful to large numbers of persons who watch the course of affairs in criminal matters. We know that many societies, religious and temperance organizations, and persons of a benevolent turn of mind, are constantly studying the question how the criminal classes may be reached, and watching the trend of criminal matters; and if these statistics could be presented more frequently and directly to the public through the press, they would be of much more value than they are.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice that the vote of $5,000 for health statistics is dropped this year. Are the Government not going to ask for any appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. CARLING. No. We only voted $5,000 to the end of the calendar year. We have not continued the collection of that information.

Mr. McDONALD (Huron). I think that is a very wise decision, as the statistics were gathered only from certain points in the country, and were always inaccurate.

Salaries—Military Branch and District Staff..... $12,400

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the present condition of the staff? Have there been any changes, and is it intended to keep the staff up as it is at present?

Mr. BOWELL. There have been no changes made since I have been in the department. No provision has been made to fill up the vacancy which occurred during the year through the death of Brigade-Major Lewis, and there is no intention to fill the vacancy. My intention is to give this matter the closest possible attention as soon as I have the time, and I am under the impression I can, without affecting the efficiency of the staff or service, still further reduce it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is one point in connection with the staff which it would be well to bear in mind, and that is the advisability of associating the heads of the militia department as closely as possible with the military schools of instruction. The experiment as carried on in Toronto has been eminently successful, and it is to be hoped the system will be pursued elsewhere. It is a system which brings the staff of the school and the permanent corps much more in sympathy with each other.

Brigade Majors..... $13,900

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is there a provision in the Act of Parliament enabling majors in the House to receive pay without violating that Act?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I remember bringing that very point up when the Bill was brought in by the hon. member for East York, and it was amended so as to allow officers to draw their pay and allowance while holding their seats in the Commons. It is the same rule which holds in the Imperial Parliament.

Ammunition, including artillery ammunition and manufacture of small arms ammunition at the Government Cartridge Factory, Quebec..... $50,000

Mr. CHARLTON. Are the Government engaged in the manufacture of small arms?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. What rifle is used in the service?

Mr. DENISON. The whole force is armed with the Snider, but there are a few Martini rifles in the country used mainly for practising for the annual matches.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is not the Snider superseded in the English service and the continental states by more modern and better weapons?

Mr. BOWELL. No doubt about that. It is only a question of expense. If Parliament will give the department a sufficient sum to provide the militia with the improved firearm, I shall only be too glad to obtain the latest improvement. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that the Snider has fallen to a great extent into disuse, particularly in the Imperial Army, but as we do not at present anticipate any difficulties with foreign countries, our volunteers can learn their drill as well with the Snider as any other rifle.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Would it not be possible for the militia to obtain from the Imperial service the Martini rifles now superseded by a later weapon?

Mr. BOWELL. I can scarcely see the propriety of taking for the Canadian rifle an arm that has been discarded by the Imperial Parliament. If we are to have any, let us have the latest.

Mr. DENISON. Although the Snider is a very good rifle and stands its work very well, it has been superseded by others and noticeably by the Martini-Henry. But that has been superseded by a later weapon, the Lee-Burton, the new magazine rifle, and a very good one, I understand. It has been suggested by some riflemen in connection with the Rifle Association, that the Martini-Henry rifle should be purchased in place of the Snider. I think that would be a very questionable policy to pursue in view of the fact that in the Imperial service they are considering the advisability of doing away with the Martini-Henry and taking up this new rifle. It would be proper for the Minister of Militia to have reports on these different rifles, and I hope he will place an item in the Supplementary Estimates, or at all events in the Estimates of next year, so that our militia will have a proper rifle in their hands instead of being armed as they are now with a rifle which is practically obsolete.

Mr. CHARLTON. I quite agree with the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) that, if we are to have a militia force, it should be an efficient one, and should be equipped with the best modern arm. No doubt it would involve a great deal of expense, but we ought to see that the volunteers of Canada are supplied with the best small arms which are obtainable. If we ever required to put our volunteers on active service, we would find them equipped with an adequate weapon, and I think it would be an excellent idea for the Minister to obtain a report as to the efficiency of the various small arms, and to gather the information which we should have before deciding, if we do decide, to change the arm now in use. We have an excellent body of volunteer soldiers, and it would be a pity, if they were called into service, to send them into the field with an equipment inferior to that of the foe whom they would be called upon to meet.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The question of arming the volunteers with the best rifle that can be produced deserves the best attention of the House and of the Government, and I hope the Minister of Militia will consider it his duty to look into this question. It will require the support of Parliament to enable him to deal with it properly. It will probably require the expenditure of $1,000,000 to arm the militia of Canada with the improved weapon. There are 40,000 to be armed at a cost of about $20 or $25 apiece. We find that the Major-General writes in the report which has been submitted to Parliament:

"The arms throughout the rural militia are old and untrustworthy, and, moreover, they show considerable want of proper care."

When we have a report of that kind, it is criminal in us to keep these men armed with these rifles and expect them to do duty, in case of necessity, with such weapons. If the country cannot afford to provide the militia with modern rifles, we should dis-

band them altogether. We can expend thousands and millions of dollars on other matters, but, when the flower of the youth of our country may be called upon to go to the front, they should certainly have proper arms in their hands. Every one knows that these rifles have been in the hands of our militia for over 30 years and they are old and unserviceable. When we send our riflemen to England on the Wimbledon or Bisley team, the Militia Department has to issue the Martini-Henry rifle to them for practice some weeks before. In a short time that rifle will cease to be useful because the volunteers in England will be served with the new magazine rifle. I hope the Minister of Militia will take this matter into his serious consideration.

Mr. CHARLTON. At all events, we should ask the Minister of Militia to obtain information as to the expense and as to what arm we should adopt. It would be going too far for us to decide now what the expenditure should be, because we should wait until we have the information.

Mr. FRASER. I think we should move with a great deal of caution in this direction. We should have a statement of the character of the various arms in use by the different armies of the world. It is a very striking thing to notice how few nations have adopted similar arms. Of course there may be national prejudices in regard to that. In England itself millions have been spent in getting first one kind of arm and then another. It would be almost folly for a new country to invest $1,000,000 in a kind of arm which in one or two years might be laid aside and in place of which we might have to get another. I cannot conceive of a reason for such an expenditure unless we were in immediate danger, and were called upon as a nation to fight. What the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) says might cut two ways. One part of the report of the Major-General is that the arms in use are old, and then he says that the men do not know how to deal with them and look after them, or that the officers do not see that the men keep them in a proper state. I do not think that is the case, or, if it is, it should not exist. But, in a country like this, with men who go through their drill who are so much superior to those of any other country in the world, men who are not pressed into the service or bribed, the arms they use are of great importance, but they would be able to change from the use of one arm to another with very little effort, so that we need not go to a very large outlay in order to get a new kind of arm which England may change very shortly. We ought to move very slowly in this matter.

Mr. HUGHES. Concerning the item in the report of the Major-General as to the poor condition of the rifles in the armouries it must be remembered that these were the rifles which were issued in 1866 and have been knocked about the brigade camps ever since. The Snider rifle belongs now to past history, but I believe that, if the Martini rifles were issued to the force in Canada, it would give great satisfaction. So far as the new rifle in use in the British Army is concerned, it is a debateable point whether that weapon will be a useful article or not. In fact, so far as we have seen it tested in Canada it has not been successful. It throws a very fine bullet, but its range is not superior to that of the Martini-Henry rifle, and it is not so easily understood by the force in general. We tested it here on the ranges at Ottawa, and the drop of the bullet was just as much, the elevation required was just as great, as it was for the Martini-Henry rifle, and if anything, a little more. The trajectory of the bullet was even more than that of the Martini-Henry rifle. However, I do not think it would be well to invest any large sum of money in the purchase of rifles at the present time, unless it is decided to adopt permanently one or other of these arms. I would recommend the appointment of a Commission to test the rifles and report at the next session of Parliament, or at some future time, as to which rifle would be the most suitable for the force in Canada. Concerning the item of ammunition, I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister of Militia. The rifle associations throughout the country find themselves called upon every year to pay large sums of money for ammunition for rifle practice. Through the kindness and the courtesy, I may say, of the late Minister of Militia the members of the Rifle League were favoured last year, and the year previously, with all the ammunition they required. That one act on the part of the late Minister of Militia, although it did not cost the country a very large sum of money, did more to encourage rifle shooting in Canada than almost anything else that could be done. Now, if the Minister of Militia could see his way clear to reduce the price of the ordinary ammunition used in rifle practice throughout Canada, I am satisfied that as the Snider rifle or the Martini-Henry makes a good shot—because a good shot with one rifle is a good shot with another one—I am satisfied that a very great impetus would be given to the force in Canada Therefore I respectfully suggest to the Minister of Militia the advisability of reducing the price of ammunition to the rifle associations and battalions for practice, in addition to the kindness already extended in giving free ammunition to the Rifle League. I would suggest placing a sum in the Estimates for that purpose, so that the volunteers of the country may get ammunition at reasonable rates.

Mr. CASEY. I agree with most of what has fallen from my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. I have not had an opportunity yet of seeing the new rifle tested; my hon. friend says he has. But I have grave doubts in any case, even if the trajectory were lower than that of the Martini-Henry, whether a magazine rifle is the best kind of rifle with which to arm our volunteers, or to arm any military force. It has been found in modern warfare that soldiers fire away their ammunition quite fast enough with the ordinary breech-loader. If they were trained shots and never fired except when they had something to fire at, and after taking deliberate aim, the risk of wasting ammunition would not be so great. But no regiment, not to speak of an army, can be composed of trained shots, and the result is that even with a breech-loader, there is a tremendous waste of ammunition. With a magazine rifle it would be ten times worse, because they would be saved the trouble of reloading between shots. Then, again, as to the destructive power of the two rifles, I know from information that the new English rifle has a very small calibre and carries a very small bullet. I understand it was the idea of those who adopted that

rifle, rather to wound than to kill, under the impression that a wounded man was a greater incumbrance to his own side than a man who was killed dead on the spot and required no further attention. That is hardly a humane view of the subject, it seems to me, although it may be very proper from a military point of view, but I fancy that for sheer effectiveness no rifle has yet been invented that will do more work than the Martini-Henry. The Martini-Henry is far from being a perfect rifle, and the adoption of it in this case was a great mistake in many ways which are too technical to bring before the House at present. But at all events, it is an extremely effective rifle at a thousand yards, and that is about as far as you can see to aim at anything. The great point is as between these two rifles that a vast stock of Martini-Henry is available, many being perfectly new rifles, and others that have been very little used. They could be obtained at a comparatively low price. I think the estimate of the hon. member from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), experienced as he is in rifle matters, is very high as applied to the arming of our force with Martinis. I am satisfied we can get a full armament of Martinis now, as they have gone out of use in the British army, and even among the volunteers in England, for a very smaller figure than he mentions. They are dead stock, so I think they would be sold to Canada at slaughter prices.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. We do not want discarded rifles.

Mr. CASEY. But the hon. gentleman will remember that they have been held in stock in various depôts throughout England; there are vast stocks of Martinis perfectly new; they are now dead stock. We are now using discarded Sniders; we are using a great many old converted Enfields, old gas pipes, that were converted by having a piece of the butt end cut off and the Snider block put in. Many of them have been in use 35 years. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says that he understands from the report that the only objection to the present rifle is they are old and are not kept in good repair. Age in a rifle, especially in a converted Enfield, implies that the rifle is worn out and unfit for use. These converted rifles, many of them, were used for years with the old iron ramrod banging up and down and smashing the grooves every time they were loaded and every time they were inspected, and we are using many of them yet, utterly unfit even for target practice, not to speak of using them in the field when a man's life may depend on the accuracy of the shooting. Now, the conclusion, to my mind, is that our present arm, as everybody admits, is totally unfit to cope with modern weapons, and that as there is an opportunity of getting a large quantity of Martinis at a very cheap rate from the British Government—not necessarily rifles that have been used and discarded, but the surplus stock of a rifle that has gone out of fashion—we should purchase them for the use of our troops. I would not object even to having rifles that had been used for a short time in the regular service, as they would be none the worst for two or three years use. The Martini-Henry has been tried in all climates and in all circumstances, and has been found to be a useful weapon. It has been tried from the Soudan to dear knows where, and has been found to be practically a very useful weapon, a very easy weapon to handle, and a very good weapon to shoot with. There is a defect in the stock that makes it rather inclined to hurt the man that fires it, but that is not a defect sufficient to authorize us in rejecting them. I say it has been found to be a practical and useful weapon and successful even in the Soudan in checking those hordes of barbarians whom you could not check in any other way than by killing them off as fast as they came on. They seemed to be utterly devoid of fear, and it was necessary to kill a large number of them to stop their advance, or it was impossible to stop them at all. The killing of the front ranks produced no effect on those behind. Under these circumstances the Martini proved an excellent weapon. These are the only circumstances under which magazine rifles would prove valuable, when it is necessary to fire a large number of shots in rapid succession. But we have no Soudanese with whom to fight in Canada. The only possible enemy we may be called upon to meet have no weapons at all equal to the Martini in effective shooting, although they may have magazine rifles, which are capable of firing a large number of shots in succession. However, modern warfare has come down to be a matter of sharp shooting at a distance, rather than killing of men by rapid shooting. Taking all these matters into consideration, I must strongly urge on the Minister of Militia, who takes a real interest in the force, the desirability of applying to the English Government and obtaining the lowest price at which they will dispose of Martinis, which have been laid aside in consequence of the adoption of the new rifle. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke of the desirability of having a trial of new weapons. We need no trial as between the Snider and the Martini, for everybody knows the difference between those two rifles. As between the Martini and the Lee-Metford we do not need to make experiments; they have been made in the old country, and we need only apply to the authorities and obtain copies of the reports made on those two weapons. We need not follow their conclusions, but we can get all the information that has been collected. Even if it were proved that the Lee-Metford is the most effective, there are very strong reasons against our adopting it. The first, is the cost involved, and the second, is the delay that would occur. A sufficient number have not yet been made for the whole British army. We should have to wait years before we could obtain any for our volunteers and then a high price would be charged, as it is a new and fashionable weapon. Some hon. gentlemen have said we should not adopt either the Martini or the new rifle, because both of them will be out of fashion in a few years, and it would be necessary to get new weapons. I do not see the force of that argument. We need not change our rifles every time the British Government changes its arms. If we obtain a rifle to suit our purposes we should keep it. If we were to wait until the ideal rifle was perfected, we should have to wait many years. We are aware that there is a large stock of Martini rifles available, which will be sold at very low prices, and these we know are good and efficient weapons, and weapons with which our volunteers are acquainted; and if they can be purchased at a reasonable price, this course should be adopted, and a certain number of battalions should be armed

every year with this rifle until the whole militia force possesses them.

Mr. PRIOR. As considerable difference of opinion prevails among hon. gentlemen connected with the militia to-day on this matter, I think it is desirable that every one connected with the force should express an opinion, and give the Minister of Militia a chance to form an idea as to what are the wishes of the militia force. I heartily agree with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) in what they say as to the Martini rifle, and also, no doubt, I would have agreed fully with the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) if I could have followed him, but he became so scientific I could not follow his remarks. I have no doubt in my mind that the volunteer force of Canada would be perfectly contented if the Government could see their way to arm them with the Martini-Henry rifle. It is a weapon good enough for the use of any volunteer. One advantage that may be claimed for it is, that it is a splendid rifle for the rifle range. It is one not easily put out of order. In this respect it does not resemble the new magazine rifle, which is not fitted to be placed in the hands of men who are not thoroughly conversant with it, and who also have not first-class armouries in which to store them. It would be a great mistake if the Government were persuaded to arm the Canadian force with the new magazine rifle. It would be far better if the House should see fit to grant the Minister of Militia a good round sum of money for the purpose of drilling the whole force every year. If the volunteers obtained the Martini-Henry rifle as an arm, I am certain that not only would they be satisfied, but they would make as good use of that weapon as they could do with any other weapon put in their hands.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not the knowledge to enable me to form an opinion of the subject, and I do not propose to express one. But the General's report on this matter is very clear. The General complains that the Snider rifle and carbine with which the militia is armed is an obsolete weapon. He does not complain so much, however, of it as a weapon as he does of the manner in which it has been used. He goes on to say:

"The Snider rifle and carbine, with which the militia is armed, is at the best an obsolete weapon, but in the condition in which it exists, in most of the regiments of the Active Militia, it has no claim whatever to be classed as an arm of precision."

Then he goes on to say:

"For upwards of twenty years they have had the roughest possible usage."

He complains, not so much at the weapon, as he complains of the usage it has received at the hands of those into whose hands it has been entrusted. I suggest a remedy, which I have no doubt the Minister will take into consideration, and that is, that certain parties should have charge of the armouries, and be held responsible for the manner in which the rifles are kept. He points out that we have already a large stock of Martinis on hand. He continues:

"A considerable number of Martini-Henry rifles are in store, and it would appear desirable that these should be issued to the permanent corps, and be gradually introduced throughout the militia."

We have the statement of the General that the present rifles are obsolete, and have been ruined by usage, and we have the statement that we have a considerable store of Martini which require to be issued. The General calls attention in the following paragraph to a matter equally serious, the lack of proper equipment. He says:

"The equipment in use in the active militia is also obsolete in pattern, and a large proportion perished from age and severe usage. There is not a battalion that could turn out in complete marching order on a given day, though many have, at their own expense, provided some of the most necessary articles. Moreover, the equipment does not exist in store, which it would be necessary to issue in the event of grave emergency. I have not inspected a single battalion in which the men's boots would have stood one month's active service, or a regiment of cavalry or battery of artillery, in which the saddlery and harness could be expected to bear a similar strain."

That is not a very satisfactory report to receive after many millions have been expended during the last 15 years on the Canadian militia. It is evident that this department requires the attention of the new Minister. It is not creditable to the department that such a report should be made, and we have the statement that we have not a single battalion that could turn out in complete marching order, and if it did, it would be so badly equipped it could not last for more than a day or so. Then the General goes on to report:

"In the matter of artillery material, the militia is very deficient. The eighteen field batteries are armed with guns which are still good, but there is no reserve of guns, nor is there a spare gun wheel to be had nearer than Woolwich. Of heavy guns the Dominion does not possess a single modern specimen. Of the armament handed over by the Imperial Government a large portion could not be mounted, and a part could not be fired."

So it appears to me that what the General says is this: We have an obsolete weapon in the hands of the militia now, that weapon has been spoiled by careless and bad management, we have a very fair stock of Martini in store, and they should at once be issued to the permanent corps and gradually introduced into the militia force. That so far as the equipment of the volunteers are concerned, it is disgraceful, and so far as the artillery material is concerned, we are in a condition of absolute helplessness. The large part of the armament handed over to us by the Imperial Government cannot be fired, and a large portion cannot be mounted. The General concludes with a remarkably lucid and fair summing up of the condition of the militia in Canada, without that amount of flattery which we too often have been supplied with. We have some plain, practical truths told us here, and I hope we will act upon them. The Major-General Commanding says:

"The clothing is fairly good in quality, but the system of issue is open to very great objection. It is complicated, expensive, and satisfies nobody. I am of opinion that economy and efficiency would be better served were annual allowances in money granted to city corps, to enable them to supply their own clothing, the responsibility for the strict inspection of such clothing and of clothing accounts being fixed on the inspecting officers. In the case of rural corps, the complete issue of clothing should be made to coincide with the term of the men's service, viz., three years."

Of course upon that point I offer no opinion, as the militia officers who are here can say whether they agree with the General or not. However, he points out that the chief defect is not in the particular arms supplied in the militia but in their equipment and artillery.

Mr. HAZEN. I am sorry that the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), who addressed the House, and who is himself, as we all know, an expert marksman,

did not tell of his own experience and what weapon he used, at the time he did the execution which we so often heard of during previous sessions and which was also mentioned last session. I think that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has struck the nail on the head in his remarks, and that it is utterly useless to make a large expenditure in supplying the militia of the country with better arms until better provision is made for the care of these arms. That matter is pointed out in General Herbert's report, as read by the hon. member for Queen's. Any one who has paid any attention to the subject knows that in very many of the country districts there is really no care given to the arms; whereas in the cities they have good armouries and drill sheds supplied by the Government and altogether better facilities for taking care of their arms. If the force were now armed with an expensive rifle, it would only be a short time until it was in the same state in which the Snider rifles are at the present day. It seems to me that before good arms are provided, some means should be taken to provide an armoury at the headquarters of every company in the country districts, and that some officials should be detailed to make an inspection every year to see if they were kept in proper order, and could be utilized if wanted. Reference has been made to the fact that there are now in store in Canada some 10,000 Martini rifles, and it would seem to me a very proper thing that these 10,000 rifles should be distributed among the city corps where they would be taken care of in the armouries and drill sheds erected in different parts of the country. A considerable portion of the militiamen of the country would then be armed with a rifle with which, when they go to the rifle matches at Wimbledon, they have to shoot. It is an unquestionable disadvantage to Canadian militiamen to shoot at the matches in Canada during the season with the Snider rifle, which is the rifle with which, with a few exceptions, the different competitions are shot: it puts our militiamen at a disadvantage when they go to the old country to find that the competitions at Wimbledon are shot with a different weapon. These Martini rifles have been in the militia stores for a long time and have not been used. I would suggest to the Minister of Militia that it would be a proper thing to distribute them among the city corps so that some use might be made of them.

Mr. HUGHES. With reference to the suggestion of the hon member from St. John (Mr. Hazen), I must say that the rural corps would object to have city corps armed with a rifle which they would not be armed with also. The member for St. John complains that our volunteers have to compete in the old country with a rifle to which they are not accustomed, but I would remind him that as many members of the rural corps visit Wimbledon or Bisley as do members of the city corps. The same objection which he points out to the Canadian volunteers competing in Wimbledon would exist as between the city and the rural corps in Canada, if the weapons were different. We in the rural corps complain that altogether too much attention is paid to the city corps at the present time; not that we object to their privileges, but that we wish to be placed on the same footing. When the orders were issued to go to the front in 1885, the rural corps turned out in as short a time as did the city corps, and they did their work just as effectively in the North-West, although the men had not the opportunity of the same training as their brother volunteers in the city. However, the fault with these rifles is not because of the bad armouries through the country, but it is because they are injured in the camps. At the present time, when our men go out, twelve or fourteen are put in a tent, lying on the green sward, often in the clay, when in camp, and during a rainy night, or when there is a heavy dew, at times when the boys get up in the morning they find their rifles lying on the ground. So long as they are not supplied with a rifle rack in the tents, this difficulty will be met with, and the rifles will continue to sustain damage. I would suggest to the Minister of Militia that he should procure rifle racks to fit around the tent pole, and I believe that they could be obtained at a very little cost. If this were done great help would be given to the men to preserve their rifles in good order. The Militia Department does not undertake to furnish the volunteers with boots, and I presume the men come into camp with whatever boots they happen to use when working at home; so that if the Major-General commanding the forces expects to find our volunteers furnished with military boots he evidently does not know how the boys in Canada are trained up.

An hon. MEMBER. Some of them would go barefooted there.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, if necessary and they make very good soldiers at that. With reference to the belts I may say that many of our corps use the belts that were in vogue in the old Crimean days. In the corps to which I belong we have a number of belts that we keep as part of our museum, and they have the bullet holes through them, placed there in the Crimea, and some of them are marked with the bloodstains which the pipeclay cannot take off. I would draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that the old cross-belt and pouch supplied to the corps at the present time is absolutely useless, and we, every year, face our Deputy Adjutant-General wearing this old archaic antediluvian cross-belt. So far as the corps to which I belong is concerned we never bring them to camp, and it subjects us to an annual roasting, but we pay no attention to it because the cross-belt is absolutely useless. I agree with the Major-General that some change should be made in that species of outfit. If we had good rifles and good belts, we would be more comfortable.

An hon. MEMBER. You do not mind resting.

Mr. HUGHES. Not a particle. What we go in for is efficiency with comfort.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear.

Mr. HUGHES. All I have to say is that the battalion which I belong to has a record.

Mr. FRASER. There is a feature of this subject which is somewhat more serious than I thought at first. Afer listening to the hon. member for Queen's, and reading what the highest military authority we have has to say about us, I am not just as vain of our prancing soldiers as I was a few hours ago. I hope this debate will not go abroad, or, if it does, we may be attacked by some little bantling South American Republic. I do think

that a great deal of money has been expended to no purpose, if what we heard is true. What have we been expending this money for? Has it been really to lay the foundations of a regular army which would be available in case of war, or has it been rather for holiday purposes? Have we been serious in our military administration, from the highest official down to the lowest? I know that the men who drill are ready to do their duty, and I would at once give my voice and vote to what the hon. member for Simcoe has said, that there should be no distinctions. If this country should ever have to fight, which I do not believe it will, the fighting will have to be done by the country boys; there is no doubt about that, they have had to do it at all times. But, situated as we are, I think we shall not be called upon to do very much fighting. I think the day of fighting, on this continent at least, except some petty skirmishes in the South American Republics, has gone by.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Indians?

Mr. FRASER. I think we have plenty of men to look after them now, and if they are treated well by the Government we have not much to fear from them. When we consider the history of the Indians of Canada as compared with that of the United States, I am not afraid of trusting our Indians so long as we treat them well and have an honest administration of Indian affairs. I suppose sometimes it has not been any too honest, but as honest even as we have it, there is no fear of our Indians. The Major-General's report shows that we have been expending money too freely in the past, but I know that the eagle eye of the Minister of War will look after matters so well that it will not be expended so lavishly in the future. Whatever we do let it be permanent, not that everybody can be drilled, but if we are going to spend $1,300,000 every year, let us have something for it that is going to stand for more than a month in case of a brush. Now, I regret that the brave son of Mars who has just sat down has laid aside everything in the way of discipline. Why, discipline, I thought, was the first, the last, the dying duty of the soldier. I do not think he ought to have said what he did, knowing that no English soldier was ever heard to say that such and such did not suit him because it was not comfortable: but his glory has always been his obedience. Even if required to appear in a panoply of steel on a July day, he was bound to appear, because as an English soldier it is a matter of very little importance whether he is comfortable or not, for the first principle of all soldiers is obedience. So far as our militia in Nova Scotia are concerned, I have not heard many complaints. I was prepared to do manful service when I belonged to them, but now that I have passed that age when I cannot be called upon except as a reserve, I do not know so much about the force; but this report would seem to indicate that our money has not been spent as well as it might be in giving us results that would be of immediate benefit. It should be expended so that at a given emergency, not months or years hereafter, but even if a war cloud should burst with the suddenness of a summer shower, we would be ready. I have the greatest possible hope that the Militia Department as it is now managed will bring about such results as will enable us to sleep all the more peacefully, knowing that there is a hand at the helm that will make our men obey orders rather than make them comfortable.

Mr. BOWELL. The discussion to-day has been conducted in a manner that will be profitable to the country as well as to the department. The suggestion first thrown out by the hon. member for Guysborough has a great deal of force in it. There is a constant change of arms in England and in other parts of the world, and it would entail on this country a very heavy expense to be continually changing in the same way. If there were a probability of any difficulties arising that would require a large outlay to secure the best arms possible to place in the hands of our volunteers, I have no doubt the Parliament of Canada would vote it. The hon. member for North Norfolk made a remark which I suppose would suggest itself to any practical mind, that is, that as new improvements are made in arms, we should obtain samples of them in order to test their quality, and to ascertain whether they are fitted for use in this country. That has been done. The latest improvement is that of the Lee-Metford. We have 25 in store marked No. 1. Since the test of that particular arm in England, it has been improved further, and there is now the Lee-Metford No. 2, which has been spoken of very highly by military authorities in England, and we have sent for one or two of them in order to ascertain their quality as compared with the No. 1. So we have not neglected the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. member for Frontenac stated very truly that it would cost a very large amount of money to supply the whole force with that arm, even supposing it were proved to be the best in existence, and one that would likely be continued in the service of the British army. At $20 each this arm for 20,000 men, the number drilled annually, would cost $400,000, plus the expense in bringing the rifles here. Now, if you arm the whole force of about 40,000, that would involve an outlay of nearly $1,000,000.

Mr. CASEY. That includes cavalry and artillery?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, the artillery would also have to be supplied with the best arms, and we would require to have a surplus on hand to replace those which would be injured, as suggested by the hon. member for North Victoria. Then, in another year or two, there would probably be another invention which would supersede the present latest improvement. The distance from Canada to England to-day and the facilities for reaching the English armouries and getting supplies are not so great that we could not afford the delay in getting what we would require, should any difficulties arise, and in the meantime do with what we have. No complaint was made with reference to the arms of our volunteers during the North-West trouble. These arms did good service, but, of course, that is no reason why we should not have a better kind if procurable. I agree with the hon. member for Guysborough when he said he had no fear of the Indians. I interjected the remark, whether he heard it or not, I do not know, that if the Indians are let alone by the agitators, who expect to make money out of difficulties, we need fear no trouble from them, as their treatment by Canada ever since the revolution and since the war of 1812 has been

such that they have no reason to feel otherwise than well disposed towards us.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Convert them into police.

Mr. BOWELL. The time may come when they can be utilized in that way just as well as the Mohawks have been in Ontario and other tribes in Quebec in defencing the country. Should such occasion arise, I hope the Indians will be in such a state that they can be utilized as white men. As far as the appropriations placed at the disposal of the department will permit, I would be only too happy to carry out the suggestions of hon. gentlemen, especially with regard to the issue of free ammunition. That has been already done by my predecessor so far as the Rifle League is concerned, and ought to be carried out to the fullest extent possible consistent with the money at the disposal of the Government. The hon. member for Guysborough answered himself, if it be not paradoxical to say so, for his second speech was a reply to his first. He pointed out that in England a vast amount of money, which might be termed squandered, had been expended in replacing the arms in the hands of the soldiers by others, owing to their deterioration through want of proper care; and it will be easily understood that in a country like Canada, with rural and city battalions extending over 3,000 or 4,000 miles in length, we could scarcely expect, with the small amount given to those who have to take care of the arms, that the utmost care desirable could be taken of them. I notice in the General's report that among the other practical suggestions he has made, this is one. It is not a new suggestion, but one which I remember being made when I was in the force and on that side of the House, and that is some time ago. He says:

"The only system under which proper care can be insured is that now existing in the militia of the United Kingdom where the caretakers are part of the permanent paid staff of the militia regiments and are amenable to military discipline."

If we have what may be termed an armoury sergeant whose duties shall be in certain districts to devote his whole time and attention to constant weekly and monthly inspection of arms, and see that they are properly kept, the deterioration in their value would not be nearly so great as it is. Many of the suggestions made by the General are, to my mind, of the most practical character, and so far as possible I shall endeavour to carry them out. The hon. member for Queen's, when he made his remarks, had not reflected on the fact that in the active force boots and underclothing are not furnished by the department. These corps turn out with such boots as they have, but if they were ordered on regular service, as during the case of the North-West rebellion, the Government would supply them with boots of a heavy, strong character which are or should be kept in stock. I am afraid the hon. gentleman was thinking rather of the regular force where, as in England and other places, there is a standing army, or perhaps the permanent force in Canada to which regulation boots are supplied. I do not know that there are any other points to which I need call the attention of the committee. I can only say that the debate has been of a character that will not be forgotten by myself while at the head of the department, and anything that can be done within the means placed at my disposal to make the volunteers more effective and comfortable, shall be done. The hon. member for Guysborough indulged in a little badinage over the use of the word "comfortable" by the hon. member for North Victoria. I can tell him this, that in my experience on the frontier, where I was four or five months on one occasion in active service, I found that the best possible way to insure discipline on the part of volunteers and make them most effective, was never to forget to look after their comforts and well-being.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is to be regretted that the report of the department was not brought down earlier so that we could have had the opportunity of looking into it before being asked to vote these estimates. This shows the injustice of going on with the estimates before the reports are brought down. However, I am pleased to know that we have a General who has submitted a report of a practical nature. It is certainly an able report, and one which I have no doubt will be of great value to the volunteer force. Any member of this House who has paid any attention to this matter in the past will not be surprised at many of the clauses, when they remember the debates which have taken place on the militia estimates during past sessions and the great deal of advice offered to the then Minister of the department by members on both sides of the House. I hope, now that we have a new Minister of Militia, he will pay some attention and give some consideration to the suggestions which are made by those who take an interest in our volunteer force. I do not at present intend to take up the time by repeating the suggestions which have been made by members who have spoken. I may say, however, that I agree that it is desirable that there should be a change in the arms. The Martini-Henry should be furnished, not as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) has suggested, only to city battalions, but to the rural battalions as well. I believe the volunteers who have taken part at Wimbledon in the past have mostly come from the rural battalions, and it would show a larger proportion for the rural battalions if they had the same opportunities which are given to the battalions in cities. I do not think the department should discriminate between battalions inside or outside of a city. In a city, they have many advantages which rural battalions cannot have. I do not agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Militia as to the appointment of an inspector at a salary to inspect the arms and the clothing of the militia. We have now a good system of inspection, but we have not the proper means of keeping our equipment in proper shape. Attention has been called again and again to the insufficiency of the equipment, and it is not altogether due to the fact that the Minister had not plenty of money at his command to carry out, not possibly radical changes, but enough money to increase the appropriation for the different corps in regard to these matters which we have so frequently brought before the House, but which have not been carried out, not for want of means but for want of administration. In many cases, we have known where articles in connection with the volunteer force were in store at Ottawa and other places when they should have been furnished to the force. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has often pointed out to the Government and to the Minister of Militia how improvements could be made, and he has been

sustained by members of this House. I have felt for a long time that it was useless to make any representation in regard to the militia, as these matters were never considered. I only hope that now, when representations are made, they will receive consideration from the new Minister. I am satisfied that the present appropriation for the militia could suffice to greatly improve the condition of the volunteers to-day in regard to their better equipment, and that they could have many of the comforts which have been spoken of from the appropriation which we now have.

Mr. FRASER. I desire to correct a misapprehension. What I said was that the history of the English army showed that immense sums of money had been spent in purchasing arms which had to be laid aside. That would not apply at all to our expenditures from year to year. A very small portion of the $1,300,000 which we spend on the militia is spent on the purchase of arms. Then, as to the comfort, I did not pretend that soldiers should not have every comfort, but I said that a soldier should not consider the clothing which is most comfortable, but should consider simply what is served to him according to the regulations. I agree with the hon. gentleman that a soldier who is comfortable and well fed will do better in the field than one who is not. It was not in regard to his comfort that I spoke, but simply in regard to the expenditure.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that a soldier should be well fed, well clothed and allowed to grumble as much he likes.

Mr. FRASER. A soldier is not allowed to grumble.

Mr. HUGHES. I am glad the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) agrees with me that it is necessary to have the soldiers comfortable.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would call attention to a very important paragraph in the report of the Major-General, and it is a report that I think we have every reason to be thankful for. It is an able, thorough and fearless report. He calls attention to a matter to which the Government ought to give their attention. It is in reference to the disturbances in Hull. He said :

"The companies employed at Hull included in their ranks numerous employés of the Government departments at Ottawa. These gentlemen have been placed in a most painful dilemma. Had they failed to obey the order summoning them to militia duty they would have been liable to heavy penalties under the Militia Act. Having sacrificed personal comfort to perform their militia duty, they have been deprived, under the Civil Service Act, of their salaries for the days they were absent on that duty."

I do not think that is right. If any employer of labour outside docked the pay of his clerk for the day he was on duty in the militia, there would be an outcry against him, and I think the Government ought to have some provision for these men. Then there has been a great outcry in the force as to not having the whole force drilled each year. On that subject the Major-General says :

"Under the system hitherto followed, no data are available on which to base a trustworthy estimate of the cost incidental to the training of the rural militia, but it is my belief that a considerably larger force could be annually trained than has hitherto been the case, without any increase in the vote for drill and training. I am not prepared at present to recommend any such increase of expenditure. I am satisfied that in the past, the results obtained in the militia training have not been commensurate with the expenditure."

He also says :

"A further cause of considerable unnecessary expense is the manner in which the sites of district camps are annually changed."

I think it is most reprehensible to change the camps from place to place.

An hon. MEMBER. Kingston.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not say that Kingston should be the place, but I think the place should be fixed and there should be some expenditure made which would last and be sufficient for some time. Again, the Major-General says :

"The remarks attached to Appendix F show, in men and miles, the amount of unnecessary transport, besides other disadvantages, involved this year by this practice. A very simple calculation will suffice to show its costliness."

I hope the attention of the Minister of Militia will be given to this, and that he will see that more economy will be effected and a larger number of men will be drilled if a different system is adopted.

Mr. DENISON. I am sorry that these reports are not put into our hands earlier because we have not had an opportunity to read them, and this is the first time that I have seen the report. It appears to me to be an extraordinary thing that any head of a department would take such a course with the men under his charge. It seems to me somewhat similar to the course which was taken in regard to some of our force which turned out on the Niagara frontier in 1866. After they came back, some of their employers objected to the men belonging to the force and, while they took this course after their return, at the time they went they could do nothing too much for them. They loaded up trains with biscuits and other things which they did not want, but afterwards they objected to their belonging to the militia, and how can you expect that ordinary citizens will not object to that when you find the Government of Canada objecting to their employés belonging to the militia force?

Mr. BOWELL. I wish to make a remark or two with reference to the points raised by the hon. member for Frontenac. When my attention was called to the fact that the volunteers who were in the Civil Service, were called out to suppress the difficulties in Hull, had not been paid, I instructed the Deputy to prepare a list in order that I might lay it before my colleagues with a view to placing it in the Supplementary Estimates and asking Parliament to vote it. The complaint of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) is not at all to the point. The heads of the departments in which these volunteers were employed, have no control over that matter. It is an Act of Parliament for which the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is just as much responsible as is the head of the department; that Act makes special provision that the employés in the department, not on the permanent staff, shall not be paid when absent from duty, and it is the Auditor General, who is the officer of this House and not of the Government, who refused to pay it. The heads of departments would willingly have paid it if they had had power to do so under the law. I do not think that the sum amounts to $50 all told, and I have no doubt that this House will readily vote the sum when the estimate is placed before them. In reference to the question of camps, I have given that subject some

little attention, and will consider it further, and then decide whether it would be wise to continue the system which has prevailed in the past, of moving camps to different sections of the country thereby absorbing a large amount of the vote for paying transport of the material and passengers' fare, or whether it would not be better to have stated places in the country at which these camps should meet. I have been looking into the matter and I find that in one camp the expense attending each man was two-thirds of the full amount of the pay of each man; in other words, we drill them 12 days at a cost of $12, and in some cases transport costs as high as 50 per cent, 63⅔ per cent. and even 75 per cent of that sum. I find no fault with any one who has advocated that system in the past. The members of Parliament are more responsible for it than the head of the department. He is constantly importuned—and already in my experience I begin to feel some of the pressure myself—to have the camps moved into all sections of the country, into some corner or other. That is a matter that will receive the attention of the department and of the Government. If it is thought advisable, in order to popularize the force, to spend this extra amount in taking the camps to different sections of the country, why we will continue to do so. If it is thought better that there shall be, as there is in England, regular and stated places in which the volunteers meet to perform their camp drill, we will also endeavour to carry out that system. I may state to those volunteer officers who are present, and to the other hon. members, that at present my opinion is in favour of centralizing these camps as much as possible and to place them in such localities as will minimize, as much as possible, the expenditure that is required to take them from one section of the country to the other. Those who have an acquaintance with the service know very well that once you have a stated place for the camps to meet, grounds are provided that will last from one year to another, and hence it is not necessary to expend the same amount of money as would be needed in a new place where you wished to take the troops.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear from the tone of the remarks of the Minister of Militia that he is attempting to follow out in his new department the course which he followed in his old department, that of attending closely to the business of that department. I feel bound to pay him the compliment, that in his own capacity he understands the business of his department. I think he shows signs of attempting to master this one with equal thoroughness. I am glad to hear what he says about the permanency of camps. I have several reasons for taking an interest in this matter. Last summer a military camp was formed for the first time in St. Thomas, in the county of East Elgin, in which it was then expected and pretty well known, that an election must shortly take place. The formation of that camp involved the expenditure of a lot of money amongst the citizens of St. Thomas, and was one of the chief arguments in favour of my hon. friend who is now the member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram).

Mr. BOWELL. If that will be the effect everywhere, I am afraid you will persuade me against my better judgment.

Mr. CASEY. No, I do not charge my hon. friend with instituting a systematic plan of dragooning voters in this fashion by quartering soldiers upon them. I do not think his policy will result in such an extreme measure, especially after the statements he has made to-day. But this camp was avowedly brought to St. Thomas in the interest of the hon. member for East Elgin. He made capital out of it, and so did his friends. I am glad to see that the General condemns the whole transaction. He says in his note on the St. Thomas camp:

"Grounds wholly unsuitable for a camp. 1,386 officers and men, and 56 horses, besides the whole of the tents, blankets and camp equipment conveyed 40 miles further than was necessary. "I. H.,
"*Maj. Gen.*"

In regard to the camp at Belleville, he remarks:

"No rifle range available with safety.
"I. H.,
"*Maj.-Gen.*"

In regard to the camp at Farnham he states:

"792 officers and men, and 155 horses, carried 55 miles further than was necessary. Tents and camp equipment likewise transported about 60 miles unnecessarily.
"I. H.,
"*Maj.-Gen.*"

But the worst of all is the Rimouski camp:

"698 officers and men, 14 horses and all tents and camp equipment transported 400 miles further than was necessary, from a good site to a bad one. "I. H.,
"*Maj.-Gen.*"

I am glad, as my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Sutherland) has said already, that the General condemns this thing altogether. When the attention of the department is called to this, it should be put straight. A great many of these suggestions might be adopted with profit. I hope, after what has fallen from Minister of Militia and the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) and the member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), that we have seen the last of this system of dragooning, as I may call it, of quartering camps here and there for election purposes. The General's suggestion should be carried out, that permanent accommodation should be provided at the most convenient points for collecting troops in that division, without regard to the political effect. I mean to say that the camps should be permanently fixed there. Now, I regret that I have had only time to skim over this report, but I find that the General urges the same point that has been urged by several hon. members, namely, that the Martini should be substituted for the Snider, and that the substitution should be gradual. The General says:

"The Snider rifle and carbine, with which the militia is armed, is at the best an obsolete weapon, but in the condition in which it exists, in most of the regiments of the active militia, it has no claim whatever to be classed as an arm of precision. A large number are of the earliest mark of converted Enfield rifles."

Which means about 27 or 28 years since they were converted, and no one knows how long they have been in service as muzzle loading Enfields before then.

"For upwards of 20 years their sights and rifling have been completely worn out. It is no exaggeration to say that in many cases the smooth bore musket would be the best arm."

For upwards of 20 years they have been subjected to such usage as they appear to have had in North Victoria. However, I do not think I have ever been in any camp where rifles were laid around on

the grass inside the tents. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) suggests the introduction of a cheap rack to put around the tent pole. When I was a full corporal we got along by standing up our rifles against a tent pole and tying them together with a piece of string; but we did not, at all events, allow them to lie around on the wet grass. The General says in the course of his report :

"A considerable number of Martini-Henry rifles are in store, and it would appear desirable that these should be issued to the permanent corps, and be gradually introduced throughout the militia. The change must necessarily be gradual, since the issue of good arms is useless, without adequate provision for their care. Under the system at present prevailing, it is idle to expect that rifles, issued to the rural militia, can be kept in good order. Even in cities, where good public armouries and paid Government caretakers exist, the condition of the arms is in many cases far from satisfactory, since the caretakers are under no control. The only system under which proper care can be insured, is that now existing in the militia of the United Kingdom, where the caretakers are part of the permanent paid staff of the militia regiment, and are amenable to military discipline. The commanding officer can then be held responsible for the Government property entrusted to his charge."

He then speaks of boots. As I understood the hon. member for North Victoria, his constituents mostly dispense with boots when at home—at all events, the hon. member led the House to understand so. The kind of footwear to which he refers is certainly not likely to wear out. I come now to the question raised by the Minister of Militia. An hon. gentleman suggests that possibly the member for North Victoria may be mistaken in regard to the customary footwear of his constituents, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) will have to settle that question with them when he next meets them.

Mr. HUGHES. My majority was 239.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that only a majority of 239 of his electors go barefoot. It may be that those were the people who voted for him. The Minister of Militia appears favourable to the idea of rearming the volunteers, but he appears to be a little afraid of the expense. I will adopt his own calculation, which is on the basis of the new rifle, the name of which I am completely mixed about, for the member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) calls it the Lee-Burton and the Minister of Militia the Lee-Metford.

Mr. DENISON. They are two different rifles.

Mr. CASEY. At all events, the Minister's calculation was based on the new British rifle. If his estimate is correct, that they can be obtained for $20 each, I am sure the surplus stock of Martinis could be obtained for $10 each. As the General, who is certainly a good judge of a rifle, recommends the Martini as the rifle for the Canadian volunteers, we need have no hesitation about adopting that rifle gradually, as he says, making a yearly appropriation to arm a certain number of battalions annually. This rifle has been tried in actual service for many years, whereas the new rifle has not undergone that test. If we have 40,000 men to arm and we could get new Martinis at $10 each, the total expenditure would be $400,000. But it must be remembered that only part of this expenditure need be borne each year. I would suggest that a whole district could be armed with Martini rifles in one year, or a battalion in each district could be armed, or some other similar plan could be adopted by which the supply might be spread throughout the country. There is the advantage not only that we have a considerable stock of Martinis on hand, but that we have a large supply of ammunition and the machinery on hand to manufacture it. The Minister intimated that while there was no objection to rearming the force it might not be long before another change was made in the arm used in the British army. But I repeat there is no necessity for our following the newest fashion in rifles. This reminds me of what is seen in prosperous farms in Ontario—old-fashioned reaping and mowing machines lying rusting in the barnyard because some newer pattern has come into the market. The Minister said there was no complaint of the Snider in the North-West trouble. He must remember what kind of weapons they were opposing in the North-West. The Snider was opposed for the most part by the old long Hudson Bay musket with flint lock.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. CASEY. That is what was reported.

Mr. BOWELL. A large proportion were Winchester rifles.

Mr. CASEY. I have been shown bullets that Dr. Orton took out of patients during the trouble, round bullets fired from flint-lock muskets. I have seen these muskets with very recent Tower marks on them at Hudson Bay stores in the North-West. They are still manufactured in London for trading with Indians. It is true there were some Winchesters used, but there was a very small supply of them. Piapot's Band possessed a considerable number, but they were not in the rebellion. The Indians and half-breeds were armed with the ordinary smooth-bore shot-gun, and that is the weapon to which the Snider was opposed, and no wonder under those circumstances it came out favourably. But the Snider really did not do much execution against the Indians, for the number of Indians killed was very small in proportion to the amount of firing done. The hon. gentleman reiterated the expression of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), that we need have no fear of the Indians. We have, however, reason to believe, judging from the events of a few years ago, that certain reasons will cause the Indians to arise and fight. An Indian rising may occur again. Even if it were not caused by acts of Government, it might be caused by rough characters on the frontier, who were apt to quarrel with the Indians wherever they find them. The Indians up to the present time have not been driven into a corner by increase of settlement. When population increases as it has done in the western States, and when the Indians are driven into a corner, you do not know what may happen, and it is absolutely essential that our men should be armed with weapons quite as good as those which the Indians can get. We know that the Indian can procure weapons across the frontier, and that no matter what he has to do he can generally find means to provide himself with a Winchester rifle. I consider that the question of free ammunition is one of the most important things for the department to consider. The first thing to teach a soldier in modern times is to be a good shot, and I consider that the issue of free ammunition to the Rifle League is not only a good thing, but that the supply should be increased so that the volunteers could have greater practice at the rifle range. If a man is not really a good shot he is not fit to be a modern soldier.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CASEY. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was speaking on the subject of free ammunition, and the necessity of granting larger supplies of it for the purpose of inducing our volunteers to practice. I referred to the beneficial effects of the Rifle League, and I can quite corroborate all that other members have said in regard to the fact that the issue of free ammunition to the Rifle League contributes much to the practice of sharp shooting. I believe that the Minister now in charge of the Militia Department is inclined to receive friendly suggestions, and I wish to impress very strongly upon him that the quantity of ammunition issued for use in camp is quite insufficient to teach raw recruits anything about rifle shooting. Although they are supposed to receive instructions on shooting in camp, yet the instructions they generally receive is so small that it is hardly discernible, and amounts to nothing more than the "coaching" received from fellow volunteers who have been practising for some time. I must urge again, as I have urged session after session, and I hope now not to such deaf ears as I have hitherto addressed it to; that the first requisite for a soldier in these days is not so much perfection in drill as perfection in shooting. It has been proven time and again since the days of the American revolution that a force of men absolutely untrained in drill, but thoroughly trained in shooting can demoralize a larger force of the best drilled soldiers in the world. The latest example of this was probably during the Boer war in South Africa. The Boers had no drill or training, but they had good rifles, were practised hunters, and they simply stalked and shot down the best British troops that could be sent against them. It is, I fear, quite impossible to look forward in Canada to the creation of any considerable force of highly-drilled soldiers for a long time to come. This House is not prepared to vote, nor would the country sustain us in voting the amount of money required for that. However, we can provide at first a comparatively small force of first-rate shots, and even though they amount to only ten or fifteen thousand men, it would be more effective than our nominal force of 40,000 men. If the Minister can see his way to reducing the nominal force of the militia, not by knocking off old battalions, but by striking so many men from each battalion, and spend the money in securing to them practical and thorough instruction in shooting, with a sufficient supply of ammunition to practice with, we would be in a much better position to resist any enemy then than we are likely to be called upon to face than we are now. Practically the only enemy we may expect to have to face are our own Indians in the North-West or British Columbia. I say that it would be far better to have a small force of volunteers armed with a good rifle and taught to use it, not in the way it is used now in camps, but to shoot with it as men shoot at rifle matches when they are competing for prizes. If we had 10,000 men fit to enter for rifle matches and to shoot for prizes, we should be far better protected against any possible enemy than we are with 40,000 drilled and trained in shooting as they now are. If we could reduce our force to such a size that we could arm it with a first-rate weapon, and make the men good shots, we should be far better off than we are with our present equipment. Then, we are asked to vote $50,000 for ammunition. I find that last year $38,314 was spent on the cartridge factory, and $15,357 on ammunition in general. I also find that last year 100,000 rounds of Snider and Martini-Henry cartridges were sold for $498. Taking that as a standard of the cost of ammunition, this $38,000 spent on the cartridge factory should have produced over 7,500,000 cartridges, whereas I find an account of only 1,500,000 as used during the year; so that there must either be a very large store of unused cartridges on hand, or else this expenditure has not produced as many cartridges as it should have done. Perhaps the Minister will be able to throw some light on that subject. Now, coming back to the report of the Major-General Commanding, I wish to call attention to the first paragraph on allowances, in which he says:

"The system under which allowances are now granted to the rural militia, is open to very serious objections. Allowances are drawn annually for 'drill instruction,' and for 'care of arms,' for which the country receives no real value."

For years past I have annually called the attention of the Government to the fact that this allowance for drill instruction is a perfect farce—that the captains of rural companies have no opportunity whatever of giving instructions to their men, even if capable of doing so, and the $40 has been simply handed over to the regimental fund for other purposes; and if these purposes are thought to be legitimate, the vote should be made under that heading, and not under a false heading. The late Minister of Militia has on several occasions expressed his agreement with me, and promised to reconstruct his estimates accordingly, but I do not find it done. The Major-General goes on to say:

"They are paid to officers who are incapable of imparting instruction, and who are unable to give sufficient attention to the arms under their charge. In the majority of cases. these allowances are looked upon merely in the light of perquisites attaching to the command of a battalion or company."

That I can thoroughly corroborate from my short experience in the volunteers.—

"The fault does not rest with the officers, but with the system, which makes an impracticable demand upon them. Considering the sacrifices made by officers of the rural militia in the performance of their militia duty, it appears absolutely necessary that certain allowances, in addition to the pay of their rank, should be granted to those who exercise the most important functions. Such allowances should, however, be the payment for a distinct value received by the country."

Then he goes on to say that he submits elsewhere the outlines of a scheme for the issue of allowances. After speaking of the allowance for recruiting, he suggests:

"A 'contingent allowance' to captains to meet certain expenses in connection with their companies, which are now unprovided for. This allowance should gradually replace the 'care of arms' allowance. The arms should be drawn by degrees into regimental stores, and placed

under the charge of a permanently paid adjutant and non-commissioned officers, who would form the permanent staff of the regiment."

In this particular I must beg to differ from the General, because, if the arms were all drawn to the battalion headquarters, it would be impossible for members of outlying companies to get rifles for practice except when in camp, and I think it is most important that they should be able to obtain rifles for practice when not in camp. Under our present system they would have only one rifle practice in three years, which is equivalent to nothing at all. I should prefer that the Government would make an allowance sufficient to pay the rent of a small room at headquarters for each company, to contain the armoury of that company, and have them kept there and issued by the authority of the captain to men who wish to attend regular rifle practices. I would urge here again that the privilege of free ammunition given to the Rifle League be extended to the amount of fifty or sixty rounds to all members of rural companies who are willing to attend regular rifle practice under some officer. The question of heavy guns has been dealt with, and I will not say anything about it, more especially as I do not know much about heavy guns; but I should like to have gone through the whole of the General's report and give my opinions upon it, for my own satisfaction, if not for the edification of the House. As the report, however, has only just come down, it is impossible to do that. The discussion of ammunition has taken so wide a scope that what I would have wished to say only after further consideration of the report has to be said now, but I hope that I shall have another opportunity of giving a more connected criticism on the whole system of military practice and a few suggestions based upon the genius of the Canadian people and their peculiar aptitude for certain branches of the military service. The hon. gentleman brought on the estimates the same day that he laid the report on the Table. I do not say that he did this intentionally with the view of thwarting discussion; but such being the case, we should reserve one of the items on the militia estimates in order that we may have further discussion on this subject after we have had time to look into the report.

Mr. McGREGOR. I have always believed it a good thing that we should train our young men in the use of these rifles, and would call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the advantages of having camp exercises in the County of Essex. The hon. gentleman will remember very well when, some twenty or twenty-five years ago, he had the advantage of camping on those grounds. He will remember well the facilities afforded there both as regards health and in every other respect. If a camp is to be given to any portion of Ontario, the western portion has certainly strong claims at present for it. We have three railroads, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific, and the Michigan Central entering our town, and we have besides magnificent water communication with other portions of Canada, so that I think that there is no place in which the Government could hold their camp as cheaply and with as much advantage to the health of the young men as in the County of Essex. It must be remembered that the young men want an outing. It may be said that it costs a little more to move a camp, but it will be an incentive to our young men to attend the camp when they know by so doing they will become acquainted with different places, because always going to the same place is rather monotonous to the boys, who like a little change. In the town of Windsor, we have electric lights, electric roads and so forth, and a most benevolent people who will meet the Government half way.

Mr. CASEY. I find that several officers in this city, the colonel of the 43rd and several officers of the Guards, have been compelled to throw up their commissions, as a condition of their remaining in the Civil Service. Colonel Anderson, Colonel Tilton, Colonel White and others have had to make this option. I am informed now that Major Toller of the Finance Department has just been gazetted in the place of Colonel Todd. There is a glaring inconsistency in certain officers of long standing being compelled to throw up their commissions because they belong to the Civil Service, while another civil servant is promoted to the colonelcy of the Guards. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman's family connections have to do with the matter or not, but it is a strange inconsistency which the Minister ought to explain.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means by family connections. No doubt Mr. Toller is connected with some family.

Mr. CASEY. He is Sir Leonard Tilley's brother-in-law.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that that injures him in any way. Being a married man, he has to be somebody's brother-in-law, if his wife has a brother or sister. The rule laid down by Order in Council is that where civil servants have duties to perform which will interfere with their duties as colonels of battalions, they must choose between the two. That matter is left to the discretion of the head of the department to which the officer is attached. When Colonel White was made Deputy Postmaster General, there was no doubt his whole time would be required in the performance of his duties as such, and that he could not divide that time and perform efficiently the duties of deputy head. The same reasons applied to Colonel Tilton, when asked to retire from the Guards by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and also to Colonel Anderson who had command of the 43rd. Those who know Colonel Anderson know that not only is he a good soldier but that he occupies the position of engineer in the department, which requires his services constantly. During the very time when it might be necessary for him to be attending to the duties of his battalion, he might be required to go to some parts of the Dominion on public business, to superintend the construction of a lighthouse or other important public work. It was deemed by the head of the department that it was in the interest of the service that he should give up his command, and he did so. As to Colonel Todd, he was in the service, but his duties in the Library were not of such a character as required the Government to ask him to retire. He retired entirely of his own accord. Some difficulty arose between that corps and the department in reference to pay, which was claimed contrary to the regulations, for the annual drill of the men. Colonel Todd's retirement occurred without my knowledge; but, when I made enquiry, I found that Major Toller, who had been connected with the corps for many years, had

succeeded to the colonelcy by right of length of service and in the way of promotion. The matter was considered by the head of the department, and, after full consideration, it was decided that, as his labours as comptroller of currency in the Finance Department were not such as to prevent his acceptance of the colonelcy, no objection should be made. The hon. gentleman knows that there are many positions held by chief clerks or deputy heads in connection with which their presence is required in the department every day in the year, and at all times that the office is open, while there are others which do not require the presence of these officials all the time, and that was the case in regard to Colonel Todd and Colonel Toller.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that there was a general rule of the service that officers holding certain positions should not be allowed to take command of a battalion. I understand now, from what the hon. gentleman says, that it is left to the head of the department to decide. Is that the rule adopted?

Mr. BOWELL. There is no general rule in the service. It is left to the head of the department to state whether the particular officer is required at all times or not.

Mr. CASEY. I think there should be a general rule that no officer above a certain grade should be allowed to attend to those duties. I think it would be well that no member of the Civil Service should be connected with the volunteer force. Not only is he taken away from his duty to attend parades and drills and matters of that kind, but, if the force were ever really needed for warlike purposes, that is the time when we would require all the civil servants to be here in Ottawa to look after the business of the country. I would be sorry to miss from the volunteer force many members of the Civil Service who have been excellent officers and excellent shots, and I do not mean to say that Major Toller is inefficient for the position of colonel of the Guards, if he can be spared from the position he occupies in the Civil Service. Of course, a good deal of the work is done after office hours, and if one colonel is to be retired because he is is a civil servant, it is very inconsistent that another civil servant should be appointed to succeed him. I am afraid this will create dissension amongst the volunteers, and good feeling amongst them is as necessary as the good comfort and the good food to which the Minister referred earlier in the debate.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that 290 tons of coal are charged for the cartridge factory at $6 a ton, with so much for duty. Is this American coal?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know. All the coal was purchased by tender. I do not know whether it is American or Scotch coal.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it American coal or Scotch coal? There is $196 duty paid, and we would like to know whether it is coal from Nova Scotia or coal from the United States?

Mr. BOWELL. Does not the hon. gentleman think that question a little captious? If it were Canadian or Nova Scotia coal, certainly the duty would not be referred to. It must be either English or American coal.

Mr. FORBES. Where is this coal delivered?

Mr. BOWELL. In Quebec for the use of the cartridge factory.

Mr. FORBES. Then it is not Nova Scotia coal?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly not, if subject to duty.

Mr. FORBES. Why is it that the department does not use Nova Scotia coal?

Mr. BOWELL. Since I have been at the head of that department I have always instructed the deputy to accept the lowest tender.

Mr. FORBES. Then I am to presume that American coal, with the duty, costs less than Nova Scotia coal?

Mr. BOWELL. You may presume what you like.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have been struck with the difference of opinion which prevails between those who are familiar or supposed to be familiar with the working of the militia force. One hon. gentleman wants the militia to be supplied with the best weapons that can be purchased to-day, regardless of expense, even going so far as to advise the Minister to spend $1,000,000 on the purchase of these arms. Then others appear to think that the discarded arms of the British army might be supplied to our men. I have always taken the stand that we spend too much money on the militia force. We have been spending for a number of years past from $1,250,000 to $1,500,000 upon the militia force of this Dominion. We would not object, perhaps, to that expenditure if it was a benefit to the people, if our force was in good training and in good condition, but when we find, as we find to-day by the report of the Major-General which is now before us, that it has been a miserable failure, that our force is in nearly every particular a disgrace to the country, and that money has been wasted by hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly, it is time for this Parliament to step in and consider well if some means cannot be devised by which this enormous expenditure can be curtailed and made productive of better results. We have only to take up the report of the Major-General to find the confirmation of everything I have said. He points out that so far as the training is concerned, it is very inferior, that the city militia acquire the forms of drill but have no means of learning their practical application. He says that in every particular the rural corps are imperfect and their organization is still more defective. Now, that is the opinion of the Major-General who has thoroughly investigated the force, and has come to that conclusion. I think it is most lamentable that after the enormous expenditure that has been made on our militia force, the Major-General is compelled to report such a statement as that. Then he speaks about allowances:

"Allowances are drawn annually for drill instruction, and for care of arms, for which the country receives no real value."

Just mark that—

"They are paid to officers who are incapable of imparting instruction, and who are unable to give sufficient attention to the arms under their charge."

Is not that most disgraceful that from year to year we have been allowing a state of affairs to go on such as he has reported to this House? Then he speaks about the arms, equipments and clothing, and denounces them in equally strong terms:

"The Snider rifle and carbine, with which the militia is armed, is at the best an obsolete weapon, but in the condition in which it exists in most of the regiments of the active militia, it has no claim whatever to be classed as an arm of precision."

Then he goes on to say:

"The equipments in use in the active militia is also obsolete in pattern and a large proportion perished from age and severe usage. There is not a battalion that could turn out in complete marching order on a given day, though many have, at their own expense, provided some of the most necessary articles. Moreover, the equipment does not exist in store which it would be necessary to issue in the event of grave emergency. I have not inspected a single battalion in which the men's boots would have stood one month's active service, or a regiment of cavalry or battery of artillery in which the saddlery and harness could be expected to bear a similar strain."

Now, it is simply outrageous that after we have been spending so much money for a number of years past, the Major-General should be compelled to report to this House a state of affairs such as here exists. It shows what I have often thought that much of this money is simply wasted and squandered. Then he speaks about barracks. I wish to call particular attention to what he says on this point. He speaks about the barracks at Kingston:

"Tête de Pont barracks at Kingston, owing to their site, are extremely unhealthy, typhoid fever and diphtheria being of frequent occurrence there."

Is it possible that we have had officers and men at the head of our militia force who have allowed such a state of affairs as this to exist for so long a time? I am surprised that the colonels, and the majors, and the captains who are so ready to strut around in their regimentals and feathers, have not proclaimed in this House, long before this, that such a state of things existed. The General condemns the force and its management in very disparaging terms. I think that when we receive such a report from a high commanding officer, one who has given personal attention to these matters, it is high time that we should look carefully to see if something cannot be done. Now, for my own part, although I do not belong to the militia——

An hon. MEMBER. This is very evident.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Still I am bound to say that the little knowledge I have leads me to believe that the administration of that department has not been what it ought to be. I believe that if we desire to have a militia force in this Dominion, it should be a force that would be available in case of emergency. But to-day, according to the statements of the Major-General, there is not a single battalion that is available in case of emergency. Is that what we desire in this country? Is that what we have been spending our millions for many long years to accomplish? Certainly not. Now, one great difficulty with our force is this, that men are taken out to drill for ten or twelve days every two years, I believe it is; young men are taken away from their business and have to go to camp, and they only get 50 cents a day.

Mr. PRIOR. That is big pay.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It may be big pay for you, but it is not for many men in this country. Some men would be very dear at that price, while others would be very cheap. I know as a fact that the 24th Battalion, about which I know something, find very great difficulty in filling out their ranks when they go to camp; I mean that in many cases when the battalion is ready to go out, it is found that many of the men have gone away and others are in situations and places which it is difficult for them to leave. Besides, a great many of them are poor men, mechanics and labourers, that cannot afford to go away and spend their time for the pittance they get. Now I think that in order to make this an efficient force we should increase the pay of those men who go out to drill, we should drill them at least every year, drill a smaller number and give a reasonable amount, so that they can afford to go to drill. We had better have 10,000 or 20,000 active men in this country who would be available in case of an emergency, than to have, as we have to-day on the pay-roll, 40,000 men that are, according to the report of the Major-General, very inefficient and unable to be used in case of emergency. I think that a great deal too much money is spent on the staff: the officers gobble up the greater proportion of this appropriation. If you look through the accounts you will find that a large proportion of this money has been spent on the staff and too little upon the men. In case of an emergency, the men upon whom we have to depend should be thoroughly drilled and made efficient in the arts of war. I think that if a proper system were inaugurated, with one-half the money we are spending to-day, we might have a more efficient force than we have at the present time.

Mr. DENISON. I am sure it must be painful to members of the House to hear an hon. member get up and adress the House in the manner in which the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) had just done. We expect that when a member gets up to address the House he knows something about what he is talking, but the hon. gentleman is entirely deficient of any knowledge of the question concerning which he ventures to teach the Government. If he would devote himself to something that he understood, it would be much better for the House and save the time of the members. The hon. gentleman told us he did not know anything about the subject. It was quite unnecessary to tell us that fact, because it was evident to every member of the House. The hon. gentleman drew a picture of the state of the militia from the report of the General. He seems to forget that the General is here for the purpose of criticising the militia, for the purpose of finding out anything that is wrong with a view to having it set right, and his report is a very good one. But the General comes from England where he has been accustomed to regular troops who are under arms 365 days in the year, and it is unnecessary to point out that our men who put in 12 days during the year cannot be supposed to be so well trained as men who drill every day during twelve months.

Mr. EDGAR. They have good boots.

Mr. DENISON. The boots are supplied by the men, and the Militia Department is not responsible for them. If they are bad, it is because the men cannot afford to pay for better ones The hon. gentleman went on to say that with all this expenditure there was not a battalion in the country prepared to go out. Surely his memory is not so short that he cannot remember 1885, when regiment after regiment was prepared to turn out in 24 hours. The idea of telling this House that not two battalions were ready to turn out is absurd, and I am surprised that any hon. gentleman should rise in this House and talk in that fashion. As an old

member of the force it certainly irritates me, as no doubt it does every true Canadian in the country, to hear any member rise and abuse the militia in that way. I wonder whether the hon. gentleman has a battalion in his own county: if so, I should like to have their opinion of his speech, because, naturally, one would suppose he obtained his opinion of the force from the members themselves, and it must be from the battalion in his own county that he formed his opinion of the militia. If there is any man from whom we might expect an assault on the militia it is the hon. member who last spoke, because in that quarter of the country recently there was held an annexation meeting. I hope when the hon. gentleman next addresses the House he will talk about something he understands.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), that the expenditure on the militia force is probably larger than this young country can maintain, and that it might be greatly reduced. Of course, in discussing this matter, we cannot bring to bear on the subject all the military knowledge, skill and valour possessed by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), but still we are here as practical men to discuss this expenditure, and I fancy there is evidence that this expenditure is not always genuine. I have personal knowledge of the manner companies are made up for camp, and I have evidence in my own locality that during the year members gradually drop out of the companies. Just before camp, however, all the boys possible are induced to go there, in order to obtain the desired numbers, and they go out to have a good time. Afterwards their duties are neglected and the companies fall away, but whenever they go out to camp the ranks are filled by young men who go out for a holiday and to have a "high old time." I do not believe the Canadian system of maintaining our militia is one which is in the interests of the country, and the expenditure is altogether too large, and might well be reduced. I have been led to make these remarks from the fact that some time ago documents were placed in my hands from Toronto attacking this expenditure. The expenditure is large, but if it were all legitimately expended there might be some defence for it. I have here the sworn declaration of a number of men residing in Toronto, which I will read to this committee, and show that in many instances the money voted by Parliament is not honestly expended in advancing militia interests, and in promoting the interests of the force in this country. I will read one or two of these affidavits. The first one was sworn to in Toronto on the 5th January, 1892, and is as follows:—

"County of York, } In the matter of the Governor
"To wit: } General's Body Guard.

"I, Charles Black, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, do solemnly declare, that I was an enlisted member of the Governor General's Body Guard, commanded by Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison, and that in the year 1887 I was present in the annual camp of the said Governor General's Body Guard in said year, as such and then held the rank and did the duty of farrier sergeant in said year.

"2. That I also did the duty of Veterinary Surgeon in said year, in said Governor General's Body Guard.

"3. That no veterinary surgeon was in said camp of said Governor General's Body Guard in said year.

"4. That I was ordered to sign four (4) blank pay-sheets, two (2) being smaller ones in said camp in said year, said order being given by and said blank pay-sheets, four being signed by me in the presence of Capt. Clarence Denison.

"5. That I was present in said camp of said year as a dismounted man.

"6. That I had no horse in said camp in said year, but was ordered to, and did ride a horse on marching out parade in said year, during said camp.

"7. That I did not attend any drill parade, except the aforesaid marching out parade during the said camp in said year.

"8. That I only received farrier sergeant's pay ($7.20 or thereabouts).

"9. That I received no pay for the veterinary surgeon's duty performed by me during said camp in said year.

"10. That I received no pay for a horse.

"11. That I now believe that the aforesaid two (2) small blank pay-sheets were officers' pay-sheets and that I had, through them being blank, been unwittingly induced to sign as veterinary surgeon and for a veterinary surgeon's pay.

"12. That I now believe and that through having been ordered to ride aforesaid horse on marching out parade and also through the pay-sheets being blank that I have been unwittingly induced to sign for horse allowance ($12) during said camp in said year.

"13. That the aforesaid Governor General's Body Guard during said camp in said year were under the command of Lieut. Col. Fred. C. Denison.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of 'the Act respecting voluntary and extra-judicial oaths.'

(Sgd.) "C. BLACK.

"Declared before me at the city of Toronto, in the County of York, this 5th day of January, 1892,

(Sgd.) "R. A. MONTGOMERY.
"*A Commissioner, &c.*"

Here is another one:

"County of York, } In the matter of the Governor
"To Wit: } General's Body Guard.

"I, Charles Black, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, do solemnly declare, that I served as a trooper in the Governor General's Body Guard, commanded by Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison, during the North-West Rebellion.

"2. That at Humboldt then the veterinary surgeon to said Governor General's Body Guard, being discharged from said Governor General's Body Guard, I was promoted to the rank of farrier sergeant and that I did do duty as such and as veterinary surgeon in said Governor General's Body Guard, from Humboldt until said Governor General's Body Guard was disbanded at Toronto.

"3. That I received pay as a trooper up to and as far as Humbolt, and pay as farrier sergeant from aforesaid promotion till aforesaid disbandment at Toronto of aforesaid Governor General's Body Guard.

"4. That I signed duplicate blank pay sheets (two) in two places after aforesaid promotion and that I now believe that through the pay sheets being blank that I had been unwittingly induced to sign for a veterinary surgeon's pay.

"5. That I received no such veterinary surgeon's pay, but did do such duty.

"6. That I received a cheque to the amount of $13 or thereabouts for the use of by me in my position as veterinary surgeon and farrier sergeant of private veterinary instruments and shoeing tools and also for horse medicine found by me for use in the said Governor General's Body Guard, said cheque being received from Ottawa and receipt for such cheque being handed by me to Capt. Clarence Denison of said Governor General's Body Guard at Toronto, in said year 1888.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the 'Act respecting voluntary and extra-judical oaths.'

(Sgd.) "C. BLACK.

"Sworn before me at the city of Toronto, in the County of York, this 5th day of January, 1892.

(Sgd.) "R. A. MONTGOMERY,
"*A Commissioner, &c.*"

"Dominion of Canada. }
"Province of Ontario, } In the matter of the Governor
"County of York, } General's Body Guard.
"To Wit: }

"I, James Slater, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, and Province of Ontario, do solemnly declare that

"1. Harry Beale stated to me that he and his son, J. H. Beale, were employed as grooms by Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison and Lieut. Browning, G. G. B. G., during the annual camp of said G. G. B. G. in the year 1888, and that they were ordered to and did sign two papers which they were afterwards informed were two blank pay sheets that they were also ordered to and did attend a parade which they afterwards learned was muster parade for pay of said G. G.B. G., said G. G. B. G. being under the command of Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison. Said Harry Beale also informed me that he and his said son had never been in possession of arms or clothing, nor did they attend any drill parade, and if they are shown on the parliamentary blue-book for the said year as having been drilled during said camp such statemants are false and misleading as they were not enlisted in said G. G. B. G., but were civilians when they were ordered to do and did do as above.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the 'Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.'

(Sgd.) "JAMES SLATER.

"Declared before me, at the city of Toronto, in the County of York, this eighth day of January, 1892.

(Sgd.) "W. H. IRVING,
"*A Commissioner, &c.*"

"Dominion of Canada, "County of York, "To Wit: } In the matter of the Governor General's Body Guard.

"I, James Slater, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, do solemnly declare that on and between Saturday, the 26th day of September, 1891, and Saturday, the 3rd October, 1891, that to my knowledge the Government of the Dominion of Canada have been defrauded of certain moneys through the false muster of one R. M. Melville and one John Hardy, in the Governor General's Body Guard, Canadian Militia, said G. G. B. G. being under the command of and mustered by one George Taylor Denison, a Lieutenant-Colonel, Canadian militia, and said two men, R. M. Melville and John Hardy, being residents of the city of Toronto.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the 'Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.'

(Sgd.) "JAMES SLATER.

"Declared before me, at the city of Toronto, in the County of York, this 30th day of October, A.D. 1891.

(Sgd.) "W. H. IRVING,
"*A Com'r, &c., in H.C.J.*"

"Dominion of Canada, Province of Ontario, County of York, "To wit: } In the matter of the Governor General's Body Guard.

"I, William Fenwick, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, porter, do solemnly declare that:

"1. I served three years in the Governor General's Body Guard under the command of Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison.

"2. About the year 1888, Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison, Governor General's Body Guard, deducted a sum of money, I think it was $5, from my camp pay of that year, telling me it was for a deficit in connection with a ball given by the Governor General's Body Guard for the benefit of the proposed monument of the men who fell during the North-West rebellion, as the proceeds were to go to said monument after expenses were paid in connection with said ball.

"3. When I objected to above deduction, Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison refused to listen to me.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the 'Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.'

(Sgd.) "WILLIAM FENWICK."

"Dominion of Canada, "Province of Ontario, "County of York, "To Wit: } In the matter of the Governor General's Body Guard.

"I, Benjamin Marshman, of the city of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, County of York, do solemnly declare that, in the year 1887, I was employed by Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison, Governor General's Body Guard, and Capt. Clarence Denison, G.G.B.G., as a groom during the annual camp of the said G.G.B.G., under command of Lieut-Col. George Taylor Denison. During said annual camp I was ordered by said Capt. Clarence Denison to sign two papers, which I have since been informed were two blank pay-sheets, and I was also ordered to answer my name on a parade, which I have since been informed was muster parade for pay. I was not enlisted in said G.G.B.G., or was I in possession of arms or clothing, or did I attend any drill parade, or had I any intention of enlisting in said G. G.B.G., as I am over 64 years of age.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the 'Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.'

(Sgd.) "B. MARSHMAN.

"Declared before me at the city of Toronto, in the County of York, this eighth day of December in the year of our Lord 1891.

(Sgd.) "W. J. FLEURY,
"*A Commissioner, &c.*"

"In the matter of the Governor General's Body Guard.

"I, Matthew Bryan, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, stationary engineer, do solemnly declare that:

"1. I was for over six years a member of the Governor General's Body Guard, commanded by Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison.

"2. On several occasions I was presented with a blank pay-sheet and asked by Major Dunn to sign the same, not knowing what I was signing. The usual way for a soldier to receive his pay, is to have a proper pay-sheet submitted to him showing the exact amount due him.

"3. In the year 1885, I went as a dismounted man with the Governor General's Body Guard to the North-West during the rebellion there, my pay as such was fifty cents per day: at Humboldt, I came across a pay-sheet of 'B' Troop, Governor General's Body Guard, on which I saw a horse shown against my name, for which the Government allowed $1 per day. I received no such pay, nor did I ride said horse shown against my name until my return to Toronto.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the 'Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.'

(Sgd.) "MATTHEW BRYAN.

"Declared before me at the city of Toronto, in the County of York, this 27th day of November, A.D. 1891.

(Sgd.) "W. H. WALBRIDGE.
"*A Commissioner, &c.*"

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no remarks to add to these affidavits. The charges made there are of a very serious character, and I trust the Militia Department will see that a proper investigation is made into them; and if they are founded on fact, as I believe they are, the affidavits all being sworn to, I think that the gentlemen who have been guilty of this transaction have shown that they are not fit men to hold office in the militia of this country.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair that the hon. gentleman from Brant (Mr. Somerville) should have heard me a little sooner, when I attempted to speak while he was reading those statements, because I was going to suggest to him before he read these affidavits, which are entirely untrue, that he might have gone to the Militia Department, and he would have seen further that the whole thing is a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end, so that he might have saved himself the trouble of reading these papers. However, as he has read them, I think it is only proper that I should explain to the House, so that it may appear in *Hansard* how this matter stands. In 1885, a man named Slater joined the Governor General's Body Guard. His time was out in 1888, when I ordered him to bring in his arms and accoutrements. He refused to do so, and I immediately wrote to him that by the law and the regulations of the department he must bring them in. He still refused. I then wrote him another letter informing him that if he did not bring them in at

once I would proceed under the Militia Act and he would be fined, as I must do my duty as an officer of the force. He still persisted in keeping the arms, and I went to the assistant police magistrate and had him summoned for holding Her Majesty's arms in his possession. He was brought before the magistrate. He still refused to give up his arms. I told the magistrate that if he would give them up, I would not proceed any further, and that would be an end of the matter; but he still refused, and the magistrate imposed on him a fine or imprisonment in gaol for thirty days, which term he served. This man Slater is a drunken old soldier, who when on a spree imagines all sorts of things, and says and does all sorts of things. For instance, he has reported me; he has reported the postmaster of Toronto to the Postmaster General, stating that I caused letters to be interfered with by the letter carriers. He has reported the lawyer who appeared for him in the case in which I had him fined, reported him to the Law Society, asking them to disrobe him because he had given up his case or sold it to me. He has reported nearly everybody he could get near, one after another. He has reported me not only here, but to the Horse Guards in England. I believe he has gone to England and there pressed his case and come back again. I think he reported the General. I do not know anybody with whom he has come in contact, that he has not reported.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He has reported me.

Mr. DENISON. Yes, he reported the Minister to the Governor General. He has gone about since 1888, when I did what I considered my duty, trying to raise trouble and giving me all the annoyance he possibly could. He has gone around and got men to make these declarations which have been read by the hon. member for North Brant to-night. The man Black imagines that he signed two pay-sheets. What he signed was a pay-sheet and a service roll, which are two different things; and instead of drawing pay as a veterinary surgeon, he drew the pay of a farrier sergeant. If the hon. gentleman had gone to the department he would have found that instead of our corps having drawn for the pay of ten officers, we only drew for the pay of nine officers, and that only nine officers drew pay. The whole thing is a tissue of falsehoods. It is not congenial to me to be called a forger and a thief, which is practically the charge which the hon. gentleman makes against me. Before making a charge like that on his responsibility as a member of the House, the hon. gentleman should have had decency enough and respect enough for himself as a member of Parliament, to have gone to the Militia Department and satisfied himself as to the facts. I would have thought that a man occupying the position of a member of this House would have had some ideas of decency and honour and some respect for the feelings of other people, instead of getting up and reading in this House the false statements of a man who is only a drunken loafer, and by his action in this House he sends these statements broadcast throughout Canada as the truth.

An hon. MEMBER. That is what he wanted.

Mr. DENISON. Yes, that is what he wanted. That is a part of the policy of slander which hon. gentlemen opposite are carrying out. I will bring this matter up again unless the hon. gentleman goes to Colonel Powell and finds out the truth, and then comes back here like a man and apologizes for making this charge against me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. These papers were sent to me only a few weeks ago.

Mr. DENISON. They were mostly published last year, and sent broadcast to the members of this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Some of these affidavits were made in January, 1892, and they are not all made by this man Slater. He only made one of them; and does the hon. member for West Toronto mean to say that all these men are drunken loafers, as he declares this man Slater to be?

Mr. DENISON. If you go to the department you can satisfy yourself.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If these men are not all drunken loafers, but respectable men, as they appear to be, their testimony is entitled to receive as much credence in this House as it would in any court. The hon. member has not attempted to answer these affidavits. He has set up the defence that this man is a drunken loafer.

Mr. DENISON. I said they were false.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We have had that answer in this House before. Charges made against members of this House and Ministers of the Crown have been declared to be false, and afterwards when evidence has been produced there has been shown to be some truth in them. I do not think the hon. member for West Toronto has a right to make any such charge against me as he has, because I had no intention of making use of these papers at all until to-night when this discussion arose on the militia estimates; and when I saw the hon. gentleman rise and talk in such a military style about the way in which the militia of this country was managed, I thought it was about time that I should produce these sworn declarations which I had in my possession, and which must have some truth in them or they would not be sworn to. It is true, I have not the originals in my possession; I have copies; but the originals are in the possession of a law firm in Toronto, and can be had. The hon. member for Toronto does not declare that all the men who signed these affidavits are drunken loafers and unworthy of credence. Is Matthew Bryan a drunken loafer?

Mr. DENISON. What does he charge me with?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am not going to read it over again. Are B. Marshman, Fenwick and C. Black drunken loafers? I fancy there must be something in this matter; and now that the hon. member for West Toronto has referred to the fact that he had this man fined in Toronto and sent to prison for not returning his arms, I will read Slater's declaration in regard to that, so that he may be heard here as well as the hon. member for Toronto:

"County of York } In the matter of the Governor Gen-
"To wit: } eral's Body Guard.

"I, James Slater, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, Esquire, do solemnly declare that I enlisted in said G. G. B. G. commanded by Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison, on or about the 14th of September, 1885.

"2. That I received my certificate of discharge from said G. G. B. G. on or about the 17th July, 1891, said discharge purporting to have been signed by said Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison on the 27th of September, 1888, the object of such being to debar me from the protection as given to me in 44 and 45 Vic., chap. 58, sec. 43.

"3. That on or about the 6th of August, 1888, I forwarded a letter through Lieut.-Col. Otter, D. A. G. of this Military District (No. 2), to said Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison in compliance with aforesaid statute and drawing his attention to the misapplication of certain Government money drawn through the military paymaster of this District (No. 2) by said G. G. B. G.

"4. That on or about the 17th September, 1883, I received a letter from Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison, of said G. G. B. G., said letter containing an order to return my arms, clothing and equipment into store, and further that I on or about the 26th of September, 1888, received another similar letter with similar order, and which latter letter was an intimation from aforesaid Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison of said G. G. B. G., that he would prosecute me if I did not comply with his order: the aforesaid orders and intimation of intended prosecution been given with the intention of by said orders prohibiting an investigation as laid down in aforesaid statute (44 and 45 Vic., chap. 58, sec. 43) into aforesaid misapplication of Government money.

"5. That on or about the 6th of August, 1888, I forwarded two letters through aforesaid Lieut. Col. Otter to aforesaid Lieut. Col.-George Taylor Denison of said G. G. B. G. drawing his attention as commanding officer of said G. G. B. G. to certain frauds in connection with the administration of said G. G. B. G. and that by such means money was fraudulently obtained from the Government by said G. G. B. G.

"6. That on or about the 2nd of October, 1888, I received a summons, said summons charging me with and being sworn to by aforesaid Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison, that I did refuse to deliver up certain arms, clothing and equipment when lawfully required so to do, said arms, clothing and equipment being the property of the Crown, and that the object of the said summons was to prevent an investigation as laid down in aforesaid statute (44 and 45 Vic., Chap. 58, Sec. 43) into aforesaid misapplication of Government money and into aforesaid frauds in connection with said G. G. B. G.

"7. That I was tried, convicted and imprisoned for thirty days in the common gaol at Toronto, said conviction and imprisonment being on an illegal prosecution (R.S.C. 49 Vic., Chap 41, Sec. 115) on a false charge and on a perjured oath, said conviction and commitment being signed by one John Baxter, a justice of the peace of the city of Toronto and that said conviction and imprisonment was a further attempt to suppress an investigation into aforesaid misapplication of the fraudulent obtaining of Government money by aforesaid G.G.B.G.

"8. That while I was in the common gaol of Toronto, I received a letter dated 22nd October, 1888, said letter being written and signed by George Taylor Denison, Lieut.-Colonel commanding said G.G.B.G., and in which letter the following words appear, viz.: 'as it is not apparent that escorts have been supplied at the expense of the Dominion on the occasion of the opening and closing of Parliament at Toronto for many years,' said words being written with the intention of preventing an investigation into aforesaid misapplication of the fraudulent obtaining of Government money by aforesaid G.G.B.G.

"9. That on the 15th of July, 1885 (or thereabouts), I received an order from Mr. Cartwright, Deputy Attorney General of Ontario, at the office of the Attorney General in Toronto, to submit an information to and for a warrant and to and for the arrest of the aforesaid Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison, of said G.G.B.G., for the signature of aforesaid John Baxter, as a justice of the peace.

"10. That I did, on or about the aforesaid date submit said information, warrant and certain statutory declarations to substantiate said charges of perjury to aforesaid John Baxter, J.P.

"11. That the aforesaid John Baxter, J.P., did refuse to look at aforesaid statutory declarations.

"12. That the aforesaid John Baxter, J.P., did refuse to look at aforesaid information and warrant.

"13. That the aforesaid John Baxter, J.P., did refuse to obey Mr. Cartwright's order or to take any order from him.

"14. That the aforesaid John Baxter, J.P., did refuse to sign aforesaid information and warrant.

"15. That the aforesaid refusal was an attempt to prevent an investigation as laid down in 44 and 45 Vic., Chap. 58, Sec. 43, into aforesaid misapplication of, and the fraudulently obtaining of Government money in connection with the administration of the aforesaid G. G. B. G., commanded by aforesaid George Taylor Denison, a Lieutenant-Colonel in the Canadian militia."

Now there is another declaration here:

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

"DECLARATION OF GEORGE MCINERNEY, OF THE CITY OF TORONTO, ONT.

"TORONTO, ONT., 3rd June, 1889.

"I, George McInerney, do make the following solemn declaration before a justice of the peace at Toronto, Ontario, and I am prepared to do so in any court of justice, viz.:

"I was present at the police court of the above city on the 13th of October, 1888, when Sergeant Instructor James Slater, of the Governor General's Body Guard, was tried on a charge of a breach of the Militia Act, in refusing to deliver up certain arms, accoutrement and clothing when lawfully required to do so, the prosecutor, Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison, G. G. B. G., made use of the following expression when the said Sergeant Instructor J. Slater was put on his defence, viz.: This man claims I owe him some money. I object to him making any statement in this court that does not bear directly on this case. In fact I consider that Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison did all in his power to prevent the said Sergt. Inst. J. Slater from making any defence, and the presiding justice (Ald. Baxter) allowed such objection to stand good by refusing to look at some papers that Sergt. Inst. J. Slater asked to be allowed to show him as a part of his defence, in fact he gave him no chance of making any defence, but found him guilty on the unsupported evidence of Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison, directly he (Ald. Baxter) refused to look at Sergt. Inst. J. Slater's papers for his defence.

"His, Sergt. Inst. J. Slater's, was a remanded case, which, in the ordinary course of justice, would be the first to be called in court, instead of which the court was adjourned, and when it reassembled, he was the only person to be tried, in fact, in my opinion, everything had been done to prevent the attention of the general public from being drawn to Sergt. Inst. J. Slater's trial, so when his trial commenced there was present in court only two other spectators in addition to myself, and there was not a reporter present connected with any local newspaper; in fact, I consider it nearly equivalent to a trial with closed doors. The following remark was also made use of by Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison during Sergt. Inst. J. Slater's trial, which speaks for itself, viz.: 'This man is not responsible for his actions.' And then Ald. Baxter convicts a man whom the prosecutor states, while on his oath, is not responsible for his actions.

"W. BURNS, "G. MCINERNEY.
"*Justice of the Peace.*"

Here is another affidavit:

"County of York } In the matter of James Slater's claim
"To wit: } against Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison.

"I, Harry J. C. Byrne, of the Village of Midland of Midland City, in the County of Simcoe, metal roofer, do solemnly declare that I am well and personally acquainted with James Slater, formerly drill instructor to the Governor General's Body Guards, and am cognizant with the facts relating to his case. In the month of September, 1888, I was employed on the 27th day of September in cleaning the saddles of Col. F. C. Denison's troop, the Body Guard. On that date the said James Slater came to the armoury of the above troop and told me that he had received an order from the said Colonel Denison to return his equipment into store, and he offered to do so, but I refused to receive the same or take them in, as I said I was not paid for that kind of work. On the 29th of September next following, Col. F. C. Denison paid me for the work I had done in his armoury, and on that date I told him of my intention to leave the city on that day or on Monday, the 1st of October, and I actually left on the latter date, and have not been in the city of Toronto from that date until the 7th day of September instant. At the time I left the keys at Colonel Denison's office, I left word that I had not taken Slater's equipment with the boy who was the only person in the office.

"And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the 'Act respecting extra-judicial oaths.'

"H. J. C. BYRNE.

"Declared before me at the city of Toronto, in the County of York, this 9th day of September, A.D. 1889.
"H. H. DEWART,
"*A Commissioner and Notary Public.*"

"DECLARATION BY SERGEANT EDWARD ROCHE, OF THE TORONTO FIELD BATTERY.

"TORONTO, ONT., 13th April, 1889.

"I, Edward Roche, sergeant in the Toronto Field Battery, do make the following solemn declaration before a

justice of the peace, and I am prepared to do so on oath in any court, if required, viz.:

"1. Sergeant Edward Roche and Trumpeter Harry Byrne, G.G.B.G., were employed on the 27th September, 1888, cleaning the saddles, &c., belonging to Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison's troop, G.G.B.G. On that date (27th September, 1888), Sergeant Instructor James Slater, G.G. B.G., came to Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison's armoury and told us (E. Roche and H. Byrne) that he (Sergeant J. Slater) had received an order from Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison to return his (Sergeant Instructor J. Slater's) equipment and clothing into store, and he (Sergeant Instructor J. Slater) proffered to do so, and we (E. Roche and H. Byrne) refused to take them (J. Slater's equipment, &c.) into store, saying we (E. Roche and H. Byrne) were not Lieut.-Col. E. C. Denison's caretakers and were not paid for that kind of work, but only for cleaning his (Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison's) saddles; we (E. Roche and H. Byrne) were paid for our work by Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison) on the 29th September, 1888, and on that date (29th Sept., 1888) we (E. Roche and H. Byrne) told Lieut.-Col. F. C. Denison of our intention of leaving Toronto on that day (29th Sept., 1888) or on the following Monday (1st October, 1888) and we did leave Toronto on the 1st October, 1888.

"E. ROCHE.
"*Sergeant, Toronto Field Battery.*

"JOHN WANLESS, *J.P.*"

Now, if these affidavits are true, and they bear evidence of their truth on their face, because it cannot be supposed that six or eight men would go before magistrates and swear to assertions that were false, it is apparent that this man Slater had something tantamount to injustice done to him. It appears that he went to the headquarters of this troop and wanted to give up his equipment, but they refused to accept it, and he was afterwards arrested and fined $20, and, because he was a poor man, he was sent to goal for a month. I say it is necessary that this investigation should be carried further, and that the Militia Department should see whether any injustice has been done to this man and whether the other affidavits which I have read are correct or not. They are sworn to and we are bound to accept such evidence unless we have some evidence to the contrary. I am not a military man, but I suppose this is the proper place to bring this matter up. I do not want to go to the department and to be snubbed by the officers of that department. This is the proper place to bring this charge, and this is the place where the charge ought to have some influence on our new Minister of War, and, if Mr. Slater has been unjustly dealt with, he should be relieved from the fine which was imposed upon him or should be recompensed for the injury which was done to him by his being sent to goal. These men who have sworn to the affidavits should be brought before the Militia Department and a proper investigation should be made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. For once, the Department of Militia has adopted a mode suggested by the hon. gentleman, and, if the hon. gentleman had considered the serious nature of the charges which he was levelling against an hon. member of this House, possibly he might have taken the trouble to investigate the charges he has now laid them before Parliament. I can state that the whole of this matter came before the Department of Militia from Council. The charges were sent to the Governor General and were sent by him to Council, and were sent by Council to the department for investigation. The investigation was complete and thorough. The Deputy Adjutant General was entrusted with the duty of investigating the complaint of Mr. Slater. The complaint was found to be utterly foundationless, and, if the hon. gentleman will call for the papers, he will find that Mr. Slater is a man who is known in that department to be one who makes it his business to complain against every officer under whom he has served. In fact he is looked upon in that department as a crank. The hon. gentleman says these affidavits cannot be all incorrect, but they may have been given on flimsy information such as the hon. gentleman had when he made his charges in the case of Slater. He stated that a system was adopted by which young men joined the different corps for the purpose of having a holiday. I think Canada remembers when, in 1885, it was not a holiday, when the young men of Canada left their houses, their homes, their business and their families to fight the battle of Canada, nor does Canada forget the manner in which they fought and did their work. Their action at that time attracted more attention to this country than anything which had occurred in our history for fifty years. They were lauded abroad, and I remember, when on the floor of Parliament it was my duty to call upon the House to vote what was required upon that occasion, hon. gentlemen opposite did not speak about holiday soldiers, but were willing to trust to the energy, the pluck and the courage of the sons of Canada to fight under the Canadian flag and to protect Canada against the dangers which threatened her. If the hon. gentleman before attacking a member of this House, would investigate the matter in reference to these charges which were investigated by the Department of Militia, he would find that this man Slater has made charges as foundationless as those which have been made by other men who are well known in this city of Ottawa. The hon. gentleman once before brought a charge which was given up because it was found that the man for whom he spoke was unworthy of credence. So it is in regard to this man Slater, and the hon. gentleman will find that no blame can be attached to the department, which investigated these charges and found that they were absolutely groundless.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understand the charge is in reference to this man having been sent to prison for not having given up his arms. The hon. gentleman does not say anything about the other affidavits charging that Government money was misappropriated. He has not shown that any investigation has taken place in regard to the charges contained in those affidavits. There are other charges which are as strong against the action of the Government as the charges of Mr. Slater, and I trust the present Minister of Militia will start a supplementary investigation and will see whether there is anything in those charges or not. They are certainly serious charges, and I do not make them against the member for Toronto with any desire to injure his reputation at all. I think this is a matter which has to do with the expenditure of public money, and this is the proper time to bring it up when we are considering a vote for this very purpose. I am not myself an officer in the militia of this country. I do not desire to be offensive to the Lieutenant-Colonel at all; it is in the fulfilment of my duty that I have read these affidavits, and if the Militia Department do their duty they will investigate, not only the charges made by Mr. Slater, but they will investigate the statements in the sworn evidence that is to be found in that document,

bearing upon the misappropriation of money belonging to the people of this country.

Mr. TISDALE. I regret very much to hear the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat reiterate his charge after the explanation of the hon. member for Toronto. I do not think it is in the interest, either of the country or of the service, that any hon. gentleman should approach the subject in this manner. Now, I believe that there are just as good officers and men among the Reformers of this country—and there are some of them in this House—as there are in the Conservative party. I am satisfied that the large majority of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House would have hesitated to bring up this charge. I am equally satisfied that the gentlemen who are serving in the force, Reformers as well as Conservatives, will regret very much that the hon. gentleman has thought necessary to bring it up in this manner. He is an old parliamentarian, he is an old public man, and no man knows better than he that the proper way to bring up this matter is to place it before the authorities of the Militia Department, to make a charge before that department, and not bring it up in this House. If he thinks that money has been spent in an improper way, surely the department is the proper place where he should lodge his charge. I want him to remember that every officer in the militia will not only regret his action, but will condemn it, because once you read these sort of affidavits in the House and mention the name of an hon. member of the House, or of any officer of the militia in the way he has mentioned the name of the hon. member for Toronto, and the story goes broadcast throughout the country an injury is done which cannot be repaired. Under the high privileges that members enjoy in this House, he can mention the name of a gentleman in the House, or out of the House, in connection with a charge, which he could not have done outside of the House without being held responsible for it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. These copies are sworn affidavits.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not care whether they are copies or declarations, they are unfair, and may be untrue; but in any case they cast a stigma upon an officer that no amount of investigation can afterwards wipe away. I say that when he was told that there had been an investigation, and that the hon. member for Toronto had asked for an enquiry, he should have held his hand. The hon. gentleman makes no charge here, but from his seat in Parliament where he is not accountable in any way, he makes insinuation against these officers whose names he has mentioned, one in the House and the others out of it. Is that fair-play? Is that the way to treat members of Parliament or officers of the force, gentlemen who devote their time to the service of the country in the militia? I hope the hon. member will withdraw his language; but if he is prepared to make a charge, let him make it through the militia authorities. He has been told there was a charge, and it was investigated. If there was any pretense that the authorities would not investigate these charges, then he might be justified in coming here and saying he could not get it investigated by the proper authorities. But instead of that he reads these affirmations, he says he believes them to be true, but he will not make a charge of any sort, and yet these things are published broadcast. I want also to refer to something said by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). I am in the force no longer, but for fifteen years I was an officer and a private in the force. In those days we trained with difficulty; we had men of both parties in the force, because I have always insisted that in the militia there should be no politics. Our battalion was composed of men of both parties. Now, when an hon. gentleman like the member for Kent stands up in this House and declares that the volunteer force is a disgrace to the country, I want it to be known: I, as one who served, but who serves no longer, wish to protest against such language. I say that the force we have is an honour to Canada, a force that we should be proud of, as equal to any other militia force in the world. I was in the old camps at Niagara when the force was no better than it is to-day. We had English officers, we had American officers, we had officers from Europe, and although we could not claim to be able to go through all the military movements on parade with precision, still they were loud in their praise of the fighting form and appearance of the brigade, and we have a force extremely creditable to those composing it and to the country. There were young men in it that the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) sneered at: yes, some of them were lads, they were lads coming from the fathers and mothers of Canada, of both political parties. Let that hon. gentleman go and try it, and see if it is a holiday, as he says it is. Let him go and live on their fare, it is not such as they get at home, it is not such as he gets at his home—restricted hours, long hours of drill. I have seen the lads when they came in; most of them are too tired to go out again, and they lie down in their tents and sleep the sleep of men who have done their duty. One of the best things about these camps is the fact that only young men of courage and endurance will consent to undergo the hardships of camp life. Therefore, I want the hon. gentleman to take back his attack upon the volunteer force, or else I want it published all over this country that he dared to stand up and proclaim that our volunteers are a disgrace to the country. Sir, at the time of the Fenian Raid, in 1866, there were some men who laid down their lives, young men who left fathers and mothers childless, left sorrowing sisters, wives and children unprovided for, and in Toronto and other places in Ontario, their graves are now to be seen where they used to live. Young men went out even from our institutions of learning and laid down their lives. They were not drilled, perhaps, in all the movements of skilled soldiers, but they were men who felt that their lives were none too good to give up when a horde of robbers came across from a foreign country. I have always said, and I believe it, that I have as much faith in the loyalty of the Reform party as in the loyalty of the other party: we have in the ranks of the volunteers, and always can get good, soldiers from both parties. Though the drill that the hon. gentleman sneers at is not such as to make fine soldiers and fine feathers, it is sufficient to teach them the elements of war, which, with their true hearts, has made and always will make them serviceable defenders of this country in time of need. Sir, the militia force of this country, in days past and to-day, is not to be ridiculed or sneered at. While our arms and

clothing are not such as we could wish, I do believe that the money we have been able to expend upon them has been productive of good results. I think the time has come when a change of arms should take place. Although for many years past we have had no foreign enemies we have had internal disturbances from which, without the militia, we would have been in great trouble. We had a disturbance in my own county when I was commanding officer of a regiment, and in other counties and some of the cities they have more than once been called out to aid the civil power, so that the militia are useful even in civil affairs. And more than that, we have armouries, and arms, and men who are not afraid to take hold of them, and these facts alone are sufficient to prevent disturbances; so that I think we have got something to show for all the expenditure we have made. Criticise the force if you will, but do not ridicule it. Criticise the Minister, criticise the department, show wherein the men are deficient, but do not ridicule them, and that is what I blame the hon. member for. Criticise the force, make it better, give them more money if you will, make them even more efficient still, but stop there. I say that the arms we have with the men behind them, have always been found equal to our need in times past, and they have protected us when we needed protection. Therefore I repeat that I regret that the hon. gentleman should see fit to ridicule the militia and to make these assertions with regard to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I did not think when I rose this afternoon to give my views on this great question I would stir up such a hornet's nest as I appear to have done. I consider it is the duty and privilege of every hon. member when a question comes before the House involving a vote of $1,250,000 to give his view upon it and criticise the mode of expenditure. In exercising the privilege this afternoon I did so simply because it was my duty, and for doing that the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) with all his eloquence rose and poured out a stream of abuse on my head. That hon. gentleman appears to think that no member has a right to say anything about militia affairs expect his lordly self. He knows all about it, and what he does not know is not worth knowing, and no one else knows anything. He advised me to speak on some subject on which I knew something. What information has that hon. gentleman given this House on militia affairs during the hours in which he has spoken on them? The hon. gentleman went even further and did exactly what the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) accused me of doing. He had the impudence to rise and criticise the Major-General, who is the very head of the Militia Department. The hon. gentleman said the Major-General was in this country for the purpose of criticising the militia, that he came from England, where there is a very efficient staff, and he did not know his business. Is that the position, and is he simply here a critic? Is that the position which the Major-General occupies in this country, and does it become the dignity of an hon. member, especially of a member who professes to know as much as does the member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), to rise and criticise and abuse the Major-General in the way he has done? I believe the Major-General knows more in one minute than that hon. gentleman ever knew or ever will know, and it ill-becomes that hon. gentleman, especially after these affidavits have been read in this House, to rise and pour abuse on the head of any man in the House, whether a militia man or not. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) rose with all the virtuous indignation he could summon to his aid and poured his wrath on the devoted member for Kent, and accused me of ridiculing the Militia Department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; the militia.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to tell that hon. gentleman that I did nothing of the kind; I did exactly what the hon. gentleman did—I criticised it, and I had a right to do so. Moreover, I did not give my views on the subject, but I gave the views of the Major-General, and read from his report. What does the Major-General say in speaking of the rural militia?

"The rural corps are very deficient in instruction, but their organization is still more defective."

Will the hon. member for Toronto dispute that? Does he say that the Major-General does not know what he is talking about? The hon. gentleman would lead us to infer so from what he said this afternoon. The Major-General next spoke of the arms, appliances and clothing, which he said were deficient. He continues as follows:—

"The Snider rifle and carbine, with which the militia is armed, is at the best an obsolete weapon, but in the condition in which it exists, in most of the regiments of the active militia, it has no claim whatever to be classed as an arm of precision."

He goes on to speak of the active militia, and says:

"There is not a battalion that could turn out in complete marching order on a given day, though many have, at their own expense, provided some of the most necessary articles. Moreover, the equipment does not exist in store, which it would be necessary to issue in the event of grave emergency."

He further says, and I wish the member for Toronto to note this statement:

"I have not inspected a single battalion in which the men's boots would have stood one month's active service, or a regiment of cavalry or battery of artillery in which the saddlery and harness could be expected to bear a similar strain."

I ask if anything could be more damaging than such a statement coming from the Major-General? The arguments I brought to bear were this: That it was a shame and disgrace to this Parliament and this country that after we have spent millions of dollars for many years to perfect this organization, to place the men in good form and equipment, there should be such a disgraceful state of affairs as is revealed by the Major-General. The argument I advanced was a proper one, and I did not ridicule the men at all, but I brought charges against the management of the department. I contended that the management was imperfect, inasmuch as the men who went out to drill were not paid sufficiently for their service, and were not drilled sufficiently often. Moreover, I find that the Major-General in speaking about the camp at St. Thomas said:

"Ground wholly unsuited for a camp: 1,386 officers and men and 56 horses, besides the whole of the tents, blankets and camp equipment, conveyed 40 miles further than was necessary."

Could anything be more disgraceful than a state of affairs like that? Take the case of Farnham. The Major-General says:

"792 officers and men, and 155 horses, carried 55 miles further than was necessary. Tents and camp equipment likewise transported about 60 miles unnecessarily."

These extracts are from the report of the Major-General, which is entitled to full credit. Let me take up the case of Rimouski. The Major-General says:

"698 officers and men, 14 horses, and all tents and camp equipment, transported 400 miles further than was necessary, from a good site to a bad one."

Is it possible that the member for Toronto will say that the Major-General does not know what he is talking about, that he simply comes here as a critic and does not know his own business? Yet here the Major-General reports that men have been transported 400 miles further than was necessary, and from a good to a bad site. The statement is a most damaging one. Now, I ask, who is responsible for all this? Why, the very high and lordly Lieut.-Colonel from Toronto, who has been neglecting his duty, and struts around on the 12th of July, when they sing "Croppy lie Down" or the "Protestant Boys," with all his war paint and feathers on, and who dictates to every hon. member what he should say in this House. That is the kind of high and mighty man he is who pretends to know all about the militia force. Then the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) comes to his assistance and gets up a lot of righteous indignation and accuses me of a statement I never made in this House. Take the report of the Major-General commanding the forces, and if it does not disclose a most scandalous and disgraceful state of affairs in this country then I do not know what a disgraceful state of affairs is. It is the more disgraceful when we have year after year for many years been voting a million and a half of dollars to get this militia force into a state of efficiency. I can call to mind when a few years ago in this House General Laurie, the then member for Shelburne, as well as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) who is an authority I believe on militia matters, expressed their opinion upon the militia forces upon the floor of Parliament. They showed that nearly one-half the money that is being spent on the militia force is simply wasted, and that if we voted half the sum under proper regulations we would have a more efficient force than we have to-day.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to enter into the discussions which have taken place for the last hour, further than to call attention—and I think the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) will come to the same conclusion after a little reflection—to what I think the unfair manner in which he has attacked an hon. member in this House, and another gentleman who occupies a very prominent position in Toronto, who has devoted a great deal of time and attention and has spent a great deal of his means on the militia force, and who happens to be a brother of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison). The declaration of the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) that he had no intention of wounding the feelings of the member for Toronto reminds me very much of the old story of the Irishman who met a friend and for love knocked him down. The member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) has read declarations here, which if they are true, the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) is unfit to sit in this House or to associate with respectable people. If these affidavits are literally true, then my hon. friend to my right and the police magistrate of the city of Toronto, have committed offences which would rule them out of respectable society and would if found true, after investigation, have been the means of causing them to be expelled from the militia force of Canada. Beyond that I do not propose to go, but I leave it to my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) to say whether after reflection, he thinks it fair, that without notice, and without moving for the papers in connection with the whole transaction, he should get up in his place and after reading documents damning the character of two men occupying respectable positions in the society in which they move and in the country in which they live, that he should say then simply that he had no intention of wounding a brother member's feelings. That is, I candidly confess, a kind of ethics and a kind of reasoning which I do not understand. The hon. gentleman from Brant (Mr. Somerville), says that he did this unpremeditatedly, but it is quite evident that he intended to make the attack or he would not have been supplied with the ammunition. When I heard the hon. gentleman read these affidavits, they convinced me that there was on the part of the person who made them an over-zeal to do a wrong, or that he had very little knowledge of the document he had been signing. It struck me that these affidavits had been written by some astute lawyer who had induced this man to sign them without knowing what he was signing. One affidavit that my hon. friend read, states that the summons and arrest for not delivering up the property of the Government, was in order to prevent an investigation. I would not like to accuse the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Somerville) of being so unacquainted with military law or military practices, or the common usages of society, as to suppose that he believes for a moment that an arrest for withholding property which belonged to the Government, could, by any possibility, prevent a military investigation into the wrongs committed by an officer of the force. It appears to me, and I repeat what I said, and looking at the names of some of the commissioners before whom the affidavits were made, confirms my belief that some astute lawyer, for political reasons, prepared the case, and that it was a deliberate attempt, if not a conspiracy, for the purpose of injuring a political opponent. I give that as my opinion, drawn from the papers which are before me. The hon. member for Brant, with whom it has always been my good fortune to be on the very best terms, being old chums as type-setters and printers together, will, on reflection, see that he has made a mistake in the character which he attributed to the affidavit. He must have seen when he read this first affidavit that it is a mere declaration, and that it is not signed. It may have been signed, I do not say it was not; it may have been sworn to, but it bears no evidence of it here, and if he looks at about one-half of the other documents he will find they are of a somewhat similar kind. I am not prepared to express an opinion as to the character or reputation of the men who signed the documents, because I know nothing about it. It is the first time I have known it beyond having seen the printed document contained in these papers last session, and handed them to my friend from West Toronto, with the remark "Denison, what does this mean; it is a severe attack

upon you." I understand further that these papers were placed in the hands of an hon. gentleman who belongs to the Opposition, who after making enquiry into their character refused positively to have anything to do with them. The result of that was that the hon. gentleman who is not in the House now, was reported to the Governor General by the same man for dereliction of duty as a politician and as a member of the House of Commons. Further, I do not desire to continue this discussion, but I exceedingly regret it for the sake of the reputation of the House, and I think that my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) will come to the same conclusion when he reflects. If he desired to make this attack upon a member of the House, if he will permit me to make a suggestion to him, it would have been much better had he moved for all the papers, and they would have been brought down and laid on the Table. If it were then shown that the officers had been guilty of the charges laid against them, and that the Militia Department had not punished them as they would have deserved had they been found guilty, then the hon. gentleman would not only have been right in attacking the Government for a dereliction of duty, but he would have been justified in laying a charge of impropriety against the gentlemen who have been accused. That is the course he should have pursued, and that is the course he would like to have pursued if he had been in a similar position to the gentlemen whom he did accuse, or had he been charged with any conduct unbecoming a member of Parliament or a gentleman. However, these are matters of taste. I do not pretend to lay any particular claim to myself when I was in Opposition, of dealing very leniently with the Government, but yet I will say this: that while I pursued an aggressive course just as my friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) does—and with that I find no fault whatever, because I like to see a man fight for what he deems to be right, and do his duty in Opposition if he does it squarely—yet when I was in Opposition, I always moved for papers, and had the facts before me before I attacked a political opponent. Sometimes I found myself wrong and other times right, and when I was right I never hesitated to push the sword to the hilt. I find no fault with the hon. gentleman for doing the same thing, but there is a proper way in which to do it in order that an hon. gentleman who is a member of this House should have some little fair-play, and be forewarned of an attack upon him which would damn his reputation and render him unfit to sit in the House, if that which is charged against him were true. I am not going to criticise the hon. member for Kent, who ought to have been a third class lawyer if he is not one, being capable of turning a corner about as fast as any gentleman of the legal profession or as a politician. He was quite right in freely criticising the department, the Government and the force. That is why these reports are laid before the House. Whether he was right in the comments he made on the force itself is quite another thing. That is what my hon. friend from South Norfolk objected to—not the criticisms or the opinions expressed by the Major-General. I am not prepared to say that I disagree altogether with what the hon. member for Kent has said in reference to the language used by the Major-General. I am convinced that many of the suggestions he has made, if carried out, would be highly in the interest of the force. The whole question is so broad in its character that when you begin to discuss the formation of these companies, their continued existence, the difficulties in keeping up the strength of the force, the great expense involved, and the time which the men have for making themselves efficient, you can scarcely wonder that many changes continually occur, necessitating the filling up of the companies from the younger men of the country. You cannot expect the older men to remain continuously in the force. There are some who to my own knowledge have been in the force continuously ever since the Rebellion of 1837; but, these are exceptions to the rule. Many men move away, or get tired of the service; but they retain their interests in the force, as well as the knowledge they have acquired of drill and military tactics, as long as they live; so that although they may have retired, they are not lost to the country. While I do not care to see the smaller boys in the force, I like to see the younger men enter it and remain in it for some years, until they become sufficiently acquainted with the service as to be useful in case their services should be required. Fair and legitimate criticism on subjects of this kind I will court while at the head of the department, because, no one man can know all the difficulties connected with it. Many hon. gentlemen who speak on this subject consider it purely and simply from an economical standpoint, without any regard to the necessities of the force, while others do it from a much less laudable motive—political. I find no particular fault with that; it is the right of every member of Parliament to do so; but hon. gentlemen who take this position must not be surprised, that if those who do know what they are talking about are disposed to ridicule their statements when not warranted by the facts or the reports before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. As the discussion on this item has taken a wide range, perhaps I shall be pardoned if I say a few words with regard to the military camps. The Major-General has given several instances where money was unnecessarily used to transport men to a distance when they could perhaps be better accommodated nearer at hand. That is strictly in the line recommended by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) and myself last year and the year before, when we strongly advised that a portion of No. 2 district should hold its camp at the town of Owen Sound, where there is a splendid ground on a high level, a good place for rifle ranges overlooking the waters of the bay, and ample means of transport by both water and rail. If a large number of the men and horses belonging to No. 2 district had been taken there instead of to Niagara, a considerable amount of money would have been saved, and might have been spent to the advantage of the force in other ways. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to this subject again. No better place can be found in any part of northern Ontario for a camp than Owen Sound; and if No. 2 district, or at least a part of that district and a part of the adjoining district, were taken there, considerable money would be saved.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I rise to say a word or two in reference to the observations made by the

hon. member for Kent which were subjected to the rather hysterical criticism of the hon. member for South Norfolk. That hon. member professed to deprecate those observations. The remark of the hon. member for Kent to which I suppose he took particular exception was that the volunteer force was a disgrace to Canada. Those were the words which he used, and which seemed to wound the sensibilities of the hon. member for South Norfolk. Well, Sir, if those words were intended to describe the personal character of the volunteer force, I think they would have been greatly to be deprecated. But I do not understand my hon. friend from Kent to have been at all discussing the personal character or the private worth of the volunteer force. I suppose he would say that in that respect they are as respectable and as much respected as those citizens who are not in the force. It was not of their private worth or personal reputation that he was speaking. He was speaking of the efficiency of the force. He was calling the attention of the House to the very large sum of money voted every year for the maintenance of that force and the increase of its efficiency. That being so, the question really is, what is the character of the force in this particular as a military force, looking at the very large sums of money that are being spent every year by the people of Canada for the purpose of maintaining it? Well, it does seem to me that when we take the criticisms of the General who is in charge of this force, and who honestly, in my opinion, represents its actual condition and state of efficiency, we must all admit that it is not an efficient force, and that its efficiency is not creditable to this country. Now, whence does this inefficiency arise? Why, the hon. gentleman himself points out it has arisen in a large degree from the attempt to make the force a source of political strength to hon. gentlemen on the opposite benches. I do not pretend to say that members of the force are being enlisted into the support of the Administration by their votes, but that the force has been sent about from one place to another, and has been made a migratory body, as much so as a camp of Arabs in the desert, and it has been made so for the purpose of bringing a certain amount of patronage and securing a certain amount of influence and favour to representatives who support the Government on that side.

Mr. BOWELL. Was not the same course pursued by you?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not the question. In my opinion it was not done, but whether it was or not it is an improper policy. The fact is it has affected the efficiency of the force, it has led to the misuse of public money, it has added largely to the expense without any corresponding advantage to the force as a force. The hon. gentleman will not dispute that. He will not dispute, for instance, the taking away of the camp from London last year, because it happened to be represented by a Reformer, although the Government had acquired a camping ground there, suitable, under all circumstances, to the force. He will not dispute the carrying on of drill operations at another place which, the General says, is altogether unsuitable. You are subordinating the interests of the force to the interests of a party. There can be no doubt of that. Every page of this report, from beginning to end, shows that to be the case. And, therefore, you have brought the force, according to the report of the commander-in-chief, into a discreditable condition. It has become highly inefficient. It is not properly armed or equipped in any way, and that is the result of subordinating the efficiency of the force and the existence of the force to subservience to a party. That is a most improper state of things. It is one that ought not to exist. It is one every page of the General's report shows does exist. We say to the hon. gentleman who is now at the head of the Militia Department and who will be responsible for the expenditure of money and the condition of the force, that something only short of revolution is required in order to bring it to a state of efficiency and give the public something for the money voted every year.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I have not been present in the House the last few days, and consequently am not aware on which item of the Estimates this debate has originated. I have simply heard the militia discussed by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) and the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) who followed, and they forcibly reminded me of a discussion which took place some years ago in the American Senate on the question of reorganizing the army. One old senator expressed his disapproval of introducing organs into the service, as his father had "fit" throughout the whole revolutionary war with only a fife and drum. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Bothwell has just remarked, that what roused the ire of the militia officers in the House was the remark by the hon. member for Kent that the militia are a disgrace to the country. That certainly was sufficient to arouse the ire of the volunteers and the officers who take an interest in the force, and before I resume my seat I hope to prove by my experience that the remark is untrue. Now, I can go back as far as the Fenian Raid of 1866, and I will quote an anecdote of what actually took place. When Colonel Peacock's columns were marching on Fort Erie, they were marching in a double column of fours. One column was composed of the regular troops and the other of volunteers; and as it is common in the service for one branch to look down on the other, not only the officers but the men of the line all despised the militia force, of course as compared with themselves. So great was the rivalry between those two sections of fours in the marching column, that when the volunteers appeared likely to give way and the victory was in the hands of the column belonging to the line, the mounted officers dismounted and led their men on foot, and the consequence was the volunteers on that occasion proved themselves the better marchers of the two. I remember it for this reason: that a company from my county, known as the "Barrie Rats," were then leading the volunteer column. I have also heard opinions expressed by men from other countries as to the quality of the Canadian militia, which would prove, were not their own actions in the past sufficient to prove, that they are not a disgrace to the country. On one occasion it was my good fortune to dine with an officer well-known in this country, an officer who has the distinguished honour of wearing the Victoria Cross, Sir Henry Wilmot, and in a speech delivered before the National Rifle Association, referring more particularly to a visit he made to the city of Toronto, when they did him the honour of parading the entire garrison for

his inspection, he described them as fine a body of volunteer militia he believed existed in the British Empire. Now, you may take that for what it is worth. That was his statement. He may have said it, as we say some things, lightly, or he may have said it in earnest. My own opinion at the time was that he said it in earnest. I can remember another occasion very near home. I was at the camp of instruction at Laprairie in 1865, when the Western Battalion, one of the battalions in camp, was inspected by Sir John Mitchell, I was then carrying a rifle in the ranks, and I can remember to this day with pride the eulogium which was passed on the battalion of which I was a member. Sir John Mitchell, turning to address the right battalion, asked our commander, Colonel Shephard of the Welsh Fusiliers: Is this the Western Battalion? Being answered in the affirmative, he said: "They are the finest body of men I ever saw in my life, Her Majesty's Household Troops not excepted." Now, as to the matter of transport, which was spoken of by my hon. friend the member for East Grey, that question was discussed some years ago in this House, and I think the matter was referred to the Deputy Adjutant General of the 2nd military district to be reported upon. We, in the town of Barrie, were anxious, like people in many other towns are, to have the brigade camp at our own town, and an effort was made to have the camp brought there, but upon enquiry, and upon an estimate being made by the railways, it was found to be cheaper to concentrate the forces of the district at Niagara, than to hold the camp at Barrie. It is also known that it is easier to provision the men in large camps than at battalion headquarters, or in small camps, and that is one of the reasons for sticking to the camp at Niagara, in addition to the fact that it is such a magnificent ground. I have never seen its equal excepting on the prairies of the west. The hon. member spoke of the volunteers drawing their pay, and he would lead the uninitiated to suppose that there was a way by which the officers could defraud the Government by entering more men on their list than they had in their battalion. I have had some experience in the camps which I have attended, and sometimes I have thought they did not deal with us as honourably as we deserved. Every man belonging to a regiment is paraded a certain distance away from the camp, with the horses and everything else. The paymaster, accompanied by the brigade staff, is present, and every man must be accounted for unless he is on guard, and that is the only exception. Cooks, orderlies, and men of all grades must be present on parade and answer their names, and every precaution is taken to prevent men being on the rolls who are not in camp. I never heard of the existence of any cases of the kind the hon. gentleman has referred to. The remarks of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) must be attributable to his want of knowledge of the facts more than to his intention to misinform the House. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) read some affidavits which had been made by a discharged soldier from the Governor General's Body Guard, or as the hon. gentleman so often expressed it, the "G.G.B.G." I have been guilty of several sins of that kind to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and if all the men I have treated in that way were to be paraded in this House and were to give me a character, I am afraid I should not have much character left. At the last camp I over heard a man abusing the food, the rations, as not being fit for dogs to eat. I called the guard and had him arrested, and I gave him knapsack drill for the rest of the camp and discharged him from the regiment at the conclusion. I believe he made some complaints to the Militia Department, but I do not know that any action was taken, because I treated him according to his deserts. If people think it is possible to deal with 400 or 500 men, among whom it is impossible not to find some unruly spirits, without carrying out strict discipline, they are very much mistaken. The very first clause in the Red Book is that the first duty of a soldier is to obey.

Mr. FRASER. I only desire to clear away the colouring which has been put on this discussion. I suppose the report of the General has excited all this discussion. I suppose it is because the report of the General is not very flattering to the officers that we have heard so much about it. Nothing has been said on this side of the House as strong as what was said by the General in his report, and it is a just criticism to say that the money we expended has not been properly expended. The member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) spoke with a righteous indignation which was evidently pumped up for the occasion. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) said the militia force, if the statement of the General was to be credited, was discreditable. The hon. gentleman who was so indignant at the statement of my hon. friend did not seem to understand the difference between drill and organization. There was no reference made to the character of the men, their nationality, their politics or anything else, but only to the way in which they were drilled and to their organization. The statements of the member for Kent only referred to the manner in which the money we voted was spent, and the report of the General shows us that the money is not expended in the manner it should be. The Minister of Militia says that is correct. What is there to cause the righteous eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite to rise because the statement is made to which I have referred? Do the militia of this country surpass those of any other country in this world, or do Canadians surpass any other nationality in the world? There is no fear of the militia, nobody is talking about them; but we do say that when we spend a million or a million and a half every year, there should be tangible evidence that the money is applied in the best manner for the good of the men. One or two statements in this report of the gentleman struck me as extraordinary; and underneath the whole of what is said by hon. gentlemen opposite, I could see that notwithstanding their loyalty, they would like very well to attack the officer who had the courage to tell them the truth about what he found in the department. He says:

"Allowances are drawn annually for drill instruction, and for care of arms, for which the country receives no real value."

That is more than we have ever said:

"They are paid to officers who are incapable of imparting instruction, and who are unable to give sufficient attention to the arms under their charge."

That is what the General says. Now, is it any wonder that in face of a statement like that, an hon. member of this House, where all parties are

represented, should deem it his duty to call attention to it?

"It cannot strictly be said that any system exists for the issue of equipment and clothing. At present many corps are left unprovided with the issues to which they are entitled, while others get more than their share."

That is organization for you. Now, is it not right that we should discuss these matters—not by rising and complaining that somebody has wounded the feeling of somebody else, but like honest men, sent here to do our duty, by endeavouring to find where the fault lies and to seek a remedy for it. Is it not our duty to see that the funds are applied in the best interests of the force, to see that the militia is put upon such a footing as that it will turn out with the drum call and do its duty? A good deal has been said about my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville). Well, while there may be a difference of opinion as to whether he should have read these affidavits, there can be no difference of opinion as to what he meant. Surely, there was nothing to show that he meant to attack the hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Denison). These affidavits indicate that money was paid out—and I want to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to this—upon returns made that were incorrect. Surely, that does not refer to the colonel of the regiment. It is a new thing that the colonel pays out money for these parties. The affidavits only refer to the parties in the regiment who made up these statements and got the money, because I take it the colonel only needs to countersign.

Mr. BOWELL. He has to certify to their correctness on his honour as an officer.

Mr. FRASER. But everybody knows that when the statement is brought to him by the proper officer, he does not enquire whether it is correct in all its details. He must take the word of his subordinate as to whether it is correct. The Minister does not know how many hours are put in by every person in his department; neither can the colonel know who drilled and how long they drilled; he accepts the statement of his subordinate.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not certify to the work done.

Mr. FRASER. Certainly not. If the Minister had to certify to all the work done in his department, he would never certify to it unless he knew of his own knowledge that all the work was done. It is the same way with a colonel. The colonel cannot know of his own knowledge that every man who is on the pay-sheet has actually drilled his full time. That is all my hon. friend said. He merely said that money was paid out to these parties that should not be paid out, that there was somewhere in the department a loose way of making payments of money—not at all attacking the hon. gentleman himself. I trust the long discussion we have had this afternoon and evening will lead us to consider seriously the statements made by the highest officer in the force, made with a keenness evidently begotten with long training in the greatest army of the world. I hope those statements will not be lightly thrown aside. It is well that our faults should be manfully told us, and I hope that not only the Minister but that every official in the Militia Department, will take to heart the statements made in that report. It is our duty to see that the money that is expended in this country for militia shall be expended according to the methods taught us by men trained in the English Army. We need not bother ourselves as to our loyalty, or bravery, or anything else, but if our militia force is properly organized, we need fear nothing; we shall be able if our turn should ever come, to take our stand and do our duty.

Mr. DALY. It is evident from the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Fraser) and from the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and other hon. gentlemen opposite, that they feel the position in which the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) placed himself when he made the very offensive remarks he did a short time ago—not this afternoon, as the hon. member for Bothwell said, but about two hours ago. Neither did the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), nor the hon. member for Bothwell, deny that the hon. gentleman from Kent stated that the militia force of Canada were a disgrace to Canada. Those are the words which stirred the righteous indignation of the member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and, like an old soldier, he got up and did his duty in defending the force. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) smiles, but I want to know if he ever served his country as the member for Norfolk has done? It well became the hon. member for Norfolk to rise in his seat and indignantly hurl back those words in the teeth of the hon. member for Kent. Now, if that hon. gentleman had had any knowledge whatever of the militia force of Canada, if he had had any recollection of the discussion that has taken place in this House during the six sessions that I have been here, he would never have got up in the House and attacked the militia force in this manner. A good deal has been said of the report of the Major-General. Sir, the Major-General says in his conclusion:

"In conclusion, it only remains for me to add that I have in this report directed the criticism it is my duty to make, chiefly upon organization."

And then to show that he does not believe that the militia of Canada are a disgrace to the country, he concludes by saying:

"Powerful in physique, intelligent and eager to learn, the militia at present contains the unorganized elements of a strong national force. Moreover, in the men of the rural militia there exists that capacity for adapting themselves to circumstances, and 'handiness,' engendered by practical acquaintance with camp life, in their ordinary avocations, which is a most valuable quality for a soldier in the field. What is required is system and organization in every department."

Now, I do not think there is any member of this House who has discussed this question, who does not admit that heretofore there has not been that organization in our militia system which we could desire, and I for one, as an old volunteer, am glad to think that we have had sent among us a Major-General who has been able to criticise, in this bold and frank manner, the militia system of Canada. I hope with the report that we have before us, now that we have had a change in the commanding officer of the force, and that we have a change in the head of the Militia Department, proper efforts will be made to correct defects which have been pointed out. Now another word as to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville). The last speaker said that the remarks of that hon. gentleman were not directed personally to the member for Toronto (Mr. Denison). I would like to ask him how he could say

that in view of the fact that after the member for Toronto had replied to the member for Brant, the member for Brant then rose in his seat and said that although he had those documents in his desk, he never intended to use them until the member for Toronto had risen with his high and mighty military air. Is that not conclusive evidence to hon. gentlemen, that it was a matter of spleen and spite on the hon. gentleman's part, and that the attack was made with a view to get even with the hon. gentleman. We have had a spectacle which I never desire again to behold in the Parliament of Canada, that a gentleman should rise and read affidavits not signed, read what the hon. gentleman admits to be copies of affidavits, and thus charge an hon. gentleman with having fraudulently used the money of the country. He cannot be conversant or have any knowledge of the responsibility that rests on his shoulders. If he was the man he ought to be, he would make openly the charges that the hon. member had dealt fraudulently with the money of the country. But the hon. gentleman's party have not pursued that course, and he, with other members of his party have given vent to venom and slander session after session, and to-day have come here, and in an underhand way, have made an attack against an hon. member and against his brother, which they dare not make outside of the House. I hope for the honour of this House that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) will not allow the matter to rest, but will bring it home to the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), and will show to this House and country that no hon. gentleman can be insulted in the way the hon. member for West Toronto has been insulted without making the man who insulted him conduct himself in a manner becoming a member of the House of Commons of Canada.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am rather amused at the forced indignation of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly). We all know what kind of a man he is, and it is no use discussing the member for Selkirk. But I repudiate that my remarks were intended as a personal attack on the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison). I had no intention of doing so. The discussion was as to the expenditure of public money, and I had with me these affidavits which had been sent to me for the purpose of having this matter investigated, and I stated in my remarks that these were simply copies of the affidavits. I state now that the originals are in the possession of a reputable law firm in Toronto, and that the gentleman who sent them stated that he had the originals and that these men had been unable to obtain an investigation before the proper authorities. What else could I do but produce these documents to the House, in order to show that the public money voted had been used in that way, that a return had not been given of the money spent in maintaining the Governor General's Body Guard in Toronto. I did not charge the hon. member for West Toronto with having put this money in his pocket—I never dreamed of it ; I did not suppose he had the handling of the money.

Mr. DENISON. You insinuated it.

Mr. DALY. You did.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I did not.

Mr. DENISON. You insinuated it, and did not believe the statement.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I did not insinuate it. I said I had reason to believe that the statements made in the affidavits are true. I ask the committee to read the affidavits again, and find out whether they contain any statements setting forth that the member for West Toronto received any of that money himself. No such statement will be found in the affidavits. It will be found that the charge made in the affidavits is that the money was not paid to those men. But the affidavits do not say that Colonel Denison got the money himself. I had no intention to charge Colonel Denison with putting money into his own pocket. I had a right to bring these affidavits before the attention of the committee, and show that there were certain men in the force who believed that money was drawn by some of the officers of that Body Guard in Toronto, and that the country received no value for that expenditure. That is the position I took, and I think I was perfectly justified in doing so. I was not making personal charges against the member for West Toronto. I was endeavouring to show the House that those men in Toronto had sworn that this money was not paid to them, although they were called on to sign the pay-roll, and thus show they had received it. That is the position I took on the matter.

Mr. HAZEN. It is quite clear to my mind that however much the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat may sneer at the indignation expressed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, at the course taken by him, it has had an effect, and that effect has been to cause the hon. gentleman to take back water, and to now make a statement before the House entirely different from his previous attack on the hon. member for West Toronto. The hon. gentleman when he first addressed the committee, declared that he would not have referred to the matter, but for the remarks which the hon. member for Toronto had made. Any one in the House who heard the attack, and heard the affidavits, or what he called affidavits, but which were not affidavits at all, read, could not help coming to the conclusion that the simple aim of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Somerville) was to besmirch the character of as honourable a gentleman as sits in this Parliament, or in any other parliament under the sun. What effect could the charge of the hon. gentleman have but that? The effect of the charge was that pay-rolls had been tampered with, and the inference drawn was that the hon. gentleman was aware that that tampering had been done, that it was known by the hon. gentleman who sits as the honoured representative of West Toronto, and who was in command of the regiment where the alleged wrong-doing is said to have taken place. I repeat, the only influence which any one hearing the allegations for the first time could have drawn from the hon. gentleman's accusation was that the hon. member for Toronto was a dishonest man, a man who, as a colonel of the regiment, permitted wrong-doing, and as such was unworthy to sit in this House. It has always seemed to me that members of this House ought to exercise a certain degree of care before making charges calculated to reflect on the personal standing of one another. I would ask hon. members if the statements and charges which the hon. member for South Brant made against the hon. member for West Toronto

had not been met in the manner they have been met, whether it is not a fact that every Liberal newspaper in the country would have heralded the information that serious charges had been made against the member for West Toronto, that the statements made reflected on his honour as a man and a gentleman, and that the charges might possibly be substantiated by evidence. I deem it to be a serious matter to make such a charge reflecting on the character of a member of this House, and a member who makes such a charge as that without, as he might do, going to the Militia Department and ascertaining the falsity or the truth of the charges, is assuming a most serious responsibility, one which no member should do when his action reflects on the conduct of a brother member, even though his politics may possibly be not the same as his own. I desire to say that any one who knows the hon. member for West Toronto, who knows his reputation and high character for honour and honesty he bears in this country, would not for a single instant, even if the charge made by the hon. gentleman had not been met, have believed that the charge is true. Further than that I may say the hon. member for Kent, in referring to the hon. gentleman's speech, spoke as though the hon. member for West Toronto were a man whose sole aim and object in his connection with the militia force was to wear a uniform and go about the streets of Toronto as the hon. member for Kent said, although I do not understand his allusion, marching to the tune of a band playing "Croppies lie Down," or a similar air. I do not know what the hon. gentleman meant by such an allusion, but any one who is acquainted with the member for Toronto knows that he is a soldier of whom any country or nation might be proud. The hon. gentleman has shown himself to be a soldier on many occasions. We all know that when a mere boy he was attached to General Wolseley's staff at the Red River Expedition. We all know that the hon. gentleman went up to the Nile in command of the Canadian voyageurs, and for doing so received the thanks and honours bestowed by his Sovereign and by his Queen. Further than that, I say that I think it was an unmanly thing for the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) to attempt to besmirch the character of the brother of the hon. gentleman, who does not occupy a seat in this House, but who occupies an official position in the city of Toronto. I sincerely trust that the effect of this discussion will be at least to make hon. gentlemen—I care not on what side of the House they may be—hesitate and be careful before making charges of a serious character, and before making reflections upon characters of hon. members of this House.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, it may well be that after the reading of the papers a moment ago, by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), that it might have been supposed on the other side of the House, that my hon. friend from Brant intended to make an attack upon the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison). But, after the very emphatic disclaimer which my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) has made, and repeated again, that he had no intention whatever of impugning the character of the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Denison), it seems to me, that there should be no more said upon this subject. I am sure my hon. friend from Brant had no intention whatever to convey anything which might be derogatory to the character of the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Denison), and I am sure further, not only in my own behalf, but, also, in the behalf of every friend beside me, that on this side of the House we have nothing but the greatest respect for the member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), and that we believe him quite incapable not only of pocketing money, but of doing anything which would be derogatory to an hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure we all consider it gratifying indeed to hear the observations made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, but I think it is due to the House, and it is due to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) himself, that such a statement should come from him.

An hon. MEMBER. He did say so.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not see the affidavits read by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville)—I think he read them twice—but I was here when he read them, and he read them as affidavits; and it has been said here that they are not even copies of affidavits, but appear to be copies of some affidavits in part, and not even bearing signatures. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) has disclaimed any idea of attacking the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison). So far so good. That is satisfactory as the hon. the leader of the Opposition has said; but I listened as well as I could to these affidavits and if I am not altogether deceived in my hearing, they contained two statements with regard to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) which I shall presently mention, and if I am wrong the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) will correct me. One of the statements contained in these affidavits which are now extended upon *Hansard* to be exhibited to the public, was that the pay-list, which had been certified to as correct by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) in his capacity as a militia officer, was falsified. Another statement which was contained in these affidavits was that he had procured, by false evidence, the conviction of a man in the city of Toronto, in order to prevent an investigation of a disgraceful charge against himself. It is in vain for any person who understands the English language to say, that having read documents of that kind in the House, it was not intended to attack the character of another hon. member; because the hon. member who is referred to in these two charges would have no character at all if there were the least semblance of truth in the statements which the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) read. I rose, not for the purpose of renewing the discussion or making it more bitter, but for the purpose of suggesting to the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) whether he should not in view of the statements which have been made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), at least himself withdraw these papers and withdraw the charges which they convey.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I said before I made no charges against the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison). I have not these documents in my possession now, and I cannot remember every word that is contained in them, but I do know that the gentleman who resides in Toronto and who forwarded them to me, declared in a letter which he sent that he had the original of all

these affidavits in his possession and that they could be produced at any time they were required. I do not know that I can say anything further in regard to this matter. The charge as originally presented was that the money belonging to the Government was not expended judiciously, and that men had been allowed to sign these pay-rolls and obtain money, who ought not to sign them or obtain the money. That was the information that was presented to me. I do not know who got the money nor who certified to this matter. All I know about it is that these affidavits were sent to me, and I have presented them to this committee, to show, that according to these affidavits, if they are correct, this money had not been properly expended. I think it is the duty of the Minister of Militia to have the men who made these affidavits—copies of which I said only had been presented to me—examined, so that he may ascertain whether they are correct or not. I do not vouch for the correctness of these affidavits or copies of affidavits, but they were sent to me as copies of original affidavits by a reputable law firm in the city of Toronto. As I said before, the position I take in this matter is, that I make no charge against anybody. The only charge I make is that if the copies of the affidavits which I have read are correct, then the money belonging to the people of Canada has not been properly expended.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see, further, that if he is not making any charge himself, he is enabling persons outside of this House, whose character he cannot vouch for, to make a very disgraceful and untruthful charge, from his place in this House, against an hon. member.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think, in justice to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), it must be remembered that when he read the affidavits he distinctly and emphatically said, and repeated it two or three times: "It must be remembered that I do not make any charge against the hon. gentleman from Toronto."

An hon. MEMBER. Why did he read them, then?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Allow me a moment, please. I have not intervened in this debate before. I have been listening to the scolding which has taken place from the other side of the House, and which to a large extent I think was unnecessary. I think that the statement made by the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Somerville), supported as it was by the leader of the Opposition, ought to be accepted. It was a very frank and a very manly statement, and I would add my testimony to that which has been expressed by the leader of the Opposition, that the charge having been read and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison) having denied it emphatically, nothing more need be said about it. If the department think an enquiry is desirable they can make it, and I am perfectly sure, as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is sure, that when the hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Denison) says the statements are false, they will be found to be false. I have the highest respect for the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison), and I believe that when he says from his place in this House that these statements are false, his word will be accepted as it has been accepted by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I do not think there is anything to be gained by a reiteration of these remarks by hon. gentlemen opposite. The scolding which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) indulged in, did not do any good, nor had it any relevancy to the matter before the House. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), however, has not received the credit he is entitled to for having stated they were imperfect when he read these documents. Although I read them they are imperfect and I know nothing of the facts.

An hon. MEMBER. What did he read them for?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He has told you because they were sent by a reputable firm in Toronto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. TUPPER. Would you have read the papers if they were sent to you in the same way?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know the name. What do hon. gentlemen mean by asking me to name. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. McALISTER. If he knew they were imperfect he had no right to use them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman read them as he received them, and he stated their imperfections when he read them. Now, I do not think there is any good to be derived from a continuation of the wrangle, because the hon. member for North Brant has done as squarely and as manly as any man could do in making the statement he has made and in repeating it again and again. Now, I rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the Minister of Militia to what I believe is a very wrong system, which we have carried on from year to year in this House with reference to the militia estimates, and which is provocative of a great deal of misspent time. The Militia Department, above all other departments in the service, ought to be absolutely free from political influence. There is no monopoly of patriotism on the other side of the House. There are as many volunteers in this country who are Liberals in their political faith as Conservatives. We have as great an admiration of the volunteer service as hon. gentlemen opposite. There are men in that service who are a credit to the country and would be a credit to any country. There are men there who when they go to the political booth vote as Liberals, but who when in the ranks know themselves as militia men. But what I want to come to is this: The Militia Department is advised by an expert sent out from the old country who knows his duty, and who in the present instance, I am proud to say, is not afraid to express his views; and when he reports to the department, criticising the organization and the manner in which the public money is spent upon it, and suggesting certain changes, I think it is desirable that the hon. Minister of Militia should adopt the plan which has been carried out for many years in the mother country. When the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy comes down to the House with his estimates, he submits to the House the policy which he asks them to adopt. If he has any changes to propose, he announces them and asks the House to endorse them. If no change is desirable, he tells the House so; and the members of the House who are conversant with the fact, as many are in this House, are then in a position to criticise. But here we have from the General in charge a large number of very valuable suggestions, and as one member of this House, I want to

know how far those suggestions meet with the approval of the Minister, and are going to be adopted. We are voting this money, I respectfully submit, in the dark. The expenditure of the money which we have voted hitherto has met with severe criticism at the hands of the General. I do not think we should be afraid or ashamed of that criticism. As one member of this House, I would convey my thanks to that officer for the manliness and courage he has exhibited—for it requires no small courage to tell the truth—in stating that while some of our regiments and companies deserve all praise, there are others that deserve censure. My hon. friend from Kent, who calls special attention to that portion of the General's report which refers to the inefficiency of some companies, has been censured on the other side. But we ought not to shut our eyes to these facts, and I do not think the hon. Minister of Militia desires to shut his eyes to them. For instance, take that very statement of the General that the 24th, the 25th and the 26th Battalions were all very weak, and the ranks were filled with boys of indifferent physique. It does not follow from that, that all the companies in Canada are included in this reflection. I know that in the province from which I come we have some companies which any general might be proud to have under his command; but we must not shut our eyes to the blots upon the force. Now, I wish to know which of these suggestions of the General meet with the approval of the Minister, and how many of them are going to be carried out. One very important remark the General makes with reference to the pay of the militia, saying that the rural regiments do not get fair-play, that they receive a very much smaller share of the money than they are entitled to. On page 4 he says, with respect to the proportion of vote No. 100 in the militia estimates allotted as pay to each category, that 44 per cent is voted to rural corps and 34 per cent to city corps, or a difference of one-third only in favour of rurals corps. With regard to this he says:

"The disadvantage under which rural corps labour is sufficiently evident, when it is remembered that their established strength exceeds that of city corps in the proportion of three to one."

If this is true, the rural corps are not being treated with fair-play; and the General suggests—I have not experience to enable me to say whether his suggestion is a good one or can be carried out—I want to know what the Minister at the head of the department is prepared to say about it—that the city corps should be paid in a different way. He proposes that the *per capita* grant should go into the regimental fund in the case of city corps, who should be in the nature of volunteers, and that the grant to rural corps should go to the men, who should be in the nature of militia. Does the hon. Minister agree with the General in that particular? Is that the policy he is going to adopt? Discussion on these estimates should not be confined to details alone; but when we have suggestions from the General affecting the whole organization of the force, I do not think the estimates should be carried through without the committee being treated by the Minister of Militia with his intention with regard to the suggestions.

Mr. BOWELL. The misfortune is that hon. gentlemen are not in the House during the whole discussion. If the hon. gentleman had paid the slighest attention to the early portion of the discussion, he would have heard my views on the suggestions made by the General.

Mr. TUPPER. He was too much occupied in covering the retreat of the hon. member for North Brant.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, and like the cuttle-fish, he left behind a good deal of mud.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do you call that mud?

Mr. BOWELL. Because you attempted to cover up what you wanted to smother.

Mr. LAURIER. Order.

Mr. BOWELL. I am exceedingly pleased to find the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman at his left so sensitive at the slighest remark which they do not approve of, while on this and other occasions they hurl forth the vilest epithets at hon. gentlemen on this side of the House without the slightest provocation, which we hear and receive as meekly as lambs, though they have no more effect than water rolling off a duck's back. What I say is that had the hon. member for Queen's paid any attention to what I said before, he would have heard me frankly state at the beginning, and repeated in reply to the hon. member for Kent, that there were many of the General's suggestions of which I highly approved and would endeavour to carry out, while there were others which in all probability I would not be able to carry out, because a sufficient sum of money is not placed at my disposal. Beyond that, I should like to know what the hon. gentleman wants a Minister, charged with the grave responsibility of spending this money and controlling the management of 40,000 or 50,000 men in the country, to do. Does he want me to pledge the Government and myself as to the manner in which the minutiæ of the suggestions made by the General are to be carried out? I made a general statement approving most of the suggestions, but knowing the genius of our people, knowing their habits, I know that some of the suggestions would not be possible to carry out. These are matters which will have my consideration as soon as I have the time and opportunity to do it. I will be frank—for I like to speak in this House as everywhere else—this report was only put in my hands last night, and it is only a few days ago I read the report of the Major-General and the Deputy Minister of the department. They have been urging the different officers to prepare statistics, and they were not ready to go to the printers until a few days ago: but I trust, if I live another year and hon. gentlemen opposite allow me to remain where I am, to be able to speak with a little more authority and knowledge of the details of the department, and, as my hon. friend next me suggests, a little less like a lamb. Another misfortune which afflicts my hon. friend from Queen's is that he is not in the habit of telling, and he will permit me to say so very respectfully, all the truth in the statements he makes in this House. It is quite true the hon. member for Brant made use of the statement to which the hon. gentleman referred, but he did not do so when he introduced the subject and read the affidavits. He did so after an attack had been made upon him by the hon. member for West Toronto, and then he got up and disclaimed all intention of impeaching his reputation and char-

acter. That is quite different from the statement made by the hon. member for Queen's. While this scolding match is going on, as the hon. gentleman calls it, let us look at one of the statements. Slater says among other things:

"I was tried, convicted and imprisoned for thirty days in the common gaol at Toronto, said conviction and imprisonment being an illegal prosecution, on a false charge, and on a perjured oath, said conviction and commitment being signed, and so on, by a magistrate."

This man Slater went on before that to state that the hon. member for West Toronto made that affidavit and thus accused him of perjury. The information was laid by the hon. member for West Toronto and this affidavit, if such it be, because it is not signed—it may be a true copy; I say nothing of that—accuses the hon. member of perjury. Yet after these charges were positively denied, after it was affirmed by the late Minister of Militia that he made a full investigation into the matter, and found that the statement, the allegations and the charges made both against the member for West Toronto and the police magistrate, Lieut.-Colonel Geo. Denison, were unfounded, still the hon. member for Brant got up and read them over and over again, and then rose and disclaimed any personal reflections. Let me ask the hon. member for Queen's: Supposing I rise solemnly and calmly and read a lot of affidavits accusing him of perjury, theft and misappropriation of public money, the truth of which he solemnly denied, and supposing I should, after his denial, repeat what I had said, but added that I did not intend to impugn his reputation, though I knew that the charges and allegations I read would be handed down for all time to come in the official report, would he look at my action with equal philosophy, and try to excuse my action as he done that of the member for North Brant? I doubt it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will not accuse the hon. gentleman of being a lamb or a sheep or anything of that kind; for I know he is prepared to fight on all occasions; but I would say that he has not answered the just criticism which I gave to him as the head of his department, and which is applicable, not only to his department but to other branches of the service. I think I may state what is the mind of the majority of the House when I say that when estimates are given in a matter of this kind, the House is entitled to know what the policy of the Government is. Now the hon. gentleman accused me of not being present. He could not have used his eyes because I was here the whole afternoon, and heard him say that some of the suggestions of the General commended themselves to him and some did not. That is exactly what I want him to tell us, which suggestions commend themselves to the hon. gentleman. Here is a valuable book presented by the General who suggests a number of ways in which our force may be made more efficient. The hon. gentleman approves of some and disapproves of others. Of which does he approve? Surely this House is not to go on voting money year after year and paying a large salary to an efficient General to direct us and recommend what we should do to improve the force, and then be told by the department that they are not to say what recommendations they accept and what they do not. We find on page 4 of this report there is a suggestion with regard to the way in which money should be paid the city and rural corps. Does he approve of that? On page 6 the General says:

"Under the system hitherto, no data are available on which to base a trustworthy estimate of the cost incidental to the training of the rural militia, but it is my belief that a considerably larger force could be annually trained than has hitherto been the case, without any increase in the vote for drill and training. I am not prepared at present to recommend any such increase of expenditure."

Does the hon. gentleman adopt that recommendation? The House is surely entitled to know that. There is an increase brought down in the estimates, but that was before the hon. gentleman received the General's report. Is that to be persisted in? Are we to vote $25,000 in advance of the General's report.

Mr. BOWELL. When we come to that I will explain

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not ask the Minister hastily to form an opinion on these important matters. He says he only got the report last night or the day before. All I have to say is that we have been forced into the estimates too soon. The hon. gentleman should not have brought on the estimates until he had the opportunity of reading the General's report and of forming his opinion. I do not say that all the General's suggestions are to be swallowed holus bolus. We do not expect that, but we expect the department to examine them carefully and to say which they approve and which they reject. The department should have a policy and be prepared to explain it.

Mr. TUPPER. I think my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia (Mr. Bowell) is rather hard on the member for Queen's. I understand the position of that hon. gentleman, and on the whole think it is rather creditable. He is heartily ashamed of the conduct of his friend from North Brant; he is too much of a man to approve it; he will fight hard, but there is not a member on the front benches opposite me to-night who would do what the hon. member for North Brant has done. There is not one who would read those miserable, despicable charges against the character of an hon. gentleman. There is not one man who would rise in his place and say he would have done what the hon. member for North Brant has done; and on the other hand there is not a man among them who, if he did so far forget himself and what was due to his position as to make that statement, who would not, on reflecting, have made the *amende honorable*. The hon. member for North Brant, although asked by the gallant leader of the Opposition to retract these charges——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I never made any charges.

Mr. TUPPER,—to express at any rate regret for having been the mouthpiece of vile and baseless slander against a fellow member of this House. He brought out all that filth and foulness on the floor, and he is ashamed of it now, yet he is not man enough to stand up in the committee and make full and ample apology such as one gentleman would to another under the circumstances. He knows that to-night he has to learn a lesson, that he has taken a course in this House that not one of his leaders will defend, and none has justified, and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), skipping by that unhappy incident of to-night's debate, plunged at once into the General's report in order to occupy the attention of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You do not want the General's report to occupy the attention of the House.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly not when the hon. gentleman's conduct is at stake, when we are considering whether the hon. gentleman would do what any gentleman would do under those circumstances instead of sitting there and playing the ignominious part he has played to-night before this House. I am not surprised that the leader of the Opposition would not undertake to justify the hon. member in making that statement, and making, as his cool excuse that he did not make the affidavit, that he did not certify to it, and that, having read it here, he was not responsible for it, that he was not responsible for the miserable and lying slander which was read by him to the House, and would not state whether he was in possession of such information as would enable him to take further action in the case. There is a course that the House would take if the hon. gentleman was worth that trouble. Where such a calumny is brought forward and repeated, it is possible for the House to record its opinion of the hon. gentleman, and of the statement which he made. Under all these circumstances, I do not know whether, in view of the full disavowal of the proceedings of the hon. gentleman by the leader of the Opposition, the House will care to follow it any further, but it is gratifying to find that no one on the front benches of the Opposition has taken the trouble to justify the action of the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville).

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened the whole evening to this discussion and I have been surprised at the indignation which has been expressed by the Minister of Marine, the indignation which he has assumed in regard to certain statements which have been made on this side of the House. The remarks of the hon. gentleman have reminded me of the style of an hon. gentleman who is not here now but from whom the Minister of Militia is a direct descendant--I mean the Minister of Marine. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) had documents in his possession which bore directly on public expenditure, and he showed clearly that, if these statements were true, the money of this country had gone in a direction in which it should not have gone. He brought that matter before the House in connection with an item which was before the House, that is the expenditure upon the militia. I heard him say that he made no personal charge against the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), but that the man whose case he referred to had undoubtedly suffered very much from the action of somebody. He also stated that the money of the Dominion had been improperly applied by being paid out in a manner it should not have been if the statements contained in those affidavits are correct. I think this is the proper place in which these matters should be brought up. If we are to go before the hon. Minister of Militia and suggest that he should investigate such cases, I doubt if we would receive a hearing at all. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) has the right, and it is his duty, to criticise the expenditure, and he has very properly criticised the expenditure in connection with the Department of Militia. I hope this discussion will have a good effect in reference to the expenditure in this Militia Department. I cannot say that the present appearance of the hon. Minister of Militia is likely to become much more warlike than the appearance of the hon. gentleman who occupied that position before; but the present Minister is supposed to be economically disposed, and I hope that the million and a quarter which we have been spending will have some better effect than we have seen it have in past years. The report of General Herbert shows that the money has been uselessly spent, and has been squandered. He condemns the expenditure from beginning to end, but, because my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) quotes from the General's report, an attack is made upon him, and it is said that he is traducing and slandering the militia of the country. He did nothing of the kind. There was not a word which he put before the committee except what he took from the report of General Herbert, and I hope that the different clauses of that report will be taken into consideration by the Government, as they show that we are spending a million and a quarter on the militia uselessly, and that the force as it now stands is no credit to this country. It is only men occupying such positions as that occupied by General Herbert who can make these criticisms fairly. Every remark which has been made by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) and my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) has been justified by the report which has been laid on the Table by the Minister of Militia.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ADJOURNMENT—WEST INDIAN MISSION.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before you put that motion I would like to call the attention of the leader of the House to the correspondence with reference to the West Indian mission that was brought down last year. I think it was stated last evening by the Minister of Finance that the whole of that correspondence was brought down last year, and that the accuracy of my statement to the contrary might be judged in other matters by that fact. I have in my hand that correspondence, and it contains the report prepared in Council, the memorandum of the letter that the Minister was to communicate to the various Governors, and some of the Governors' answers. There is not any account of the speeches that were made by the hon. gentleman in various places in the West Indies, that are usually included in these papers, and there is no report whatever that the Minister made upon his return to His Excellency or to the Secretary of State. I would ask the leader of the House whether these papers which were not brought down last year, might not be laid upon the Table of the House this session. I cannot conceive that there can be any reason for further withholding those papers from the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The statement which the Finance Minister made last night was that all correspondence relating to these negotiations had been brought down last session. I think that is correct. I think he was then controverting a position taken by the member for Bothwell in a previous speech, that the correspondence had not been brought down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say the correspondence, I said the papers and correspondence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not profess to be verbally accurate, and I assume, of course, that the hon. member correctly recollects his own speech. I am sure I recollect distinctly what the Minister of Finance said, that all the correspondence on this subject had been brought down. I doubt that there is any document remaining not brought down. But if there is any, it will be brought down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is surely a report of the Minister on his return.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am satisfied that there is not. But if there is, it will be brought down.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 11th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUEBEC HARBOUR AND RIVER POLICE.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66) to repeal the Act respecting the Harbour and River Police of the Province of Quebec. He said: The House will recollect that an anomalous condition of affairs in reference to the River Police has existed, and did exist for many years in Canada, that is to say, that, while the municipalities in general were responsible for the order preserved in the various ports connected with them, in the Province of Quebec there was for some time before Confederation and afterwards a harbour police maintained by the general Government in the ports of Montreal and Quebec. I believe the reasons for the existence of this force were in connection with the large extent of wooden shipping which came into these ports, and the large amount of tonnage engaged in the trade of those ports, and also in regard to the practice of crimping, which was detrimental to the owners of shipping. In order to protect them, this force was instituted and maintained for many years. The shipping concerned was supposed to pay the tax or expenses necessary for the maintenance of the force. Many changes have occurred in connection with this trade, and none more remarkable than the decline in the wooden shipping at these ports, and, following very closely the work of the police and knowing that this was a tax upon the ports and was injurious to the foreign shipping going into them, I recommended the abolition of the force in the port of Montreal. The force in Montreal was abolished together with the tax. Then it seemed to be the almost unanimous wish of the people of the port of Quebec that the police force and the tax should be maintained there; but, again following very carefully the work of that force in Quebec, I have come to the conclusion that there is no reason for its existence there, and certainly no reason for the federal authorities to be concerned in the administration of the police affairs of that harbour. It was represented before that there was a very large harbour there, covering various municipalities, and that the city of Quebec alone could not assume the protection of the shipping at that port. Since then, as hon. gentlemen will see by the report of our agent there, not only has a change come about, but the captains of vessels are themselves aiding and abetting the very system of crimping which Parliament tried to keep down in their interests. So keen has become the competition that the captains of the ships have themselves made it impossible for the police to do the work for which the force was originally created. So to speak, they steal men from one another. I believe, also, that the owners of ships are mostly averse to this tax and will be glad to have a repeal of the law, which, for the reason I have given, has become practically useless. I referred to the report of my department and the report of the agent in order to bear out to some extent the statement which I have made as to the change in this business of crimping. Not only is there a change in the views of the locality as to the usefulness of this force, but I have a memorial of the Board of Trade of that city in which they ask among other things for the abolition of this tax. That, of course, confirms to a certain extent the position which I take. But even above these grounds, there are perhaps much broader grounds to which I might invite the attention of the House, namely, that it is an anomalous position of affairs that this Parliament should be concerned in the protection of that harbour, be it large or be it small. If one municipality is not able to discharge its duty in this respect, it is for the consideration of the local authorities, who can give it any protection which is needed. There is another consideration, and that is the question as to the jurisdiction of our police force there. As a matter of fact, the local authorities enforce the Act. Our police are merely used as constables, but the administration is in the hands of the city of Quebec. I have the operations for the last two or three years very carefully noted and recorded, and they lead me to the opinion that the force which has been maintained at that city for the last two or three years, is not only a useless body, in the strict sense of the word, as regards the purposes for which it was originally created, but that it is in the interest of shipping in that locality that the tax should be abolished. I wish to point out that the Province of Quebec, in fact the Maritime Provinces, are largely interested in this question. I am informed, and the Board of Trade confirmed that view in their request to have this tax abolished, that the imposition of a tax at the port of Quebec causes the imposition of retaliatory taxes, as it were, in the ports of the United States, upon vessels hailing from those provinces, especially from the Province of Quebec, regardless as to whether that tax is imposed at Montreal or any other port, but simply because it is imposed in the Province of Quebec. Therefore, the question is all the more important. Vessels hailing from ports where there is no such tax, pay less fees in the United States ports than Canadian vessels hailing from the ports of that particular province. For this reason I move for leave to introduce this Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood the hon. gentleman to speak of a memorial from the Quebec Board of Trade; has this been laid on the Table?

Mr. TUPPER. It only reached me the other day; it is dated the 6th April. I shall be happy to bring it down.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VOTERS' LISTS OF 1891.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. (67) respecting the Voters' Lists of 1891. He said: Many of the lists were not received till the month of January, 1892, and a large number are not finally disposed of yet. The delay arises in part from the fact that last year Parliament extended the time for receiving affidavits up to the 15th August, and the revising officers were hampered and delayed in their work by the action of this House. Then, as regards the other object of the Bill, it is proposed that there shall be no revision of the lists this year. The Government, in deciding on this course, do so with the intention of introducing a measure to simplify the Act and to reduce the expense of the revision of the lists.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether these two measures which are foreshadowed are to be introduced this session?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I cannot tell the hon. gentleman until after the Easter recess. It is under consideration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the House passes to the Orders of the Day, I wish to recall the attention of the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to the papers brought down with respect to Newfoundland. I asked him some time ago about certain papers which were missing, important documents, notably one of them, a despatch from Lord Knutsford, I think dated the 11th February, which was missing from the papers—I asked him whether it would be brought down. The hon. gentleman stated across the floor of the House at the time that he would let me know, and afterwards he was kind enough to mention to me privately that at present he was not in a position, but he hoped to be in a short time, to give an answer, one way or the other. Since I had the conversation with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I have gone very carefully over the papers with the view of seeing whether all the facts that we wished to have, can be gathered from the papers that we have now. I must say to the hon. gentleman that I am of the opinion that it is impossible to form a proper appreciation of all the facts, as they are presented in the existing papers. I think that the House should require to have that despatch, it is a most important despatch, not only with respect to the immediate matter which I have before the House, but with respect to the larger matters which are, apparently, embraced within its scope, if I may judge from the memorandum of the reference that is made in the papers now before us. I have, therefore, to ask the hon. gentleman whether he is in a position to say that this despatch will be brought down? It is dated the 11th February, and in it an offer is said to have been made by this Government through the Imperial Government.

Mr. TUPPER. We all desire that the fullest information on this subject shall be given to the House, and I believe that in a very short time both of these papers will be laid on the Table of the House. No time has been lost in endeavouring to obtain the necessary sanction, and I expect within a few days to have the necessary authority to lay the papers on the Table of the House.

THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE—THE WEST INDIAN MISSION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to say that the official communications and reports of the recent Washington negotiations have not yet been laid before the House, and it is of great consequence that they should be, in light of the memorandum to which my hon. friend for Queen's has referred. It is pretty clear that the hon. gentlemen went to Washington in consequence of the despatch sent by Lord Knutsford to the Government of Canada, and it is very desirable we should have before us any memorandum, or any despatch or communications that may have passed. I would also again call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that we have never had before us yet one syllable of his West Indian mission; the correspondence that took place, and his speeches in Jamaica and elsewhere, although mentioned in the press, have never been laid before Parliament; nor have any communications or memorandum made by him on this subject, been brought under our attention. All the papers that we have had yet brought down to us are those that relate to the determination of the Government on the subject before the hon. gentleman set out on his voyage.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 40) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Carpenter.)

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Women's Baptist Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—(Mr. Stairs.)

LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 45) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Fairbairn.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask whether this is one of the railway lines which are somewhat affected by bye-election promises; whether the electors of the riding or ridings through which this proposed line is to pass, have had any promises from members of the Government, or from parties representing the Government, in the bye-elections? I would also ask whether it is the intention of the Government to grant any subsidy to this road, or whether any promise of that kind is extended in regard to this road?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Government has no information on that subject.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the Government would be kind enough to inform us whether there is any intention, on behalf of the Government, bearing upon the prospects of this road, as to granting it aid in the future?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No application to that end has been considered, and I am not aware that any has been received.

Mr. CHARLTON. That scarcely answers the question as to the intention.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

GLOBE PRINTING COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 31) respecting the *Globe* Printing Company.—(Mr. Innes.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. MULOCK. I move to add the following amendment:—

Provided always that every such by-law, and every repeal, amendment or re-enactment thereof, unless in the meantime confirmed at a general meeting of the company, duly called for that purpose, shall only have force until the next annual meeting of the company, and in default of confirmation thereat, shall from and until that time only cease to have force.

I observe that the proposed section gives to the directors powers formerly held by the shareholders, following in that respect the Companies' Clauses Act; but it does not add the safeguard contained in that Act, namely, that the exercise of such powers by the directorate shall only have force until the next annual meeting, when it shall require confirmation by the shareholders. So I propose to add the proviso contained in the Companies' Clauses Act.

Mr. BOWELL. Does not that give power to the directors to amend by-laws and to act under such amended by-laws until they are disallowed by a meeting of the shareholders, and is that advisable? I think the general mode of conducting incorporations of this kind is to have the by-laws confirmed by the shareholders before they come into operation; otherwise the directors might in the meantime destroy the whole property of any corporation.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the law ought to be as he states. But we are not enacting a new provision of the general law.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you not rather take power from the shareholders under this provision and give it to the directors?

Mr. MULOCK. I am not in charge of the Bill. Some of the shareholders have called my attention to this section, by which it is proposed to transfer power from the shareholders to the directors, following section 13 of the Companies' Clauses Act; and I propose that if they take part of the section they should take the whole of it—the lean with the fat.

Mr. BOWELL. I know that in some loan companies the directors have not power to amend by-laws until they first derive it from the shareholders. I think it is rather a dangerous power to give to directors. The provision proposed in the amendment will certainly protect the shareholders to some extent, but how far it will protect them in their property in the interim between the time of the passage of a by-law and its disallowance or confirmation by the shareholders, is a question for those who have stock in the company to consider.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is a very proper one, because it seems to bring the provisions of the Bill into accord, not only with the Companies' Clauses Act, but the Dominion Letters Patent Act, the Ontario Letters Patent Act, the Railway Act, and all other Acts of the kind except the Act respecting Loan Companies and Building Societies, to which the hon. Minister of Militia has referred. I do not think we could undertake to propose, in the case of the private Bill before us, to alter the general law or to make it very different from what the general law is, and what the private Acts are of all other similar companies.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not going to propose any change, but I dissent from the proposition laid down by the hon. gentleman. When any Act is before Parliament it is for Parliament to say what its provisions shall be. It matters not whether they be in accord or not with the provisions of any general law; Parliament has the power to say whether any general Act is correct in principle or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is confounding the powers of Parliament with its duties. It has power to do many things it ought not to do; and whatever may be our powers we ought to exercise them in the direction of securing uniformity in private Acts with the general policy of the law. If that policy is found to be wrong, we ought to begin with the larger measure and amend the general Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman forgets that this Bill is taking away from the shareholders and transferring to the directors the power and authority they already possess. By the earlier Act their shareholders had the power to make by-laws, and the hon. member for North York tells us some of the shareholders object to being deprived of the authority they hold. Otherwise, of course, no person would object to it.

Mr. MULOCK. I said my attention had been called to the matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. By some shareholders?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes.

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

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Murray.)

Bill No. 64) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Corbould.)

FREE ADMISSION OF UNITED STATES NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. INNES asked, Whether the Government is aware that a number of United States papers, such as

the Buffalo *Express*, Utica *Globe*, Toledo *Blade*, and some Chicago papers, are sending copies of their Saturday and Sunday editions to different newsdealers throughout Canada by express, without paying duty, in contravention of the Customs laws of Canada, and to the serious loss of newspaper publishers in the country, who are thereby subjected to unfair competition with American publishers whose agents evade the payment of the Customs duties imposed on newspapers coming into the country by express?

Mr. BOWELL. Newspapers are free, whether they come in by express or by any other mode of conveyance. There is, therefore, no contravention of the Customs law by reason of such importations. See Tariff item No. 673.

LONGUEUIL WHARF.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked: What is the amount spent for works on the wharf at Longueuil, since 1886? To whom were the several amounts paid: how much to each person, and for what kind of work?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The amount spent on construction account reached $28,739.96. For repairs, $1,517.75. The account paid to the builders was $25,550.50. For timber, stone and other materials, $2,463.39. There were paid to labourers and clerks of works, $2,238.84. The sum of $11,680.50 was paid to the contractors, Burns & Smith, and the sum of $13,875.00 to Mr. T. A. Chagnon.

ATLANTIC MAILS.

Mr. McNEILL asked, What arrangements have been made to carry Atlantic mails for this year? Does the Government select the individual steamers for the service? Is the selection to be confined to steamers of the Allan line?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A contract has been entered into with the Messrs. Allan from the 16th day of December last, which provides that the steamers shall be first-class vessels and the line shall consist of the *Parisian*, *Vancouver*, *Sardinian*, *Circassian*, *Mongolian*, *Moravian*, *Labrador*, *Sarnia* and *Oregon*, and such other vessels as may be subsequently built or purchased, but no steamer thus built or purchased is to be of less size or power than the *Parisian*, and the consent of the Postmaster General must be obtained before any such steamer can be used for service under this contract.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is any provision made by which the steamers of the Dominion line can be used?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, the *Vancouver*, the *Labrador* and others are specified.

EXPORT DUTY ON SAW-LOGS, &c.

Mr. IVES moved:

That it is expedient to impose export duties on saw-logs and spruce pulpwood, when exported from Canada.

He said: Although the subject which I propose to introduce is of very great importance, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any very great length, reserving to myself the right of reply, which I understand I have. If we for a moment refer to the lumber duties as they stood in the United States before the passing of what is known as the McKinley Act, and compare them with what they are now, we find that the only change made was $1 a thousand on white pine. The duties remain precisely the same under the McKinley Act as they were prior to the passing of that Act, except as to white pine which was reduced from $2 to $1 a thousand. I mention this fact because I find that the public have an erroneous impression that considerable reductions were made. It is generally supposed that the reduction also applied to spruce. No doubt it was expected by the Canadian Government as well as by the Canadian people that the reduction would apply to spruce as well as to pine. But, Sir, the only concession made to us, or made to the people of the United States, was a reduction of $1 upon white pine, and that was the only advantage, if advantage it may be called, which the people of this country obtained when they removed the export duty, not only from white pine, but from all other kinds of logs, shingle bolts, &c. I find, Sir, that the change which our Government made has been popular with no class of the community except the manufacturers of white pine lumber. I do not know how numerous a body of men they may be, but certainly they are comparatively few in number. But if you will canvass the country over you will find that the removal of export duties is condemned and is unpopular with every other lumber interest, with every other manufacturing interest, and, in fact, with the people generally, and that the only people in the world who are pleased, or who have been at any time pleased, are the white pine men. Now, it is an anomaly which the other lumbermen have a right to complain of, that while the more valuable lumber, lumber which is worth, on an average, $20 a thousand, is admitted into the United States market at $1 a thousand, the less valuable lumber, the spruce lumber, worth, perhaps, on an average, $10 a thousand or less, is charged double that amount, or $2 a thousand. I also complain, not only of this anomalous position which all other lumbermen are put in by the action of our Government, but I complain of it because it is against the interests of all other lumbermen, and is, I humbly believe, against the interest of the country, in favour of not a very numerous, but a very powerful and wealthy interest, in Canada, namely, the white pine interest. Hitherto the manufacturers of white pine stood with other Canadian lumbermen and worked with them shoulder to shoulder for the advantage of the united industry, and for the advantage of the country, but from the time that these gentlemen, owing to the action of our Government, obtained that enormous advantage over their brother Canadians engaged in similar enterprise, from that moment their interest has been antagonistic to the interests of the rest of the Canadian people, and they are clamouring for the continuation of a state of things which is unfair and unjust, and has always been unfair and unjust to all the rest of the people of this country. But what great advantage have the white pine men obtained by the removal of the export duties from all classes of lumber by the radical measure which the Government adopted? Those of them whose logs are beyond the reach of the American

people, that is to say, whose logs are so far up the headwaters of the Ottawa River that there is no danger of their being floated, across the Georgian Bay or Lake Michigan, so far up the head waters of the Ottawa River and its tributaries that they cannot be brought out by rail—in fact, those lumbermen have an advantage, we will say, of $1 a thousand. But the other white pine men who had built mills and who had invested their capital on the Georgian Bay and in the Lake Huron section of the white pine belt of Ontario, have not received any benefit, have not enjoyed any advantage; on the contrary, they have had to compete in the log market with the American people, who enjoy an advantage of $1 a thousand over them in the United States market, because when they saw their logs and send them into the United States market they have to pay $1 a thousand duty to the United States Government. The result has been just what is set forth in a letter which, with your permission, I will read. It is a letter from Mr. John Moiles, and is dated Sault Ste. Marie, 28th April, 1891. He says:

"SAULT STE. MARIE, ONT., 28th April, 1891.

"Mr. W. H. PLUMMER, City.

"DEAR SIR,—I am afraid we can get no logs to saw at our mill on John Island this year. Last season we cut 16,700,000 feet, but this year, all the saw-logs in our neighbourhood are going to Michigan. Sibley & Baringer will take from Spanish River about 12,000,000 feet. Gates and the Michigan Pipe Company, 11,000,000 feet. E. Hall, from Spanish River and Manitoulin Island from near Little Current, about 16,000,000 feet. The Emery Lumber Company, from French River, about 20,000,000 feet. Mr. McRae, of the Mildrum Bay Mill, is not going to start his mill this season; he wants to sell his logs, 4,000,000 feet. The Spanish River Lumber Company, for whom we sawed last season, do not want to hire any logs sawed this year, they intend to sell all of their logs that they cannot cut at their own mill. They will have to sell 6,000,000 feet. Cook Bros., Serpent River Mills, have 10,000,000 feet more than they can saw in their mill this season, they intend to sell them to Michigan parties. As you see the above makes 86,000,000 feet, it may vary a little either ways, but these figures are very near correct. I have been told that there are a great number of logs going to Lake Erie, but do not know the parties who are taking them. I was in Saginaw, Michigan, a few days ago, and spoke with some lumbermen about towing logs from over here to Michigan. I said that I did not think this Government would let them take away all the logs free and leave the mills on this side idle, when they charge $1 per thousand feet custom dues to let lumber into their market; they said the Canadian Government would not dare put on an export duty. Now, if we have to pay duties on oil, sugar, meat and machinery, and $1 per thousand feet to get our lumber into the United States, and the Michigan men get their logs from this country free, and have no duty to pay on anything, we cannot compete with them and will have to shut down our mills. In that case the farmers on the north shore of Lake Huron will lose a good market for their produce. When the mills are running they give the farmers a good home market for everything they have to sell. I hope the Government will put on an export duty early in May before they take away the logs, so we can get some of them to saw.

"Yours very truly,
"JOHN MOILES."

Now that letter expresses briefly and forcibly the exact position in which the white pine men of Canada are who are situated in that section of country where the Americans can float logs by water, or can car them handily to mills in the United States. I humbly submit to you, and to the judgment of the House, that the advantage which the white pine men of the Upper Ottawa have, of $1 a thousand, is not sufficient to compensate for the loss sustained by the saw-mill men in other portions of Canada where logs are now floated across the line and sawn in the United States manufactories. But if there were no other interest, if there were no spruce interest, if there were no public interest; if the people of this country who want a labour market, and the farmers of this country who want a market for what they raise upon their farms, had no interest, yet I claim that the disadvantage to certain sections of the white pine industry is greater than all the advantages that have been reaped by the few who have been beyond the reach of the competition of American log buyers. If that is the position of the white pine man, what is the position of the spruce men? The position of the spruce men is simply this: That they are handicapped in the competition with the United States manufacturers by $2 per thousand duty upon a product worth upon an average $10 per thousand, or a duty equivalent to 20 to 25 per cent. The result is, that along the frontier, and not only along the frontier but wherever our rivers or streams extend in such a direction that they may be utilized for floating logs to the United States; wherever spruce logs can be floated out of Canada into the United States, and wherever they can be loaded and carried to the United States mills, they are being taken out of the country, being sawn in the United States, and our people are leaving our own country and going across the line to work in mills where our own lumber is being sawn and manufactured, and this will increase day by day as the logs become scarcer in New England and as the markets there improve. The result is that all through the Eastern Townships you will find—I am speaking more particularly of the country with which I am specially acquainted—mills closed, which would not be closed were it not for this anomalous state of things: and where the mills are not closed, where the saw-mill owners own their limits and are independent of the American log buyers, even then so great is the difference made by the $2 per thousand duty, it is more profitable to them to load their logs on cars, send them to the United States and sell them, than to manufacture them and send the lumber to the United States. And if this state of things continues the result will be that the spruce lumber of this country will be more and more, until finally, it will be altogether, manufactured on the other side of the line, and we will have the pleasure simply of making a present to the Americans of our forests and our forest products, because, when you have driven the local mill men out of the field, the price paid for logs will simply be that which pays the farmer for cutting them, without any reference to the value of the logs themselves or to stumpage. This has been the effect on the white pine and the spruce interests. The effect of the removal of this duty on pulpwood has been even more disastrous, and the McKinley Act is even more unjust to the pulpmen than it is to the lumbermen. I said a few moments ago that the only change in duties under the McKinley Act was to reduce the duty on white pine lumber. But the McKinley Act increased the duty to the point of prohibition on ground pulp, so as to make it impossible to manufacture it in Canada and export it to the United States, and increased the duty to $6 per ton, or $90 per car, on chemical wood pulp manufactured in Canada and sent to the United States. The Canadian pulp manufacturer, making ground wood pulp, was obliged to close up his mill so far as the American market was concerned, and had the pleasure of seeing the very

timber, which was his raw material that he depended on when he constructed his mill, put on the cars and carried to the United States and manufactured into ground wood pulp on the other side of the line. So far as the chemical pulp interest is concerned, the McKinley tariff is not absolutely prohibitory. It is possible under certain conditions to manufacture and export chemical pulp to the United States and make a living profit. If our mills had their raw material, on which they had a right to depend, preserved to them, they would be able to get on, and live, and employ a large amount of labour on the manufacture and sale of chemical pulp to the United States. But this is what is happening. The Canadian manufacturer of chemical pulp built his mill on a certain river, or with respect to a certain tract of country that he looked upon as furnishing a preserve of raw material for his industry. The removal of the export duties has brought into his reserve companies from the United States, who have built mills just across the line for the purpose of manufacturing Canadian wood into chemical pulp, and they have to carry it by rail less than 30 miles perhaps from the very mill which was built with respect to those certain reserves of timber; and our local mills are being rendered useless and are being thrown into bankruptcy, not because they cannot make pulp under present conditions, but because men on the other side of the line, not 30 miles distant, who have no export duties to pay, who take the wood in free, and have not to pay $6 a ton import duty into the United States, are taking away the lumber and taking it away by thousands of cords, or even thousands of car loads, into the United States, to be manufactured in pulp mills erected for the express purpose of manufacturing Canadian wood, and which have no other timber reserve to depend upon whatever. We have, then, this position: That by the removal of the export duties our people got the advantage of a reduction of $1 per thousand on white pine, which we will grant was an advantage to certain of our white pine manufacturers. But while it was an advantage to certain of them, it was a disadvantage to others, and was in fact an advantage only to those who cannot be reached by the American buyers, or by those who have their mills on the other side of the line, and who are interested in taking white pine there and sawing it. We have had as a result no concession in spruce whatever, but the mere act of the Government has made the white pine men antagonistic to the spruce men, and has left the spruce men to stand by themselves, not only alone but against the opposition of the white pine interest. So far as ground wood pulp is concerned, it has been ruined, because the increase in the tariff on the other side has rendered it impossible to manufacture and export it to the United States profitably. So far as chemical pulp is concerned, the duties have been increased, its position was made worse, although it is not yet so bad but that it may survive. It is being attacked by the rest of the lumber being taken away to the United States and manufactured there. Now, Sir, for a moment I wish to call your attention to the fact that when you come to select the one of greater importance, it is not the white pine interest but the spruce interest. The white pine of this country is confined to a comparatively small area. It is confined to the Ottawa, and the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron sections of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. There is no other white pine in the Dominion now of any consequence whatever, and not only is it confined to these small areas, but it is being rapidly exhausted, and very good judges estimate that at the present rate at which pine is being manufactured, in ten years the production will necessarily be limited to one-half the quantity that is now manufactured. That statement goes to show that in ten years hence, one-half the present pine limits will have become fully exhausted, and that the white pine interest itself will, in consequence, become a comparatively unimportant one. Another thing to consider with reference to this matter is the fact that the white pine does not reproduce. Either some change of climate or some change of natural conditions has prevented the reproduction of the white pine which was found in this country when it was first settled. The tree that grows up in the place of the white pine is exceedingly dwarf, knotty, and valueless, so that when the present white pine timber is exhausted the industry will entirely disappear. So far as the spruce interest of this country is concerned, it is an infinitely more important interest to-day than the white pine interest ever was. Spruce is the timber of the whole Dominion of Canada. It is the prevailing timber of the Maritime Provinces, of the Province of Quebec, of the larger half of the Provinces of Ontario, of Manitoba, and of the North-West Territories, east of the mountains, so far as that region has any valuable timber of the soft species. In fact, it is the timber of the Dominion, and it has this advantage over pine, that it reproduces and that under a proper and suitable system of cutting, and wise forestry laws, it would be perpetual. Everybody knows that spruce, if lumbered properly, and if trees not less than 12 inches on the stump are cut, it will reproduce in from 15 to 20 years, and be as good in every respect and as well timbered as it was before it was lumbered, and so on for all time so far as we can judge. Such being the fact you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the spruce timber being spread all over the Dominion, and having the quality of reproducing, certainly is entitled to the consideration of the Government, and to the consideration of this House, in any policy that may be adopted here. The Provincial Governments have a large interest in this question. The Provinces of Ontario and Quebec especially have been deriving a large amount of money annually from our pine forests chiefly. That remark applies to a greater extent to the Province of Ontario than it does to the Province of Quebec. That revenue will disappear almost entirely within the next 10 or 15 years; but if a proper policy is pursued by this Government and by the Local Governments, and if proper regulations are adopted in reference to the spruce lumbering on Government lands, so as to protect the forests from destruction by fire, I undertake to say that in 25 years from now the Local Governments of this Dominion will derive a larger revenue from spruce than they have ever derived from white pine, even in the palmiest days of that industry. I believe, Sir, and I know what I am talking about, that the forests of Canada contain the future paper material for the continent of America. I know that there is not sufficient pulp material in the United States to last them 10

years, and that from that time onward they will be almost, if not entirely, dependent upon the spruce forests of Canada to furnish material for the paper industries of the United States. There are 1,150 paper mills in the United States at present, and the quantity of pulp that is consumed by these mills is something enormous. You may reckon an average of 10 tons a day for each one of them, and probably still be within the mark. Now, excepting the bass wood and poplar wood which they have to depend upon to a small extent in the Western States, there is no material of this kind of any consequence west of the St. Lawrence River, and from that to the Mississippi River. There is no pulp material of any importance in the United States west of the St. Lawrence River, and at the present day 60 per cent of the quantity required is taken from Canada and manufactured there. East of the St. Lawrence there is in the Adirondacks a quantity of spruce timber still left; there is a small quantity in Northern New Hampshire, and in Northern Vermont, and a considerable quantity in the State of Maine. But, Sir, at the present day, to say nothing about the mills west of the St. Lawrence River, there are fifty pulp mills in New England which are getting their total pulp supply from Eastern Canada, and which would be obliged to close up within three months if they could not get the material here to take to the United States for use in their mills. I undertake, to say, Sir, and I repeat it, that the material for paper on the continent of North America is in Canada and nowhere else, and it is worth taking care of and worth preserving. In fact, it is the main thing that our Provincial Governments have got to look to in the immediate future, so far as revenue from timber is concerned. The question may be asked me: What would be the effect if the export duties are reimposed? When I first put this notice on the Order Paper, I was told by a good many members: If you put on export duties, the Americans will immediately add the export duties that you impose to their present import duties, as they have power to do under the McKinley Act. Now, Sir, that is not the case, because the proviso of clause 218 in the McKinley Act says:

"Provided that in case any foreign country shall impose an export duty upon pine, spruce, elm, or other logs, or upon stave bolts, shingle wood, or heading blocks exported to the United States from such country, then the duty upon sawn lumber herein provided for, when imported from such country, shall remain the same as fixed by law in force prior to the passage of this Act."

Therefore the only bad result that would follow would be that the pine duties would go back to $2 per thousand as they were before the export duty was removed. That is the only effect it would have until new legislation is adopted in the United States. Now, Sir, what led to the reduction of $1 a thousand on pine? I think the hon. member for North Norfolk could tell us, if he were disposed to do so, that what led to that reduction was the fact that certain American citizens, influential at Washington, influential members of the Republican party, had become owners of large and extensive timber limits in the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron section of Ontario, and were extremely anxious to get their logs into Michigan, where their mills were without logs, and which they were obliged to get or lose the money they had invested in those mills. Their anxiety to get stock for their mills from the Canadian forest became so great that they persuaded Mr. Blaine and the other authorities at Washington to reduce the import duty $1 a thousand upon pine on condition that the Canadian Government would remove all export duties from pine, spruce and every other kind of logs. Now, Sir, if those duties were reimposed to-morrow, the same influence which caused that reduction of $1 a thousand would, I think, if our Government would stand to their guns, get the duties taken off pine and spruce altogether. If not, we would keep our logs and our lumber, the Americans would get along without us, and we would get along without them. Whatever would be the effect upon the pine and spruce log industry, of this much I am perfectly certain, that if we had an export duty upon spruce pulpwood, or upon spruce lumber, so as to prevent it being taken to the other side and used as pulpwood, the effect would be that the duty on Canadian chemical pulp and ground wood pulp would come off, and pulp for American paper mills would be manufactured to a large extent in Canada. Because it stands to reason that if the Americans had not that $6 a ton protection, it would be their interest to bring the soda ash to the wood, instead of the wood to the soda ash. They must have our lumber for pulpwood; they cannot do without it; and if they did not take it, the price of pulp would rise so much in the United States that Canadian pulp could be sent there over the duty. We are not afraid to compete with the Americans in the manufacture of chemical pulp or ground wood pulp. We have the timber here, and they have not; we have just as good water power as they have; and although there are a good many interests in Canada that would suffer from free trade, that one interest would not suffer and I have never pretended that it would. I believe that we can afford to adopt the freest possible trade with the United States so far as the pulp and paper trade is concerned, because we have the raw material. Anyway, whether we can or cannot, they must have our spruce to make pulp, or else have our pulp; and if the export duties were put on, we would certainly find the Americans proposing to remove or lower the duties on lumber on consideration of our removing the export duties, or they would see the manufacture of pulp going on in Canada to a much larger extent than has ever been dreamed of as yet. I do not ask for prohibitive export duties. I ask simply for that degree of protection by the way of export duty that will put us on even terms with the Americans with whom we have to compete. Now, it takes two cord of pulpwood to make a ton of chemical pulp; so that $6 a ton on pulp would be equivalent to $3 a cord on wood. This, everything else being equal, would put us on an even footing with them so far as chemical pulp is concerned. A duty of even $2 a cord would put a pulp mill upon almost every water power in the Eastern Townships, and afford an enormous amount of labour within that section at least of the Province of Quebec. If the Government are disposed, for the reasons which I have very imperfectly stated, and for other reasons, to reimpose the export duties, they should be put on in such a way that they can be removed partially or altogether whenever the United States show a disposition to meet us half way, and to reduce or altogether remove their import duties. I do not propose this as a re-

taliatory measure in any respect. I do not see how the Americans can find fault with our putting our own manufacturers, as much as possible, on even terms with theirs by means of an export duty protection to correspond with their import duty protection. If we were to go further and make it prohibitive there might be some complaint, but so long as we make it only sufficiently protective to give our own people fair-play and equal conditions with theirs, and impose it in such a way that it may be reduced or taken off altogether whenever their import duties are reduced or taken off altogether, I think it would be fair and just, and I do not think it could fairly be complained of by the American people. But whether it can or cannot be, this much is certain, that the principle that actuates the Government at Washington is the interest of the American people and that only; and the principle that must actuate the Canadian Government is the interest of the Canadian people and the Canadian people only, without any reference whatever to whether their policy is popular in the United States or not.

Mr. CORBOULD. I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without saying a few words on behalf of those engaged in the lumbering industry in British Columbia. As you are aware, Sir, that industry is second to none in the Dominion of Canada in its importance; but those engaged in it are placed at a disadvantage so far as the eastern market is concerned. Although the American duty on white pine has been reduced to $1 per thousand, still our Douglas fir going into the United States is not classed as a pine, but under the head of "not otherwise provided for," and a duty of $2 a thousand is imposed upon it. Although our fir logs are admitted free, the American pitch pine, coming from the United States, is used in making car sills and for similar purposes as our Douglas fir is used for. The pitch pine from the United States being admitted free into Canada, our lumbermen cannot compete with it in the eastern markets, and I think that a duty should be placed on the pitch pine coming from the United States similar to that imposed on our Douglas fir going into the United States. This would give those engaged in the lumber interest a fair chance to compete in the eastern market with the lumber coming from the United States, and I hope the Minister will see his way to imposing this duty, which I do not think would be considered in any way a measure of retaliation, as it would only be placing the two interests on the same footing. I think that all the British Columbia members in the House will back me up in what I have said, so far as our lumber interests are concerned. It was intended that a deputation from the lumbermen in British Columbia should wait upon the Minister upon this subject. I was in hopes they would be here before this motion came up, but unfortunately as yet they have not arrived. I, therefore take this opportunity of expressing their views and the views of the different members for British Columbia.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Sherbrooke has my sympathy in the fact that the spruce interests did not receive concessions under the McKinley Bill similar to those received by the pine interests. It is a matter of regret to everybody interested in the welfare and prosperity of Canada that this should not have been the case; and were there any method by which we could surely place them in a better position than they now occupy, I should be in favour of adopting it. But I have very serious doubts as to the propriety of adopting the measure proposed by the hon. gentleman as a remedy for the grievance under which the spruce interest labours. When we come to examine the thing critically, it will be found that to take the course proposed, would be likely to bring about disaster. The hon. gentleman informs us that the McKinley Bill made no change in mitigation of the lumber duties except with reference to white pine. We will find that, in addition to white pine, a change was made in the duty upon pine clapboards of all classes. A change was made in the duty upon pickets and palings from 20 to 10 per cent *ad valorem*. A change was made also in the duty upon shingles, from 35 to 20 per cent, so that five mitigations of the American duty are made in place of the one stated by the hon. gentleman. He tells us that the removal of the export duty was an act on the part of the Government popular only with the white pine interest. I must take issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. I quite well remember when the hon. gentleman who at present fills the position of Secretary of State, strongly protested against the imposition of an export duty on elm logs, and the result of his protest was that the duty was not imposed. I remember that on account of the opposition to the export duty on oak logs, that duty was removed; and I am ready to assert to-day that the imposition of a duty on pulpwood would be unpopular with thousands of small farmers who have pulpwood, and would not see the propriety of being obliged to hold the wood without a market until the pulp manufacturers were ready to buy it at their own prices. The hon. gentleman tells us that the only kind of lumber which received any mitigation of its burdens in the McKinley Bill was the most valuable kind, and that it was worth on the average $20 per thousand. This is, Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, an exaggerated statement of the average price of pine. The quality of pine that is actually benefited by the mitigation of duty to $1 per thousand is the coarse, cheap grade which could not be manufactured with profit, but which at present can be manufactured and leaves a margin of profit. That coarse grade can be manufactured and sold under the reduction of duty, which formerly was left to perish by fire or rot in the woods. He tells us that the white pine men obtained an anomalous advantage under this law. Well, the white pine men did not obtain this. The white pine men were passive in this matter as well as the spruce men. It simply happened that the spruce interests of Maine and other New England States, under the management of Mr. Reid, and Mr. Dingley, and Mr. Blaine, succeeded in resisting successfully the movement in favour of a reduction of duty. The five articles I have named were the only ones that benefited, under the provisions of the McKinley Bill, from the reduction of the duty. The white pine men did not obtain this advantage, but it came to them without any motion on their own part. The hon. gentleman tells us that an immense movement in saw-logs is taking place on Lake Huron, that the mills there cannot obtain stock to saw, that the logs are all being sold to the American market, and he read a letter from Mr. Moiles informing him, that the mills from that side cannot obtain logs and that all

the logs are being towed away. Well, I am informed that this self-same Mr. Moiles has made a contract to saw several million feet of logs on the Canadian side at John Island, and I think, that is somewhat inconsistent with the statement made by my hon. friend. I happen to know something about this matter. In fact, the firm with which I am connected is placed in a position where we have to choose between sawing logs on the Canadian side and towing to the American side. They made a careful calculation in the matter. We do not own a mill, but have to saw our logs, and the result is this: If we tow our logs to the American side, we save the payment of $1 per thousand duty; but on the other hand we must pay a tow bill of $1.50 per thousand feet, incurring besides a navigation risk equivalent to at least 75 cents per thousand, making $2.25 as actual cost-risk of towing the logs over. When we place our lumber on the other side, we leave it at a point where we can get freight at 25 cents per thousand cheaper to Chicago and Buffalo than from the Canadian side if sawn there, so that the net loss in towing to the American market and sawing the logs there is $1 per thousand. No man will build a mill on the American side to tow logs to from Canada. Millmen having mills in Michigan will tow their logs, but there is no other inducement to tow the logs, and it is correct that the disadvantage of towing logs to the United States to saw them there is $1 per thousand under present conditions, taking risk of towing into consideration. The hon. gentleman speaks of logs going to Lake Erie. There is only one firm towing there now, and they are towing what is called long timber, spars and timber of that kind, but the volume of trade in that region has been diminishing year by year for many years, and is almost about to cease. There is only one firm left in Canada that is towing logs there now, and I believe this year that firm will tow only two rafts of about 5,000,000 feet. The hon. gentleman informs us that the advantage arising from the repeal of the export duties and the reduction of the American import duty accrues exclusively to the white pine lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley, that the lumbermen of the Lake Huron district do not take the same view in regard to the advantage. I think I know something about the feeling and interests of the lumbermen of the Lake Huron region, being one of them myself, and I do not believe that 5 per cent of the lumbermen of the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron district are not opposed to the imposition of the export duty. A deputation waited on the Government some two years ago asking them to remove this duty, as it prevented our getting free lumber from the United States. They have also been down recently; and I am safe in saying that the trade there are unanimously opposed to the duty as much as the lumbermen of the Ottawa Valley are. In fact, it is almost the unanimous feeling of the lumbermen from the Ottawa Valley to Rat Portage. The hon. gentleman tells us that spruce logs are being towed out of the country very rapidly. The Trade and Navigation Returns of last year would perhaps give a better idea of this than any assertion of the hon. gentleman's, and I find that last year the amount of spruce towed out of the country was 28,500,000 feet, that is up to the 30th June, 1891. The total amount of logs given by the Minister of Customs as having been towed out from 13th October, 1890, to 1st January, 1892, was 43,000,000 feet of pine and 28,000,000 feet of spruce. While in this way we exported to the United States 28,000,000 feet of spruce logs, we imported from the United States several times as much. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is not aware that an enormous trade in spruce is established, and has been established for years with the northern portion of the State of Maine, and that the spruce from that region passes down the River St. John in New Brunswick and is converted into lumber by Canadian mills.

Mr. IVES. By American operatives.

Mr. CHARLTON. Probably he is not aware that our export of spruce logs to the United States is a mere trifle to what we import. The hon. gentleman says that the duty on pulpwood is $6 a ton. According to the McKinley Bill the duty on mechanical pulpwood is $2.50 a ton, on chemical pulpwood unbleached $6 a ton, and on chemical pulpwood bleached $7 a ton.

Mr. IVES. I said chemical, not mechanical.

Mr. CHARLTON. The wood pulp chemically treated is subject to a duty of $7 a ton dry weight, but the great mass of pulpwood which is converted into pulp is a wood which is ground without being treated chemically. That is the great mass of the wood which is exported in this way. The hon. gentleman proceeded to state that pulp mills were erected on streams—and I presume there is one on some river in his own locality—and that the pulpwood on those streams was being taken out of the country and the mill was liable to be left without stock at some future time. I suppose the hon. gentleman desires that there shall be a chance given for capitalists to erect pulp mills, and that the Government shall enact a law allowing them to hold the raw material in reserve until they are ready to buy it. He would not only permit them to hold their limits, which they have a right to do because they belong to them, but he would prohibit anybody else from entering into the purchase of pulpwood. That is what the hon. gentleman means, that the raw material, which by Divine right belongs to the proprietor, shall not be converted into money, but that the owner shall be prevented from turning it into cash and shall be compelled by a legislative enactment to hold this raw material until the pulp manufacturer is ready to buy it at his own price. As to his assertion that spruce forests might be made perpetual by the enactment of proper forestry laws, by preventing the cutting of timber under 12 inches in diameter, every practical man knows that the result of leaving the smaller timber standing is generally that it is destroyed by fire. The large timber is cut down, and the limbs and refuse feed fires and the small timber is destroyed. There is not one case in a hundred perhaps where tracts have been cut over in that way in which the timber continues to grow, because a fire gets in and then the timber is killed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). These forests do not belong to us.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, they do not. They belong to the provinces. The hon. gentleman tries to convey the idea that we have an absolute monopoly in this matter, and that, if we can make regulations and the United States have to sue to us for their material because we place an

embargo on their obtaining it in this way, they will go down on their knees to us. He asserts that there is not enough wood pulp material in the United States to last ten years The assertion is utterly absurd. There are enormous quantities of this material in the Adirondacks, there are enormous quantities in New Hampshire, there are enormous quantities in Maine, in Michigan and Wisconsin. There are great quantities scattered through other states, Minnesota has immense quantities, and if the Americans turned their attention to the illimitable forests of the south, they would be able to obtain all they wanted. There is an interest in the United States that would welcome the imposition of a duty upon pulpwood as an enactment that would serve their own interests by making their forests of timber more valuable for the purpose of converting the wood into pulp. We have not a monopoly of this, we are simply supplying the demand now, to some extent, because we have superior geographical facilities and transportation facilities for reaching the market of some sections.

Then, the only effect of putting back this export duty would be to raise the duty upon lumber to $2 per thousand in place of $1 as at present under the McKinley Bill. Why, says the hon. member, if the duty were reimposed, the same influence would force off the duty on pine and spruce lumber that succeeded in getting this provision made under the McKinley Bill in 1889. He refers to the interest of the Michigan men, men who have invested to some extent in timber lands in Canada. Now, when the McKinley Bill was under consideration this same interest in Michigan petitioned Congress. What did they ask? Did they ask for the removal of the duty on lumber? Did their conduct and their views on this occasion give the slightest reason to suppose they would ever favour the reduction of the duty on lumber, or the removal of the duty? On the contrary, these petitions were poured in from Michigan, Wisconsin, northern Ohio, from Minnesota, and from all the lumber regions in the vicinity of the great lakes. This is what they asked for:

"That in case any foreign country shall impose an export duty upon logs, shingle-bolts or other kinds of wood, that may be designed for, or used as, the raw material of any American saw-mill, mill, or factory, than the sawn lumber, shingles or other manufactured product of such kinds of logs, bolts or wood as may have an export duty imposed upon it by such country, shall, when imported from such country, be subject, in addition to the regular duty provided by law, to an additional duty equivalent to the amount of such export duty, and that such additional duty shall be imposed upon any article that might otherwise be upon the free list."

Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever influence that interest may possess, it will use its influence, in case an export duty is reimposed, to get Congress to add the export duty to the import duty. Now, my hon. friend feels aggrieved because the white pine interest is enjoying an advantage that the spruce interest is not enjoying. I am sorry that is the case. I wish the spruce interest were enjoying the same advantage; but if my hon. friend's prayer is granted, if the export duties are reimposed, of course he will have companions in misery, for the white pine interest will be obliged to pay $2 a thousand in place of $1 as at present, and to that extent he might be gratified, but it would not benefit him. He might find the next step in the programme would be that he had invited disaster to himself. I do not suppose his position would be improved if the export duty that might be imposed on pulp goods, was added by the Americans as an additional duty upon his pulp. I do not suppose that the spruce interest would be greatly benefited if, in place of paying $2 a thousand as at present on their lumber, they were obliged to pay the $2 a thousand plus the export duty upon spruce logs. That was $1 per thousand, and they would pay three; if the export duty was $2, they would pay four. It is for this reason that I feel nervous about this matter, not that I do not sympathize with the hon. gentleman, because I would be in favour of adopting any measure that would afford relief to so important an interest as the spruce interest; but because I feel convinced that the adoption of this measure would invite disaster, and that disaster would come; because the sure result of the reimposition of the export duty will be that the American Congress will add that reimposed export duty to the import duty, whatever it may be. Now, we do not want that, I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want it, the pine interest does not want it, nobody wants it, and we do not want to enter upon a policy of irritation that will be calculated to produce results of this character. There is one feature about this case that we want to bear in mind. The American Government and the American Congress are debarred by constitutional provision from imposing an export duty; they cannot impose an export duty at all, and if they desire to retaliate for the imposition of an export duty by a foreign power upon articles imported into that country, they must do it indirectly. Now, the condition of trade between these two countries is one that, perhaps, many of us are not aware of; the condition of trade in logs is one that American public men were not aware of, I believe, until late years. I think the first investigations made in reference to the matter were made by the American consul who preceded the present one, Mr. Hotchkiss, who was a lumberman, and who himself investigated this matter and ascertained that the export duty of logs from Canada to the United States was less than the imports of logs from the United States to Canada. I wish to lay before the House and the Government some figures bearing on this point. I will take the seven years from 1884-85 to 1890-91. I will give two tables showing the exports of saw-logs from Canada into the United States during that period, and the imports of saw-logs from the United States into Canada during that same period:

Saw-log exports, Canada to United States.

1884-85	$ 225,000
1885-86	314,000
1886-87	346,000
1887-88	390,000
1888-89	677,000
1889-90	615,000
1890-91	722,000
	$3,289,000

Saw-log imports, United States to Canada.

1884-85	$ 604,000
1885-86	493,000
1886-87	336,000
1887-88	280,000
1888-89	360,000
1889-90	256,000
1890-91	859,000
	$3,188,000

But there was a branch of this trade which the Trade and Navigation Returns do not cover, and

that was the trade from the State of Maine down the St. John River to the Province of New Brunswick. At one time I moved for returns showing the volume of that trade, and as I was unable to get the information from the Government I sent to the secretary of the Fredericton Boom Company who gave these following statistics as to the volume of that trade for the series of years commencing in 1884-85. This gentleman gives the quantity of pine, spruce and cedar logs brought from the State of Maine in each year, estimating the value at $8 a thousand, which, I am told by New Brunswick lumbermen, is probably an undervaluation :

Year.	Feet.	Value.
1884-85	90,000,000	$720,000
1885-86	99,000,000	792,000
1886-87	101,500,000	812,000
1887-88	99,000,000	792,000
1888-89	78,000,000	624,000
1889-90	100,000,000	800,000
1890-91	92,500,000	740,000
		$5,280,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is that what passed through the boom ?

Mr. CHARLTON. That is what passed through the boom from Maine, according to this authority. This return was made before the returns were completed for the year 1890, and he estimated the amount for that year at 100,000,000 feet. Now for the succeeding year, 1890-91, I averaged the six previous years, which gave a result of 92,500,000 feet. The total value of $5,280,000 of the logs imported into New Brunswick from the State of Maine, is in addition to the $3,198,000 worth that we imported into other parts of Canada from other parts of the United States, as shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns ; so that our total imports have been $8,468,000, and the excess of imports over the export of logs during the seven years has been $5,179,900. Now, Sir, if this is the case I would ask, what justice there is in the imposition of an export duty ? If we have been receiving nearly three times as many logs as we have been exporting, it is a little invidious to impose an export duty upon logs when the American Government is debarred from retaliating in kind by a constitutional provision. I find in analysing these returns that our exports of logs last year under the operation of the free list, was less than our imports of logs as shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns, without any reference to our imports from Maine. Last year our exports amounted to $722,000 and our imports to $859,000, as shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns, and during the three last years the amount does not vary materially. So I cannot conceive there is any great necessity, even with the increasing volume of trade, for the action which the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Ives) asks. In brief, then, we are importing from the United States vastly more spruce than we are exporting, for we have imported from the United States, in seven years, spruce and other logs to the value of eight and a-half millions against three and a-quarter millions exported, and, under all the circumstances, there is no call for an export duty. It would be a most natural thing for the United States, being in possession of these facts, as they are, to say that the imposition of this duty, in the face of the fact that they are sending us a larger quantity of logs than we are sending to them, is most unjust, and they will retaliate as best they may, and the most natural form of retaliation—probably the only form they could adopt under the circumstances—would be to add whatever export duty they chose to adopt to the import duty collected, leaving us to choose whether we would pay little or much or nothing at all.

The exceptional position in which the pine interest is placed is deserving of a few words at my hands, and I think I am not abusing confidence, if I mention the part which you, Mr. Speaker, and myself, took in this matter. We all, of course, felt a very great degree of interest in the discussions on the McKinley Bill. Our hopes rose and our hopes fell. We hoped at one time to get free lumber, and I think we would have got it if the export duty had not been in operation. It was used with great adroitness by the American lumbermen to resist the demand for free lumber, and that was the reason, probably, why we did not get the concession. It was understood, information was received here, that if the Canadian Government would officially promise to remove the export duty in the event of the McKinley Bill reducing the lumber duty $1 per thousand, that provision would be inserted in the McKinley Bill. Whether the information was correct or not I do not know, but we believed it was, and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that you as a representative of the lumbermen on one side of the House, and myself as a representative of the lumbermen on the other side of the House, waited upon Sir John Macdonald with respect to this matter. We placed before Sir John Macdonald the facts that the export duty, in all human probability, was inimical to our interests in so far as its effects had been to lessen our chance to get free lumber ; that we believed if the Government of Canada would make an official promise to reduce the export duty in consideration of the lumber duty being reduced $1 per thousand, it would be done at Washington, and by Sir John Macdonald's direction, you, Mr. Speaker, placed a question on the Notice Paper, and that question was duly asked, and it was answered by Sir John Macdonald on behalf of the Canadian Government. I have the record here in *Hansard*. It occurred on May 19, 1890. The question was asked by Mr. Bryson, in your absence, Mr. Speaker, from the House :

"Mr. BRYSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, with the permission of the House, I would like to ask a question which has been put on the Notice Paper by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). The question is this: Whether, in the event of the United States Congress reducing the import duty on sawn lumber to $1 per thousand feet, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs? It is very important that this question should be answered at the present moment."

This is the answer :

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will answer that question. In the event of the United States Congress reducing the import duty on sawn lumber, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs. I will take an opportunity of conveying that decision to the proper quarters."

I suppose, of course, that Sir John Macdonald had that decision conveyed to the authorities at Washington. When the McKinley Bill finally passed, it was discovered that its provisions with respect to the reduction of lumber duties did not embrace spruce lumber. We were very sorry that was the case, and I suppose the Canadian Government were

not bound by the promise it made, although the language of the answer, as contained in *Hansard*, would have bound the Government to remove the duty, as there was the reduction in lumber duties and the answer did not specify what the reduction should be. But the spirit of the understanding was that the duty on spruce should be reduced, with the reduction on pine. Such was our expectation and hope, and all the interests of the country felt disappointed that this was not done. But the question arose, what should be done under the circumstances. Here was a chance to remove from one great industry a tax which bore heavily upon it, and if that step was taken, and if the duties were so relieved, it would not prejudice the interests of the other, the spruce interest, but leave other interests precisely where they were if relief was afforded to the pine interest. Sir John Macdonald and his Ministers decided, and very wisely decided, in my opinion, to remove the export duty, and to relieve the most important branch of the lumbering industry from a burden that pressed seriously upon it. No less than 800,000,000 or 900,000,000 feet of white pine lumber are exported from this country to the United States, and to secure a reduction of the burden of $1 per thousand means something like $900,000 annually.

Mr. IVES. $800,000 or $900,000?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am referring to the quantity that goes to the United States, not that going to the South American and other markets. This Bill went into operation on 6th October, and our Government issued the order removing export duty on 11th October, and in doing so they acted in consonance with the general interests of the country and the lumber trade, and at the urgent solicitation not only of the pine lumber trade but of those who had been opposed to them—they acted according to the wishes of the entire pine lumber trade. The effect of this action on the lumber trade has been a salutary one, as I said a few moments ago; it has enabled the white pine lumbermen to market coarse grades of lumber in large quantities, which hitherto had proved unsaleable and worthless. It was not the valuable pine timber that was worth $20 per thousand that had been so much benefited by the removal of the tax, but the trade in the poorer qualities, and the great bulk of the timber was becoming of poorer quality, first, because it had been cut out, next, because of the second cuttings, and also because fire had raged through extensive limits; and all the inferior grades, all those coarse grades which otherwise were worthless and added nothing to our wealth, were specially benefited by the reduction of this duty.

The impression obtains very often that pine is growing scarcer, that our command of the American market is more and more assured every day, that, in fact, we have control of that market, and that the imposition of a duty on lumber does not materially affect the interests of Canada, because the Americans will pay the duty. It must, however, be remembered that the illimitable forests of pitch pine in the south, where these pine lands may be obtained at $1.25 per acre, and for which $5 is an excessive price, forests not liable to destruction by fire, because there is no undergrowth, lands covered by timber which is inexhaustible and which will hardly be touched during the next 50 years—this southern pine is constantly encroaching on the markets of the white pine of the north. It has driven us from one market to another, and it has taken the place of all our coarse grades along the seaboard. We meet it in Chicago, we meet it in Cincinnati, we meet it even in Cleveland and Buffalo, and we have a constant struggle to maintain our ground in the markets. We have also to meet the southern yellow poplar, and to contend with the fact that two-thirds of the finishing lumber used in many sections of the northern States is brought from the south. That has a tendency to depress the value of the better grades of pine, and this removal of a burden to the extent of $1 per thousand was a great boon to the white pine interest of Canada, and was a boon that inflicted no injury upon my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) nor upon anybody else engaged in the spruce trade, because it simply left them right where they would have been left if the Government had refused to make this provision and to secure for the white pine interest a reduction of $1 per thousand in the duty on lumber.

There is now, Mr. Speaker, a Bill before Congress, having for its object the placing of all lumber upon the free list. That Bill has a good prospect of passing, and I hope it will become law. If it has not already been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means it soon will be, and it is one of the same class of Bills as the wool Bill, and other free trade Bills which will undoubtedly pass the American House of Representatives. That Bill provides for placing upon the free list:

"Timber, hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars and in building walls. Timber squared or sided. Wood unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other articles of sawed lumber. Hubs for wheels, posts, last blocks, waggon blocks, &c., staves of wood. Pickets and palings, laths, shingles, clapboards, pine or spruce, and logs.

"Provided, that if any export duty is made upon the above mentioned articles, or either of them, by any country whence imported, all articles embraced in this Act imported from said country shall be subject to duty as now provided by law."

My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) will see from this Bill and from this last proviso in it, what the feeling in Washington is. He will see that this is a feeling hostile to the imposition of the export duty, and if he is a wise man he will realize how necessary it is to refrain from this irritating policy; because were we to impose an export duty, we would ruin whatever chance there is of the passage of this Bill giving free lumber. The hon. gentleman will see that there is a provision in the Bill that if any export duty is levied on any article enumerated in the list then every article in the Bill will go upon the dutiable list of imports to the United States. Those familiar with the movement of matters at Washington know perfectly well that the fact that the Canadian Government imposed an export duty has been used with great adroitness and effect by every enemy of free lumber in the United States. As I said awhile ago, I repeat now: That I believe we were defeated in our hopes of securing free lumber under the McKinley Bill, which proposed to put various raw materials on the free list, by the fact that we had existing in this country an export duty. I say here, Sir, that we have no hope of free lumber into the United States as proposed by this Bill of Congress before the Committee of Ways and Means if we reimpose the export duty, because the bare fact of our reimposing

it would dash to the ground every provision for admitting these articles which I have enumerated upon the free list.

A convention of lumbermen met at Washington a few weeks ago, and it included delegates of lumbermen from California, from Oregon, from Washington, from Minnesota, from Wisconsin, from Michigan, from Texas, from Louisiana, from Mississippi, from the Carolinas, from Georgia, and from every lumber section of the United States. It was one of the most powerful and influential delegations that ever appeared in the American capital, and it met there for the purpose of protesting against this Bill which proposed to place lumber upon the free list. If this country imposed an export duty they would have made use of that fact, and if we are ever foolish enough to reimpose that duty they will make use of it, to urge it against the Bill, and it will place in their hands a most potent and effective weapon for defeating this very measure which we hope to see passed in Congress. In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I think I may with every propriety urge my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) to let this question alone, and to permit the forces which are now working for free lumber to work undisturbed. I think I might ask my hon. friend not to propose this irritating piece of legislation which would dash our hopes in reference to this matter to the ground. We have nothing to gain in this country by a policy of irritation. There is now a strong movement in the United States in favour of free lumber; all the building interests and the consumers of lumber are in favour of it. It is easy enough to rally to the cause of free lumber in the United States an overwhelming following if you do not prejudice your case and arouse animosity, and place in the hands of the enemies of the measure some potent weapon whereby they may be able to appeal to prejudice and passion, as you would do if the motion of my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) was granted.

With regard to the question of pulpwood I do not design to go fully into that matter. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) who is to speak, knows a great deal more about that subject than I do, and I will leave the treatment of that branch of the subject to him saving such incidental allusions as I have made on the question.

I will briefly summarize what I have said, by the reiteration of the statement that there is no antagonism of feeling between the white pine and the spruce interest. So far as our influence could be used, we have used it with the desire of securing the reduction of lumber duties all around. We were very sorry when this was not obtained, and we would be glad to see it obtained now. We hope for free lumber, and we believe that a Bill admitting Canadian lumber into the United States free of duty is coming. We deprecate this movement to reimpose the export duty, because we find in it a movement calculated to retard that and to prejudice our chances of securing that great boon. I further deprecate this motion to reimpose the duty, because I believe it invites disaster, which if this step is taken will inevitably follow. I believe from what I know of the feeling in the west, I believe from the movement, as I pointed out when I read this petition sent in 1889, so widely circulated and numerously and influentially signed, I believe from what I know of the lumber interest of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Ohio, that if this imposition of export duties is carried out, it will almost surely be followed by the addition of this export duty to the American import duty. The Americans now, as the Yankees say, have caught on to the fact which they did not know a few years ago, that we were selling them about one-third as many more logs as they were sending us. They were formerly not aware of the relative trade in logs between the two countries, but they understand it now, and understanding it they will see in a more glaring light the injustice of the imposition of the export duty. When they see the injustice in that light they will be more certain to retaliate, and if they do retaliate, they must retaliate on the line I have indicated. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my hon. friend will not press his motion, and, even if he does, I hope that the Government will not listen to it. I trust that this matter will be allowed to go on as it has gone on. If we are to reimpose this export duty now it would be better a thousand times that we had never taken it off, because if we had not taken it off, we would not excite so much ill-feeling as we will do now when after taking it off we impose it again. Realizing as I do that nothing but mischief can come from the granting of the motion of my hon. friend (Mr, Ives), and that he will bring on the head of the white pine lumbermen, upon the whole lumbering interest of Canada, and upon his own head, disaster, I hope, Sir, without reference to political feelings or anything of the kind, but merely with reference to a great business industry in this country, that the Government will not meddle with this question.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was advancing reasons against the reimposition of the export duty on logs. Amongst other reasons, he said that the lumbermen who were getting out logs could not get them cut into lumber in this country. Well, I do not know what his experience may be, but if he should go up along the Georgian Bay, and call at Midland, where there is a large mill capable of cutting about 125,000 feet of lumber in ten hours, he would find that there would be no difficulty in getting logs cut. That mill, owing to the removal of the export duty on logs, is to-day idle, whereas, a few years ago, it was engaged during the whole season. The hon. gentleman also said that we have nothing to gain by a policy of irritation towards the United States. I do not take it that in any legislation here, directed towards the interests of our own people, and calculated to better their condition or improve the country, we can be said to be pursuing a course of irritation towards any country. We are not legislating with regard to outside countries, but with regard to the interests of our own people, and so long as we keep within the bounds of international law and discharge the duties we are sent here to attend to, I do not think there is any justice or reason in the assertion that we are pursuing a course of irritation. If it is in the interest of our people or any considerable number of them, that

an export duty should be imposed upon logs, I think we should impose it irrespective of the opinion entertained of us by any foreign country. The hon. gentleman says that there is now a Bill before the United States Congress to place lumber on the free list, and, therefore, if an export duty were put upon logs in this country, it would have the effect of preventing that Bill passing. There is no guarantee of that Bill passing. We know that from year to year Bills of a similar character are introduced into the United States Congress, but up to the present time not one of them have passed, and we have no reason to suppose that the Bill now before that body is any more likely to pass. The hon. member also stated that lumbermen now take out of the bush a class of timber that would not be used if this duty were imposed; in other words, that it is not the better class of logs which are sent to the United States, but the coarser grades. I think the hon. gentleman ought to know better, because he is engaged in the lumber business himself. I have been credibly informed by one of the largest lumbermen of the Georgian Bay that the very reverse is the case—that some four or five good logs, sometimes more, are taken out of the tree and shipped to the United States, and the coarser logs are left here because it would not pay to ship them to the United States. It is clear lumber that commands the readiest sale in the United States, and only the best class of logs are sent there. Three or four or five good logs are taken out of each tree and shipped away, and two or three logs left which it would not pay to ship. I am told that nearly one-fourth of the lumber is left in the woods in that way, and in a year or two this is destroyed by being worm-eaten or by fire. I am told that the Ontario Government lose a large revenue from this cause every year, as they are deprived of a royalty on all the logs which would otherwise be taken out. Therefore, about one-fourth of the revenue from royalties is lost to the Provincial Government. It is not only in the interest of the revenue of the Province of Ontario, but in the interest of the country at large that we should not allow this system to go on. The hon. member for North Norfolk stated that there is a loss of about $1 to $1.25 a thousand in logs sent to the United States, for towing, risk, &c. If that is the case that much would be saved by cutting the lumber here. But he said that the lumbermen cannot lose so much, because it pays them better than it would to pay $2 a thousand on lumber. Therefore, on every 1,000 feet there could be only a loss of 75 cents if the export duty were put on, and this country would gain a great deal more than that by cutting the lumber here. The hon. gentleman says he understands that the mills are not idle, but are cutting logs, and he instances a case where a lumberman told him that he got a large contract for cutting logs during the present season. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if he goes along the north shore of the Georgian Bay and visits Parry Sound or Midland, he will find large mills lying idle, in which there are thousands and tens of thousands of dollars invested, and where thousands of men a few years ago used to be employed. The mill at Midland, which used to cut 125,000 feet every ten hours, and ran frequently both night and day, employing directly and indirectly 300 men, and having about $50,000 invested in plant, is not doing a dollar's worth of work to-day and is not employing a single man—all by virtue of the policy of removing the export duty on logs. That industry built up the town of Midland, and employed a large number of men who consumed the products of the country about. There are various reasons why an export duty should be imposed on logs, and I will mention some of them. Consider the large quantity of logs sent out of the country every year. The hon. member for North Norfolk states that there are about 820,000 logs sent out every year. From my examination of the Trade and Navigation Returns, I do not think that they give us anything like an accurate statement of the number of logs exported: at best they give only an approximate estimate. To show the rapidity with which our forests are being denuded, I will mention the approximate quantity shipped this year by a few of the lumber companies in the north-western part of Ontario, which I obtained from a gentleman engaged in the lumber industry. One company expects to send about 25,000,000 feet, another 20,000,000, another 8,000,000, another 20,000,000, another 25,000,000, another 15,000,000, another 20,000,000, another 6,000,000, and miscellaneous dealers about 75,000,000 feet. All these companies, it is estimated, will send out during the present year 220,000,000 feet of pine lumber from the North Shore and Georgian Bay district across the lakes, in logs. A few years ago this was all cut in Canada. Now, we know that the lumber industry has been developing very rapidly. The returns sent to the Ontario Government show that all the pine timber is taken off about 36 townships every year. How long will it be at that rate before all the pine timber is taken out of the country, and one of the most valuable assets of the Province of Ontario is destroyed? There is another feature of the situation which is very interesting and should not be lost sight of. The streams down which this lumber is brought all flow southward into the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. The timber is brought down these streams as timber is brought down streams generally. We find that the lumbermen are extending their operations further north every year, and at the rate they are doing so, they will soon be at the sources of the streams at the height of land; after which we will have that fine timber, which ought to be kept for the supply of the people of Ontario, taken off to the height of land, and we will not be able to bring any more timber this way until railroads penetrate that country, because the streams on the other side or north of the height of land instead of flowing southward, flow northward to James and Hudson Bay, by which route it will have to be shipped. Our province will thus be denuded of the valuable timber we need at home. This great destruction we ought not to allow to continue. If we do not live to feel the effects, those who come after us will, and it behooves this generation to be more careful of that valuable asset which is one of the most important we have. If we let this timber go what loss will it represent to the people? Making an approximate estimate of the taking out of these logs, I am told by lumbermen that it costs about $4.50 per 1,000 to get them out; it costs about 50 cents per 1,000 to drive them down the river, and $1.25 for towing, making in all $6.25 per 1,000 as the expense of taking out the logs and putting them on the lakes. Then they are transferred to the American side. Now, if this work were all done by Canadians, we would not have so much to complain of, but many of the men

who own these large timber areas are Americans, and these Americans bring their labour and supplies from the other side. They take these logs into the waters of the Georgian Bay or Lake Huron, and then tow them across to the American side. Thus that work not only gives employment to Americans in Canada but, this duty being off, the logs are sawn by the Americans at home. Our labouring men are, therefore, shut out of this market for their labour which they formerly enjoyed in the winter seasons. On the American side these logs are manufactured. It costs $2.50 per 1,000 to manufacture them, 50 cents per 1,000 to ship them over, and the incidental expenses amount to 25 cents per 1,000, making a total of $3.25 per 1,000. If you add $3 per 1,000 for the feeding of the men and the expenditure and other interests involved, that makes $6.25 per 1,000 lost to the people of Ontario through the manufacture of these logs on the other side. What does that represent? It represents, on the amount of lumber taken over this year, a loss to Ontario of $1,320,000, which is the direct loss, not to mention the loss sustained through the capital involved in the large mills on this side, in the erection of mills and machinery being unremunerative, through these mills now lying idle. That means, besides, a great loss to our farmers and tradesmen, because when these mills were running in Canada the men employed in them spend their money here, whereas now all that expenditure is made in the United States. It may be said that our Canadians can get employment on the other side, but as soon as they cross the line they are met by the alien law and sent back. I know several of these men, who have been going year after year over from my district of the country to work in these mills and lumbering operations, being thrown out of employment on account of the lumber being cut up in the United States. Not only do Americans take their place in getting out the logs in the winter on this side, but they take their place also in manufacturing it on the other side. This is the condition of things we find in our country: Our mills are lying idle and our men are out of employment. Mill after mill, which was formerly in full operation, is now lying idle. In the Georgian Bay and Parry Sound districts, I am told that two large companies are shutting up their mills this year, and it is likely that one or two others will follow suit, so that in a short time this great local industry will be destroyed if this thing goes on. In the Midland district and Collingwood, and in the Georgian Bay district and other places where large mills have been running for years, to-day these mills exist only in name, and where hundreds of men were employed there are none now at work, all which is brought about by the remission of the export duty on lumber. In the interests of the settlers, in the interests of the farmers who formerly found a market for their produce, in the interests of all those who require lumber, we ought to have this duty reimposed; and I do not believe that, take the country as a whole, it will be found as the hon. member for North Norfolk, said, that the people engaged in the trade are a unit on the question. I have talked to several lumbermen there, and find they are not a unit. Of course there are men who find they can with less trouble take out the logs and sell them to the United States, and are in favour of free export, men, for instance, like the hon. member for North Norfolk, who are engaged in tha business, but there are many others in the trade who hold a different opinion. I do not pretend to say that the hon. gentleman is solely actuated by selfish motives, but when a man's interests are involved, his judgment is likely to be clouded. But there are thousands of people in our country, who are disinterested parties, in so far as their having any financial interest in the business is concerned, and their views are entitled certainly to be heard. The duty ought never to have been taken off. I do not think its reimposition would at all influence the United States either in putting on any higher duty or taking it off, because they are bound to have our lumber in any case; and I also believe that at present our lumber is going too rapidly out of our country. It may be in the interests of our lumbermen that this duty should be kept off. Some hon. gentlemen, speaking on this question, say you are hampering the lumbermen in every way possible; you are putting a duty on pork and thus making his supplies dearer, and now you propose to reimpose the export duty on lumber. But it is most significant that every man engaging in timber limits is able to make money out of them, and that very rapidly. The experience of men dealing in such limits is that their value doubles every four or five years, and we find that limits, which were bought for $40,000 or $50,000 some years ago, bring even as high as $500,000 to-day. This rapid increase is shown by the sales which have been made, not only by the Local Government but by private individuals, from time to time. We find that the increase in value has been going on very fast during the last few years. As a rule, men who have timber limits hold them for a large profit, until they choose to realize on them, and I do not see how their interests should suffer to any extent by the reimposition of this duty. I say the timber is being taken away too rapidly, and it gives employment to people on the other side instead of to our own people here, and this is destroying one of the most important assets of the country. We should endeavour either to stop it or keep it within reasonable limits. I hope the Government will consider the matter and take steps to prevent what I know takes place along the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. I have only spoken in regard to white pine because that is what is principally taken out there, but I have no doubt the same thing is true in regard to spruce and other timber. It was one of the greatest mistakes that could have been made when the Government took off the export duty, and when they put that duty on again the people of the country will be satisfied that they have received a most important advantage.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Representing, as I do, a portion of the country which is perhaps more interested in this matter than any other, I deem it right to say a few words on this question; and, certainly, it is a question that requires more attention almost than any other in connection with the tariff and which requires the most careful consideration on the part of the Government and the House. As a decided, and I hope a consistent, supporter of the National Policy, I would prevent, if it were in my power, a single pound of raw material leaving this country which could be manufactured within its bounds, provided that, in so doing, I was not doing a

greater injury to the country than I was conferring any advantage upon it. I believe this is one of the questions in regard to which that consideration must arise. It is much to be desired that there could be found some practical method of overcoming the present difficulty, not only because it seriously affects the material interests of the country, but because it has placed us in a most humiliating position in regard to the American people. As to the portion of the question which relates to lumber, I think the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) has hardly made out his case in regard to his representation in connection with the spruce timber interest. I find that we export of pine lumber from this country to the United States about $7,000,000 worth per annum, and our export of spruce—because the export to Great Britain is not affected—our total export of spruce deals manufactured in this country to the United States last year only amounted to $83,000. About $600,000 worth of spruce deals was exported which was not the production of this country. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has already explained what they were. The statement of the export of board and plank makes no distinction between the spruce, the pine and the other kinds of timber, so that it is impossible to ascertain what quantity of spruce of that dimension has been exported. We find that the total export from New Brunswick of sawn lumber, exclusive of deals, was $150,000 roughly, and there is no great quantity of spruce exported from any other part of the country. Thus, besides the $600,000 worth of American timber manufactured at St. John from which the country get the benefit, less than $500,000 worth of board and plank is to be set off against the $7,000,000 worth of pine timber exported. I think the hon. gentleman has, therefore, failed to make out his case in regard to the comparison between spruce and pine timber. I cannot help thinking that the hon. gentleman must have some other motive to induce him to act in this matter than the interest of the producers of spruce timber. There is one consideration which has hardly been dealt with, and it is this: On the strength of the abolition of our export duty on logs and a reduction in the rate of duty on the other side, very large contracts have been entered into in that part of the country which borders upon the United States, the basis being the present duty of $1 a thousand. The Finance Minister must undoubtedly see the great danger which would arise to the interests of this country if that policy were to be changed and we were to put a sudden stop to these transactions, as we would most certainly do if that duty were again put on. When we consider the small amount of the interest affected by the abolition of the duty it would appear the height of madness if, without any previous preparation, we were to bring that trade into danger by such a course, and so affect our home trade throughout this whole Dominion. That point has not yet been touched upon, but it is one of the most important to be considered. I have no special sympathy with the lumbermen—politically I have nothing special to thank them for—but I believe that we ought to do that great and important interest some justice, and I am sorry to say that it is evident that my hon. friend from Grey who has just spoken (Mr. Sproule) is sadly astray in his figures.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. SPROULE. I got them from one of the largest lumbermen on the Georgian Bay, and he ought to know.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman says it costs $6 a thousand to manufacture the lumber.

Mr. SPROULE. I said it cost $2.50 to manufacture it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Then I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman. Hon. gentlemen must not be led away by the idea that, when the logs are exported, this country gets no benefit from the trade. Taking the most favourable view from the hon. gentleman's standpoint the figures may be put at 3 to 2. That is, the cost of getting out the logs and bringing them down to the mills, wherever they may be situated, and including the rafting, is far within the mark of $3 a thousand, and in giving that figure I am erring in a safe direction. The cost of manufacture is not more than $2. So that we would get $3 on every thousand and lose $2, and I believe that, in stating that, I am erring on the side of the hon. gentleman. And there is no doubt that the sale of limits has brought a great amount of capital into this country. I was discussing this matter with a lumberman, and at that time I was opposed to taking off the duty, but I may say that keeping on a duty which is in existence and putting on a duty which has once been taken off on an understanding that the other side will do a corresponding thing, are two different matters. It is fair to argue that it would be wrong to take off a duty, and it would be equally fair to argue that, when once it had been taken off, it should not be reimposed. This gentleman to whom I was speaking said, discussing some limits on the Georgian Bay, what is the difference? We will get so much for the logs. I said: You may get your $100,000 for them and you may go to England or anywhere else and spend that amount, but it does not follow that what you receive will be spent in this country and I would far rather that the amount should be spent on labour in this country than that you spent it elsewhere. We must admit that a great deal of capital has been brought into this country by the sale, the profitable sale of these limits. Thus the contention is not altogether on one side, and, when the hon. gentleman said just now in discussing this question that these American firms who are taking out their saw-logs on the Georgian Bay are importing their own men and their own produce, and taking all the benefit out of the mouths of our own people, he is astray. These men do not import their own labour and for this reason. It would be rather absurd, seeing the number of our own men who go to Michigan to work in the shanties and come back when the work is over, that these people should bring them all back and so incur a double expense.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that what I stated is true in my district.

Mr. O'BRIEN. In Muskoka and Parry Sound districts, there is not a man who cannot get the work he wants. The men employed and the material used to feed those men are chiefly the men of this country and the produce of this country. Therefore, the statement is altogether incorrect. Of course, some plant and some machinery may be brought over, but as a general thing the cost of

producing logs is spent in this country, is spent for the benefit of this country. As I said before, I am not inclined to view the lumbermen with any special favour, but I will say, as a matter of justice to that great interest, an interest which, I believe, employs more labour and consumes more produce than any other interest of Canada, that it is just the one interest in this country, and I say it advisedly, which derives the least possible benefit from the protective system now established; there can be no question about that. I do not think you can point to one single respect in which the lumber interest derives any benefit from the National Policy; if you can, I have never been able to discover it; therefore I think they are entitled to fair consideration. It is a fair argument for them to put forward when they say: You tax everything we use in the manufacture of our material, and yet you are going to expose us to the risk of another dollar per thousand by the course you propose to pursue. Now, I say that, view the lumber interest as you will, that is not giving it fair-play, it is not treating it as you treat any other industry in this country, it is not giving it the same consideration which you give to any other industry that we possess amongst us. You protect the farmer, you protect the miller, you protect the manufacturer, and I am in favour of doing so, so far as it can be done with general advantage—you protect our manufacturing industries generally with the exception of the lumber interest, this is the only one you do not protect. Now, my hon. friend talks of the enormous fortunes made in lumber. I believe it is true that large sums of money have been made by speculation in timber limits, but speculating in timber limits is not carrying on the lumber business. Anybody can speculate in timber limits, a lawyer or a doctor can do that; but the business of lumbering is entirely distinct from such speculation. From what I know of the lumbermen of the Lake Huron district, considering the capital expended, the capital invested, judging from the amount of money laid out every year in carrying on that business, I will venture to say there has been a smaller profit made in the lumber industry than in any other industry of this country—I think that statement is strictly within the mark. At any rate, if any men have made fortunes in lumbering, I have never come across any of them, but I do know many men who have lost money, and some who have been ruined in that business. So far as the lumber interest is concerned, I think the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) has entirely failed to make out his case. There is another subject which I wish to mention, it has been alluded to by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), and it is one of the questions which weigh most materially with me in dealing with this subject. I think it is a great national misfortune that there is no Government in this country, Dominion or Provincial, which has yet found a way to protect, preserve and reproduce our pine forests. Every country in Europe, I think, without a single exception, that has a civilized government and that has pine timber to any extent, takes measures to preserve its timber, and they are able to export as much timber to-day as they did three or four hundred years ago. Canada, with all her boasted intelligence, all her boasted civilization, her self-government, &c., is entirely behind the age in this important particular. Neither the Provincial Government nor the Dominion Government think they can get rid of our lumber fast enough as long as they can turn it to any profitable use. Now, with regard to the effect upon the consumption of timber by the reimposition of the export duty and the necessary reimposition of the import duty, it will be just this: When the duty was $2 a thousand on the lumber it did not pay Canadian lumbermen, unless the prices were exceptionally high, to export anything but the best qualities. You must remember that in the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron timber limits—and I fancy the Upper Ottawa timber limits are in the same category—the amount of timber that is really fit for export is very limited. I do not know what proportion of timber is fit for export, but it is comparatively a small proportion. Now, under the former state of things, when you cut the whole produce of your limit, cut everything before you, you had an immense quantity on hand of very inferior lumber that was not worth as much, even, as the spruce that my hon. friend says is so much less valuable than the pine timber. That was not saleable in Canada, for the reason that there was a greater quantity of it than the country wanted, therefore that lumber either had to remain in the woods in the shape of logs, or had to remain in the yard unsold. The duty prevented its being sold in the States, the price would not bear the $2 a thousand duty. The result was that when a lumberman went through his limits, it being impossible for him to tell, looking at the tree, in all cases, whether he was going to make exportable timber or not—there always being a certain element of chance in it—he cut down the tree; if he got a good log out of it he took that log, if the other logs were not worth taking for export, he left them behind, and of course that was so much timber wasted. On the other hand, if he did not cut it, he left it liable to the worst enemy of timber, and that is fire. So that the timber stood a chance either of being left in the woods to rot in the shape of a prostrate tree, or if it was left standing, it remained subject to damage by fire; the result in either case was an enormous amount of waste in all our timber limits. When the duty was reduced to $1 a thousand, of course there was a much greater proportion of timber that the lumberman could export. If he could export 500,000 feet out of 1,000,000 feet under the $2 a thousand duty, he could export 750,000 feet under a $1 per thousand duty. The moment that dollar was taken off there was an immense quantity of inferior lumber which at once found its way into the American market. I remember meeting one of the largest lumbermen on the Georgian Bay shortly after the duty was taken off. He told me he had just made a sale of 1,000,000 feet to one party of a quality of lumber which, before that, he could only dispose of in the very limited home market. And so it went on. Now, if you reimpose the export duty, and consequently have the reimposition of the import duty, the lumberman will do as he used to do, he will go through the limits and leave an immense quantity rotting in the log, or if he leaves it standing, it will be liable to fire, in either case a certain loss; whereas, even with the $1 per thousand duty he can manage to dispose of everything, he takes all before him. Viewed merely as a commercial transaction it is

undoubtedly better that the timber should be taken clean off the land than that a portion of it should be left to waste. Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) gave us the figures which he said it would cost him to take saw-logs across the water. His figures differ very much from the figures given to me. I am assured that logs can be towed across the Georgian Bay to Michigan and insured against loss, for $1 a thousand. Now, I was hoping, having no sympathy with those gentlemen who are taking away saw-logs, that the result of the experiment would be that there would be such a loss in the rafting that they would give up the attempt to take them across. Under the system now adopted, the towing covers the insurance, so that a man who takes logs across knows that the most it will cost him is the $1 per thousand.

Mr. CHARLTON. That system of insurance has ceased. I gave the correct figures as the cost.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am very glad to hear it, because that may possibly help us to find the way out of the difficulty. But assuming the figures to be as stated, then it is quite clear that if the Americans, and there is reason to think they will take this course because their interests point in that direction, take off the present duty of $1, then Canadian and American manufacturers will stand on the same footing, and there will be no object in transporting these logs. On the whole, therefore, I think, while I deprecate most strongly the extravagant waste that has been going on for years in our forests, while I regret most deeply that no one has been sufficiently ingenious and enterprising to adopt some method of preserving and restoring our forests, it would be most dangerous in the lumber interest to reimpose the duty, because it would lead possibly to a commercial crisis, at all events to commercial depression, and while it would not only inflict very great injury on the lumber interest, which is an interest that barely gets fair-play, it would not have the effect desired in any single particular. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said a good deal about closing mills in the Georgian Bay district. I can tell that hon. gentleman in this House that if the $2 duty were reimposed, for every mill closed now, two or three would be closed then. It would cause far greater loss to the lumbering interest in every particular than by allowing matters to remain as they are at the present moment. So, with the lumbering interests as now carried on, the necessary loss of material following the reimposition of the duty, the depression of business that would be brought about, and the failure of the proposed remedy to meet the existing evils, I say it would be a suicidal act to reimpose that duty on saw-logs. To come now to the question of pulpwood. It stands on an entirely different footing from saw-logs, and there is scarcely a parallel between the two cases. A pine tree once gone is gone forever. Nature may possibly restore it; we are doing nothing to help nature or to take the place of nature. But pulpwood is restored in a very few years. There are two principal elements in connection with this pulpwood. One is in regard to poplar. The hon. gentleman wants to place an export duty on poplar. No benefit will accrue by that proceeding to any single interest. Poplar is not manufactured in this country, and the trees are of no value for pulp after they have attained a growth of eight or ten years, as I am informed by those engaged in the trade. Accordingly, it is a wood that quickly reproduces itself. There is no possible danger of the failure of the poplar, because in those parts of the country where it grows it will keep on growing, and in a few years after it has been cut over it can be cut over again. The same remark applies to spruce. With respect to the supply of pulpwood, I believe from the information I can obtain that there is pulpwood in Canada to supply the continent of America with paper, just so long as pulpwood is wanted for the manufacture of paper. It must be borne in mind that only a few years have elapsed since this material was introduced for paper making purposes. Possibly in a very few years some other material will come into vogue which will do away with the value of our poplar and spruce. Is it to be supposed in this age of invention one particular material will remain as that used for the manufacture of paper, or any other article? The idea is absurd. What will be the effect of placing a duty on pulpwood? The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) told us, very properly, that American manufacturers have established their mills near the boundary for the purpose of getting our pulpwood. I suppose that is true. They could get our pulpwood at less cost than their own. But it is altogether a mistake to suppose that they suffer from any deficiency of pulpwood themselves. In Maine, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, and this statement has been confirmed to me by a gentleman whose name only needs to be mentioned to ensure his most perfect credibility, and that gentleman assured me of his own knowledge that in that state there are millions and millions of cords of pulpwood. So, there being no deficiency of material, if we impose an export duty, the only result would be that the Americans would move their mills nearer their own sources of supply, and we would lose the value of our own pulpwood entirely. There would be no more exportation of pulpwood, and this wood which restores itself in a few years, would go to decay without returning one dollar into the pockets of the people. And who would benefit? Why, the few pulp millowners we have in this country. What is the present price of pulpwood? It is $2.50 in my county. Does the hon. gentleman want to get it cheaper than that? Does he, who seeks to advance the industries of this country, and give labour to the people, desire to drive hundreds out of employment in order to secure pulpwood for less than $2.50 per cord? If that is his object—I do not say it is—his motion is one that should be scouted by this House. If pulpwood stood on the same footing as pine lumber, if once it is cut it would be gone forever, I admit there would be a great deal more force in the reasoning that we should keep it for ourselves. When like any other crop, after it had been cut down, it grows again and there is no prospect of a deficiency of supply, it is perfectly ridiculous to talk about imposing an export duty. The same result too would happen as would occur if you hampered the lumber trade. Large contracts have been made throughout the Laurentian region, from Ottawa to Sault Ste. Marie, and are you going at once to put an end to that trade? Are you going to say to the labourers, that no further business can be done? If you do so, you will be simply allowing the material to rot, not-

withstanding the fact that if cut it will be restored in a few years. In one township in my own constituency $25,000 has been spent among the farmers and labourers in the production of pulpwood. Yet the hon. gentleman who wishes to promote our industries, desires to prevent the people from getting out any more pulpwood. A more unreasonable proposition it would be exceedingly hard to find. Under these circumstances, I have no hesitation in saying, both as regards the pine and as regards the pulpwood, that this is a case in which it is not our duty in the interests of the National Policy or in pursuance of the principles of that policy to prevent the exportation of that raw material. It is an exceptional case, as I have proved, and it would be the height of folly for the Government to now step in and re-enact the legislation which was repealed two years ago. Under these circumstances, I think the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) had better reconsider his motion. There is just one other subject which I will touch upon, although it is not strictly germane to this question, but, perhaps, I may have no other opportunity of referring to it. I say that we are placed in a most humiliating position as regards the States with respect to this particular trade. We are in this position: That we are commercially dependent upon them so far as our export of this particular class of lumber is concerned. There is literally no other market to which we can send that lumber. We have no other outlet for it, and, therefore, we are at the mercy of the Americans and dare not protect our lumber as it was protected by the export duty. I quite admit that this is a humiliating position, and the only way I find out of it is that we should seek to secure as far as possible other markets than those offered by the country to the south of us. Unfortunately for the Georgian Bay district, I believe there is no other outlet possible for the lumber of the region, and I am sorry to think there is not. The quality of the lumber is not sufficiently good to make it worth while to cut the whole of it for export to another country—not even to the United States except at the lowest rate of duty, or no duty at all and the cost of transportation prevents them taking it to the seaports for shipment to England or to the West Indies. A large portion of our timber does undoubtedly go to England in the shape of pine deals or square timber, but it is only the best quality that is exported in that way, and when the best timber is taken off the limit the remainder is no longer suitable for that trade. There must, however, be a large field for the export of our lumber, because we find that the Americans purchase from us somewhere about $11,000,000 worth per annum—of course it varies according to the commercial condition of the country, and last year there was comparatively little sold—but notwithstanding this import of ten or eleven million dollars worth from us, we find that they in turn can export lumber of a similar class, to about the same value. It is evident that they export in some shape about the same quantity that they buy from us, and this shows that there is a large market available for our lumber if we could only obtain access to it. It is, then, a matter of very great importance, not only for the manufacturers but for the Government of this country, to try in every possible way to develop other markets, so that we may be relieved, if possibly we can be relieved, from this our present humiliating position. Although I would be the last man to advocate legislation in this House that would even seem to be in the interests of our neighbours, yet I think there is great force in the argument of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in this particular connection. I believe with the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that we are bound to legislate in our own interests and in the interests of nobody else; but I believe at the same time we must be guided by circumstances, and that we must not run a principle into the ground simply for the name of carrying it out. In this case, I believe that we must admit the exceptions which I have endeavoured to establish. Now, Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, and looking at the question from the point of view which I have endeavoured to state to this House, I think that the Government have no option but to continue the present condition of things, and I think also that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has made out a very strong case, because he has shown, and I think, shown with a great deal of force, that there is not only a possibility, but a very strong probability of the present duty in the United States being taken off. If that duty should be taken off, we will to a very great extent have solved this problem, because then there would be no longer any inducement to take this lumber across the lake as there is now. Our manufacturers, and the Michigan manufacturers, would then stand on the same footing, and this is another very strong reason why we should take the advice given by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and for the present at any rate, leave this matter remain as it is. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that these considerations will have weight with the Government, and that they will avoid adopting a course in this matter which would, I think, be commercially disastrous, and which, if the motion of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) were adopted, would interfere greatly with the lumber industries of this country.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House at the present moment, but, as other hon. gentlemen have spoken of Eastern Canada, I would like to give an idea of this question as it affects the people of our western country. It is true that white pine is very materially affected by the increase of the export duty; but, Sir, there is an interest in Western Canada which would be very largely and seriously affected, especially if this export duty were placed upon hard wood. The young farmers of our country starting out in life, buy their property, pay pretty good prices for it, and commence taking off the logs for the purpose of making money to support their families and themselves until they can get the lands clear. We export very largely of elm, white ash, basswood, buttonwood, and other kinds, and if the export duty of $1 per thousand were placed upon that wood, it would be a very great loss to the class of people I refer to, because they would be, to a large extent, compelled to quit supplying the American market. The wood which is sold to our American neighbours is of that kind, which would otherwise be burned by the farmers and would yield comparatively no profit whatever. The profit that our people make out of exporting these logs goes to maintaining their

families while they are making homes in the west and paying for their farms. I might also point out that the larger quantity of this wood is gotten out in the winter, when there is little employment otherwise, and when the farmer and his family have time on their hands. During the winter months they find occupation for themselves and their teams in this way, and realize a fair profit for their industry. Now, if this duty were replaced upon logs, we would be compelled to give up that trade and we would lose the amount of the duty tenfold. My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) says the duty would affect the mills in the east, and that these mills would be again employed if the export duty were reimposed. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is not for the want of the export duty that these mills are stopped, but it is on account of the McKinley Bill, and this Government cannot in any way repeal the McKinley Act. Even if the export duty were reimposed on logs as hon. gentlemen know, it would not in any way bring back the trade which the present high American tariff has deprived us of. We must remember also that a very large number of our farmers and of the dealers in pine timber and other woods have made arrangements for the trade of the coming season, and the placing of the export duty on these logs at this time of the year would be a great injustice to these people, and would in addition deprive hundreds of working people of a very large amount of remunerative employment. It is also a point that should not be lost sight of, that a large amount of the products of the farmer are used by the people who handle these logs. If the duty were reimposed there is no doubt that a very large number of those who are now making their living in the west, and in Muskoka, would be forced to leave our country and go to the United States. We should remember also that there is a large amount of logs and timber imported into Manitoba from the Rainy Lake district amounting to about $412,000 worth per year. Ontario alone has imported over $400,000 worth from the same district; and the Rainy Lake district which includes part of Minnesota adjacent to the Province of Ontario, sends to the western portions of that province, also to Manitoba, the logs which enables them to get cheap lumber to build up their new homes in the west, and to reimpose the export duty on logs would immediately increase the cost to the settlers in Manitoba by the risk of retaliatory legislation by the United States. It is the duty of the Government to do everything in their power to enable these people to obtain cheap lumber in order to make for themselves good, warm and comfortable homes. We know that the great west is going to grow rapidly, and the country will have the benefit of that growth, and, therefore, we must help the people there by giving them cheap lumber, which is one of the mainstays of the country. The hon. member for East Grey says that about 225,000,000 feet are taken off in a single year, depleting 36 townships. Now, my experience is that if the timber is good, as we know it is in that northern district, one good township will produce 225,000,000 feet alone. Then, the hon. gentleman said that the mills on the north shore were not running. What is the reason? It costs $1 a thousand to take that 225,000,000 feet across the Saginaw Bay into Michigan, and it costs about 75 cents for insurance, so that a lumberman would have an advantage of $1 a thousand at least by cutting the timber in Midland. But those who own the mills have sold their limits and pocketed the proceeds and made a good profit by the transaction. That is the reason their mills are idle. I feel satisfied that the Government know the condition of the country and will not do anything towards placing this export duty on logs at the present time.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I wish to say only a few words on this question, which interests my constituents. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) stated that it was in the interest of the Eastern Townships to reimpose such an export duty on logs. In saying this I think he must be moved by some local interest, and not by the general interests of the Eastern Townships. There is a large trade done in the shipment of pulpwood from that district. I know that at one station in the County of Compton some $25,000 worth of pulp was shipped during the last year, and the business is a large and profitable one for the farmers. In my own constituency a large quantity of that kind of lumber is exported. I believe that the adoption of such a policy would be equivalent to saying to a couple of pulp manufacturers: You can have that lumber as cheap as you wish, for the farmers will have to give it to you at your own price. I think it would be very unfortunate to those farmers if the proposed export duty should be imposed. I do not speak of logs generally, because I do not claim to be posted with regard to them; but the pulp industry is a very large one in the Eastern Townships, and the duty would help only a few people. If the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is in favour of reciprocity in natural products, such a duty would be a departure from that policy. I believe the farmers of the Eastern Townships have already been restricted sufficiently in their trade without this fresh restriction, which would almost complete their misery. I am pleased to give my vote against the imposition of the proposed duty.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) describe the condition of the people in the Georgian Bay district and Muskoka as very deplorable, thousands of them being in great distress. If anything could be done in the way of legislation to help them out of their misery, I should be very glad to lend my aid. But with regard to this question of an export duty, the people engaged in cutting and selling logs, I suppose, are Canadians of fair average intelligence, and I presume the logs they cut and sell belong to themselves, and, notwithstanding the intelligence of the hon. member for Sherbrooke and the intelligence of the Ministry and the intelligence of this House, I presume that these men have only cut such spruce logs or pine or poplar logs or any other kinds of logs as belonged to them, and know how to make the most out of them. In selling these logs they do not enquire whether the man who wants to buy them is an American or a Canadian, whether he is black or white, They have a log to sell, and they want the most they can get for it. I want to know how that is going to be improved on. Certainly, if they have not a right to do that they are not fit to do business, and you ought to appoint guardians for them. You ought to enquire and find

out the class of men who do not know what to do with their own property, and take charge of them, and sell their property for them. It appears to me that this question has not a great deal to do with the lumber business, because the timber lands of this country do not belong to the Dominion, but to the different provinces. I think myself that if the timber of this country could be husbanded it would be a good thing; but I think that the parties who own the logs which are sold along the frontier or anywhere else know best what to do with them, and governments would consult the people's interests best by minding their own business and letting the people mind theirs. An export duty is inconsistent with the National Policy. All the protectionists I have heard talk have wanted everything possible kept out of the country, but they have wanted everything possible in the country sent out of it. That is protection—to make things scarce and dear by not letting people bring things in: but as to preventing things going out, this is a new departure in protective legislation. We are always told that when our exports exceed our imports we are in a very healthy condition. Now, they want to prevent us exporting logs. One hon. gentleman wanted all the raw material kept in the country. Suppose other countries undertook the same policy, suppose the United States undertook to put an enormous export duty on cotton, then all the cotton mills in Canada would have to shut down. Why, the talk is complete nonsense. It is underestimating Canadians, free intelligent Canadians. Who sells this wood? It is the farmers, the intelligent farmers, to a large extent, who have certain lumber on their premises? Now, I know that the people are learning the lesson regarding the husbanding their forests. It is the case with all new countries that the people are extravagant when the country is all covered with timber, and with the axe and fires they fast deplete it; but there is now a proper sense of the value of the timber on the part of the men who have it. You might as well prevent people selling their sheep as selling their timber. You want the wool for your manufactures and the mutton to eat, and you might as well prevent them selling their sheep as selling their timber. I do sometimes regret to see the small spruce lumber cut off, the growth of which would be a source of great income, but still those who own it know best what they do. Perhaps they are clearing their land for agricultural purposes and are glad to have a market: and they do not care who comes along, they will sell to the one who will pay the most, and then what difference does it make whether the man is across the imaginary line in the United States or whether he is in Canada. Does it make any difference to whose mill it goes? All the farmers want is to get the grist, the profit, and we ought to allow him to do so. I have not much fear of the Government putting on an extra duty just now, although we are a warlike people and are getting ready to fight somebody. That somebody must be our neighbours across the border, because the Indians are nearly all gone, and we are spending altogether too much on our army to fight them. The half-breeds, I do not think, will try it again, and if they should we are spending too much to manage them. Whereas if it be our neighbours, we are not spending anything like enough to fight them; and if it is to fight among ourselves, we will only use the expenditure against each other in civil war. But we are not going to tempt our neighbours much longer. Our relationships with the United States are becoming better understood by everybody. We cannot afford to fight. I would not cow down, no matter what they did, but I would not do a foolish thing because they do a foolish thing. I would not do a miserable mean thing because they do. We are not going to tempt them too much. I do not want to feel dependent upon them, but as I have said God never made an independent man or nation, and the longer we live alongside that nation the more we will feel our dependency upon them, and to an equal extent, in proportion to population, they are dependent upon us. They buy nothing from us they do not want, and we buy nothing from them we do not want, and the less you restrict trade the better for all hands. With reference to this export duty, my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) spoke of its costing $2.50 to manufacture these logs into lumber. Why, you can go over to the Chaudière and you will find that they will manufacture logs for 75 cents per thousand. My constituents are opposed to this duty, and whether they are or not, I am, and I am opposed to an import duty too. I believe that the more you can get into a country, and you will get nothing into the country that people do not want, the better. And the more you can get out of the country and get a fair value for, the better for everybody. Do not restrict trade. To trade is as natural as to breathe. It is an evidence of civilization, an evidence of progress and of everything that is great and good. We have restricted it long enough, and here we are, during three months of a session, making laws about trade, when if we would only mind our own business and let the country do what they want to do, there would be no trouble about it at all. If you would remove all obstructions between the United States and Canada, there would be no trouble. Every man in Canada who had something to sell, if he could sell it at home to better advantage would do so, but if he could sell it better abroad he would do so; and if he sold it abroad, would not that help Canada by bringing in wealth? It is because governments will not mind their own business, but will hamper trade, we have all this trouble. The only country not troubled about the trade question is the mother country. There are no two parties on that question there. They have settled the battle about the trade question, and they settled it irrespective of all other European countries, and if I had the power in Canada, I would do the same thing. I would make this a free country to live in. I would open up and develop the resources of the country more rapidly than they have been. If it were not for these export and import duties, these high protective tariffs, both peoples would trade and things would go on smoothly and everybody would benefit. I have no fear that the Government is going to put on this export duty. This McKinley Bill seems to frighten everybody. It never frightened me very much. Of course, when countries resort to this sort of thing, they make it hard to trade. They can put on a tariff so high that they cannot get over it, and that is consistent, because if we do not want to trade with the people stop it altogether. If to trade is an injury, be consistent and stop it. But let trading go on between those

two peoples, and there will be no talk of war and there will be no Minister of Militia and no necessity for throwing away a million and a half of dollars every year. Trading is the most natural thing in the world, it is the evidence of civilization and advancement, it is the next thing to religion and better than some folks' religion. And yet it is the great question which is agitating Canada and the United States. The same sort of battle is going on there which is going on here, the most silly fight, the most unprofitable, the most childish contention about buying and selling, about a thing that belongs to the man himself, that nobody else has an interest in, and that will always regulate itself. The moment a man sells his logs to some one who takes it across to make pulp, and he does not make money out of it, he will not go there again. And if the man who bought does not make money, he will not come again. Let the people alone, and then you will see that this country will begin to advance. We are not advancing now. Why, my hon. friend from Grey's description of the country was a most melancholy one. Jeremiah's lamentations did not begin to compare with his. It was a most doleful description of a large district of country in Canada, and that too after we have had the National Policy for fourteen years. And now you are going to help them by making it so that they cannot sell anything. You have prevented them from getting what they want to eat, and now you want to prevent them from having anything to sell. The whole thing is absolutely absurd.

Mr. DEVLIN. The county from which I come is deeply interested in this matter, and the County of Pontiac also. I have listened with much interest to some of the speeches which have been delivered, and it must be said that the subject is one of exceeding importance. It cannot be claimed that the tax is absolutely required for revenue, nor can it be said that the tax should be imposed for any other industry than the industry which has been referred to by the hon. gentleman from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). I do not intend to make any extended remarks, but simply to give the views of some of the most prominent lumbermen in the Dominion. Not more than a mile away, we have some of the most extensive mills in this Dominion. We know that they give employment to large numbers of men and that their interests are to be very seriously considered. I received not long ago a communication from one of the most important lumbermen of this section, and in it he said :

"I feel it would prove a very serious matter to the lumber interests were such a duty reimposed, as it would most surely have the effect of causing the American Government to reimpose their import duty on sawn lumber of $2 per thousand feet, the same as previously existed, with the possibility of having the export duty on logs whatever that might be, added thereto.

"Of course Mr. Ives' resolution is in the interests of the spruce manufacturers, who no doubt feel that the duty on spruce should have been reduced the same as on pine, and justly so, but I cannot see what he would gain by reimposition of the export log duty, thereby increasing the duty on pine without any corresponding advantage, for as previously stated if the American Government should decide to add the export duty to the old import which they threatened to do, surely he would be worse off than now, and even if the Americans did nothing more than return to the old tariff of $2 on pine and leave spruce the same as it is now, which would be the least they could do, what would Mr. Ives gain? Nothing, I contend.

"I am sure it would prove a very serious matter all round if this resolution should be carried."

This comes from a large manufacturing establishment over which Mr. J. R. Booth presides, and I suppose that gentleman understands whereof he speaks. I also have in my possession a communication from the lumber firm of Perley & Pattee, and in it I find the following :—

"It would be a most unfortunate thing for us if the Government should reimpose the export duty on logs. Not only would the old rate of duty come into force on lumber going to the States, but it is extremely likely that the amount of such export duty would be added to it and this would be practically prohibitory."

And from the firm of Buell, Orr, Hurdman & Co., a firm of great importance, giving employment to many hundreds of people, I have this :

"We think it would be a great injustice to the trade to reimpose the export duty on saw-logs. The McKinley Bill passed by the United States Congress provides, that if this country places an export duty on saw-logs, then the duty in force prior to the passage of the McKinley Bill is again placed on lumber from this country, namely, $2 per thousand feet, instead of $1, as it now is.

"The reduction of the import duty to $1 per thousand feet has been of great benefit, both to this country and the lumber manufacturers; it has caused the value of timber limits to materially increase, and it has also helped the lumber manufacturers at a time when they greatly needed it.

"The reduction to $1 per thousand feet gives us a new market for the lower grades of lumber, that we could not sell to, when the duty was $2 per thousand, and also increases the prices on the better grades that found a market there before the reduction in duty.

"It also seems to us that the present time is very inopportune to bring up such a discussion as this, as there is now before the United States Congress a Bill to permit the free entry of all lumber from Canada. If this Bill passes it will be of the greatest benefit to Canada.

"The continual agitation of this question, and such uncertainty about the intention of the Canadian Government, makes people very timid about investing in timber limits, or even entering into the business of manufacturing lumber. If a firm bought limits at their value to-day, and then Government were to impose this export duty on logs, it would more than wipe out any anticipated profit.

"It seems to us that Mr. Ives's Bill is one benefiting a very few people, and the revenue to the Government is a very small item, in comparison to the amount of money that the duty, as it now is, brings into the country, and the number and amount of interests to be damaged by the proposed Bill of Mr. Ives."

I have also another communication, but this is in favour of the attitude taken by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). It is a communication from a gentleman who has deep interests in the trade, I refer to Mr. E. B. Eddy, but we know that he has interests also which would be served by the imposition of an export duty on pulpwood. I contend that, apart from this industry to which I have just referred, and apart from the interests of Mr. Eddy, and those over which he has control, no other interests would be served by the measure proposed by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). We know that large quantities of this pulpwood are constantly being exported to the United States, and I cannot see that our farmers lose anything by having that market open to them. On the contrary they are benefited. They sell their pulpwood to those who require it in this country, and they also sell it to those who require it across the line. Our friends who desire to have the tax imposed have already an advantage over our neighbours over the border. They have not to pay the freight, and that is a marked advantage in their favour. Besides, it is a matter deeply interesting to the lumber industry, as is evident from the communications I have read, and we cannot interfere with the interests of the lumber merchants without interfering in a serious manner with every other class of people in the Ottawa Valley. Attack the lumber-

men and you attack the labouring classes, you attack the farmers, you attack the mercantile classes, in fact you throw the whole commerce in this large and important valley into a state of uncertainty. I hope this motion will be voted down, because it is in the interests of the country generally that it should be voted down, inasmuch as it would benefit very few while causing deep loss to the people generally.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It is not often that I find myself in a position to support the action of the Government, but I do think that, when they removed the export duty on logs in order to benefit the lumbermen, they took a step in the right direction, and I agree with the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that, whether they were wise or unwise in their action at that time, it would be extremely unwise to take a step back and now reimpose the duty, particularly in view of our present relations with our cousins on the other side. We find that the lumbermen on the other side are presenting their case to Congress, and, in the same terms as the protectionists are using in this country, are urging that competition with Canadian lumbermen should be withdrawn from the American market, and that the duties on Canadian lumber going into the United States should be reimposed. I think the lumber interest can fairly be left to take care of itself in the way of representing the interests of that section of the community with the Government. There is a large amount of wealth and influence involved in the manufacture of lumber in Canada that can gain a ready ear for the representations they may have to make to the Government affecting their interest. Now, I want to say one word on behalf of what Abraham Lincoln called the common people. You remember, he said long ago that he believed the Lord loved the common people because he made a great many of them. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has put in a plea on behalf of the new settler that has to struggle against difficulties in the wilderness of clearing off the forests and bringing the land into a state of cultivation. I say it would be cruelty in the highest degree to put any difficulty in the way of that settler realizing money out of the timber he has upon his land that is not available for lumber purposes at the time; but for the purpose of enabling the pulp manufacturer to secure his pulp timber at 25 or 50 cents a cord less, to reimpose these duties would be simply cruelty to a large number of citizens that we have induced to settle on the new lands of that region. It is in the interest of these men, to-night, that I want to say one word, and ask that the Government should pause before they yield to the proposition of the hon. member for Sherbrooke. I think we can safely leave the pulp interest of Canada to take care of itself; and while I think that the admission of pulp into the American market free of duty is a question that might engage the attention of our Government in future reciprocity negotiations with the Americans, along with many other questions, with mutual interest to both they and us, I do feel that for the present it is not in the interest of our people to reimpose these export duties. They belong, it seems to me, to the barbarous laws of the past, that ought to be buried decently out of sight and left in oblivion in this age of our world. I do say that to take from the workingmen of these northern townships an opportunity of getting even 25 cents a cord more for their pulp timber, would be a cruelty on the part of this Government that I should regret very much to see inflicted. I hope the Government will not yield to the proposition of those interested in the pulp business on the Canadian side, and reimpose this duty upon the export of pulp timber. With regard to the spruce men, it does not affect us in the west to the same extent that it does those in the east. To judge by the expressions of sentiment from my hon. and advanced friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), we can safely leave those men to the care of the Government, because, as was correctly remarked by the member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin), the reimposition of this duty would place the spruce lumbermen in no better position than they are now, and it would undoubtedly affect detrimentally the interests of thousands of poor settlers on the north shore who have already a hard struggle for existence.

Mr. IVES. Before the motion is put I desire to say a few words in reply to some of the speakers who have taken part in this debate. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in the course of his remarks, gave us an insight into the history of the negotiations which resulted in what he termed the compromise, by which our Government removed the export duties altogether from all all classes of lumber, and the American Government did—what? Removed the lumber duties? Oh, no. Make any kind of lumber free? Oh, no, but reduced the duties on white pine one-half, to $1 a thousand. He was just enough, Mr. Speaker, to allow you to share with him the honour of having taken an active and important part in bringing about that compromise which was so advantageous to Canada and so creditable to the Government. He says that you, as representing the pine men on this side of the House—and I am very glad you did not undertake to represent any other than the pine men—and he as representing the pine men on his side of the House—approached the late Premier and informed him—and I presume the information was obtained by the hon. member for Norfolk on one of his trips to Washington—that it would be extremely advantageous, not to lumbermen, but to the pine men, if before the McKinley tariff were finally settled, all the export duties here were removed, and he told the late Premier that we would likely get free lumber if the export duties were removed. He went on to tell us how the late Premier asked you to put the question on the paper so he could answer it in such a way that the policy of the Government might be known at Washington at once. The question was, what course the Canadian Government would take if the American Government would do—what? Reduce the pine duties to $1 a thousand? Oh, no, but to make free lumber; and the answer that Sir John gave was that if the Americans gave us free lumber the export duties would be removed. Well, Mr. Speaker, I remember very well that question being put and the answer that was given; and as a man interested in the manufacture of spruce lumber, I was not very much alarmed at the answer. The answer was that if we got free lumber, which, I suppose, included spruce lumber as well as pine lumber—because I was under the impression that there was

more than one kind of lumber, I think the member for Norfolk is under the impression there is only one kind--the answer was that if we got free lumber, the export duties would be removed. That is precisely the position I am asking the Government to take now ; I am asking them to undo the mischief and the evil that the member for North Norfolk advised the Government to do at that time, and to put us exactly in the position that whenever the Americans are prepared to give us free lumber then we are prepared to take off again the import duties ; whenever they are prepared to give us the free importation of pulp, then we are prepared to take off the duty on pulpwood.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to correct the hon. member in one statement. The hon. member represents yourself and myself as representing the pine interest. Such is not the case, we represented the lumber interest, but as you well know, expecting that the reduction of duties would apply to all classes of lumber, we were not aware that any other arrangement would be made until the McKinley Bill was published. It was not expected we would get free lumber, but it was expected, and the promise of Sir John A. Macdonald was made upon the supposition that the duties upon lumber would be reduced.

Mr. IVES. That is not an answer to the question. I do not care to be interrupted at this moment. The hon. gentleman, however, has been kind enough to express his regret that the spruce people were not treated with more fairness and consideration. The hon. gentleman professed to have interested himself on our behalf on that occasion. I should judge it, by the way these negotiations resulted, that the answer Sir John Macdonald made in the House led the lumbermen in Canada to suppose they were not going to be left in an isolated position, that, whatever concessions were obtained for one class of lumbermen, and one class of lumber, would be obtained for all. The hon. gentleman said I was quite wrong in stating that no change was made favourable to the Canadian lumbermen in the McKinley Bill, except with respect to pine lumber. He corrected me by saying that the tax on clapboards was reduced to $1 and shingles were also reduced. I find on examining the McKinley tariff that the hon. gentleman was again working for the pine men rather than for any one else, because only pine clapboards were reduced, and they were put at $1 per thousand, while spruce clapboards were placed at $1.50. Again, white pine shingles were placed at 20 cents per thousand, while all other shingles were left at 30 cents. So I do not think the hon. gentleman made very much of a point in correcting me, and stating that I had misrepresented the McKinley Bill by saying that pine and pine alone was benefited by the changes then made. He said that white pine men did not obtain this advantage, that it came to them. Well, it came to them, as the hon. gentleman has told us, for he told us how it came to them ; it came by himself, and you, Mr. Speaker, moving the late Prime Minister to make this declaration, which was not followed out and stood by, but materially departed from, as I have pointed out, and that it only made a concession to pine and not to other kinds of lumber. The hon. gentleman then went on to say that so far from its being in the interests of American owners of timber limits in the Georgian and Lake Huron district to float their lumber to the United States and saw it there, it would not pay them at all to do so. That may be. But it so happens that nearly all lumbermen, including the hon. gentleman's own firm, American owners of Canadian timber limits have mills in Michigan and other parts of the United States, and it so happens that all, or nearly all, the pine in that district, as the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated, is floated to the United States. The hon. gentleman did not have the hardihood to tell us that his company saws its logs in Canada, because every one knows that the greater part are sawn in the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. They are sawn in Canada.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman is deeply interested in most of the legislation which is calculated to compel people to be good and moral, and we would naturally expect that he would not misrepresent any of the facts that are pertinent to the question under discussion. He told us two or three times over that Canada imported three times as many logs as it exported. The hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware how the figures are arrived at. He knows in the first place that the Trade and Navigation Returns are incomplete, as to the exportation of logs, and he knows in the second place that the large importation of logs that make up those figures, which he mentioned to-night, and which on many previous occasions he has given to the House, are American logs cut by Americans in a State in the United States, floated down a treaty river, sawn on the Canadian side, because the mill privilege is there, and afterwards taken into the United States free of duty under a special provision of the American tariff, and of every American tariff that has existed for the last 100 years. He knows that this importation of logs into Canada, which I have heard him refer to in his speeches on two or three other occasions is made up almost wholly of the cut in the Aroostook district of Maine, floated down the St. John River, sawn on the Canadian side by Americans working in Canada, but living in the United States, and raising their family in that country, and that this lumber under the American tariff enters the United States free of duty, and, therefore, has no right to be mentioned as Canadian lumber and as American logs imported into Canada. These facts are well known to the hon. gentleman and to every lumberman in this House. The Trade and Navigation Returns do not give an idea of the extent of the exportation of logs from Canada to the United States. There are two companies, who are my immediate neighbours, the Connecticut Lumber Company and the International Company, each of whom in 1891 exported 7,000,000 feet of logs, or 14,000,000 altogether, and there is no mention of these exportations in the Trade and Navigation Returns of that year. And the same occurs all over the Dominion. As soon as the export duty was taken off, the customs officials, as they saw no special reason why an account should be taken of the logs, did not take account of them, and if the Trade and Navigation Returns represent that we import more logs than we export, the statement is far from the truth. The hon. gentleman misled the House, I will not say inten-

tionally, in another particular. It will be remembered that I adduced as one of the most important points of my argument that the American people are dependent on Canada for their supply of paper material. The hon. gentleman, in reply, stated that there was an enormous quantity of paper material in the Adirondacks, Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. I will not argue that question with him. People living in New England and in the paper business do not say so. They say the limits are very much worked out, and, as they are in the hands of large holders, the ordinary buyer cannot secure material. The point to which I wish to come is this: The hon. gentleman referred to the illimitable supply of pitch pine in the southern States which would be available for the paper makers of the United States. The hon. gentleman must know that pulp cannot be made out of pitch or hard pine, and he certainly was intentionally misleading the House or was ignorant of the subject he was talking about when he mentioned southern pine as being one of the resources which the United States have to fall back on for their paper material. It is not so. The truth is, as I have stated, that the paper material for this continent is here in Canada. The point I tried to make was this, that by protecting that material, even to the extent of the American duty upon pulp, we would secure the manufacture of that material in Canada and give the labour to our own people. The hon. gentleman in still another particular deceived the House. He attempted to convey the impression that the removal of the export duty saved to the white pine men $1 per thousand upon 800,000,000 feet which was manufactured during the last year. That is to say, $800,000, according to his view, was saved to the manufacturers of white pine last year. He argued in this connection as if all this lumber were exported to the United States, as if none of it were used in Canada, as if none of it were sent to England or South America; in fact, as if the whole product were exported to the United States. The fact is that if he looks to these same Trade and Navigation Returns which he referred to, he will find that less than one-half of the quantity is exported to the United States, and therefore instead of saving $800,000, the saving, according to his own figures, was less than that amount. Later on, the hon. gentleman said that this reduction in duty had not saved anything upon the best grades of pine, and that the saving was only on the inferior grades. I, therefore, leave it to himself to figure out how much was really saved to the white pine men by this reduction of $1 per thousand. The hon. gentleman, and several other hon. gentlemen who have followed him, intimated that what I was asking for in the pulp matter was that the timber of Canada should be preserved to the pulp manufacturers of this country. He says that I seem to have an idea that the timber on the stream where I may have a pulp mill is my divine right, and that the Government are bound to see that nobody else is allowed to come there and interfere with me. Well, Sir, it is not so at all. What I am contending for is that the pulp material of Canada, on the principles of the National Policy—which I suppose to be in force in this country—should be manufactured into pulp if possible here in Canada, that the labour should be given to Canadian labourers, and the profits, if any there are, should be given to the Canadian manufacturer. I do not ask that pulpwood on my river should be kept for me. I say: Let it be open to all Canadians and let it be open to all Americans too, who will come and manufacture it here in Canada. So far from my having any personal interest in this matter I want to tell the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that I have not the slightest personal interest in it one way or the other. The companies to which I belong and in which I have an interest have their own limits from which they draw their own supply of pulpwood. They are not purchasers of pulpwood, and it will not make one single farthing difference to me whether this policy is adopted by the Government, or whether it is not adopted by the Government. It only makes this difference, that I want the Government to settle the policy of the country on this point. If the Government decide they will not impose the duty upon pulpwood, then we know where to build our next pulpmill. We have had one burned down this winter and are going to rebuild this summer, so that we wish to be guided by the decision of the Government and of Parliament on this question, as to whether we will build it on the Canadian side or on the American side. Our limits are just as handy to enable us to take our pulpwood south and manufacture it at Stewartstown, in New Hampshire, as to take it north and manufacture it at Sawyerville, or Cookshire. The railway freight is no more, and the expense is no greater. If we are to have no export duty on pulpwood then we can go to Stewartstown and take our pulpwood there and manufacture it into pulp and save $6 a ton. That is not only what we are going to do, but what everybody else is going to do. To me, personally, it makes no difference whatever, if it is imposed or not, and I do not care one brass farthing, further than that I wish to see the policy of the country settled in this respect. If that policy is to be not to impose an export duty, then let us know it and we will govern ourselves accordingly. If the National Policy and the principles of the National Policy are to be applied to this question, as they have been applied to other questions, and the export duty is imposed and kept there until such time as the American duty is taken off, then we will stand by the National Policy as we have stood by it on all other questions. So much for the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I now wish to address a few words in reply to my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He started off by telling the House that he had not a great deal to thank the lumbermen for, and that they had never been particular friends of his. I should judge that if they read his speech they will also come to the conclusion that they have not a great deal to thank him for. The hon. gentleman undertook to say that I must have had some other motives than the interest of the country in making this motion. I do not know whether it is parliamentary or not for an hon. member of this House to make such a statement, but for my part I do not care whether it is or not. I simply wish to characterize it as untrue and as unworthy of the hon. member who made the statement. I have no financial motive as I explained already, and it makes no financial difference to me whether this motion is adopted, or whether it furnishes a hint to the Government to introduce tariff amendments in that direction or whether they do not. The only thing which is

important to me and to other business men engaged in the manufacture of lumber and paper material, is to know what the policy of the Government is to be, for some years to come, upon this question. The hon. gentleman says he does not know a great deal about lumbering and that he is not a lumberman. I can quite believe that. He told us that he looked over the Trade and Navigation Returns, and that he found that, whereas last year we exported $7,000,000 worth of pine lumber we only exported $83,000 worth of spruce. He says they were spruce deals, and he also says they were sent to the United States; but, in the case of pine, he takes the total exported, and in the case of spruce he only takes the deals and he confines that export to the United States. Now, as a matter of fact, we do not export spruce deals to the United States to any extent at all, and I am surprised that he found even as much as $83,000 worth sent to that country. It is, therefore, quite easy to believe the hon. gentleman, when he tells us that he does not know anything about the lumber business at all. I venture to say, for the information of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that taking into consideration the local consumption of lumber all over this Dominion, and also the lumber exported, that there were more feet of spruce lumber manufactured in the last year than there were of pine lumber. I will even go further: I will say that there was a greater value of spruce lumber manufactured in the Dominion last year than of pine lumber. The lumber used by the people of this country is very largely spruce lumber. Then our exports to South America, to England and the United States are not deals. We do not export spruce deals to the United States. But scantling and dimension timber and boards and clapboards exported to the United States amounted not to $83,000, but to millions of dollars' worth; so that before the hon. member undertakes to instruct us on the subject of exports of lumber to the United States, he had better inform himself more fully. He refers to the great unfairness it would be to people who have made contracts for future delivery, suddenly to make a change and impose export duties. Nobody proposes suddenly to make a change. We would be quite willing to have the change go into effect six months, or eight months, or even a year hence. All we ask is to have the policy of the country settled on this point either one way or the other. Then, the hon. gentleman gives some further information with regard to pulpwood. He tells us that an export duty would be a great injury to the owners of poplar pulpwood. If the hon. gentleman will read the motion, he will find that it does not refer to poplar pulpwood at all, and there has never been the slightest intention to extend it beyond spruce and pine. He tells us that the dollar per thousand reduction which was obtained in the American duty has enabled the Canadian lumbermen to dispose of everything in the way of pine lumber, whereas previously they had to leave all the poor lumber in the woods. Perhaps he will tell us how $1 a thousand makes that difference? As a practical lumberman I can tell him that if you could not sell any of the lower grades of lumber before that reduction, you would find a good deal of it left on your hands, after the dollar a thousand was taken off. Other hon. gentlemen have referred to the hardship that would be done to the poor farmer if this policy were adopted. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) thinks that the farmer who owns his own wood should be allowed to be the judge as to whom he will sell it to and where he will sell it. That raises the same old question of free trade and protection. The hon. gentleman is a free trader. He admits that he would allow the farmer to buy as well as to sell wherever he likes; he would take off the import duties as well as the export duties. Well, we cannot quite do that. My proposition is simply this: The farmer at the present time gets $2.50 a cord for his pulpwood, which the hon. member for Muskoka says is the price paid in his district. At this rate the farmer is getting only what the labour costs to take out the wood, and he is getting nothing at all for the wood itself. It is also said that the imposition of an export duty would reduce the price at which the Canadian pulp maker would be able to buy wood. Well, he could not buy it at less than it costs to get it out and to haul it; but it is hoped, if we adopt the principle of protection, and apply it to this question as we have done to every other, that the development of the industry in Canada and the competition among our own people, will raise the price to such an extent that the farmer will get not only sufficient to pay for his labour, but also something for the wood standing before it is cut. As to the unpopularity of this proposition among the farmers, I quite admit that it would not be popular for the moment; but we are here to legislate for the good of the whole country—for all classes. It is not profitable to the lumbermen to have an additional dollar or two of duty put on pork or 10 cents a bushel put on oats: but they do not make a very great fuss about it. You may say that the lumberman ought to be permitted to buy his oats and pork where he can get them the cheapest; but that is not the policy of the Government: and if we give the farmer protection on oats and pork and all his grain, we may say to him: You are not getting more than the cost of your labour for the pulpwood you sell to the United States, and if you help us to establish in Canada this industry, it will give employment to your sons in the manufacture of pulp, and in a year or two we will give you a better market for your pulpwood instead of leaving you to send it to the United States as you are obliged to do now. This is the whole question. As I said before, the only thing the pulpmen and paper manufacturers of Canada ask is fair-play and a fair application of the principles of the Government and the party to their business as it has been applied to every other industry in this country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, before this question comes to a vote, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter in which I think the hon. member for Sherbrooke misrepresented the hon. member for North Renfrew and the hon. member for North Norfolk. He says they represented simply the pine interest. Well, both of these hon. gentlemen declare that they represented the lumber interest of the country. The hon. gentleman also says that it was understood that the duty was only to be taken off logs and pulp timber when the Americans admitted lumber free. Now, Sir, such was not the declared intention. The hon. member accuses the Government by implication of deceiving the people in that

respect. Now, here is what passed on the subject. Mr. White, of Renfrew, put a question on the Order Paper, which was asked in his absence by Mr. Bryson. The question was :

"Whether in the event of the United States Congress reducing the import duty on sawn lumber to $1 per thousand feet, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs. It is very important that this question should be answered at the present moment."

The House will remember that at that moment the McKinley Bill was before Congress. Here is the answer of the late leader of the Government, Sir John A. Macdonald :

"I will answer that question. In the event of the United States Congress reducing——"

Mark you, not throwing off—

—" reducing the import duty on sawn lumber, the Government will remove the export duty on pine and spruce logs. I will take an opportunity of conveying that decision to the proper quarter."

That is the assurance the Government gave. So that the country has not been deceived or misled in any way by the Government. The hon. member for Sherbrooke says that he wants the Government to settle their policy on this question. Why, Sir, it seems to me, from the drift of his motion, that he wants the Government to unsettle their policy on this question. They have settled their policy by throwing off the duty ; now he wants them to unsettle it again by reimposing the duty. The hon. gentleman made another important admission. He said that those who supply pulpwood and take it either to the factories or export it to the United States barely get pay for their labour, and get nothing for their wood. What does the hon. gentleman by this resolution propose to do ? At present they have two parties competing for their pulpwood, the American mill owners and the mill owners on this side ; and he proposes to prevent one of the parties from competing, so as to leave farmers at the mercy of the mill owners on this side. On a question of this kind, involving the trade policy of the country, the Government should have stated at the outset what their policy in the matter is. If they had they would have saved a great deal of needless discussion, for if the Government had declared it their policy to let things remain as they are scarcely a word would have been said on this side. However, as the matter is in uncertainty, we have to deal with it as it comes before us, we must bear in mind that the present is a peculiarly important time as regards the lumber industry. There is a Bill before Congress to remove the duty from lumber altogether, and allow our manufactured lumber to go free to the United States. And mark this fact that, under the terms of the McKinley Bill, that large reduction, in most cases 50 per cent, was made on all lumber coming from countries which do not impose an export duty. Therefore, if this motion were to carry, the effect would simply be to kill, perhaps for many years, the benefit our lumbermen receive under that Bill. I remember in 1890 I had the honour to point out to the Government, when their tariff Bill was before the House and they were going to reimpose the duties we had thrown off goods similar to those that were admitted free into the United States ; when the Government were going to reimpose the duty on similar articles coming into this country, we on this side pointed out that it was a direct encouragement to the passage of the McKinley Bill, and would almost certainly have the effect of causing that Bill to become law. The event has shown that we were right. To-day we are met with the same difficulty. There is a Bill before Congress to make lumber free, and if we reimpose this tax on logs we will furnish those who are opposed to that Bill the strongest argument for its defeat. The hon. member for North Norfolk says that the Bill now before Congress provides that the lumber shall only be free from countries which do not impose export duties on logs or timber so that it would be the means of actually defeating the object of the Bill and rendering the lumber of this country liable to the old duty prevailing before the McKinley Bill became law. The hon. member for East Grey made a strong plea in favour of reimposing the duty. He said that our lumbermen formerly took out only the good timber and left the inferior, the balance going to waste in the woods.

Mr. SPROULE. I said they do that now, when they are taking the logs across they only took the best, because it was not profitable to take the rest.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I can tell the hon. gentleman that before the duty was reduced a great part of the timber was left in the woods, and that for the simple reason that the duty which prevailed on the other side prevented our exporting inferior lumber such as is used in farm building. As soon, however, as that duty was lowered one-half there was $1 more profit in it, and that was an inducement to the lumberer to get out the inferior wood as well. A gentleman living in that country told me that the lumbermen were actually coming back, clearing away the old and getting out logs they had left before in order to take them to the mill.

Mr. SPROULE. I got my information from extensive lumbermen who ought to know.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With regard to this question about pulp material, spruce logs to be manufactured into pulp, it has been shown to-night, and that statement has been corroborated by those who understand the question, principally by the hon. member for Muskoka, that in this country there is plenty of pulp timber to supply the whole continent. A gentleman told me to-night, who lives in the midst of the spruce country, that a spruce forest renewed itself in fifteen years, and we know that the poplar wood will renew itself in six or seven years, and if you look at the immense stretch of country where these woods grow, you will see at once that the hon. member for Muskoka was perfectly correct when he said that we had resources of pulp timber sufficient to supply the whole continent. Now, what is proposed by this Bill ? It is proposed that only a certain portion shall be used, and the rest, so far as we can prevent the sale, shall be locked up. That the people who have the timber shall not make use of it, except such portion as may be used by the pulp mill owners in this country. The farmers are not to be allowed to sell to Americans, but only so much as they can find a sale for in this country. I have been in that Muskoka country and have been in most of the newer part of the country. The Local Government have reserved the pine timber and prevent the poor settlers bringing in revenue or making anything in the shape of profit or anything to help their families out of the pine timber. They have been deprived of that advantage and the only thing left the settlers is the spruce timber. Now, these gentlemen want to prevent them having a market for that. Now,

not only is this true of spruce timber, but it is true of a great many other kinds throughout the country. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) has drawn the attention of this House to the logs that are sold in the western part of Ontario. All along through the three Counties of Essex, Kent and Lambton, there are still considerable tracts of wooded country, and that is principally wooded with what is known as soft elm. That is largely used for manufacturing purposes, and, as the law now stands, with the duty off the logs for export, the poor settlers on these lands have the choice of selling to the local mills or selling to the United States. Now, there is a peculiar hardship of their condition. These lands largely went into the hands of speculators. Men now buy wild lands for from $12 to $20 an acre. We all know the hardship which there is in going on wild lands, clearing the land up and supporting a family until the land is cleared in order that something may be obtained for sustenance. This motion contemplates compelling these men to sell the timber on their wild lands at a disadvantage and at a reduced rate to the mills in the locality. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is perfectly consistent. He has always been the advocate of the privileges of the classes against the masses. His object has always been to foster and protect the interests of the few wealthy against the interests of the many and the poor, and that is the course he is pursuing to-night. I say that the House ought to consider the interests of the people as well as the interests of a handful of speculators, and the very object of this resolution is to prevent the poor settlers from having access to two markets and to compel them to sell in only one market, and to sell to that one market at a reduced rate. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) said he had faith in the Government that they would not adopt such a resolution, and I have faith in the Government that they will not take a course which would injure the poor in favour of the rich and against the interests of the people in general.

Mr. ALLAN. I have no desire to occupy the time of the House, but this subject is one of importance, affecting the timber interests of the country and particularly the timber interest of the western peninsula of Ontario, which comprises the principal elm districts of the country. Various movements have been inaugurated during the last twelve years to secure such legislation as is sought for in the motion now before the House. At one time an effort was made by the elm manufacturers to secure an export duty on elm logs, and that is a question which, I believe, is involved in the motion now before the House. In 1880 the people in that section were very much alarmed at the movement which was made in favour of that, not so much from the strength of the movement itself, but from the stealthy way in which the manufacturers sought to obtain the imposition of that duty. It was shortly after the adoption of the National Policy, and some of the manufacturers, by issuing a secret letter, happened to obtain a meeting in the town of Chatham. It happens that a gentleman who was opposed to the export duty attended that meeting, and he found that there were some present who had been at Ottawa and had seen the Finance Minister and other members of the Government and had urged the imposition of this export duty on elm logs, which was as good as promised to them, but in the letters which were sent out through the country the utmost secrecy was enjoined, and they hoped to have this duty imposed by stealth. They knew that, if the people at large knew of their object, it would be defeated. What was the result? They came to Ottawa and a meeting was called of those who were opposed to the duty. At once telegrams and letters were sent to the representatives of the different constituencies from Essex to Haldimand, asking them to interview the Government and see that legislation was delayed until the other side could be heard. That was done. Petitions were widely circulated throughout the country, and although it was in the inclement season of the year, in the spring, when the roads were very muddy, one of the largest petitions ever presented to this House, outside of temperance petitions, was presented against the imposition of that duty. If the record can be found, it will be seen that petitions signed by about 15,000 names were presented against the export duty, and in addition to that, one of the most influential deputations that ever waited on a Finance Minister, went to him and opposed the imposition of that duty, accompanied by twenty or thirty member of Parliament. The Government, although Sir Leonard Tilley, the then Finance Minister, stated at first that it was in accordance with the National Policy, did not impose that duty, and until a year or two ago nothing more was heard of it. I think this should be settled for all time to come. At that time a vast expense was incurred in order to prevent its adoption. Petitions could not be circulated in all these counties from Haldimand to Essex at that season of the year without great expense, and twenty or thirty men could not be sent to Ottawa to protest against it without expense. They were not millmen. It was the wardens of the counties and the presidents of Conservatives associations and men of that kind who had influence with the Government who came to Ottawa on that occasion. Now we find that the very same movement, accompanied by the very same arguments, is being agitated by the spruce millmen. It is the same as before. The interests of the country are to be promoted. They have at heart the interests of the farmer, the mechanic and the labouring man; if this were true and if they were sincere, their conduct would be worthy of all praise, but the people neither appreciate their motives nor their action. In Western Ontario, their movements are understood all along the line. Now, even the millmen refuse to take any part in them because they know that it is a movement for self alone and that the people understand that. They, hope, by driving out the exporter of timber the producer will be left at the mercy of the mills which are scattered all over the country, and thus they will deprive the poor settler of the market for his logs. Now, wherever railways pass through the counties of Essex and Kent, the poor settler can sell his logs. If it is in the vicinity of a mill he has the choice of a market; if there is no mill, he can sell to the exporter, and the result is that a very large trade is being done, this timber is going out of the country, and our forests are being rapidly denuded, as stated by the hon. member for East Grey, but of a class of timber that we can very well spare in the

west, of elm trees decaying and dying and which should be cut and shipped as rapidly as required in the interest of the settler. It is far better for the farmers in that section of the country not to waste the timber but to cut it and get everything they can for it, it is better to have the land cleared up, as that is one of the best portions of Ontario, and to allow the settlers to continue selling their timber either to the mill men or to the exporter. That is precisely the position in reference to the elm timber. I was talking with a leading lumberman that came to Ottawa the other day, Mr. Ouellette, whose interest, I supposed, would be in favour of an export duty, but he said it would be simply absurd; he said he did not believe any mill men now would have the cheek to ask it. That is the view he took of the matter. They certainly cannot defend it, because it simply means the destruction of the farmers' market where there are no mills, and where there are mills a reduction in the price of lumber to pretty nearly, if not altogether, the extent of the duty. Now, that is the position so far as the timber districts of the country are concerned. I say it is a policy that cannot be defended, it is an unjust policy. If the mills cannot be continued in this country without taking from the settler the logs he has to sell, the fair way would be to come to this Parliament and ask the country to bonus these mills. To take off half the price of elm timber or of spruce timber, and to say that you must lose half of the value in order to enable the mills to run, would be iniquitous and indefensible, and divested of all disguises is simply an attempt of the mill men to depreciate the price of timber in this country so that they can run their mills more profitably than they do now. I do not think it necessary for me to say anything further upon the subject. I know this is the feeling in the west without reference to party; I know that there are no mill-men now who openly advocate such a policy; it is simply indefensible, and has not the support of the people of the western peninsula of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Any one who has listened to this debate, which has now continued for so many hours, will have the conclusion pressed pretty strongly upon him that there are diverse interests in connection with this matter. My hon. friend who preceded the last speaker (Mr. Armstrong) said that he thought the policy of the Government should be announced on this occasion; and just a few minutes before that he took occasion to say that he thought the policy of the Government had been pretty well settled, and what the hon. gentleman from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) seemed to wish to do, was to unsettle that policy. So far as the policy of the Government is concerned, it has really been explained to-night by the reading of the records as to what led up to the taking off of the export duty. The Government at that time considered the question and their object was, as was stated in Sir John A. Macdonald's letter, to gain for the sawn lumber of this country a reduction of duty in the United States markets, and to give in exchange for that the export duty upon spruce and pine. That this object was not carried out was certainly not for lack of interest in the spruce industry on the part of the Government. When the McKinley Bill was enacted, as has been stated, it was found that the reduction of duty had not been made upon spruce lumber, but simply upon pine lumber. The question then considered very carefully by the Government was as to whether it would be good policy, under these circumstances, to take the export duty off from pine and spruce logs, and thus get, for a very large part of the lumber industry of this country, access to the market of the United States at less duty than had been enforced previously, or than would be enforced provided these export duties were not taken off. It was seen at that time, and thoroughly known by the Government, that so far as the policy of the Administration and of the dominant party in the United States was concerned, regarding the continuance of the McKinley Bill, it was not probable that any change would take place with reference to the duty on spruce lumber if we refused to take off the export duty and thus give the reduction of $1 per thousand to the exported pine. It was considered best at that time that the export duty should be removed, and thus, while placing spruce in no worse position in the United States market, to gain for the pine industry a better position so far as taking off that duty was concerned. That was what led the Government to take the action it did, even though only one-half had been given by the American Congress in comparison to that which the Government thought would be given. So far the Government does not see that any change has taken place in the position. If we imposed an export duty upon lumber to-day, it would put the spruce industry in this country in no better position, in so far as the American market is concerned; and it would put the pine industry in the position of having the duties doubled, and to a certain extent, at least, it would circumscribe the profitable market for pine, or for certain qualities of pine, in the markets of the United States. There is no doubt, as I think every member on either side of the House will readily acknowledge, that the spruce industry was unfairly dealt with in that legislation, and the Government, and I think every member in the House, regret that it is so. The whole point for us to consider is this: How can we help the spruce industry by reimposing export duties upon spruce and pine logs, and may it not be that by doing so we shall injure the pine industry? Therefore, as my hon. friend from Sherbrooke has expressly asked us to declare it, the policy of the Government at the present time, considering the circumstances I have mentioned, and the state of flux, so to speak, of opinion in the United States with reference to lumber duties, the policy of the Government is not to reimpose export duties. In saying this I may add that I have not the least sympathy with the arguments which have been used by some hon. gentlemen in reply to my hon. friend from Sherbrooke, in that he was an interested party simply standing up for an advantage to himself. I think that interest is very apt to be a prominent incentive with most men in discussing these matters, or in asking for reduction or increase of duty; but my hon. friend from Sherbrooke might just as well have said that the pine men were very deeply interested in keeping things as they are, as for them to say that he was interested in championing the spruce interest and in desiring to have the export duty reimposed. I think my hon. friend argued his case fairly, and I must say, he argued it well. But although his arguments were good, they do not yet convince

me, and do not, I think, convince this House, that there is any benefit to be gained at the present time for the industries of which he particularly speaks, by reimposing the export duties on logs. I am sorry to have to make to him this announcement; but I hope that, taking into consideration all these circumstances, my hon. friend will agree to withdraw his motion and not press it to a vote.

Mr. IVES. As I said before, it does not make any difference to me individually whether the motion is adopted or rejected. I am glad to hear that the Government, having done what I consider a very silly thing, have decided to stand by it. Therefore I will consent to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.10 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 12th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CROWN PROSECUTIONS AND SUITS

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That in view of the prosecutions and suits, criminal and civil, which have been instituted under instructions from the Department of Justice arising out of the proceedings and enquiries before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections in the session of Parliament of 1891, under the Order of Reference of 11th May, 1891, and also arising out of the proceedings and enquiries before the Public Accounts Committee during the same session, this House deems it advisable and necessary, in aid of the said prosecutions and suits, to allow to be given in evidence before the respective courts before which the said prosecutions and suits are to be tried, the admissions, statements and evidence given before the said committees respectively by the parties accused, and by the defendants in the said several suits when testifying before the said committees respectively. And this House also deems it advisable and necessary to order that all clerks and stenographers who were in the employment of the said House attending the said committees respectively do attend, if required, from time to time before the courts before whom the said prosecutions and suits are being tried, and give evidence as to the statements upon oath made by the several parties accused and the defendants before the said committees respectively, and that the said clerks and other officers do produce before the said courts respectively, all books, papers, exhibits and other documents received in evidence or produced and used before the said committees respectively, and which are necessary in connection with the following prosecutions and suits now pending:—

The Queen against Nicholas K. Connolly and Thomas McGreevy for conspiracy.

The Queen against John R. Arnoldi for malfeasance in office and false pretenses.

The Queen against Horace Talbot and A. C. Larose for conspiracy and false pretenses.

Crown suits for the recovery of money:

The Queen *vs.* Larkin, Connolly & Co.
" Buntin, Reid & Co.
" The Barber-Ellis Co.
" Millar & Richard.
" MacLean & Roger.
" George Low.
" Polson Iron Works Co.
" Dominion Type Foundry Co.
" J. T. Johnson.
" André Senécal.
" H. J. Bronskill.

That in case of further indictments and actions arising out of the Larkin-Connolly transactions, this House also deems it advisable to allow the use of the evidence in its possession in support of such indictments before both the grand jury, and the court and jury in case such indictments are found and go on for trial.

That this House, while waiving its privileges in these particular cases, with the view of eliciting all the facts and obtaining substantial justice in the premises, does not in any sense give up its well established and undoubted rights whenever it may deem it in the public interest hereafter at any time to protect all witnesses examined before this House or any committee thereof in respect of anything that may be said by them in their evidence, and to refuse permission to any clerk, or officer of the House, or shorthand writer employed to take minutes of evidence before the House or any committee thereof, to give evidence elsewhere in respect of any proceedings or examination had at the bar or before any committee of this House.

He said: The House has, of course, become aware, although not officially informed, that in pursuance of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections adopted by the House last session, prosecutions were instituted against the persons who were concerned in the alleged malfeasance which that committee investigated. In addition, certain persons who were implicated in proceedings which were enquired into by the Committee on Public Accounts last session were prosecuted, and others have had suits brought against them by the Crown in the Exchequer Court of Canada and other courts to recover sums of money which, it is alleged, they had improperly received from the Government. The first of these in order, are the proceedings against Nicholas Connolly and Thomas McGreevy for conspiracy; against John R. Arnoldi, for malfeasance in office and conspiracy; against Horace Talbot and A. C. Larose, for conspiracy and false pretenses; the Crown suits for the recovery of money against the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., for sums of money which, it is alleged on the part of the Crown, they had improperly received in connection with the contract for the Lévis Graving Dock, Esquimalt Graving Dock and Quebec Harbour improvements. There are, also, sums of money sought to be recovered from Buntin, Reid & Co., the Barber-Ellis Co., Miller & Richard, MacLean & Roger, Geo. Low, Polson Iron Works Co., Dominion Type Foundry Co., and J. T. Johnson, in relation to sums of money which it is alleged those persons paid to employés of the Government; and prosecutions against André Senécal and H. J. Bronskill for money which they had received from persons who had dealings with the Government. As I have mentioned to the House, these prosecutions and these suits had their origin in the investigations which took place before committees of this House last session. I will refer the House to the clause of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is the basis of the prosecutions which have been instituted against the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. of a civil character, and the criminal proceedings which have been instituted against Nicholas Connolly and Thomas McGreevy:

"The committee recommend that, in addition to such action as may seem to be called for under the findings hereinbefore expressed, such legal proceedings as may be available be taken against those who are concerned in this conspiracy, and that for that purpose the books and papers which were before your committee be retained (or so many of them as may be necessary), in order that they may be available for such proceedings."

Under that report the action taken by the Governor

in Council was to adopt an Order on 14th October, 1891, stating that on the report of the Minister of Justice, referring to this report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, it is recommended that such legal proceedings as may be available may be taken against those concerned—and so forth—as stated in the report of the committee. There is a recommendation on the part of the Minister that he be authorized to take such criminal or civil proceedings as he may consider the evidence warrants, and he be authorized to retain such counsel as he may consider advisable in connection with such proceedings, and also to communicate with the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec and act with them in regard to any civil or criminal proceedings the Harbour Commissioners may deem it proper to take. The Minister also recommends that the books and papers in the hands of the committee of the House may be retained for the purpose of these prosecutions. The committee submitted the recommendation to His Excellency for his approval, which was given. Under that power, Mr. Speaker, indictments were laid against the two Connollys, Mr. Thomas McGreevy and Mr. Larkin: or, rather, I should say, that they were first summoned to appear before the police magistrate of this city for preliminary examination, preparatory to an indictment being presented to the grand jury at the following assizes. I must remind the House that a portion of the claims which the Government have against Larkin-Connolly arises out of the business of dredging in connection with the harbour improvements of Quebec, and the claim in regard to that item would lie in the Board of the Harbour Commissioners themselves. It was for that reason I obtained authority from His Excellency to communicate with the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec and act with them in connection with any criminal or civil proceedings the Harbour Commissioners thought proper to take, and the result of this communication was that the Harbour Commissioners made an assignment to the Crown which would enable the Crown to institute legal proceedings for the recovery of money alleged to have been improperly paid to that firm in connection with dredging operations. That assignment has only been executed very recently, the delay being due partly to defects in the organization of the board. There were some vacancies it was necessary to fill in order to enable the board to entertain the proposition, and come to a decision on the question as to whether this assignment should be made to the Crown or not. Before the matter could be investigated by the police magistrate in this city, certain proceedings were taken in the city of Quebec, which it becomes my duty to explain to the House, because they are intimately connected with the request I am now making to the House. In the course of a criminal trial in that province, a subpœna was issued by the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec, demanding that certain persons, who were supposed to have the custody of the books and papers referred to in the committee's report, attend and give evidence before that court on the trial of that criminal case, and bring with them, and produce there, the books and papers which are referred to in that report, and which were placed before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and which this House ordered to be detained in custody for the purpose of the prosecution, and which were, by order of His Excellency in Council, transferred to my department for the purposes of these prosecutions. These subpœnas were directed, one of them to the Deputy of the Minister of Justice, another to the clerk of the committee, in whose actual possession the books and papers were at the time, and another to myself. It was, of course, incumbent on us to obey the subpœnas, and the subpœnas were obeyed with a view to submitting to the court which had the proceedings before it, the claim to withhold the books and papers for the purpose of the prosecution, but likewise for the purpose of pressing every claim which we could properly assert in regard to their custody and possession. With that view the Deputy Minister of Justice and the clerk of the committee of the House went to Quebec, in obedience to the subpœna, with the books and papers. While there, a proceeding was taken on behalf of the Connollys, which I must mention to the House as furnishing one of the reasons why I am making this motion to-day, a proceeding for the purpose of enabling them to recover possession of all those books and papers which were alleged to have been deposited in the hands of the committee by Larkin, Connolly & Co. Under that proceeding steps were taken which, it seems to me, were in direct violation of law and an abuse of the processes of the court under which these steps were taken, and the result of which was, that for the time being the prosecution was deprived of these books and papers. The officer having the execution of the writ, seized not only the boxes containing the books and papers, but the person who had actual manual possession of them, and took them into his custody. They were subsequently placed in the possession of an employé of the Connollys, who claimed them as the guardian for the time being, although he was not appointed by the court; and it was necessary for my deputy to make a special application to the court, which was based on the grounds that these books and papers were privileged from seizure, that the books and papers which were seized included books and papers which were not mentioned in the writ which the officer was professing to execute, that the Crown was entitled to retain the custody of these books and papers, and that the process itself, and the mode of executing it, were an abuse. That was followed by a decision which ordered the books and papers to be given up to the custody of, I think, the prothonotary of the Superior Court at Quebec. That subsequently was varied on appeal, but the substance of the result was this: That the books and papers which were not strictly covered by the writ, being the books and papers which had been put in evidence and which did not belong to the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., were obtained possession of: but that the books of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and their papers, remained subject to the adjudication of the Superior Court of Quebec.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

A Message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:—

MR. SPEAKER,—

His Honour, Mr. Justice Strong, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:--

An Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.
An Act further to amend Chapter ninety-six of the Revised Statutes, intituled "An Act to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels."
An Act respecting the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.
An Act to amend "The Canada Temperance Amendment Act, 1888."
An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, while the result has been that the books and papers which were not put in evidence before the Committee on Privileges and Elections by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., have thus been obtained, for the purposes of the prosecution and the suit in the Exchequer Court, there still remained the fact that the books and papers which are claimed by them are not for the time being accessible to the Crown for the purpose of the prosecution; the trial of which will commence, as I am informed, in about one week from the present day. The right to the possession of these books and papers may not be determined before that date by the Superior Court of Quebec, which is charged with the litigation in regard to the matter. Under these circumstances, the House will perceive that it is absolutely necessary that the resolution which I have moved should be adopted, in order to give proper facilities for these proceedings. The question may be asked: How the prosecution went on in its preliminary stages without the books and papers, and without the resolution which I now move. On the hearing of the preliminary examination before the police magistrate in Ottawa, a question was raised by the persons who had thus obtained by violent means possession of the books and papers, as to the right of the Crown to use anything that had transpired in evidence before a committee of this House, and they practically claimed the protection of the privilege of this House against the production of any such evidence before the police magistrate. After hearing argument upon that question, in order to enable it to be raised before a higher tribunal, the magistrate declined to receive the evidence, and the result was that an application was made to the High Court of Justice in the city of Toronto for an order compelling the police magistrate charged with this investigation to receive that evidence. The division of the court which heard the argument declined to give the remedy asked for on the ground of want of jurisdiction; but one eminent judge gave, without dissent on the part of his brethren, a statement of his opinion on the question which I shall now repeat from recollection: that was, that although the court had not jurisdiction to entertain the application to order the police magistrate to receive the evidence, the evidence was admissible and should be received by him, and that such evidence should indeed be received on the trial, in view of the fact that what was practically claimed by the defendants was the privilege of the House of Commons of Canada, and that the House of Commons of Canada had ordered the prosecution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has the hon. gentleman got that declaration?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, I have not; I expect to have it, however, in a few minutes. I telegraphed to Toronto for the exact text of it, so as not to be obliged to rely on the newspaper report, but I have not yet received it. Upon that the police magistrate received the evidence and committed the accused for trial. The trial was adjourned for a time on the application of the defendant, and is expected, as I have said, to be commenced within one week from the present day. With the view of removing any doubt from the question, in so far as this House can remove any such doubt, I have offered this resolution, and I propose to state briefly to the House what, in my humble opinion, is the position in which the matter stands, from the point of view of this House and its privileges. The doubt upon the subject has arisen from the fact, that certain rules were adopted many years ago, by the British House of Commons, asserting the privilege of witnesses appearing before that House, and those rules apply to this House of Commons and to proceedings taking place before this House. There had been a decision come to in the case of Rex *vs.* Mercerон, reported in 2 Starkie's *Nisi Prius* Cases, at page 366, in which the chief justice of that day, afterwards Lord Tenterden, expressed the opinion that the evidence was admissible. The evidence referred to was this: The defendant had been compelled to appear before a committee of the House of Commons, and had upon examination delivered in a list of certain public houses, with the names of the owners and other particulars. Upon the part of the defendant it was objected that since this statement had been made under a compulsory process from the House of Commons, and under the pain of incurring punishments as for a contempt of that House, the declarations were not voluntary, and could not be admitted for the purpose of criminating the defendant. But Chief Justice Abbott ruled in the way that I have stated. Thereupon the contest which raged for so many years on matters of privilege between the House of Commons and the courts, was renewed in connection with this particular subject. I need not delay the House by referring to that historic contest, which was carried on through so many branches of litigation, and with regard to so many questions that came before Parliament for enquiry. But, confining myself to the way in which the contest was waged with regard to this particular subject, I would refer to the fact that on the 26th of May, 1818, in consequence of that decision, Mr. Speaker called the attention of the British House of Commons to the matter, and suggested that the House should make some resolution on this question of its privileges. He stated as follows:—

"The House would feel there could not be a more important duty than to protect its witnesses; but it would be impossible to afford them that protection unless the House has some restraint on the manner in which either its proceedings or its witnesses were produced in confidence before the courts of law. All the instances that he had con-

sidered concurred in showing that an application had either been made to the House of Commons or to the Speaker for this permission."

The House will readily understand, when I mention it, and more particularly when I read the authority which expounds it in clearer and terser language than I can devise the foundation of this privilege. It has long been one of the most cherished privileges of the British House of Commons, that nothing that transpires within its walls shall be reported elsewhere, and so strictly has that rule been laid down that no member or officer of the House has been permitted to testify or to repeat what has occurred in the House. Witnesses, even though examined before a committee of the House, are presumed to have been examined by the House itself, and to have been put in the same position as though, as a matter of fact, they had been examined before the bar of the House. Accordingly, on the same day Mr. Bathurst moved the following resolutions—and these are the rules which govern this branch of the privileges of the British House of Commons now, and which, I assume, apply to this House as well:

"That all witnesses examined before this House or any committee thereof are entitled to the protection of this House in respect of anything that may be said by them in their evidence.

"That any clerk or officer of this House, or shorthand writer employed to take minutes of evidence before this House or any committee thereof, do not give evidence elsewhere in respect of any proceedings or examination had at the bar or before any committee of this House, without the special leave of the House."

Some argument may possibly be made—if any hon. gentleman should dissent from the view I am taking, and from the adoption of this resolution—as to the particular effect of the rules which I have just read; but I submit, as the foundation of all that I have to say on this subject, that the rule of the British House of Commons and which, as I have said, applies here, is a rule not in favour of the privilege of witnesses in particular, but a rule guarding the privileges of the House itself. This will be observed more clearly when I remind the House, as there is, perhaps, hardly occasion to do, that the House of Commons, British or Canadian, cannot, by a resolution of its own, vary any of the rules of evidence, or say that a witness shall not be interrogated in a court of law if the law lays such witness open to interrogation. Therefore the House could not do anything more, and is presumed to do nothing more, than declare its own privilege in respect to the evidence given by witnesses testifying before the House. From this explanation it will be immediately recognized that what these witnesses would claim, if they should claim to be exempt from giving evidence as to what transpired before a committee of this House, would be, not a right of their own, but a privilege that belongs to this House, and this House only. That is more apparent from the second rule that I have read, which forbids any clerk or officer of the House of Commons to testify as to what passed before the House or in a committee of the House, without the special leave of the House. If it could be supposed to be an absolute right or privilege on the part of a witness appearing before the House, or before a committee of the House, the House could not with any degree of propriety give leave to an officer or a shorthand writer to testify as to what the evidence of that witness was. But my interpretation of those rules is, I think, clearly borne out by the fact that the rules themselves provide a means by which the House can dispense with that privilege, which is, therefore, I contend, to be regarded as a privilege of the House. Inasmuch as these rules bear upon their face the indication that the privilege may be disregarded and dispensed with, I presume I need say little more as to the power of the House to dispense with them. But, if I were to suggest a case in which it would be proper for the House to be called upon to dispense with this rule, this privilege, this protection of secrecy, I would suggest a case which may occur at any time. Let us suppose a committee charged with an important investigation such as this was, and let us suppose that, in the course of the enquiry, a witness who testified here in Parliament before a committee, manifestly committed perjury, and the House ordered him to be prosecuted. He would in that case deserve, of course, the most condign punishment. But if it were his absolute right to insist on immunity from the consequence of his false testimony before a committee of the House, the object of the House would be defeated, and the House rendered powerless by the assertion of its own privilege on behalf of the person whom it was actually prosecuting at the time. I am not, for the time being, or indeed at any time, making an accusation of perjury against the persons concerned in this particular transaction as defendants. On the contrary, I desire to make no such imputation against them, but am merely suggesting an illustration as to how they stand, they being in exactly the same position, as regards the propriety of using their evidence, as the witness whose case I have just suggested by way of illustration. They are persons who have been concerned in important contracts with the Crown, whom this House has pronounced to be evidently guilty of a conspiracy, and against whom this House has ordered a prosecution. The particular evidence which led the House to the conclusion that they were guilty of conspiracy was the accounts appearing in their own books of several of these transactions. These books were produced by order of this House, and when the House ordered that the parties should be prosecuted, and that, for the purposes of the prosecution, these books should be handed over to the proper authorities, Mr. Justice Ross pronounced from the bench that this was a prosecution by Parliament and, therefore, no question could arise as to the privileges of Parliament in this matter. An eminent authority on the law and practice of legislative assemblies—an American authority—Mr. Cushing, treats of the subject thus:

"A witness before the House of Parliament cannot excuse himself from answering any question that may be put to him (with a single exception presently to be noticed) on the ground that the answer would subject him to an action or expose him to a criminal proceeding, or be the means of divulging the secret of his client communicated to him in professional confidence, or be any breach of a judicial oath as grand juror, &c., some of which would be sufficient grounds of excuse in a court of justice. This difference between proceedings in Parliament and in the ordinary courts has been established upon grounds of public policy and is considered to be fundamentally essential to the efficacy of a parliamentary enquiry, but while the law of Parliament thus demands the disclosure of the evidence, it recognizes to the fullest extent the principle upon which the witness is excused from making such disclosure in the ordinary courts of justice and protects him from the consequence which might otherwise result from his testimony, the rule of Parliament being that no evidence given in either House can be used against

the witness in any other place without the permission of the House, which is never granted provided the witness testifies truly."

The latter, of course, is a mere dictum of the writer. The rest of the extract states in substance the ruling of the authorities which the author cites in support of his position.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Has the Minister of Justice found a case in which there is an exception to that dictum, a case where a prosecution has been ordered?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. However, before proceeding further, and inasmuch as that writer states the ground of the exemption, I want to call the attention of the House to an important distinction, which, I think, exists with regard to the enquiry which took place last year before the committee of this House, and which, I presume, would mark any enquiry before a committee of this House in modern times. You will observe that the primary reason given by this authority for the existence of such a privilege, such an unusual protection of the witness, is that in an enquiry before a parliamentary committee, or before the House itself, a witness has not the ordinary privilege he would be allowed in the ordinary courts. He is not allowed to excuse himself from answering on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him, and that, as I shall show the House, is the case in some other, although very few, tribunals. But the foundation of the principle I have stated is that the witness is not excused from answering on the ground that his answer may incriminate him, consequently he is deprived of the privilege which he has in a court of law. The distinction I wish to press on the House is that, in the enquiry which took place last year—and the same course would be followed, I presume, in any enquiry which would now take place before the House or a committee—every claim that a witness made was allowed with as much liberality as it would be in a court of law. In the committee where these persons appeared and testified at every stage, when the witness declined to answer, on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him, his claim to this privilege was allowed on the same principles as would prevail in a court of law, and therefore the reason of the privilege, as stated by this authority, the ground upon which that privilege rests is entirely gone. The same authority goes on to say:

"The parliamentary law on this subject is declared and embodied in the following resolutions of the House of 26th May, 1818."

The resolutions I have already read.—

"It will be observed that these resolutions do not in terms prohibit members from giving evidence of the confessions or statements of a witness before the House. This circumstance having been alluded to in the debate, Mr. Speaker Manners Sutton took occasion thereupon to make the following remarks:—

"'Some expressions having fallen from the learned member which are so directly at variance with the first and most important privileges of this House, that I feel it my duty not to allow them to pass without notice. I understood him to say that it might possibly happen that a member of this House might be required to give evidence in a court of law on what had passed within these walls. Now, I conceive that hardly any doubt can exist in the mind of any honourable member that he is not at liberty to give evidence elsewhere of what passes here, without the direct, or at least the implied, permission of the House. I wish to state this principle as broadly as possible, for if I am mistaken it is high time my error should be corrected. * * * No honourable member who hears what passes within these walls, and no other person has a right to hear it, can be

required or allowed to give evidence in a court of justice touching a matter which he has so heard.'"

The same authority goes on to say:

"If a witness is thus sufficiently protected, so far as the officers and members of the House are concerned, there yet seems to be nothing in the law or practice of Parliament which prevents other persons, reporters for example, accidentally, or perhaps even officially present, if not under the control of the House and hearing the statement of a witness, from testifying in any court of justice. If the law of Parliament does not extend to such persons, the only effectual mode of securing the protection of a witness would be to exclude all but members and officers during the examination.

"In the House of Lords..... it has been the practice for many years, when the evidence of such witness is about to be taken, to pass an Act, which is agreed to by the Commons, to indemnify them in the fullest manner against the consequences of their evidence."

There is a short passage on the subject in Taylor on Evidence, at page 758, 7th edition:

"I hold it seems clear that if a prisoner, on being examined as witness, has consented to answer questions to which he might have demurred as tending to criminate himself, and which, therefore, he was not bound to answer, his statement will be deemed voluntary and as such may be subsequently used against himself for all purposes unless he be protected by the special language of some statute."

Any member who desired to pursue the subject may refer to the 9th edition of May, page 174, and will find cited there a somewhat familiar passage in reference to a question between the courts and the House of Commons on a matter of privilege. Sir Orlando Bridgeman says:

"The resolutions of either House are not so concludent upon courts of law but that (with due respect nevertheless, and to their resolutions) we must give our judgment according as we upon our oath conceive the law to be, though our opinions fall out to be contrary to those resolutions or votes."

Lord Chief Justice Willis said:

"I declare for myself that I will never be bound by any determination of the House of Commons against bringing an action at common law for a false or double return."

Lord Mansfield said:

"That in his opinion declarations of the law by either House were always attended with bad effects. He had constantly opposed them wherever he had an opportunity, and in his judicial capacity thought himself bound never to pay the least regard to them."

Lord Denman, in Stockdale *vs.* Hansard, said:

"But having convinced myself that the mere Order of the House will not justify an act otherwise illegal, and that the simple declaration that the Order is made in exercise of a privilege, does not prove that privilege. It is no longer optional with me to decline or accept the office of deciding whether this privilege exists in law."

Then, on page 175 of Cushing, there is this passage, which, I think, is very applicable to this matter. In 1889, there was a Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed to examine into the proceedings of friendly societies. In the course of that investigation, it was shown that certain malpractices had occurred in reference to the Yorkshire Provident Insurance Company. The special report of the committee stating that the state of affairs disclosed by the witnesses put forward, shows how serious are the risks to which the humbler class of assurers are exposed, at the hands of unskilful or unscrupulous promoters. On the 18th July, 1889, the Solicitor General reported from this Select Committee as follows:—

"Your committee have had before them for examination the shorthand notes of evidence given by Mr. Richard Martin before the Friendly Societies Committee with respect to the Yorkshire Provident Insurance Company, and the books and papers produced by him, and also a letter addressed to Sir Herbert Maxwell by Mr. Richard

Martin, and certain books forwarded by Mr. Richard Martin to the clerk of your committee. Your committee having considered the special report of the Friendly Societies Committee, and the evidence and other materials mentioned, are of opinion that such evidence, books, papers and documents should be placed in the hands of the public prosecutor, in order that criminal proceedings may be instituted against the persons responsible for the management of the Yorkshire Provident Insurance Company. —*Commons Journals*, 1889, Vol. 144, p. 346."

This resolution was carried on the 23rd July, 1889. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked me a few moments ago whether I had found any case in which the rule was dispensed with in regard to the privilege of a witness other than when a witness had given false testimony. I submit that this is one of those cases, because the privilege in regard to the testimony given before the House would be of no use if the House ordered that the books should be put in the hands of the public prosecutor for the purpose of prosecution. It is true that this does not state that these documents were used on the trial, but the privilege was completely gone when they were put in the hands of the public prosecutor for the purpose of the prosecution. If the witness were protected from what took place before a committee of the House, certainly he would have been protected against the use of the books put in the hands of the person conducting a prosecution against him. In connection with my remark, that in some other tribunals the same want of privilege exists as exists in a committee of this House as to declining to answer a question, I may refer to the case of Regina *vs.* Scott, 7 Cox, 164, to show that the absence of privilege in answering a question exists in the Court of Bankruptcy, in which there was no privilege allowed the bankrupt from answering any question on the ground that it might criminate him. While that was a statutory provision, that does not affect the question, because it was held in the case that I have just named that the exemption from prosecution did not follow the fact that the bankrupt was bound to answer although the answer might tend to criminate him. There are several other cases in which this question has been discussed, but I think not usefully discussed as far as the purposes which we have in view were concerned, because the question turned in those cases on statutory provisions which do not apply to this case. What I have said on this subject extends to the cases mentioned in this resolution. The case against Larkin, Connolly & Co. is both civil and criminal, and so is the case against Thomas McGreevy. As regards the other cases I may mention to the House that in regard to the prosecution against Talbot and Larose, the principal witness for the Crown, one Charlebois, has left the country, and has not only disobeyed his subpœna, but has also forfeited his security, and in all probability the prosecution cannot succeed against these men without the evidence which was taken before the Public Accounts Committee being allowed to be put in. In regard to all these cases, and especially in regard to what took place before the Public Accounts Committee, I am, in making this motion, laying aside altogether any consideration as to what view the prosecuting officer may take as to the propriety of using this evidence. It may be, especially in regard to such cases as the case of Talbot and Larose, in regard to which the House of Commons has not actually ordered the prosecution, that the counsel for the prosecution may consider whether he should use the evidence which the persons who are now accused gave in pursuance of a public enquiry, and that might depend on the good faith with which they gave evidence before the committee. I simply ask that any such consideration shall be laid aside for the present, and, simply that no privilege of this House shall affect the cases. A letter which I have received from the counsel for the Crown in this connection states shortly the necessity for this evidence. Mr. Osler writes me :

"TORONTO, 11th April, 1892.

"The Hon. Sir JOHN S. D. THOMPSON, K.C.M.G.,
"Minister of Justice, Ottawa.

"SIR,—With reference to the request made by the counsel in charge of the prosecutions instituted by your Department of Justice as the result of the enquiries of last session, and in answer to the request from the Deputy that I should particularize the evidence that I shall require to use I beg to say, in Queen *vs.* Connolly and McGreevy, I shall require to put in the whole of the evidence given by them before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I cannot put in extracts, for a defendant is entitled to have the whole amount of his admission put in ; it is to be remarked that neither these defendants claimed privileges before the committee, and Mr. McGreevy was not called by the committee but called by his own counsel as a witness in the matter. I may say that the necessity for using this evidence at all arises from the fact that by the action of the defendant Connolly and his brother we have been deprived of the books, papers and exhibits which were ordered to be detained by the House of Commons, and that if these books and papers are returned in time for use at the trial I may be able to do without putting in the admission of the defendants before the committee as evidence.

"QUEEN *vs.* ARNOLDI.

"In this case I may be able to do without the evidence given before the Committee of Public Accounts, and I have included this case in the requisition more for the purpose of having all the defendants treated alike than for any absolute necessity that arises in the case for the use of the evidence. It is to be borne in mind that the defendant in this case did not claim the privilege.

"QUEEN *vs.* TALBOT AND LAROSE.

"The principal witness for the Crown, one Charlebois, is not to be found, and we cannot succeed in the prosecution in his absence without using the evidence given by Talbot and Larose before the Public Accounts Committee. If the House of Commons gives its consent to the use of this evidence, I shall, nevertheless, consider with Mr. Kerr, Q.C., the counsel appointed by the Ontario Government in connection with the Crown work at the ensuing Ottawa Assizes, how far it will be proper for the Crown officers to make use of the admission of Larose as against himself. It may be that he should be treated as an informer who disclosed a fraud against the Government to which he had been a party, and that he should be treated as a Crown witness, though an accomplice in the matter.

"With reference to the suits for the recovery of money the litigation has not yet arrived at the stage of preparing evidence for trial, and our requisition for the use of the evidence in these cases is with a view of its becoming necessary at the trial, especially in the cross-examination of the defendants, should they make statements inconsistent with their former evidence.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant

"B. B. OSLER."

The requisition which Mr. Osler refers to in that letter was sent me on the 8th inst., and is as follows :—

"The counsel in charge of the prosecutions and suits, criminal and civil, which have been instituted under instructions from the Department of Justice arising out of the proceedings and enquiries before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections in the session of Parliament of 1891, under the order of reference of 11th May, 1891, and also arising out of proceedings and enquiries before the Public Accounts Committee during the same session, deem it advisable and necessary, in aid of the said prosecutions and suits, to have the leave of the House of Commons to give in evidence before the respective courts before which the said prosecutions and

suits are to be tried, the admissions, statements and evidence given before the said committees respectively by the parties accused, and by the defendants in the said several suits when testifying before the said committees respectively, and they also desire that it may be ordered by the House of Commons that all clerks and stenographers who were in the employment of the said House attending the said committees respectively, may be at liberty to attend from time to time before the courts before whom the said prosecutions and suits are being tried, and give evidence as to the statements upon oath made by the several parties accused and the defendants before the said committees respectively, and that the said clerks and other officers be ordered to produce before the said courts respectively, all books, papers, exhibits and other documents received in evidence or produced and used before the said committees respectively.

"The following are the prosecutions and suits now pending, and in which it is desirable to use the said evidence:—

"The Queen against Nicholas K. Connolly and Thomas McGreevy for conspiracy.

"The Queen against John R. Arnoldi for malfeasance in office and false pretenses.

"The Queen against Horace Talbot and A. C. Larose for conspiracy and false pretenses.

"Crown suits for the recovery of money:

"The Queen *vs.* Larkin, Connolly & Co.
" Buntin, Reid & Co.
" The Barber-Ellis Co.
" Miller & Richard.
" MacLean & Roger.
" George Low.
" Polson Iron Works Co.
" Dominion Pipe Foundry Co.
" J. T. Johnson.

"The counsel in charge may also think it advisable to lay one or more further indictments arising out of the Larkin-Connolly transactions, and they desire to use the evidence in support of such indictments before both the grand jury and the court and jury, in case such indictments are found and go on for trial."

I have thought it well, as these questions are not common in this House, and as there is no written rule upon the subject here, that while we waive our privilege—as I have asked the House to do, and subject to the consent of the House—to conclude with a declaration which will preserve in fact, notwithstanding anything that may be said in this discussion, the privileges of the House of Commons. My resolution, therefore, concludes:

That this House, while waiving its privileges in these particular cases, with the view of eliciting all the facts and obtaining substantial justice in the premises, does not in any sense give up its well established and undoubted rights, whenever it may deem it in the public interest hereafter at any time to protect all witnesses examined before this House or any committee thereof in respect of anything that may be said by them in their evidence, and to refuse permission to any clerk or officer of the House, or shorthand writer employed to take minutes of evidence before the House or any committee thereof, to give evidence elsewhere in respect to any proceedings or examination had at the bar or before any committee of this House.

I think it will be impossible to find, in the course of an examination of the evidence which I have referred to as having been taken last session, any reason why this evidence should not be permitted to be used at any stage of these prosecutions or of these proceedings. Feeling confident in that view, I beg to offer this resolution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This motion which the hon. leader of the House has asked the House to adopt, seems to me a very important motion, and it ought to receive the very careful consideration of the House before it is adopted. It is, Sir, no doubt the duty of the House to examine into grievances, into abuses of various kinds, that may be submitted to it for consideration. The House has to examine into acts of a public character by men in the discharge of public duties, in the fulfilment of public obligations; it has also to enquire into private abuses for which the law does not make provision. Abuses of this sort, however, are very much rarer in modern times than they were at an earlier period. The general rule of evidence taken before Parliament, or before a committee of Parliament, is as the Minister of Justice has stated. The rule is compulsory. No party can ask to be excused from answering any question because the evidence that he is called upon to give, the question that he is called upon to answer, is self-incriminating. That objection or plea may be put forward in a court of justice. It has no place in parliamentary enquiry. I wish to call the attention of the House to the statement of counsel in that respect which the Minister read, because counsel had said with respect to testimony given by several of these witnesses, that they had not declined to answer, although the evidence would be self-incriminating. That would be a good reason for using their evidence against them if it had been given in a court of justice, but no such plea being effective before a committee of Parliament, it not being recognized as an adequate objection by the law of Parliament, the rule, I take it to be well established, is that all evidence given before a parliamentary committee is evidence given under compulsion and, if he speaks the truth, under the protection of the House. There is no discretion. There is no consequence that may follow to the witness as a result of the answer he may give, that would be regarded as an adequate reason in law, whatever may be the personal action of the committee, why a question should not be answered. That being the case, it is of great consequence that Parliament should consider what would be the effect if it agreed with the motion of the Minister of Justice in its present form, in the broad, comprehensive and sweeping character which that motion presents. Sir, this House has certain inquisitorial duties devolving upon it of a very high character, of very great consequences, and it would be a lasting injury to Parliament if we were to adopt any rule at the present time, in order to reach a culprit or punish him, that would have the effect of destroying the power of Parliament as a body possessing inquisitorial powers. If the notion were once impressed on parties who had done wrong and whose conduct was about to be enquired into, that they were liable, after the examination was over, to be brought before the courts of justice and be prosecuted in such courts, and condemned on evidence which they were not at liberty to refuse to give, it is quite easy to see that the power of Parliament to effectually make enquiries would be altogether gone. It would have no power to prosecute enquiries such as that for which prosecution at this time is sought in the courts. A witness might, under these circumstances, say before a parliamentary committee: "I decline to answer; I decline to answer, because I do not know what use you may make of the answer I am about to give; I cannot tell whether you will prosecute me. I cannot tell beforehand what conclusion you will arrive at, because in an important case, prosecution was instituted twelve months after the evidence had been taken, and you authorized the use of the statements made by witnesses for the purpose of criminally convicting them before the ordinary courts of law." That is a very serious matter, and when we consider the law of Parliament when we look into its provisions, when we see with what jealous care it has protected its authority and prevented the evidence that has been given

before one of its committees being used in a court of justice, we will see that it is based upon public policy for reasons of state and of great consequence in the public interest which are paramount in their importance to the condemnation or conviction of any particular individual. I do not admit there is an exception to the rule which the Minister of Justice read from Mr. Cushing's work, "Law of Legislative Assemblies." I think there is no exception to that rule, and I will be able to refer to two or three cases that have come before the attention of the Imperial Parliament where that rule was recognized, amongst which I may name the case of the East Retford Disfranchisement. The Minister of Justice referred to the case of the King against Merceron, reported in the second volume of the *Nisi Prius* reports of Starkie, and which was delivered by Mr. Abbott, who was one of the judges of the King's Bench. The Minister of Justice stated the facts of that case. The party Merceron was the owner of certain public houses. He had committed a fraud in the discharge of a certain public duty, and he had given evidence before a certain parliamentary committee, evidence, of course, not taken upon oath, which his counsel said ought not to have been used, but which nevertheless was allowed by Mr. Justice Abbott to be given against Merceron at the trial. The Minister of Justice said that was the first case where the matter fairly came up. I do not think so. I think there are many earlier cases, and the rule was settled before that time, namely, that what was stated in Parliament was not a matter that could be investigated properly by the courts. This rule was, at very early periods, even in the time of Charles I, over and over again violated by the courts; but it was over and over again confirmed by the House of Commons, and was ultimately recognized as the settled law of Parliament. I find, in a later case, Gilham's case, where Sir Wm. Follett wished to quote the decision of Mr. Justice Abbott in support of his contention, that Mr. Justice Abbott, then sitting as Lord Tenterden in the courts, said that there was some mistake about his judgment in the Merceron case, that the evidence must have been given before some committee where the witness would not be bound to answer. His Lordship assumed that when he admitted that evidence it had been given before some committee where the witness would not be bound to answer, thus assuming that it was a voluntary statement and that he need not have made it, and that being a voluntary statement, which he need not have made, it was properly used against him. But, Sir, this matter came up at a later period in the case of the Queen *vs.* Garbett, which was argued before the Barons of the Exchequer and was afterwards taken before the Exchequer Chamber, and was very fully considered. The Merceron case was again referred to, and Chief Justice Wilde, of the Common Pleas then, referring to this decision of Mr. Justice Abbott in the case of Queen *vs.* Merceron, said:

"In a few days after that trial it was thought so wrong, that such evidence should be given, that a resolution was passed that the shorthand writer should not give evidence of examinations before committees of the House of Commons without leave of the House; and I have known the leave to be refused; and my lord Chief Baron (Pollock) tells me he has known judges to allow the shorthand writer to refuse to give evidence, on the ground that he was forbidden by the House of Commons to produce his notes. I think there was another objection to the reception of the evidence in Mr. Mercéron's case as being a proceeding in Parliament, as an examination before a committee such as that was, would be a proceeding in Parliament."

Now, the assumption of Lord Chief Justice Wilde in that case was, that if there were a proceeding in Parliament it was not open to the person to use it before the ordinary tribunals, and so we have the rules adopted by the House in the Merceron case which the Minister of Justice has read, and which must be regarded as the law of Parliament in this case; the rule which affirmed the immunity of witnesses before parliamentary committees from being subject to prosecution or condemnation upon the evidence which they had given before those committees. Let me now refer to the case of Mr. Edmonds. Mr. Edmonds had been, I think, Registrar of Patents. He was about to retire, or had retired from the office, and I think some relative of Lord Westbury was appointed in his place; but when the office of Mr. Edmonds came to be examined it was found that he was a defaulter to the extent of several thousand pounds, and the matter was investigated and discussed several times by the House of Lords. The prosecution of Mr. Edmonds was spoken of, and the Master of the Rolls said that it would be an unusual thing to prosecute Mr. Edmonds on the evidence given before the committee, because it was upon his own evidence alone that the defalcations could be established, and the Master of the Rolls expressed the opinion, and in that opinion Lord Selborne concurred, that it would be an improper proceeding to undertake to use his own evidence against him, or to seek his prosecution, since it was upon his own evidence alone that his guilt could be established. In that opinion both the Attorney General and the Solicitor General of the day concurred. I might also refer to other cases, Mr. Speaker. I have not undertaken to cite any authorities in defence of the proposition that all the evidence given before a parliamentary committee must be regarded as compulsory, for the reason that there no privilege can be pleaded by a witness before such a committee. But, if it were necessary to refer to any authority, I might refer to the case that was cited before our Committee on Privileges and Elections last year, where Colonel Fairman had private notes with regard to the constitution of Orange lodges in various portions of Ireland, and he refused to produce his book relative to some matter under consideration of the committee, because it contained a great many private notes. After consideration it was held that he must produce it, and that he could not withhold it on the ground that irrelevant matters were contained in it. When the conduct of the Duke of York and Mrs. Clark was being investigated by a committee of the House, the Rev. Mr. Williams was called upon to give evidence, and in that case the committee decided that there was no privilege to shield him from answering fully any question that the committee might see proper to put. There are, also, the cases of Jasper Parrott, and Mr. Harlow, and Peter Johnson, where persons were to be prosecuted outside, for the evidence or statements that they had made before a committee of the House of Commons or the House of Lords; and where Parliament interfered. In the case of Jasper Parrott parties outside accused him of perjury and brought an action against him, and the House came to his

protection and ordered the parties who had instituted the action to appear before the House. They had then to give an assurance that the action would be abandoned, or they would have been punished for contempt. The action in each of these cases was declared to be a contempt of the House. Now with regard to questions of public policy. We have in our statute relating to the subject of larceny, express provision that a party under certain circumstances shall not be at liberty to refuse to answer questions. We have adopted exactly the same rule as is adopted in Parliament. Let me call the attention of the House to what our law provides; I refer to chapter 164 of the Revised Statutes, section 71. It is as follows :—

"Nothing in any of the twelve sections next preceding shall enable or entitle any person to refuse to make a full and complete discovery by answer to any Bill in equity, or to answer any question or interrogatory in any civil proceeding in any court, or upon the hearing of any matter in bankruptcy or insolvency, and no person shall be liable to be convicted on any of the misdemeanours in the said sections mentioned by any evidence whatsoever in respect of any act done by him, if at any time previously to his being charged with such offence he has first disclosed such act on oath in consequence of any compulsory process of any court of law or equity in any action, suit or proceeding *bonâ fide* instituted by any party aggrieved: or if he has first disclosed the same in any compulsory examination or deposition before any court upon the hearing of any matter in bankruptcy or insolvency."

The rule there is clearly this: It is in the public interest that the truth should be known, it is in the public interest that full investigation should be had, it is in the public interest that a party should not be at liberty to refuse to answer any question, and that he must tell the truth and the whole truth. He must disclose in the public interest everything that he knows, but the statute at the same time provides that when you compel him to testify against himself, it deals with him fairly in that particular, that you are not at liberty to use the testimony he so gives in any of these civil proceedings, against him subsequently in a criminal prosecution. That is one case; but take the case of the Controverted Elections Act. You undertake to prosecute or to make enquiry as to corrupt practices; you do not allow a man to refuse to answer, but you insist that he shall answer fully. If he answers fully and fairly the judge may give him a certificate which will protect him against prosecution, but you insist in the public interest that the answers shall be full. You seek to secure by that, above everything else, a complete and full statement of what it is important to know; and you protect him against prosecution, because you feel that it is of more consequence in the public interest that the truth should be disclosed with regard to any wrong-doing in connection with the act, than that he should be punished upon his own testimony for that particular act; and so you say to him: You must tell the truth; you cannot plead that your testimony is self-incriminating and that you must not answer, but the law will not punish you upon your testimony; there must be the independent testimony of some other party before any punishment of you can take place. The law with regard to poisoned grain is the same. It will not allow a person in an investigation to say: I cannot testify or I will incriminate myself. The law says: Your testimony will not be used against you, but you must disclose everything in connection with the matter. The law with regard to merchandise marks, and the law with regard to gaming houses, are the same. Any hon. gentleman who looks at Taylor on Evidence, section 1455, will see these cases referred to and the principle which I have mentioned laid down. Now, the principle in all these cases is the one which the motion of the Minister of Justice, if taken in its broadest and most comprehensive sense, invades. It is one thing to say that the evidence may be used in so far as it may be the evidence of other parties than the parties themselves; but is it not going a long way to take the testimony of Mr. Connolly and Mr. McGreevy, to convict Mr. Connolly and Mr. McGreevy of conspiracy? You take the testimony of men that you could not get outside. Suppose you had put these men on trial and had examined them in the courts, how far could you have gone? How far would you have had the right to go? Are you going to say that you will go further in their prosecution, in consequence of their having been examined before a committee of the House, than you would have gone if no such examination had been open to you? If the rule you propose to adopt in this case is fair, if it is one in the public interest and in accordance with the policy of the law, why should you not make it the law generally and not an exception? Now, Sir, the House has ordered the prosecution; it did that last year: and it is open to hon. gentlemen to order the use of the evidence taken before the House; but how far will you go? Will you go so far as to say that the answers which you have compelled these men to give, and which you could not have compelled them to give in a court of justice, shall be used against them? For instance, suppose you had questioned Mr. Connolly or Mr. McGreevy with regard to the moneys that they received fraudulently and improperly; suppose you had put these questions to them before a magistrate, could you have compelled them to answer? Most assuredly you could not. If you had put them in a court of justice upon trial, you could not have compelled them to answer. Well, are you going to use this testimony, which you have compelled witnesses to give on grounds of public policy, or are you going to allow that evidence to be used as against those parties? The Minister of Justice says, yes. Well, Sir, if the evidence terminated with the parties—if the rule laid down affected them and them only, and that was the end of the thing, you might say that these men had acted in a most dishonest and improper manner, and that they were getting no more than they deserved. But if the effect is to effectually destroy all enquiry in this House in the future; if the effect is that when you next investigate a matter before the Privileges and Elections Committee, the witnesses who appear before that committee say: We will not answer; you may prosecute us; you may send us to the penitentiary upon our own testimony, but we decline to answer; what can you do with them? You can send them to gaol for the rest of the session, but that is all. Do you think they would hesitate for a moment as to the choice they would make? Would they not say at once: We decline to answer, and you may do your worst; you may send us to gaol for the rest of the session; but if you were to prosecute us afterwards and send us to the penitentiary for five years, it would be a much more serious matter; and so we defy your investi-

gation. I say that you are adopting a policy which may have the effect of destroying parliamentary investigation for all time to come. Now, that is a very serious matter. I ask the House to consider, and to consider seriously this fact, that it is the rule of the English House of Commons, and it is the rule of the House of Lords as well, that there shall not be prosecution upon the testimony of parties given before the House itself. I have referred you to Mr. Edmonds's case. The reason given in that case for not prosecuting him was that if he were convicted, it must be upon his own testimony; and that it would be an improper proceeding, and contrary to the policy of the law, to apply to persons who were not examined before a parliamentary committee a different rule altogether. If you should say to Mr. Connolly or to Mr. McGreevy, produce your books and we will not use the evidence given before the parliamentary committee, that would be another and a different proposition from the one the Minister of Justice has submitted to us. But, I say, that where parties have made a full statement, there is no instance of their having been prosecuted, so far as I know, upon their own testimony. There is the one case mentioned, the case of Merceron, which was known to have been an improper proceeding, one not authorized by Parliament; but I find no case where Parliament has authorized a prosecution, or where it has authorized the use of a man's own testimony given before a committee of either House, as incriminating testimony against him. Now, there is another feature of this matter. In all cases where the confessions or oaths given elsewhere have been allowed to be used, against parties upon a criminal proceeding, they are cases where it is presumed the oath, admission or statement was voluntary. Take the case of the Queen against Coote, which was decided, I think, in the Province of Quebec. It was taken to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Mr. Coote was in charge of a building which had been burned. Nobody had been as yet accused, but he was examined by the fire marshals, and suspected upon his own statement. He was prosecuted and convicted on the statement he had made on oath prior to his being accused at all. The judgment in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was delivered by Sir Robert Collier, I think. Sir Robert said every man must be presumed to know the law with respect to his own rights, and when he made the statement it must be regarded as a voluntary statement, and not having been made under compulsion, it was admissible. Whether an individual can claim privilege, even after the House granted permission or not, I will not here discuss, because that is a question which will properly come before the courts; but what I wish to call the attention of the House to is that, whatever step this House takes, it should take cautiously, bearing in mind the fact that the great, the paramount interest it has in view, is the right of investigating into abuses on grounds of public policy. It must not create a powerful deterrent against the discharge of this duty in all time to come, by bringing men before the committee, compelling them to give evidence, and upon that evidence, given under compulsion, indict them before a criminal court, convict them and send them to the penitentiary. In my opinion, and I bind nobody else by what I say, whenever you do that, you are taking the most effectual step ever taken by any parliamentary body to render any enquiry or investigation into abuses abortive in all time to come.

Mr. TUPPER. I quite agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that, in a matter of this kind, this House should proceed cautiously, and I think that the position taken in support of the resolution now in your hands, Sir, shows that caution is being exercised. The rule as laid down by, and to which I may again refer, the authorities discussed, which is the admitted rule governing practice, according to both hon. gentlemen who have spoken, is that all witnesses examined before this House, or before any committee of this House, are entitled to the protection of this House in respect of anything that may be said by them in their evidence, and that no clerk or officer of this House, or shorthand writer employed to take evidence therein, or in any committee thereof, shall give evidence elsewhere in respect of any proceedings or examination had at the bar or before any committee of the House, without the special leave of the House. It goes no further than this, to leave each particular case to stand upon its own particular merits, and to warn this House that its each particular case shall be so decided. The cases referred to to-day, beginning with the case of Rex *vs.* Merceron and other cases, vary in their particular features, but it is significant, in the long array of cases mentioned to the House so far during the debate, that no particular case contravenes those principles which seem to be laid down by the authority I have just given. No case countervenes the position that when this House has reached the stage we have reached in connection with these criminal proceedings, we should then render all possible assistance in having the instructions of the House properly carried out. For instance, the Edmonds case, to which the hon. gentleman alluded, would have been in point, and his argument would have been in point, had he used that case, and the principles there enunciated, when this House was deliberating as to whether it should prosecute these men or not. That was a case expressly connected with the question to which I have just referred, as to whether proceedings should be instituted, and it is authority so far as it goes, to show that the House should be very careful in directing criminal proceedings, when the evidence upon which those criminal proceedings shall depend, was obtained under the powers of this House before a committee of this House. But I call the attention of the House to this important feature in connection with the matter now before us, that we have passed the stage discussed by the hon. member for Bothwell, rightly or wrongly. We have exercised our discretion, wisely or unwisely, and we have not only ordered that these men be prosecuted, the most of them directly, the others indirectly, but we have, indeed, adopted the very practice now suggested; and that is this, that the resolution under which the proceedings are being carried on, directed not merely the prosecution of the parties, but the impounding of their books and documents and papers, if my memory serves me right, for the very purpose of being used in the prosecution, so that practically the discretion of this House has been expressed. We have all agreed that a rule which may very wisely be applied

in certain instances, giving a protection that may very wisely be afforded in certain cases, should not be applied in this, and that in this case the House should not be embarrassed in having this law carried out. Many of the cases referred to concern proceedings by outside parties against witnesses and parties who have been before parliamentary committees. These cases, I submit, have no application to a case as this, where the Crown is acting practically under the instructions or upon the advice of Parliament itself. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell laid considerable stress upon the policy involved, so to speak, that if Parliament adopted the course of procedure suggested in this motion, it would tend to prevent that frank avowal with reference to facts or circumstances which Parliament would desire before any future committee of investigation. I submit that all the difficulties to be raised in the way of a future enquiry we have raised far more effectively by having instituted this very series of criminal proceedings. I say that the step taken last session, then, has done all the harm, so far as that aspect of the case is concerned, that can possibly be done, because we have intimated to witnesses by that procedure and the course we took, that we will, on the disclosure of serious facts and on the proof of crime or wrongs committed, put into operation the criminal law in connection with them. Now, then, so far as that feature goes, we have passed that stage, rightly or wrongly; and the question is now, as I submit, whether there could be a stronger case for obtaining special leave to allow that assistance contemplated in that motion, and to allow the officers who were carrying out the command and direction of this House to have the benefit that the use of this evidence and the advantage this record will afford. It seems to me that no stronger case could possibly appeal to the discretion of the House, and that the hon. gentleman's objections have no application to the present state of the proceedings, whatever application they might have to the question whether we should prosecute these men.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think there is practically a substantial agreement between the gentlemen who have spoken on both sides of the House in respect to the substance of the resolution, but my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) suggested that there were certain protections which the law always throws around a man who is compelled to testify in regard to certain facts which may criminate himself, and that any provision in that case has been omitted from the resolution. I think that is the only question between the resolution which has been moved by the Minister and the exception taken to it by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I think we may start with this fact, that this House should have, and every committee of this House should have, the right to insist that every witness shall answer any and every question put to him to elucidate the facts referred to a committee for enquiry. That is essential to the privileges and rights that Parliament has heretofore exercised. In every public enquiry that is made, it becomes necessary to ask questions of witnesses which, if they were asked in any court of law, the witness would decline to answer. Here we do not allow the witness to decline to answer. We do not allow the privileges which prevail in courts of law, and the result is that, if the witness is compelled to answer, if the answer is forced from him, it should not be used against him when he is prosecuted. I take it that the evidence and the books that the committee which was appointed by this House had before it last session, were, according to the statement of the Minister, improperly withdrawn. I take it that this House will do everything necessary to vindicate its privileges and its rights, and that we will not allow those who withdrew those books from the custody of the House to take any advantage of that withdrawal. It would be monstrous if, because of that withdrawal, those who withdrew those books should escape the consequences of the evidence which would be given if the books were present. They certainly ought not to be in any better position than they would be if the books were here, but they ought not to be in any worse position. The proposition is, that the parties implicated are to be prosecuted for their wrong-doing, and the House should certainly do everything which is proper to facilitate that prosecution, and to see that everything in the way of books and papers is placed in the hands of the public prosecutor, but the House ought to be equally careful in determining that no man who has been compelled to give evidence against himself in the committee, should be convicted by that evidence in a court of law. If we do not put in that proviso, we strike a vital blow at all parliamentary enquiry. What is the sense of the House referring such a matter to a committee and haling witnesses before a committee from all parts of the country, when, if the witnesses give evidence which may criminate themselves, that evidence may be used against them in a court of law? The great surety we have for eliciting the truth, and the whole truth, in matters before our committees, is that the witnesses know, and parliamentary law lays it down as a certainty, that, if they give that evidence, they will be protected against any use of that evidence in a court of law as far as they are concerned. I do not think it necessary to go into a discussion on what the leader of the House has stated the law to be, because it seems to me to be evident that the answers to questions given, under the circumstances to which I have referred, correspond to the answers which are given to a police officer by a person he has arrested when he is under duress, that is, that they are not to be used against him on a prosecution, and notwithstanding all the resolutions of Parliament which would compel a man to give evidence against himself, there is no exception to the rule, that when he does answer a question, his answer shall not be used against himself in a criminal prosecution. The reference the hon. gentleman made to the case of Merceron was true as far as it went, but Mr Taylor, in commenting upon it in his book, says:

"Though this case is of little authority on the subject under discussion, as the evidence could not then have been given on oath."—See per Ld. Tenterden in R. v. Gilham 1 Moo. CC. 203.

The general result of the authorities is summed up by Mr. Taylor in his book on Evidence as follows:—

"If a prisoner, on being examined as a witness, has consented to answer questions to which he might have demurred as tending to criminate himself, and which, therefore, he was not bound to answer, his statement will be deemed voluntary, and as such may be subsequently used against himself for all purpose, unless he be protected by the special language of some statute."

That quotation the hon. gentleman read as the law, but he will see it is largely modified by the footnotes which say that a large majority of the Irish judges took a different view of the law in R. *v.* Gillis, 17 Ir. Law R.N.S. 512. The hon. gentleman has said that no privilege was claimed at the time of the examination.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said that wherever privilege was claimed it was allowed.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was one of the subcommittee that sat on that matter, and, when Robert McGreevy came before that committee, the first thing he did was to protest, and he said he would not produce his private books or his bank books, because they would disclose matters that should not be disclosed, and he was informed by the chairman, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), that the ordinary privilege in a court of law did not exist here, and the case which has been referred to by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as to a member of the Orange lodge in England being compelled to testify before a committee what took place in the lodge room was cited as an example to show that there was no privilege existing before a committee of the House of Commons.

Mr. TUPPER. This was not a question of privilege.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was simply a matter in regard to private affairs.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not put this on any technical ground, and it has been stated again and again that before a committee you cannot claim any privilege. I am quite sure the committee clearly expressed it time and again, and the chairman repeated it half a dozen times to the witnesses, and told them, you can claim no privileges. Now, I think there is no great difference between the two sides of the House. I think this House, having ordered the prosecution to proceed, is bound to do everything legitimate and fair to further the prosecution, but I think there is a point at which the House ought to stop. I think that the general principle which the wisdom of our ancestors has laid down, and all the courts of law have carried out, that a man making a statement where he is compelled to answer, shall not have that statement used against him in any prosecution against himself, is one that we should adopt here; and I think the hon. gentleman's resolution might be modified to that extent. I would suggest to him that we make a provision that no consent which we give now, will justify or authorize the use of the evidence of any man against himself. While the hon. gentleman was speaking I hastily drew up the following as an amendment:—

"Provided that no consent on the part of the House shall extend to any admissions or statements or evidence given by any one of the said parties being used against himself."

That, I think, will meet the ends of justice, and to a large extent, protect the absolute right of this House to make any enquiry which it chooses to refer to a committee, thorough and exhaustive, and at the same time will make it clear that no man need be afraid or ashamed to give the truth and the whole truth when he is asked a question before the committee; but, on the contrary, he shall be compelled to do so, without fear that his answer shall be used against himself afterwards.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will add but a few words, as I am reluctant to detain the House any longer. I can hardly accept the suggestion which the hon. member offers to me, because it would nullify all that is in the resolution. What I propose by the resolution is to avail ourselves of the evidence and statements given by those parties before the committee. The hon. gentleman will see at once that if I accepted his amendment I would be unable to offer the books in evidence, or the statements of what the books contained, because these books were produced by these parties and admitted under oath, in the course of their testimony, to be their books, to be their ledger, to be their cash books, to be their journals. If I agreed not to put in evidence anything they have said, I have no evidence to give as regards any of the proceedings before that committee. As regards anything else, or any other person I said I could understand there ought to be some qualification.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The books can be produced as independent evidence: surely the production of the books of these parties before the committee does not prevent their production before the courts just as if they had never been before the committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman misapprehends the difficulty which I am asking the House, by this resolution, to meet, and that is the non-production of the books. If I had the books here I would not present this resolution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will remember, I think, that all the secondary evidence which he has in his possession, and which was offered respecting the books, was evidence given by Martin P. Connolly, the book-keeper, and that could not, in any sense, be said to be evidence criminating himself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not all the evidence. Nicholas Connolly was examined at great length upon the books; I admit his memory was very defective, but he made some very important statements.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He did not make any entries.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He did not make any entries; but if I were defending him in a civil suit, in the absence of the books, and of the statement made upon the books, I should challenge all the testimony derived from the books themselves. I think there was a misapprehension as to the use I made of the decision in the case of Rex *vs.* Merceron. I did not rely on it as an authority, but for the purpose of introducing a narrative as to the way in which these rules came to be adopted in the British House of Commons. As regards the argument upon which the whole opposition to this resolution is based it seems to me to be somewhat overstrained. The argument is that the House will be less powerful in making enquiries into public matters if witnesses know, when they come before these committees or come before the bar of this House, that they are liable to be prosecuted for what they shall say. My answer to that is that the witness knows that now; he knows that

there is in his favour a general rule that the officers, shorthand writers, &c., shall not divulge what takes place; but he knows that the rule is accompanied by a proviso, "unless the House shall otherwise order." But, in every other respect a witness coming before the bar of the House or before a committee is practically, as I propose to place these parties, at the mercy of the House as regards the disclosure of what takes place before the bar or before the committee. I am strengthened in the belief that these parties should be placed at the mercy of the House in this particular, by the fact that they have committed a wrongful and violent act, they have deprived this House of the evidence which was in its possession, and which was most important for the purposes of the prosecution.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me to be agreed on all sides that the general form of the law now existing should be adhered to so far as possible. Under that law it has always been understood that the witness who comes before Parliament or a committee of Parliament, is privileged, and shall be protected. I do not know how far the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, controverts this principle, but to some extent he does controvert it. But if he will allow me to remind him of the rule which has been quoted, it seems to me the proposition is more broad than he makes it. There are two propositions in that rule. The first is:

"All witnessess examined before this House or any committee thereof, are entitled to the protection of this House in respect to anything that may be said by them in their evidence."

Now, that is absolute. They are entitled to the protection of the House. The second proposition is not at all an exception, but it is a further rule for the protection of witnesses. It reads thus:

"That no clerk or officer of this House, or shorthand writer employed to take minutes of evidence before this House or any committee thereof, shall give evidence elsewhere in respect of any proceedings or examination had at the bar or before any committee of this House, without special leave of this House."

What is the meaning of these two propositions? Simply that a clerk of the House, or shorthand writer, cannot be summoned to give evidence without leave being first obtained. Between these two propositions there is a great difference. The one says that the clerk or the stenographer who takes the evidence shall not even be summoned to appear before another court without leave being obtained from this House itself; and that as to the witness who has testified before Parliament, he is entitled to the protection of Parliament, and Parliament shall see that everything that he has stated upon the floor of the House in relation to public matters, and for the information of the public, shall be held sacred and shall not be violated under any circumstances whatever. Now, the hon. gentleman himself, it seems to me, in his general proposition, has controverted that proposition, because, if I understood him correctly, he based his resolution altogether, not upon general principles which may apply to all cases, but upon the particular feature of this case. That matter, I admit, does not stand in the same position in which it stood when Parliament was prorogued last fall. At that time the House was in full possession of all the evidence adduced before the committee. Now, as the hon. gentleman has stated, by an abuse of the process in a court of law, Parliament has been deprived of one portion of the evidence which had been taken before the committee. A certain portion of the evidence, and the books which had served in the trial, cannot be had, and the hon. gentleman simply wants to place the parties exactly in the position in which they were when Parliament prorogued So far so good: that is substantial law and reason that every one will approve. It is quite fair, it is just and reasonable, that the men who are accused to-day should not gain any privilege nor obtain any advantage by the undue process of law which they have abused in order to deprive the Crown of availing itself of the evidence which had been given against them. Let the hon. gentleman carry his resolution to the extent of placing the parties in exactly the position they formerly occupied, and as if this abuse of process had not taken place. But the hon. gentleman is seeking to go further than that. The resolution goes further than what I have suggested, because, after all, if the evidence given, say by Robert McGreevy, or Thomas Mc Greevy, or by Connolly, is to go in its entirety before the court, all the admissions which have been made may go against them, not only upon the point covered by the books which are missing, but upon other points as well. In taking the proposed action we are violating law and justice, which has always been maintained in all British courts, namely, that no one brought before Parliament shall incriminate himself. If we depart from that rule we must introduce another rule. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) truly said, that if we adopt the system suggested there will be difficulty subsequently in obtaining evidence before this Parliament. If the Minister of Justice were to restrict his motion, and were, for example, to say that the evidence, so far as related to missing books should apply against these parties, I could understand his contention: but there is no restriction proposed. The resolution provides that the whole of the evidence given by any of these parties shall be used against them at the trial. I submit that such a course is in violation of the principles of justice and equity, and especially British justice, and is altogether antagonistic to British law, to criminal law, to civil law as we understand it in this country, and to the express will in Parliament. Of course, if the Government decide otherwise, they must assume responsibility for their action. At all events, I must protest that we have in this resolution a deviation from the well-known rule, that anything which is spoken on the floor of Parliament or before a committee of Parliament at a public investigation for the sake of truth, which is receiving a severe blow to-day.

Mr. OUIMET. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to add a few words to what has already been said. It appears to me that hon. gentlemen opposite are advancing the arguments that will certainly be adduced on behalf of the accused when the suit is before the court, namely, as to whether the evidence which will be presented will be admissible against them or not. The only point asked by this resolution is, that notwithstanding the privilege that exists with respect to evidence taken before the bar of the House or before any committee thereof, all the evidence taken last year before the committee referred to in this resolution, shall be available for use in courts, but within the rules of law.

When this evidence is placed before the court, the question will then be discussed as regards its admissibility, either as admissions on the part of the persons concerned or as secondary evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The objection raised on this side of the House was not that stated by the hon. gentleman. It was merely that there should be a limitation put upon the consent, and the consent should not extend to any statement made by a witness tending to incriminate himself.

Mr. OUIMET. I say what we have to do now is, to decide if it is expedient and judicious for this House to renounce its well-known privileges in order that the ends of justice may be attained in the different prosecutions ordered by this House. The first request is :

"To allow to be given in evidence before the respective courts before which the said prosecutions and suits are to be tried, the admissions, statements and evidence given before the said committees respectively by the parties accused, and by the defendants in the said several suits when testifying before the said committees respectively."

The second request is :

"That all the clerks and stenographers who were in the employment of the said House attending the said committees respectively do attend, if required, from time to time before the courts before whom the said prosecutions and suits are being tried, and give evidence as to the statements upon oath made by the several parties accused and the defendants before the said committees respectively."

All that is asked by this resolution is, in the first place, to allow the evidence taken before this committee to be sent before the courts, where it will be availed of according to the rules of evidence ; in the second place, to permit the stenographers and all employés of the House to give such evidence as is allowed by the court, and nothing else. If we were to go further than that, surely we would be anticipating the decision of the judge. There is no danger involved in the course which we are now proposing to follow, for the rules of evidence are well known. If the admissions made by the respondents when examined as witnesses are to be considered as compulsory admissions, the court will treat them as such. If there is no just reason to admit secondary evidence, the evidence as to the contents of the books that are now missing will not be admitted. We have nothing to do with these questions. All we ask is that this House renounce in the present case its well-known privilege that its proceedings shall not be brought before the courts, unless the necessity of such proceeding be clearly proved. Here, however, the necessity has been shown. If the Order of Parliament for the prosecution of these parties is to be complied with, it is necessary that the permission now asked should be granted ; otherwise, the order of the House will be nullified, and, as the Minister of Justice has intimated, if the Opposition prevents the Government from obtaining the permission asked for, it would be just as well to say that from the present moment we will discontinue all these prosecutions. The counsel for the Crown have declared that it would be useless to proceed further without having this evidence. That evidence will be taken for what it is worth, and it will be used according to the well-known rules of law. I do not understand that any inconvenience will result from the present proceedings, but it is apparent to me that the ends of justice will be promoted thereby.

Mr. MULOCK. It has been urged that every witness who gives evidence before a parliamentary committee has the full protection of Parliament, and that nothing he says can be used in evidence against him ; in fact, it has been urged that the evidence has been given under compulsion. If there was a law like that, if Parliament has passed a resolution to that effect, creating a contract between Parliament and a witness, that what the witness said here would not be used against him, I would most religiously advocate the securing to such witness all his rights. But I do not construe the rule that has been cited as going so far. The rule has been cited, and correctly, no doubt, that every witness in giving evidence before Parliament or a parliamentary committee is entitled to the protection of Parliament. What is the rule in courts of law ? If we wish to construe this rule we must construe it intelligently, and there is no better guide for construing a rule than that furnished by courts of law. There is no better recognized rule in courts of law than that a witness cannot be compelled to incriminate himself. But when a witness steps into a witness box and is asked a question, which, if answered, might incriminate him, what is his duty ? The rule of law protects him, and so he is entitled to the protection of the courts. But suppose he fails to ask for protection, suppose he wishes to waive his right and to answer the question, without first obtaining the protection of the court ; the point is, that at that stage he must assert his own right, and if he fails to claim the protection of the court the evidence which he has given against somebody else may be used against himself. I would like to ask how you can draw a different conclusion from a rule of Parliament that does not go any further, and I submit that it does not go any further. My attention has been called to the East Retford Disfranchisement case in Vol. 18, Parliamentary Debates, New Series. In this case a witness refused to answer certain questions, and the rule of Parliament was in force then as it is now. The witness was at the bar of the House and refused to answer the question, and how did they compel him to answer ? Parliament had to read the rule to him and to undertake that he would get the protection that the rule gave him if he chose to ask for it. They did not say that the rule itself gave him protection without his claiming the benefit of the rule, and when at the bar of the House he claimed the protection of the rule, Parliament then endorsed the rule again for his protection and he was able to give evidence which could not be used against him. I, therefore, say that in the case we are now discussing there is no decision, in my opinion, which construes the rule in the alleged large and far-reaching character that has been assigned to it. Those witnesses had a simple course open to them, and when they were asked to give evidence before the parliamentary committee, they could have said : We claim the protection of the parliamentary rule ; give us the undertaking of Parliament, and then we will give our evidence. Had that demand been made upon the committee at the time, the committee would have reported the matter to this House and the House would have given its order of protection. However, they chose not to make that demand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is hardly fair, because they were told they were bound to give evidence.

Mr. MULOCK. I was present at most of these committee meetings, and I never heard it stated that the witnesses were bound to give evidence without an order of protection. It may have been so stated, but I have no recollection of it. I remember that they were told that witnesses would be examined touching the contents of books in a certain way. I believe, however, that these witnesses did not ask for the protection of Parliament before they gave evidence that might incriminate themselves; but there were stenographers there, and the evidence will show whether they took such a position or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Parliament asserted in the examination of persons in reference to the sale of offices by the Duke of York and Mrs. Clarke, upon examination of the Rev. Mr. Williams, that there was no privilege to claim, and that a person must answer any question that the committee saw proper to put.

Mr. MULOCK. The decision which I have cited in 1828, was ten years subsequent to the enquiry to which my hon. friend refers, and it, therefore, superseded any decision of the committee of a prior date. At all events, I take the ground that a witness is bound to protect himself, and it is not for Parliament to be astute to find excuses to defeat the ends of justice. Those who seek to defeat the ends of justice must take their own course in order to avail themselves of the protection which they can, under the law, secure for themselves. For my part, unless they can show an undertaking on the part of this Parliament to protect them, I for one am in favour of giving them the benefit of all the evidence that is within the reach of this House and the country.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that several members of the House on both sides have spoken to me, pointing out that if the House would adjourn at 6 o'clock to-morrow evening until after the holidays, it would afford them an opportunity of leaving for their homes by the trains which depart before that hour. Many of the members from Nova Scotia and the Eastern Provinces will have to take the train to-morrow afternoon which leaves here at 4.40. If it would meet the views of the Government and the Opposition as well, that the House should adjourn to-morrow evening at 6 o'clock, I know that it would meet with the wishes of the majority of the members of this House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I must say that the adjournment at 6 o'clock to-morrow evening would meet the views of the majority on this side of the House. It would meet with general approval if it did not interfere with business.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In questions of this kind we are always in the hands of the House. I thought, however, that, although the House might not sit very late to-morrow evening, we could carry on the business until probably 11 o'clock.

Mr. MULOCK. All the trains leave here before 11 o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman will permit me to refer to a private conversation that I had with him, I stated that I was of opinion that we might sit until 11 o'clock, but I have had such a shower of protesting since then, that I think, if the leader of the House will agree, we might adjourn at 6 o'clock to-morrow evening.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Under these circumstances, and to meet the views of hon. gentlemen, it is understood that the House will adjourn at 6 o'clock to-morrow evening.

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

After Recess.

THE CRIMINAL LAW.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law. He said: I desire to avail myself of the indulgence of the House to move that this Bill be read a second time in advance of the printing being done, because the Bill is a very large one, and the mere fact of its having been printed and distributed, which will no doubt be done this evening, would not have given members time to examine so bulky a measure; and the second reading of the Bill and its reference to a select committee, which I propose to ask for, will somewhat advance its consideration, will direct the attention of the members who are to serve on that committee to the measure during the Easter recess, and will enable that committee to go promptly to work when the House resumes business. I think, however, that I ought, especially as I am asking the indulgence of the House on the matter, to state shortly what the principal provisions of the Bill are, because it has received considerable attention in the country, as I am reminded every day by valuable suggestions for its improvement, which I am still receiving. The objects of the Bill are very tersely expressed in one passage of the report of the Royal Commission which investigated the subject of the criminal law in England, in defining the effort at codification in a similar Bill in Great Britain in these words:

"It is a reduction of the existing law to an orderly written system, freed from needless technicalities, obscurities, and other defects which the experience of its administration has disclosed. It aims at the reduction to a system of that kind of substantive law relating to crimes and the law of procedure, both as to indictable offences and as to summary convictions."

The Bill is founded on the draft code prepared by the Royal Commission in Great Britain in 1880, on Stephens' Digest of the Criminal Law, the edition of 1887, Burbidge's Digest of the Canadian Criminal Law of 1889, and the Canadian Statutory Law. The efforts at the reduction of the criminal law of England into this shape have been carried on for nearly sixty years, and although not yet perfected by statute, those efforts have given us immense help in simplifying and reducing into a system of this kind our law relating to criminal matters and relating to criminal procedure. The contents of the Bill are shown on the first page of the draft. It will deal with offences against public order, internal and external; offences affecting the administration of the law and of justice; offences against religion, morals and public convenience; offences against the person and reputation; offences against the rights of property and rights arising out of contracts, and offences connected with trade; it will deal with pro-

cedure and proceedings after conviction, and actions against persons administering the criminal law. I may say, as regards any provisions of our law touching the subject of evidence, that I have endeavoured to eliminate them from this Bill, with the view of introducing, as I propose to do immediately after the recess, a Bill relating to evidence in all matters which are under the control of this Parliament. Notice of that Bill is on the Notice Paper. I would further explain that the Bill aims at a codification of both common law and statutory law relating to these subjects, but that it does not aim at completely superseding the common law, while it does aim at completely superseding the statutory law relating to crimes. In other words, the common law will still exist and be referred to, and in that respect the code, if it should be adopted, will have the elasticity which has been so much desired by those who are opposed to codification on general principles. But it will not provide for the punishment of anything which has been hitherto a statutory offence unless that offence is proscribed by the terms of the enactment itself. I will call attention briefly to a few changes in the law now existing and well understood which the Bill contemplates. Substantially it follows the existing law. It proposes, however, to abolish the distinction between principals and accessories. It aims at making punishments for various offences of something like the same grade more uniform. It discontinues the use of the word "malice" and the word "maliciously," which are now so common in both statutory and common law, and which have been found to lead to considerable uncertainty and ambiguity, in the administration of the criminal law by juries. A few lines from the report of the Royal Commission in England will explain that proposition. They say:

"We have avoided the use of the word 'malice' throughout the draft code, because there is a considerable difference between its popular and its legal meaning. For example, the expression 'malice aforethought' in reference to murder has received judicial interpretation which makes its use positively misleading."

It defines murder, and in cases of doubt settles what murder is. With that view it defines provocation, which may reduce a homicide from murder to manslaughter. It deals with the offence of bigamy, principally for the purpose of removing the doubts which exist now as to the actual state of the law with regard to the period during which belief of the decease of the other party to the original marriage may be an exoneration. Questions always arise as to the *bonâ fides* of the belief of that decease by the person who has acted on the presumption that the decease has occurred; and, following the principle recommended by the Royal Commission, in order to relieve from the crime of bigamy, it makes the decease of the husband or wife of the first marriage absolutely necessary. All other matters relating to belief as to the decease of the other party to the original marriage must be treated as matters of extenuation and matters moving the clemency of the Crown. It proposes to abolish the term "larceny" and to adopt the term "theft" instead, as was strongly recommended by the Royal Commission in England. With regard to the law of procedure, I propose to abolish the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours. A short passage from the British report will explain the importance of that change. It says:

"The distinction between felony and misdemeanour was, in early times, nearly, though not absolutely, identical with the distinction between crimes punishable with death and crimes not so punishable. For a long time past this has ceased to be the case. Most penalties are no longer punishable with death and many misdemeanours are now punishable more severely than many felonies. The great changes which have taken place in our criminal law have made the distinctions nearly if not altogether unmeaning. It is impossible to say on what principle embezzlement should be a felony, and the fraudulent misappropriation of money by an agent or the obtaining of goods by false pretense a misdemeanour; why bigamy should be a felony, and perjury a misdemeanour; why child-stealing be a felony, and abduction a misdemeanour. The result of this arbitrary classification is that the right to be bailed, the liability to be arrested without warrant, and, to a certain extent, the right of the court to order the payment of the costs of prosecutions vary in a manner equally arbitrary and unreasonable."

It is proposed likewise to abolish the provisions of the existing law with regard to venue. We treat the place of trial as a matter of convenience, and the accused may be tried where he has been arrested or where he may be in custody. It abolishes writs of error and provides an appeal court, which is practically the same as the old court of Crown cases reserved with larger power than at present. It provides also for new trials in certain criminal cases, and contains a new provision that, in certain cases and on certain representations, a new trial may be ordered at the instance of the Crown, represented by the Minister of Justice for the time being. The attention of the public has been directed very considerably to one change, which was mooted in connection with the reorganization of the law relating to criminal matters and criminal procedure, and that is the proposed abolition of the system of indictment by grand jury. The attention of the Parliament and the public has been directed to that question very forcibly indeed by a member of the other branch of Parliament, a member to whom, I am sure, both Houses owe a great deal of gratitude for the pains and the care and the attention he has devoted to legislation during the many years of a useful and honourable life. I refer to Senator Gowan. He moved in the matter a year or two ago, and it was thought best that the attention of the public should be drawn even more strongly to the question than it was by the remarks he made on the subject in the Senate. The result was, as the House may remember, that a circular was sent to all the judges in the country who have criminal jurisdiction, and indeed all the officers charged with criminal prosecutions, calling their attention to the change which that learned gentleman thought desirable, and asking their opinions as to its propriety and expediency. It was felt that the opinions of those who are connected with the administration of criminal justice and have its care from time to time would be great assistance to Parliament in framing any change that might be thought desirable; and we have had in response to that, a great number of replies, most of which have been published, and some of which have come to hand since the publication of the return by order of Parliament. The opinions upon that subject by those who were thus addressed were very divided indeed. Most of the judges who are accustomed to administer justice without juries, in ordinary proceedings, were in favour of the change. The others were divided in opinion, and it is impossible to deny, in view of so strong a division of opinion on the subject, that it seems

unwise, in connection with this measure, to force that provision on the attention of Parliament at present. I must say that I concur personally in the opinion expressed in another place by the learned gentleman to whom I have made reference, and I think that in many respects the administration of justice would be improved if we dispensed with the intervention of grand juries. I will say one word as to the disputed question of jurisdiction in this matter. The proposition was mooted long ago that this matter may be beyond the control of this Parliament, and may be more properly exercised by the provincial legislatures. When we come to deal practically with the matter, that difference seems to me to vanish. It is not a question after all of whether the grand jury forms a part of the organization of the court or not, and therefore is under provincial control. It is a question whether, in criminal procedure, it is desirable to continue the exercise of functions by the grand jury, and in adopting an amended criminal procedure, I take to be beyond doubt that the question as to whether we should or not dispense with the services of the grand juries, is one which is included in that division of the criminal law. I observe one criticism which it may be well to notice, as affecting to some extent public opinion upon this question. The circulars which were addressed to the judges and the prosecutors and attorneys general throughout the country, had, as one result, the effect of calling the attention of the grand juries themselves to the question and even from them diverse opinions have come. The criticism to which I refer is this, that it was most unreasonable to expect from the grand jurors any expression of opinion favourable to the discontinuance of their functions, and that it would be practically like consulting Parliament as to whether Parliament should be abolished or not. Speaking from my own experience, which has been pretty general in the province in which I practised, the contrary is the fact. The grand jurors of that province have nearly always been in favour of the discontinuance of their services, because those services they consider onerous and unimportant. There are two strong reasons that induce me to delay any request to Parliament to alter the law with regard to this system. One is the opinion expressed by high authority that, for the present at least, a continuance of the functions of grand jurors leads to a large body of respectable persons in the community being present at the exercise of the functions of the court and leads to their assistance in the exercise of those functions, the result of which is said to be, and I believe it to be, that these persons have their confidence in the system of justice as administered in this country increased, they feel a greater co-operation and sympathy with its administration; and to some extent additional publicity among the best classes of the community is, in that way, given to the proceedings in our courts of justice. Another consideration which has had great weight with the judges who desire that the change should not be made at present, is the uncertainty as to what procedure would take the place of that before the grand jury. I can suggest no other as likely to take its place, except something like this: The requirement that every person, before being tried, should be committed for trial after a preliminary investigation or an examination by some competent authority. There

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

are many offences, as most members are aware, for which trial may take place now without any commitment for trial preceding the charge to the grand jury and the application to the grand jury and indictment by the grand jury. It will be absolutely necessary that we should insist upon a provision, if we should abolish the functions of the grand jury, that every person tried must first be committed for trial, and in the second place that the complaint, indictment, charge, or whatever it might be, which would take the place of a grand jury's indictment, should be approved by the judge before whom the trial is to come on.

Mr. LAURIER. This Bill is not yet, according to the rules of the House, in such a condition that it should come up for discussion, but, as I understand that the hon. gentleman intends to refer it at once to a select committee, and as the purport of the Bill is what the hon. gentleman has just explained, that it will not introduce any great changes, but is to put in statutory form what has already existed by statute modified by the opinion of eminent jurists, I think it may go at once to a second reading. There are many new features in the Bill, but I think there are none which will startle the country or take the people by surprise. Most of the new features are properly based on the changes which have taken place in the criminal law up to the present time. There is one feature in the Bill with which I concur, and that is that the hon. gentleman maintains the functions of the grand jury. He does that more in deference to public opinion than in accordance with his own view. In this important matter of the grand jury, I am a conservative to the hilt. I believe in the grand jury. Of course, the grand jury has not the same functions to discharge now that it formerly had. In an earlier period of history, the function of the grand jury was to review the state of affairs in any county and point out any abuses that existed. This function is now largely performed by the press of the country, but the most important functions of the grand jury still remains, and that is the indictment of criminals. I know of no system that can be devised which offers not only to society but to the party himself a better protection against undue persecution than the system of a grand jury. There are a number of offences which border on the thin line which separate criminal offences from others, and I think in these cases the summoning of the grand jury, composed of the best and most substantial men within a certain radius in the community, is the best guarantee that a man will not have his liberty placed in jeopardy unless he is justly accused. If the grand jury were to be abolished, and a man had simply to be left to the decision of the magistrate, I would say that the character of the magistrates or the local judiciary would have to be very much improved. In many places persons are appointed as justices of the peace whose ability and knowledge are very limited, and if all these matters were to be left in the hands of these magistrates, the liberty of the subject might be unduly interfered with. So far, I agree with the conclusion of, I believe, the greater number who have been consulted, that the time has not come—and I do not think it will ever come in a free country—that the grand jury should be dispensed with. I would ask the hon. gentleman one question, simply for my own information. He states that

in the new code he has dispensed with the word "malice." What does he propose to substitute for that important word?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I propose to substitute a new definition of the crime of murder, and new definitions of those crimes in which the word "malice" was previously used.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So far as my own personal view is concerned, I am pleased that the hon. gentleman has not dispensed with the constitution of the grand jury. I am not going into a discussion as to whether a grand jury is a necessary part of the criminal procedure, but whatever may be its origin in that respect or whatever body may have control over the appointment of a grand jury, there is no doubt in my mind as to its importance in the administration of criminal justice. I think the views expressed by Professor Lieber on this subject are of very great value and force, and he says that it is important to have a body to ascertain whether the party accused ought or ought not to be put on trial. The grand jury performs this function, and it also performs another, and that is the enlistment of the people in the administration of justice. Even where the intelligence of the people might be greater than it is in England, the administration of justice is less satisfactory where there is no jury system. Under this system their sympathies would be enlisted when it is their duty to administer justice and to take part in that function, because in that case the people are enlisted on the side of the Law. No doubt, where you have questions of disputed facts, questions as to the determination of matters of damage and so on, it is important that the principle of the petty jury should be maintained, and it is also of consequence that in matters of criminal justice, both the petty and the grand jury should be maintained. You have in the grand jury to assist the judge the best persons in the community, the best informed and the most law-abiding members of the community. They assist the judge in enforcing the law, and everywhere you find scattered amongst the community those who have taken part in nearly every session of the court, who are there to repel the attacks which may be made against those whose friends have been convicted or otherwise punished; and I say that those persons, both on the grand jury and on the petty jury, standing up for the administration of the law, should be retained as a matter of very much greater consequence than those who seek the abolition of the grand jury are willing to admit. The Minister of Justice admits that some other person or body would require to be invested with the powers and duties now devolving on the grand jury if the latter were abolished. I do not know who could be vested with that authority that would discharge the duties more satisfactorily. I admit that you might get some one individual trained in the law who, perhaps, would sometimes avoid the mistakes into which a grand jury might fall. But that is only one matter to be considered. There are the general interests of the public, there is the feeling of confidence of the public, there are the advocates who assist in the administration of the law who are scattered throughout the community and who do not a little towards upholding the law as it is administered under the present system. In my opinion it is of very great consequence that the grand jury system should be retained, and I should deeply regret to see any step taken to abolish it, and to substitute something else in its place. It is a popular element composed of the most influential, and, on the whole, among the best informed members of the community; and these being men of social standing and influence, being men of more than average intelligence, it does seem to me that it would be a very great mistake and it would be a retrogressive movement, it would be the sacrifice of a strong popular element in our system, if the grand jury were abolished and an attempt made to substitute some person or body in its place.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot answer very shortly the question put by the leader of the Opposition in regard to the substitution of some other phrase for the word "malice," because it requires the examination of a number of sections. I will give some specimens of how it is proposed to deal with the matter. Section 215, for example, says:

"Homicide may be either culpable or not culpable. Homicide is culpable when it consists in the killing of any person, either by an unlawful act or by an omission, without lawful excuse, to perform or observe any legal duty or both combined, or by causing a person, by threats or fear of violence, or by deception, to do an act which causes that person's death, or by wilfully frightening a child or sick person.

"Culpable homicide is either murder or manslaughter. Homicide which is not culpable is not an offence.

"Culpable homicide is murder in each of the following cases:—

"(*a*) If the offender means to cause the death of the person killed;

"(*b*) If the offender means to cause to the person killed any bodily injury which is known to the offender to be likely to cause death, and is reckless whether death ensues or not;

"(*c*.) If the offender means to cause death or, being so reckless as aforesaid to one person, and by accident or mistake kills another person, though he does not mean to hurt the person killed;

"(*d*.) If the offender, for any unlawful object, does an act which he knows or ought to have known to be likely to cause death, and thereby kills any person, though he may have desired that his object should be effected without hurting any one."

And section 223:

"Culpable homicide is also murder in each of the following cases, whether the offender means or not death to ensue, or knows or not that death is likely to ensue:

"(*a*.) If he means to inflict grievous bodily injury for the purpose of facilitating the commission or any of the offences in this section mentioned, or the flight of the offender upon the commission or attempted commission thereof, and death ensues from such injury; or

"(*b*.) If he administers any stupefying or overpowering thing for either of the purposes aforesaid, and death ensues from the effects thereof; or

"(*c*.) If he by any means wilfully stops the breath of any person for either of the purposes aforesaid, and death ensues from such stopping of the breath."

And so with regard to all the offences.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is still more difficult to understand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The difficulty about malice was that it was used in a legal sense quite contrary to the popular sense.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Still everybody understood it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Nobody in practice understood it but the lawyers. The first labour of the judge was to get the jury to dispense altogether in their minds with the sense which everybody had

put upon the words "malice aforethought," and to tell them that what the indictment said about malice did not mean what everybody in creation except the trained few, supposed it to mean. The object is to use the words in their popular sense.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I move that the Bill (No. 7) respecting Criminal Law, be referred to a committee to be composed of members of both Houses, and that the members on the part of this House be: Messrs. Adams, Amyot, Brodeur, Baker, Carroll, Coatsworth, Choquette, Corbould, Curran, Delisle, Daly, Dickey, Edgar, Forbes, Fraser, Girouard, Kirkpatrick, McLeod, Langelier, Monet, Mulock, Masson, Sir John Thompson and Weldon.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are more than fifteen members, I observe, on the special committee to whom the motion proposes to send this Bill. It will be necessary to suspend the rule.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I beg to move that the rule be suspended in that particular. The committee will require to be a large one, both for the ample examination of the Bill and to facilitate the transaction of its business.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that a Message be sent to the Senate requesting their Honours to unite with this House in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses to examine and report upon the Bill from the Commons (No. 7) respecting Criminal Law, and to inform the Senate that Messrs. Adams, Amyot, Brodeur, Baker, Carroll, Coatsworth, Choquette, Corbould, Curran, Deslisle, Daly, Dickey, Edgar, Forbes, Fraser, Girouard, Kirkpatrick, McLeod, Langelier, Monet, Mulock, Masson, Sir John Thompson and Weldon will act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of said Joint Committee should the Senate agree to its creation.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—PRIVILEGE.

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

Mr. DENISON. In referring to a matter that was brought up the other night in the most contemptible manner by the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DENISON. I will withdraw that word, Mr. Speaker, if it is unparliamentary, but it is rather difficult to know what word to use when speaking of a person of that class.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to say that it is a matter hardly worth the while of taking up the time of this House to reply to, but as it has been given a fictitious importance by being brought up here by the member for North Brant, I think it is only my duty to myself and my duty to this House that I should explain the matter as shortly as possible. It may be divided into two parts, one, a charge against myself, and the other a charge against the corps which I have the honour to belong to. All the charges are of the flimsiest character, and I think, Mr. Speaker, as they are allowed to remain in the *Hansard*, that the original documents should be placed before us so that we may be sure that the hon. member for North Brant has not been imposed upon by fictitious documents. However, be that so or not, it is not my purpose to dispute it. I should like to refer to these affidavits somewhat in the order in which they have been read. The first one is that signed by a man called Charles Black. The items 1, 2 and 3 are practically true; in fact, all of them are true except, 4, 11 and 12, which I should like to read to the House. No. 4 is as follows:—

"4. That I was ordered to sign four (4) blank pay-sheets, (2) being smaller ones in said camp in said year, said order being given by and in said blank pay-sheets (4) being signed by me in the presence of Capt. Clarence Denison."

No. 11 is as follows:—

"11. That I now believe that the aforesaid two (2) small blank pay-sheets were officers' pay-sheets and that I had through them being blank, been unwittingly induced to sign as veterinary surgeon and for a veterinary surgeon's pay."

No. 12 is as follows:—

"12. That I now believe and that through having been ordered to ride aforesaid horse on marching out parade and also through the pay-sheets being blank, that I have been unwittingly induced to sign for horse allowance ($12) during said camp in said year."

These allegations resolve themselves into two charges; that I, or my corps, improperly drew $12 horse pay; and that we drew pay for a veterinary surgeon instead of pay for a farrier's sergeant. I have obtained from the department the original pay-sheets that were put in,—and they were there for Black or any one else to see who chose to go to the department for that purpose. I find here the last name but one farrier sergeant C. Black paid from June 27 to July 2, 12 days at 90 cents per day, $10.80. Blank column where horse pay drawn. This shows that no horse pay was drawn, and this disposes of that charge. The only officers for whom we drew pay were nine, being six troop officers, a surgeon, an adjutant and quartermaster. No pay was drawn for a veterinary surgeon, and we had no veterinary surgeon there. I may also mention as a matter of fact that none of this money passed through my hands. I merely certified that the payments were correct; I made none of the payments, and received none, except the small amount of pay which came to myself. The next affidavit is one signed also by Charles Black to about the same effect as the last one, except that it deals with the North-West Rebellion. In that he says:

"4. That I signed duplicate blank pay-sheet (2) in two places after aforesaid promotion, and that I now believe that through the pay-sheets being blank that I had been unwittingly induced to sign for a veterinary surgeon's pay."

I have also obtained the pay-sheets for the whole time the corps served in the North-West, on which occasion, I regret to say, I had not the honour of being present. These pay-sheets show conclusively that no pay was drawn for a veterinary surgeon, the only pay drawn being for the troop, officers, and the staff, which consisted of the colonel in command, the adjutant, the surgeon and quartermaster. There is no veterinary surgeon's pay drawn for time during the whole time the troop was in the North-West. That, I think, conclusively settles affidavit No. 2. Hon. gentlemen can look at these documents and see the particulars for

themselves. The next affidavit is one signed by James Slater, the man who went about seeking to procure evidence against us. He says :

"I, James Slater, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, do solemnly declare that on and between Saturday, the 26th day of September, 1891, and Saturday, the 3rd October, 1891, that to my knowledge the Government of the Dominion of Canada have been defrauded of certain moneys through the false muster of one R. M. Melville and one John Hardy, in the Governor General's Body Guard, Canadian Militia, said G. G. B. G. being under the command of and mustered by one George Taylor Denison, a Lieutenant-Colonel, Canadian militia, and said two men, R. M. Melville and John Hardy, being residents of the city of Toronto."

I may say in reply that both these men put in the whole of their drill, and received their pay, and I hold in my hand the receipts for the pay they received. I think that fact disposes of that affidavit. The next is one by a man name Wm. Fenwick, who states as follows :—

"I, William Fenwick, of the city of Toronto, in the County of York, porter, do solemnly declare that :

"1, I served three years in the Governor General's Body Guard under the command of Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison.

"2. About the year 1882, Lieut.-Col. Fred. C. Denison, Governor General's Body Guard, deducted a sum of money, I think it was $5, from my camp pay of that year, telling me it was for a deficit in connection with a ball given by the Governor General's Body Guard for the benefit of the proposed monument of the men who fell during the North West rebellion, as the proceeds were to go to said monument after expenses were paid in connection with said ball."

I may say, in reply to that affidavit, that it is of very little consequence whether it was true or not. If it was true, the action complained of would be done with the consent of the man himself, who made the affidavit. But it so happens that it was not true. I have the different account books where the items are charged against the men, if any are entered up. I find in 1888, the year he speaks of, there was no such stoppage against Fenwick ; there were the usual stoppages for mess, forage, and so on, but no stoppage for a ball. I have also examined the books for 1887 and 1889, as there might have been a mistake of a year. I find no such stoppage for a ball charged against the men in 1889. The accounts are signed by Fenwick. Hon. members of the House are quite welcome to look at these books and satisfy themselves in regard to this matter. Even supposing the charge were true, I would not object to it in the slightest degree ; but it so happens that there is no truth in that statement. The next affidavit is one of B. Marshman, who swears—I need not trouble the House by reading the whole of it—as follows :—

"I was employed by Lieut.-Col. Fred C. Denison, Governor General's Body Guard, and Capt. Clarence Denison, G.G.B.G., as a groom during the annual camp of the said G.G.B.G., under command of Lieut.-Col. George Taylor Denison. During said annual camp I was ordered by said Capt. Clarence Denison to sign two papers, which I have since been informed were two blank pay-sheets, and I was also ordered to answer my name on a parade, which I have since been informed was muster parade for pay."

I may mention that the strength of a troop in the Body Guard is 42 men. We are allowed pay for 35 horses and 42 men. This arrangement is made as it would be a useless expenditure to the country to keep a horse for every man, as a certain number of men are required for guard, cook, officers' servants, and so on. This practice has been carried out in order to effect a saving of public money. In regard to uniforms, we have to be as economical as possible, and members of the House will understand that the rough usage which a cavalry man gives his uniform in grooming his horse is more severe than that given to the uniform by an infantry man, who performs no such work. But the uniform is to last for five years. On this account when a man has put in three years' service and leaves we sometimes give his pair of trousers for overalls to a servant or cook, and that is all the uniform they get, and as a matter of fact they scarcely need any uniform at all. This B. Marshman says he did not enlist, that he did not sign the service roll. I sent for the service roll, which I now have in my hand, and I find that Benjamin Marshman signed the roll on 27th June, 1887. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) said the other night it would be a very funny thing if all these men were drunken loafers. I do not refer to the affidavits of Roche and Bryan because they do not affect the result one way or the other, but it so happens that Bryan and Marshman who made affidavits are men who have both been up before the Police Court in Toronto ; Bryan on two occasions for drunkenness and Marshman once, so that they are hardly what you could call the best type of witnesses you could procure for this purpose. The affidavit of Matthew Bryan refers entirely to the North-West and I regret that Col. Dunn who commanded that troop is now in Manitoba, so that I had no time or opportunity to communicate with him as to the charge made here. I find on turning up the pay-sheet, which I have before me, that Matthew Bryan went up there as a dismounted man, and that at Winnipeg a horse was purchased, as they had only 34 out of the 35 in the troop which must have been assigned to Bryan because he rode in the North-West, and I remember hearing that he was thrown from his horse, He admits himself that he had a horse, for he says, "nor did I ride said horse shown against my name until my return to Toronto." This shows that he did ride that horse. I have, however, nothing further to say with regard to that as I could not communicate with Col. Dunn on the subject, and can only speak from the pay-rolls which are before me. Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the affidavit of Geo. McInnerny, I may remark that it confines itself to a statement that Magistrate Baxter did not do his duty. That of course is none of my business, and I have no desire or intention of entering into that question. If Mr. Slater, or the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) choose to report Mr. Baxter they are perfectly at liberty to do so. The next two affidavits are signed by Harry J. C. Bryne and Edward Roche. I shall not trouble the House to read them, but they are merely to the effect that Slater went to the store-room and offered to deliver up the arms. I doubt that statement, but whether it is true or not it makes no difference, for the reason that it was Slater's business to bring me the arms, and I had demanded them from him on several occasions. I may refer back a moment to state that during the drill that year he was perfectly useless, he came there after a prolonged spree, and the doctor said he was verging on D.T's, so that he was no use to us. I told him after the drill was over to send in his arms, and I took the further precaution of sending a non-commissioned officer to him with an order to return the arms to store. He refused the non-commissioned officer to do so, and

being in no particular hurry about them I wrote to him, and I wrote to him again, and threatened him then that if he did not bring in his arms I would have to prosecute him. I did it for this reason. After the 14th September in that year his three years were up, and he still held the arms. I had either to allow this man to defy me and keep his arms, or to go before a magistrate and force him to return them. I can assure you that I was not long in making up my mind which course to pursue. The only other statement I have to make with reference to this, is in answer to his assertion that he did not get a certificate of discharge until a comparatively recent date. The cause of that was this: When I notified him to return his arms I had the discharge prepared and signed and waiting for him to come and call for it, and hand in his arms. He never called for it and it lay there for months and months, but that was his own fault. It is his business under the rules and regulations to call for the discharge. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is a single other point further that I can touch upon which has not already been answered. If any hon. gentleman wishes to make further enquiries or to ask for further explanations I shall be only too glad to give them, but while I do this, I must say again what I said the other night, that it was a most improper proceeding, and a most unparliamentary proceeding for any person sitting in this House as a member of Parliament to take the course adopted by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) the other night. He should surely, when he is attacking the honour of a member of this House, have taken a little trouble to satisfy himself of the truth or falsity of these charges. They were all in the department and he could have seen them; the department looked over them and said there was nothing in them, and if he had chosen he could have found that out. But instead of doing that he comes to the House with these trumped up affidavits and the House can see what use he made of them the other night. The power of some to imagine evil in others is greater than in other persons, and I think that every hon. member in this House will say that the course adopted by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) was a most unparliamentary one, and one that would not commend itself to any other member of this House. I may say that in the city of Toronto where I come from these charges would have no weight, because nobody would believe them there; but on account of their appearing in the press and on account of them going forth through the country in the manner in which they have done, they might gain credence in some quarters, and it is therefore necessary for me to deny them. Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I must thank the hon. the leader of the Opposition for the kind manner in which he received my statement the other night and accepted my word. I am sure it is only what I might expect from his character and from the gentlemanly instincts that I know he possesses. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that there is anything else I can add to what I have already said on this matter.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I can hardly allow this occasion to pass without saying some words in regard to the unwarrantable attack that has been made upon my hon. friend and colleague the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison). Those of us who have known the hon. gentleman for very many years are surprised indeed that such an attack should have been made upon him, because we know that his honour has always been unimpeachable and that his integrity has never been assailed. There are circumstances connected with this matter which, when they are made known, place the member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) in a very unpleasant light before the public generally. This list of documents upon which the charge was based is no new thing at all, because I suppose there is hardly a member of this House who did not receive that bill of charges last session. There are very few hon. gentlemen here who have not heard of this crank who has been making the charges, and I feel sure that the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) who read the papers the other night, had these papers in his hands last year, and therefore that he has had abundance of time for the purpose of investigating them. I feel assured also that if he had taken the slightest pains to make an investigation himself, if he had put himself about in the very least degree to ascertain whether the charges were true, he would have learned that they were false as my hon. friend has proved them to be to-night. It appears to me, Sir, that not only did the hon. gentleman who made the charges, owe something to the character and the standing and the reputation of the hon. gentleman against whom he made those charges, but he owed something to his own character. It appears to me that he owed something to the dignity that ought to be felt by every member of this House; and I must say that I feel sorry for any man who could so far forget his position as a member of this House, and therefore forget his position as a gentleman—because I think every member of this House ought to be a gentleman—that he should so far forget all the finer feelings which one man ought to have towards another, as to bring on these papers—not the original papers, but only copies of them—such charges as he brought against the hon. member for West Toronto. I would go further. Now that the matter has been so thoroughly explained, I think that the hon. member for North Brant owes it not merely to the hon. member for West Toronto, but to this House and to the country, to apologize for the statements he has made and the course he has pursued; and I trust that the hon. gentleman, who has had quite sufficient time for reflection since he brought these charges, will see fit to retract them to-night as publicly as he made them, and to apologize to the hon. member for West Toronto for having made them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I desire to say a few words with regard to this matter, and to bring to the recollection of the members of the House the occasion when these affidavits were read. It was when the House was in Committee of Supply on certain votes required for the militia, amounting to something over $1,250,000. During that discussion I saw fit to make use of certain affidavits, which had been placed in my hands, as I stated, by a reputable law firm in the city of Toronto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will give the name o the firm. It is Dewart & Irving.

Mr. COATSWORTH. They are only copies of the affidavits.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the hon. gentlemen will just keep cool, I shall get along faster than if they interrupt me. The gentleman informed me in the letter which enclosed the affidavits that he had the original declarations made before magistrates in his possession, and that they would be placed in my hands whenever I required them. So that, so far as I was concerned, I was acting in good faith that the original documents were in the possession of those legal gentlemen in the city of Toronto, and that they could be had at any moment; and they are there still. When the matter came up for discussion I saw fit to bring that first set of declarations before the committee, to show, as I believe they did show, that the expenditure on the militia force was not just all that it should be. After referring briefly in the commencement of my remarks to the extravagance of the expenditure on the militia system, I went on to point out some particular instances. Now, I consider that it is the duty of every man who seeks to guard the interests of the public and to look after the expenditures of the country, to use all possible means to get at the truth of those expenditures and to see that they are justly and properly made. I had in my possession those affidavits setting forth certain facts, and I believed those affidavits to be true. I believed that I had a right to show to that committee that this expenditure was not legitimate: and certainly it must be apparent to every man in this House that having in my possession those affidavits, I had a right to suppose that I had proof of what I stated with regard to those charges. Now, to make sure of this matter I referred to some of the public documents, and in looking over the report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year ending the 31st December, 1887, I found that in Military District No. 2, Lieut.-Col. W. D. Otter, Deputy Adjutant-General, the actual strength present at inspection of the Governor General's Body Guard, was 10 officers and 76 men, and that the inspection took place on the 2nd of July. Then I turned to the Auditor General's Report for the year ending the 30th of June, 1888, which included the time when this inspection took place, and I found by that report that the Governor General's Body Guard was composed of 86 officers and men. Then I turned to the Militia Report again and found the officers composing the Governor General's Body Guard numbered 11, and I found that the veterinary surgeon was not appointed until the 23rd of December, 1887, so that it was impossible for Frank Alexander Campbell, the veterinary surgeon whose name appears in this report, to be present at that inspection; and the information contained in the letter which I received from Toronto, was to the effect that George T. Denison was in England at the time of that inspection. If that is not correct, I should like my hon. friend——

Mr. DENISON. Certainly it is correct.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, I also found—this was after the debate the other night—that the hon. member for West Toronto made this statement:

"The man Black imagines that he signed two pay-sheets. What he signed was a pay-sheet and a muster-roll, which are two different things, and, instead of drawing pay as a veterinary surgeon, he drew the pay of a farrier sergeant. If the hon. gentleman had gone to the department he would have found that instead of my having charged for the pay of ten men I only charged for the pay of nine men, and that only nine men drew pay."

Mr. DENISON. That means nine officers.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, I have shown to the House that ten officers drew pay, by the Report of the Militia Department and by the Auditor General's Report for that year, and I think I had reason to base some dependence on the affidavit made by Mr. Black. If we are not to depend on the reports which are sent down by the different departments to Parliament——

Mr. BOWELL. Will the hon. gentleman let me ask him a question? Does the Militia Report state that any number of men were paid? Does it not simply refer to the number on the muster roll?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is just as I said.

Mr. BOWELL. I am speaking of the Militia Report.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It reads: Actual strength present at inspection, 10 officers and 76 men; and then we find that, according to the Auditor General's Report 86 men were paid, which is exactly the number mentioned present at the inspection. There are only 11 officers in the corps, and there could only have been nine at that time drawing pay. As I said before, the veterinary surgeon was not appointed, and leaving out the chief officer who was in England, there were only nine other officers, yet the Militia Report shows that ten were paid. I think under those circumstances, I had good ground for supposing and believing that there was some serious fault to be found with this payment of money made to the Governor General's Body Guard in Toronto. And, what further confirmed my suspicions was a reference to the Auditor General's Report of this year. One of the hon. gentlemen who criticised my remarks the other night seemed to think it was an unpardonable sin to criticise any one in the House connected with the militia, and that it was a more enormous sin still to criticise any one out of the House connected with the militia. I find, by referring to the Auditor General's Report of this year, that a state of affairs exists with regard to the management of the militia of this country which, no doubt, in some respects, influenced the General, whose report was referred to the other night, in making some of the statements he did, unless his report was written before: but, at all events, this is not creditable to the militia force, and it induced me to think that if all the irregularities set forth in this report did occur, it is quite possible and probable that the statements of this man Black with regard to the money paid to the Governor General's Body Guard of Toronto, were correct. I will not detain the House with reading the names of all the officers who are mentioned in the Auditor General's report as drawing more pay than was due them and occupying higher positions than they were entitled to occupy. The following appears in the Auditor General's Report:—

"AUDIT OFFICE. OTTAWA, 15th June, 1891.

"SIR,—I wish to call your attention to the following overpayments and other irregularities in your annual drill vouchers for the 6 months ending the 31st of December, 1890."

Then follow two or three pages of names, numbering over 90 officers, all the way up to majors and colonels, who drew money, amounting from $3 to $27

each, which they were not entitled to draw, and which they illegally drew, and which the Militia Department illegally paid, and which illegal payments were discovered by the Auditor General. It is fortunate for the people of Canada, in more ways than one, that they have an Auditor General. Now, these 90 men, I believe all officers, drew sums of money from $3 up to $27 each illegally, and the Militia Department paid them. I hope that, under the management of the present Minister, a different state of affairs will be brought about. Let me read the reply sent to the Auditor General, by Mr. Panet, the Deputy Minister, to show what he says with regard to these over-payments:

"DEPT. OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.
"OTTAWA, 9th September, 1891.

"SIR.—Adverting to your letter of 15th June last, calling attention to over-payments and other irregularities in the annual drill vouchers for six months ended 31st December, 1890, I have the honour to inform you that the respective cases have been duly investigated, and that all the officers implicated in such irregularities have now been called upon to refund, by deposit receipt to the credit of the Receiver General, the amounts which they have been improperly paid. The Minister of Militia and Defence has likewise ordered that stoppages of pay, to the amounts overcharged, be made in all cases of officers serving in present or future camps or at annual drill or on other service, where it is shown that the refund has not taken place."

Now, that is a departmental document. That ought to have some weight with this House in forcing them to the conclusion that I was justified in believing the statements which were declared by this legal firm in Toronto to have been sworn to before certain magistrates in the city of Toronto. I do not think, therefore, that I require to make any apology for having discussed that question as I did. I think we are here, as I said before, to discuss the estimates and discover any frauds that may have been committed upon the Government of this country, and I was simply discharging my duty, and am not prepared to say that I did any wrong in discussing this matter. The hon. member for East Toronto had the hardihood—and it is not the first time he has made remarks about me which were not justifiable not only in this House but in the Public Accounts Committee last year—he had the hardihood to say that he believed I had received these affidavits last session. Why did he believe that? I tell the hon. gentleman that I never saw these affidavits until they were sent to me this session.

Mr. COATSWORTH. They were all over the House last Session.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman says they were circulated here last year. Let me call his attention to this fact, that the whole of the affidavits or declarations, whatever you like to call them, which were first presented by me to the House were sworn to, one on the 15th January, 1892, another on the 5th January, 1892, another on the 8th January, 1892, another on the 30th October, 1891, another on the 8th December, 1891, another on the 28th December, 1891.

Mr. COATSWORTH. They were just resworn to make you fresh.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Now, I think that the hon. gentleman ought to do me justice and apologize for making this statement, because he had every opportunity to verify it and see what dates were on these declarations, and he stands up before this House and accuses me of having documents in my possession last session which never had existence in the country at all then, but are all of recent date. And I may say further that I had no intention whatever of reading the other declarations which I did read, and would not have read them had it not been for the statement made by the member for West Toronto. He has himself to blame for my bringing up those other declarations, which may possibly have been in the possession of the hon. member for East Toronto last session, but which I never saw until they were sent to me. The hon. member for West Toronto declared that this man Slater was a drunken old soldier, and that he was only a drunken loafer. Now, the boast of Britons has always been that equal justice and fair-play should be meted out to rich and poor alike; and, Mr. Speaker, the sense I have of British justice and fair-play, compelled me to rise and give to this House this man Slater's statement of the case. I had no intention of presenting that statement at all, because it was first in the list of affidavits and I turned them over and went on to those of recent date which bore strictly and solely upon the expenditure of public money. But since this man Slater was charged with this offence, knowing that he was an old British soldier, knowing that he had fought in the British army in India, knowing that he ought to be respected instead of having his character blackened in such terms as those used by the hon. member for West Toronto, I did him the justice of reading his statement. Furthermore, I have information from members of this House and residents of Toronto, who declare that James Slater is a very respectable man, and, that being the case, could you, Mr. Speaker, or any other member of this House, expect me to sit silent when I had this man's own defence in my possession and not present it to the House? I was impelled to do this in justice to that man. I will not now detain the House with a recital of his grievances. I have a record of the Toronto police court, setting forth his grievances and showing that he thinks he has been very wrongfully and very harshly treated in this matter. He says so in his own affidavit, and it is true that he used very strong language in that affidavit. I had not read it through before I read it to the House, and, had I known that some words were contained in that affidavit at the time, I do not think I would have read that affidavit here, but I think that this man Slater was harshly treated and that I could not be blamed for trying to champion his cause here, that is, presenting his case to this House from his point of view. I do not think there is anything unmanly for a man to stand up in this House and declare that he finds he has a reason to regret having made use of statements which he ought not to have made. I say that, if I had known that these words, where he states that he had been convicted on false and perjured evidence were in that affidavit, I would not have read it. I think I did wrong in reading that statement, and I as freely and cheerfully retract that as I can possibly do in this House. I had no desire, as I said before, to injure any man, any member of this House or any one outside in this matter. I was seeking to do my duty, and I think I was doing my duty in endeavouring to show that the public funds had not been properly expended. I believe

I had reason to do that and that was the course I took, and that is all I have to say in regard to it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have just a word or two to say, not to continue the discussion in the manner in which it has proceeded so far, but to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a feature of the discussion the other night of which I think he has lost sight. The hon. gentleman has explained the circumstances as to how he came to read these papers to the House in committee. He was pursuing, he thinks, his duty in making enquiries into certain irregularities in the public expenditure, and he has said that, if he had known that the affidavit which he read contained the statements "perjured evidence" and "false accusations," he would not have read that affidavit. The House, however, has further to consider that the hon. gentleman, in point of fact, made, although not upon his own responsibility, two distinct charges against the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison). In the affidavits which he read to the House the other day there were two very distinct charges made, irrespective of the words which he wishes the House to consider withdrawn. In the first place the accusation made against the hon. member for West Toronto was that he had falsely certified to a pay-sheet for the purpose of drawing the money irregularly from the treasury, and that he did that as an officer of the militia. The second charge was that the hon. member for West Toronto procured the conviction of this man improperly for the purpose of suppressing a charge against himself. I submit to the good sense of that hon. member himself, as well as to the opinion of the House, whether it is right that charges of that kind should be made in this House and, after the explanations which have been made by the accused member, should not be withdrawn. I think the least we should expect from the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is that, in addition to what he has said as to these two words in the affidavit, those two explicit charges should be withdrawn, after the statement which has been made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) and the proofs he has produced. If the hon. member does not take that course in regard to those charges or does not propose to substantiate them, I shall feel it my duty to place before the House a resolution on the subject.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure the House will be convinced from what fell from the lips of my hon. friend (Mr. Somerville) that he has every intention of doing what is fair as between himself and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison). Perhaps I am to some extent responsible in this matter myself. In the month of January last I received a letter from this man Slater stating that he had been very badly used by the member for Toronto, who, I believe, had been his colonel, that he had been prosecuted and convicted on false testimony, and further that false certificates had been given in the regiment, and he wanted to place these matters in my hands in order to obtain justice. I answered at once to Mr. Slater that I would be very slow to believe anything wrong on the part of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison). I have not had very much acquaintance with the hon. gentleman, I have only known him as a colleague in this House, but I would not believe that he had misappropriated public moneys or anything of that kind. At the same time, the hon. gentleman is human, he deals with soldiers, and as this man complained that he was badly treated, without believing that it was true, without knowing whether it was true or not, I stated in my answer to him that I would be slow to believe anything against the member for Toronto, but I said Parliament was opened to him as to any one else, and, if he had a real complaint to make, I would take charge of it. The matter remained in that shape until I received a letter from my friend Mr. Dewart, a young lawyer of Toronto, and with it I received a batch of papers which I placed in the hands of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville). I never knew what was in them until I heard them read in this House. The hon. member for Toronto was altogether wrong in thinking that the hon. member for Brant had these papers in his possession last session.

Mr. COATSWORTH. The man saw me shortly after my election and showed me papers, last year, similar to those which were read this session, and I understood that a similar batch of papers was sent to all the members of the House. The member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) tells me Mr. Trow had them last year. I certainly understood that every member on both sides of the House was in possession of them last year. I feel sure they have been simply resworn to make them fresh.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend says that he read these affidavits hastily. He explained the other day, and he explains again to-day, that he had no intention of conveying the impression to the House that the hon. member for Toronto should be guilty of such a low offence as to appropriate public moneys. He stated that the other day, and he reiterates his statement to-day. All I understood him to mean the other day was that there had been irregularities in the Militia Department, and also in the regiment in which the hon. gentleman belongs. Irregularities may happen everywhere, but surely that does not at all imply that the hon. member for Toronto is guilty of an offence. My hon. friend does not at all say that he intended to charge anything of the kind against the member for Toronto. Now, in face of the repudiation which he has made of all intention of saying anything against the honour of the member for Toronto, it seems to me that his explanation has gone as far as the House is entitled to exact. I hope that after such a frank explanation on the part of my hon. friend, the matter will be allowed to rest where it is.

Mr. LISTER. I have looked over the *Hansard* and I fail to find any such charge as the Minister of Justice mentions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the declaration.

Mr. LISTER. There are no charges made in the *Hansard* by the hon. member for Brant against the member for West Toronto.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is the worst way in which to make charges in the House.

Mr. COCKBURN. I regret exceedingly that the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has not considered it his duty, after the explanations that have been made, to offer an unqualified apology to this House and to my brother member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) for the language which he used and the charges which he made. I am emboldened to think that he will yet do so,

from the language that was used in this House about eight and forty hours ago by the hon. member who has the honour of leading Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. He then told us:

"There is an unwritten law of Parliament which expects every member of this House to act as a gentleman; and the common sense of the country will expect that if any member should be guilty of making such a foul charge against another without having strong reasons for making it, and good evidence to support it, he will not be fit to associate with gentlemen, and he ought to be expelled from the House."

These are the words, and they are memorable words, of the leader of the Opposition, and they do credit to his heart and credit to those gentlemanly instincts with which he has always conducted the Opposition in this House. I trust that his follower from North Brant, however humble he may be, however impervious he may be to such influences—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am in order; Sir, I say I trust that this gentleman will try, as far as in him lies, to imbibe some of that spirit which has been inculcated here only eight and forty hours ago by the hon. gentleman whom he now professes to obey as his leader. Sir, since the debate opened the other evening, I have had an opportunity of paying a running visit to Toronto, and I can assure you that the charges made by the hon. member for North Brant are there regarded with both ridicule and abhorrence. There is no family in Toronto, no family in the whole of Ontario, that stands higher in public esteem than the family of the Denisons. For seventy years they have stood in the front as the defenders of their country, and in every clime, in Canada, in Britain, in India, everywhere they have been ready to shed their blood and to give their means for the defence of the country. They are sprung from a good, sound stock, they are sprung from the old U. E. Loyalists, and they have never done anything, directly or indirectly, to my knowledge, or to the knowledge of any one, except the hon. member for North Brant, which would befoul the escutcheon which they have borne so bravely before them. Sir, he has tried to explain to us the irregularity which he alleges to have occurred with reference to the pay-list. I hold in my hand the pay-list itself which explains the matter most clearly. I find there the officers mentioned as having received pay, with their signatures attached. Here are the names of the officers:

"Fred. C. Denison, Captain and Bt. Lt.-Col.
"F. A. Fleming, Lieutenant.
"F. B. Browning, 2nd Lieutenant.
"Orlando Dunn, Captain and Bt. Major.
"Wm. Hamilton Merritt, Lieutenant.
"Casimir Dixon, 2nd Lieutenant.
"F. L. M. Grasett, Surgeon.
"C. A. Denison, Captain and Adjutant.
"John Sloan, quartermaster."

These are the nine officers who are mentioned as having received pay as forming part of the Governor General's Body Guard. Sir, if hon. members are to be allowed with impunity to make such charges, such base charges, as have been made by the hon. member for North Brant, there will be a sensible lowering of the dignity of this House. We shall find that outside, by our own constituents, the value that we are inclined to place upon ourselves, will be that which will be placed on us by them. Sir, if the dignity of this House is to be lowered, if members are to be allowed to fling broadcast unfounded accusations of this kind, the result will be that in a few short years we shall find the tone of this House sensibly lowered. So far, since Confederation, we have striven to maintain it as a House in which gentlemen may fitly associate together. But if charges of this kind are to be bandied about, if an hon. gentleman who has served this country in the east, who has served it on the Nile, who has served it everywhere, and has always been ready, with every member of his family, to serve his country—if such a gentleman is to be treated in this way, what are we to expect will be the future of this country? What sacrifices can we expect will be made for this country by our militia men and officers? I trust, therefore, that this gentleman for North Brant will duly consider the statement made by his hon. leader, and will consider that if he desires to remain a worthy member of this House, to be considered by them as fit to associate with gentlemen, to be considered as a person who ought not to be expelled from this House, he will rise in his place and tender that ample apology which one gentleman is supposed to be ready to tender to another, as soon as he has learned that the evidence on which he has made his charge is totally unfounded, as the evidence has been on which he made this charge.

Mr. CASEY. Although in modern days the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) is a boy with the boys, although he sometimes plays cricket out on the green in front of these august edifices, the instincts of the schoolmaster survive in him still. It seems to be utterly impossible for him to let slip any opportunity of giving a lecture to somebody. An hon. member behind me suggests the word "scolding." I do not know but the word scolding would be more proper under present circumstances. He has jumped into the middle of a debate with which he had nothing to do; he has tried to jump upon an hon. member who has been attacked for doing what he thought was his duty, and has lectured him, or, as my hon. friend has suggested, scolded him. I do not know what some parts of his remarks had to do with the question, but there is one portion of them to which I must refer. He referred to the family of which the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) is a member, to their long existence in Toronto, to their origin, and to the distinction which they have always merited in that city. Now, Sir, I do not think we need to be told these things. I think the family of the Denisons are sufficiently well known to the people of Ontario not to need a certificate even from the late head master of Upper Canada College. I think they are quite as able to stand on their own reputation as on his certificate. As for the point at issue, leaving aside this chaff, I think the matter has been taken too seriously by both sides of the House. Since I am as old a parliamentarian as any hon. member present, with two or three exceptions, I may be permitted to express the opinion that it is impossible to draw rules so strictly as to prohibit members from reading affidavits in the House and asking explanations thereon, simply because they may cast reflections on some member of the House. It would be utterly destroying our liberties and privileges to draw the rules so strictly. It is altogether unfair and untrue to represent the member who reads the affidavits as having made the charges himself. He says,

for example: I have here an affidavit from a man who is represented to me as respectable and he swears so and so, leaving himself open to the charge of perjury if his statement is incorrect. The member states that he wishes the department in question, such, for instance, as the Militia Department, to enquire into the matter, or he may suggest that the enquiry be made by the House or in some other manner. I do not think these present charges are exactly a proper subject for enquiry by a parliamentary committee, but I did not hear all the explanations of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Denison). In my opinion, an enquiry should be made by a proper military court in order to settle the matter once and for ever. I do not wish to be understood, as the hon. member knows, as attaching the slightest weight to the affidavit of Slater—I do not know the other men. The hon. member is also aware that I made no attack against his personal character, but after so much talk has been indulged in, the best way to settle the matter would be to have an enquiry which would settle the matter beyond all doubt, especially as it has gone broadcast throughout the country. Now, after wasting so much time on the subject, we should accept the retraction made by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville).

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CASEY. Yes. I am afraid the hon. member was not attending to what the hon. member for North Brant said. We have already wasted sufficient time on this matter, and I hope this is the last we shall hear of it.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not intend to prolong the debate further than to say that the fullest investigation was made into these charges which have been referred to in this debate, and also in the debate which took place the other day. After the discussion in the House, on proceeding to my office yesterday morning I sent for the General and asked him if these charges were ever investigated. His reply only confirmed the statement made by my predecessor during the discussion, that they had been fully investigated, that he had taken up the charges *seriatim*, that he had gone fully into them, and there was not one word of truth in any of them, so far as they related either to Lieut.-Col. George Denison or to the hon. member for West Toronto in this House. I asked him if I was at liberty to make that statement in the House, as no doubt the matter would be again referred to, and he said I was. I have made this statement in the hearing of hon. members of the House, in order that we may not again hear the desire expressed that a further investigation should be made. That has been repeated over and over again. Had there been no investigation, I feel no hesitation in saying that I would have ordered an investigation to be held at once, in order to relieve the character, if such were necessary, of the hon. member for West Toronto, and brother, whose name has been referred to so often, of any imputation, as I could not believe it possible that those gentlemen could be guilty of that with which they were charged in what purports to be affidavits. I regret to say that I cannot agree with the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Casey) or with the leader of the Opposition, when he says that the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) had made that retraction which I think under the circumstances should have been made. He did, however, make one statement which any one who knows anything of the volunteer force or has had any connection with them, either past or present, is familiar with, the fact that irregularities may occur, arising principally from a want of knowledge of the regulations and orders which govern the force. The remarks which were made by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) in regard to the overdrawing of pay by a number of officers would leave the impression on the minds of those who heard him, and those who may read his remarks, that there had been an attempt to swindle, if I may use a common expression, because it was nothing more or less if it were done intentionally. It was something new to me, but when I looked at the Auditor General's Report—and I may as well confess I had not read it before—I could well understand how these irregularities occurred. There are many cases in which a battalion when it turns out for annual drill is not complete—I have in my eye the 15th Battalion of Belleville. In it are a number of young men who would no more think of taking the $3.50 improperly than the hon. gentleman would think of putting his hand in his neighbour's pocket. I find one acted as captain during the time the battalion was at camp and had command; his rank in the volunteer force was only that of first lieutenant, and under the regulations he was only entitled to a first lieutenant's pay, but as he had performed the duties of captain he no doubt thought it perfectly proper to claim captain's pay. I am informed that in some cases the pay was drawn with the consent of the deputy adjutant general of the particular district, under the impression that, having acted in a higher capacity, the officers were entitled to the pay of that rank of the position in which they acted. When the Auditor General examined the record—take the case of the gentleman to whom I have referred who only held the rank of first lieutenant but drew the pay of captain—he drew the attention of the department, and on this gentleman being informed that he had received pay to which he was not entitled, he paid back the amount. That is the character of all these over-payments that have been made so far as I have been able to investigate them, which has been only during the past few months. I make this statement in justice to the young gentleman I referred to, and whom I know very well in my own city, and I believe the same is applicable to most of the other cases. It is in this way that irregularities would very naturally occur, from the fact that the men had not studied the orders and regulations governing the force. I sincerely regret that the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), whom I have known for a great many years, had not thought proper, after the explanation which has been made by the member for Toronto, in which the leader of the Opposition must know, and the member for West Elgin must also have known, if he had heard it, he proved every statement which had reference to himself individually to be incorrect, and that he had the evidence of the pay-list before him, the original document which he obtained from the department to show that the affidavits were not correct. So far as these documents are concerned they are, as

I pointed out before, not affidavits at all. There are some of them not signed and there is no *jurat* attached to some of the others; but apart from that altogether, they make serious charges against the honour of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) and for that reason after the evidence which has been placed before the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), in justice to the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison), and in justice to the House, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) should have made an unreserved withdrawal of the charges, and I hope he will see his way to do so yet. One thing struck me in connection with this matter, and it is rather singular. It is that the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) said over and over again that he received these documents—affidavits as he called them—from a reputable law firm. The leader of the Opposition says that he handed them to the member for North Brant, and that he is the gentleman who received them. I leave that little contradiction to be settled between the two gentlemen.

Mr. LAURIER. There is nothing to explain in that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOWELL. It was a little irregularity.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not an irregularity. I have explained to the House in what manner these papers came here; they simply passed through my hands and I never looked at them.

Mr. MULOCK. Not having been present at the debate of last Friday evening, and not having read the debate except such as appeared in the public press, I can only perhaps imperfectly add to what has already been said. I was struck with something that appeared in the public press with regard to this matter. I saw it stated as a report of the debate in this House, that Sergeant Slater was a person of loose character, I forget the expression used.

An hon. MEMBER. A drunken loafer.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, a drunken loafer I believe. For some years Sergeant Slater reported his grievance to me. He called upon me some years ago and narrated how he had been convicted for refusing to return stores, and I must say that I felt then that he had been hardly used in that transaction. My impression from seeing him was that he was a man of honesty of purpose, not desiring to do any one wrong, but of an excitable disposition and of very fixed views. For example, I can remember one of the charges that he thought was a very heinous one, and which, as at first explained it to me, seemed a very serious one. It was this: He told me that he was engaged to discharge some duties and that there was a certain regulation pay attached to these duties that he was entitled to, but that this pay had been withheld from him. He made himself believe that the withholding of that money had resulted most seriously in regard to his family, and I think he said that his wife had almost died from want, by reason of his not receiving the money which he thought it was his right to obtain. Not being familiar myself with the militia law, or the practice which of course at times seems to supersede the law, I made enquiry of some militia officers, one of whom I think was my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and he explained to me that the statutory allowance for such services went to the officer of the company or the regiment as the case might be; that it was for the officer to get the services performed, making such terms as he chose, and that the person who made the contract with a superior officer was only entitled to such pay as was the result of the agreement: the statutory pay being a fund placed at the disposal of the superior officer. That may be the law, and no doubt it is, but a person hired to do these services might form a very inaccurate opinion as to his rights. This man Slater has no doubt drawn that conclusion. He has suffered very considerably by reason of his imprisonment, and domestic affliction, which he has in some way connected with the treatment he has received. The consequence has been, no doubt, that he has been over-excited, but he certainly does impress one who has not had the opportunity of seeing him personally with the sincerity of his cause. He has called on me at odd times during the last two or three years, and in the few times that I have seen him, his appearance in no way indicated that he was of a drunken or dissipated disposition. On the contrary I have never seen a person in the service more tidy in his dress, and altogether apparently more respectable than he. I was amazed, therefore, to find that he was described as being so dissipated a character. If I had not had the opportunity of seeing him personally and weighing his expression, I would have been disposed to attach a great deal of importance to any communications that he should have sent me, but having the advantage of seeing him, I must say that I feel somewhat inclined—while not questioning his veracity or desire to tell the truth—to question the accuracy of his general statement. I do not know that I can say anything further in regard to this matter, except so far as I have been able to discover from what my hon. friend the Minister of Militia has said, all these allegations have not been investigated. If I understand rightly, the affidavits contain certain charges, and the Minister of Militia mentioned that the Major-General commanding has assured him that he has investigated these charges and that they are wholly inaccurate as regard anything chargeable against my hon. friend the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) or any of his family. So far as I am concerned I can well believe that without any investigation, and if any word from me were necessary as a vindication of the member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) it certainly would be forthcoming. My hon. friend the Minister admits that these documents contain other charges than those affecting the gentleman to whom I have referred.

Mr. BOWELL. They contain a lot of charges.

Mr. MULOCK. Did Major-General Herbert say that he had investigated these charges in all their ramifications no matter to whom they referred, and did he report that they were absolutely without foundation as regards any person?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. Then certain charges have not been investigated?

Mr. BOWELL. We are not discussing that question at all. We are not discussing the general charges, but we are discussing the imputations cast upon a member of this House. There will be no objection in the world to give the hon. gentleman the result of the investigation. I merely

refer to the General's declaration that after investigating the allegations of these affidavits, he finds that there was nothing either directly or indirectly that could reflect on the reputation of either of the two colonels referred to.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood that these two documents were read bearing upon the estimates, and of course some allegations in these documents had no reference to my hon. friend from West Toronto or to any of his friends. Therefore, to some extent at all events they allude to charges not yet disposed of. I understood my hon. friend from North Brant to withdraw any endorsement which he might be supposed to have given to any charges in these documents as against my hon. friend from West Toronto, and, therefore, I was at a loss to understand wherein he had not made that *amende* which the hon. Minister of Justice seems to think necessary. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Justice what more he thinks ought to be done by the hon. member for North Brant in order to meet the requirements of the situation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I thought that was well understood. I thought I declared that the hon. member for North Brant in my opinion seemed called upon to withdraw the statements, made by him on the authority of these affidavits, in so far as they affected the honour of the hon. member for West Toronto, and to accept the statement which the hon. member for West Toronto had made in disproof of them. But if that form of words did not contain that retraction, he should use the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition, which he was supposed to have used, but which he had not used at all.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know what took place before I came into the Chamber, but I thought that the hon. member for North Brant had withdrawn the charges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He said he regretted having used two words which imputed perjury.

Mr. MULOCK. What other charges are contained in the documents?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Certifying falsely to papers for the purpose of getting money, and maliciously prosecuting a man in order to screen himself from a charge.

Mr. MULOCK. There is something definite now for the hon. member for North Brant to go upon. I must say, with regard to the prosecution in question, that it was in my judgment a mistake. It was an unnecessary prosecution, I think. While it may have been considered necessary for purposes of discipline, it seems to me harsh treatment of a good, honest citizen and soldier. Now, I would say in conclusion, that the hon. member for North Brant was only doing his duty, if he believed in the truth of these statements, in bringing them to the attention of the House. Perhaps, if it occurred to him he might have adopted some other course, or made fuller enquiry, if he had known, as perhaps those belonging to Toronto would have known, that Sergt. Slater may not have been as careful in the use of language as one ought to be. But, under the circumstances in which he received the documents, coming to him duly accredited as they did, and in which he, somewhat inadvertently, without great consideration and premeditation, brought them to the attention of the House, it appears to me that he has done all that he ought to be called upon to do in stating as far as he can wherein these are in error. If he has not covered the points mentioned by the hon. Minister of Justice in words, I am sure that he will be ready to do so if he feels called upon. But I suppose he is not expected to plead, as in a court of law, with minute detail. I presume it is sufficient for him to say that no wrong was intended. Members of Parliament are often called upon to air grievances; and if every time they do air a grievance which afterwards turns out to be unfounded, they are to be brought before the House, intimidated, and threatened with resolutions, what is to become of the rights of the people? The Minister of Justice threatens to do something terrible. He is going to bring a resolution before the House. Now, that is a species of intimidation which is unworthy of the hon gentleman. He laughs. Probably it may be fun to him, because he has a majority that will do pretty much what he likes and what he wants them to do. At the same time it is not the way, I submit, to conduct parliamentary proceedings. Members of the House do not become personal guarantors of the correctness of the information which they receive. If it comes to them duly accredited, endorsed as it were by the oath of the people who send it, and if they have no reason to suppose that it is incorrect, I would like to know what their duty is. If there is any class of members in the House whose duty it is to bring grievances to the attention of Parliament, it is the members of the Opposition; and when my hon. friend from North Brant received those documents from the hands of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, accompanied as they were by a communication from a reputable law firm of the city of Toronto, and they impressed upon his mind the existence of a wrong, he was not to blame if he thought his proper course was to do what he did; and now that the matter has been brought to his attention, and a refutation has been made, which I am sure we all accept, the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member from North Brant ought, I think, to satisfy every reasonable person.

Mr. DAVIN. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is greatly to be regretted that my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) has spoken in the tone he has on this subject. The question before the House is not the character of Mr. Slater, nor even the character of my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville). The question before the House at this moment is the honour and dignity of this House. It was a serious thing, although the hon. member for North York does not seem to think so, for an hon. member of this House to read—I heard them myself—affidavits grossly libelling a member of this House, without one word of comment to show that he did not entirely endorse them. But it is a much more serious thing, after the hon. member for West Toronto has shown to a demonstration that there was not a tittle of ground for those gross libels, for the hon. member for North Brant to rise in his place and say that he regretted using one or two words, instead of frankly and fully withdrawing the libels that were contained in those affidavits. I regret very much that my hon. friend from North York and my hon. friend

from West Elgin spoke in the manner they did. I think, Sir, it shows that there is in the House a want of appreciation of what is due to the dignity of this assembly, and I must say this: that no man can have occupied a seat in this House for three or four sessions as I have done without having seen that there is in some hon. members a desire to libel other members of this House—a desire to make charges affecting the character of members of this House and to let them go broadcast throughout the country, and in that way to lower the dignity of the House and injure its efficiency. I repeat that the question is one affecting the honour and dignity of the House. It is a serious one, and if the hon. member for North Brant does not fully withdraw the libellous statements made in those affidavits, the House ought not to be satisfied.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would just say, with regard to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that when I want to add to my dignity as a legislator, I will not go to his school.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think I am perfectly in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to add to his retraction he can do so, but he cannot go further.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would just say to the hon. member for Centre Toronto that when I want to learn dignity and lessons as a gentleman I will go to another master than to him, because I think his manner is so pompous, it would not at all be an acquisition. Now, with regard to this matter, I distinctly declared, all through the debate the other night, when these declarations or affirmations were being read, that I repudiated any responsibility for them.

An hon. MEMBER. Why did you read them?

An hon. MEMBER. You said you believed they were true.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I read them as coming from parties who, I believed, ought to be credited, but I have no desire to prolong this debate at all, as you may well suppose, Mr. Speaker. I would just say this: that, so far as I am concerned, I understood that I had, as far as the hon. member for West Toronto is concerned, withdrawn any charges with regard to his character. I had no intention, as I said before, of imputing anything against the character of the hon. gentleman, and I believe it is my duty to say that, as far as he is personally concerned, I am perfectly satisfied with the explanation he has made. I do not understand exactly what the hon. Minister of Justice meant with regard to my not having withdrawn what I ought to have withdrawn, because I thought, when I made my former statement, that I had withdrawn these charges, so far as the hon. member for West Toronto is personally concerned. I wish to say here that I am not driven to this explanation by any of the threats made against me in this matter. I make this explanation; if it does not satisfy the House I cannot go any further.

Amendment, to adjourn debate, negatived.

Mr. DAVIN.

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

(In the Committee.)

Militia Clothing and Overcoats..... $80,000

Mr. CASEY. I see that the General states in his report:

"The clothing is fairly good in quality, but the system of issue is open to great objections. It is complicated, expensive and suits nobody. I am of opinion economy and efficiency would be better served, were an annual allowance in money granted the city corps to enable them to supply their own clothing, the responsibility of strict inspection of such clothing being placed on the inspecting officers."

I would ask for some information as to what is the present system of issue. I notice that the General speaks of the clothing as being only fairly good. Considering what has been said about the advantage of having all the clothing made in Canada, and considering it is made by a firm, the leading member of which is a prominent member of this Parliament in another place, we ought to expect something better than fairly good.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not able to answer that question as satisfactorily as I should like. I have not heard any complaint about the quality of the clothing for some years. There was a period when great complaint was made, but at the last investigation in the Public Accounts Committee, it was shown that the cloth out of which the tunics and overcoats are to be made is a great deal better than that which was imported from Great Britain. The suggestion that the city corps should be given an allowance with which to purchase their own clothing is not a practical one, because it would destroy uniformity, as there would be any amount of diversity in colour and cloth. The system of issue is that which has prevailed for years. The clothing when issued is for five years, at the expiration of which it is renewed. Hon. gentlemen who have served in camp must admit that five years is a pretty long time to ask a volunteer to wear his coat if used in camp every year. Of course city corps, which do not attend camp, do not wear out their clothing to the same extent as those volunteers who drill in camp.

Mr. CASEY. As the hon. gentleman knows, the men in camp have simply to lie on a blanket spread on the ground, and in wet weather that often amounts to lying in water and being soaked through, on one side at least. It would be good economy to take some means of making the tents more comfortable and thus save the clothing. The hon. gentleman recommends that the rural corps should have an issue of clothing every three years, and I think he is going near what ought to be. Certainly if the rural corps have to go to camp as they do now, they will require new clothes every three years. In the case of city corps which do not go to camp, of course the case is different.

Mr. MULOCK. Are these supplies obtained by tender or how?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that tenders were asked for the supply of the cloth and the clothing and that they extend from the 1st of January, 1891, for three years.

Mr. MULOCK. Who were the tenderers, and who has the contract?

Mr. BOWELL. The contract for the cloth for tunics was given to the Almonte Woollen Mill Company; that for the tunic serge was given to Doull & Gibson of Halifax; for cloth for the trousers to the Almonte Woollen Mill Company and to H. Shorey & Co. of Montreal, and also to Doull & Gibson of Halifax; the contract for breeches was given to O'Brien & Co., of Montreal, and the contract for chevrons to the Almonte Woollen Mills. These parties furnished the cloth and got the articles made.

Mr. PRIOR. I would call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the artillery is worthy of having an issue of clothing much oftener than the infantry. As he knows, the artillery have to drill with big guns and have far more heavy work to do than the infantry, and, if the infantry can get along with an issue of clothing every five years, the artillery ought to have an issue at least every three years. A year or two ago the Minister of Militia promised us that he would see that an issue of fatigue clothing was made for the artillery in which they might do their repository drill. As yet, we have not seen any of that fatigue uniform, and I do not know if any has been ordered, but I call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that at present, as I know in my own brigade, the uniforms of the artillery are almost unfit to be seen in public, and that is not because they have not been taken care of, but because so much work has been done by the men wearing them. I hope the Minister will see that we have fatigue uniforms for repository duty, so that we may preserve the ordinary uniforms for public use.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think possibly my hon. friend is going beyond the promises I made. I stated, and I still believe, that it would be economy to have fatigue uniforms issued to the artillery, from the fact that to my mind there would be an economy if, apart from the ordinary tunic, that branch of the force had a cheap fatigue uniform served out to them. I believe I stated to the hon. gentleman on more than one occasion that I was in the hands of Parliament, and that, if Parliament would extend the vote so as to enable me to get that fatigue uniform, I would be happy to serve it out to the artillery. I may say to my hon. friend who now represents the department that I think he will find, on looking into the different branches of that department, that as a question of economy outside of any other consideration it would pay the department to issue these fatigue uniforms instead of having the men go through their heavy gun drill in the ordinary uniforms.

Mr. ALLAN. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that these uniforms are secured by contract. I should like to know what mode is adopted to get these contracts awarded. Are firms throughout the country asked to tender, or in what way are the contracts let?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As the contracts were given out when I was administering that department, I may state that, upon the full reports of all the officers of the department, it was considered that it was better in the public interest to give the contracts to firms who, for the purpose of carrying out fully, as they have done, the contracts confided to them by the Government, had gone to large expense to obtain machinery for the purpose. When I was first called upon to take charge of the department, tenders for clothing were called for every year. I can safely say that, by consulting the official records and the blue-books, when that system obtained in Canada, the department lost severely from the fact that men tendered who had no means to carry out their contracts and tendered at lower prices than they could fulfil their contracts for, and they failed in that, and the force had not only to be equipped but uniformed, so that at a moment it became necessary for the department at any cost to get the uniforms which the contractors had failed to provide and which we had to furnish to the force. I express this opinion from my experience of 12 years presiding over that department. I believe that it is in the interest of the public to award these contracts to firms who are prepared to invest a large amount of capital in this expensive machinery which had to be imported from England. The same thing has followed in other countries where this system has obtained.

Mr. MULOCK. Oh, oh.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is laughing at. In England the manufacturers of uniforms in Pimlico make a specialty of manufacturing not only for the English but for continental armies, just as the contractors are making a specialty in Canada under the new regime. But I wish to point out that the change was made upon the report of our store inspectors and of the officers in charge of that branch. I can say that in my experience of that department, the officers who advised the Government to adopt that system, are officers in whom we can place implicit confidence, from their great experience and from the manner in which they have conducted the branches to which they belong. I would still advise that the contracts for five years should be given, subject, of course, to the right of a new Parliament to sanction them.

Mr. ALLAN. I am afraid the Minister has misunderstood my question. I asked what system was adopted in the purchase of this clothing? The hon. gentleman has given an explanation which I think is rather hazy. He says that the clothing is supplied by firms who had the contract hitherto. What I wish to know is, how are the prices arrived at with the firms who supply this clothing, are the people generally, the large concerns throughout the country, allowed to tender? I think this matter ought to be cleared up. I recollect that last year explanations were given on this very subject which were unsatisfactory. I would like to know if contracts are made by tender, when they are let, how they are let, and how the prices are fixed?

Mr. BOWELL. I think it is not improbable that the member for Essex (Mr. Allan) did not understand the explanation given by the late Minister. The present contracts extend from the first of January, 1891, to the first of January, 1894.

Mr. ALLAN. Were they let by tender?

Mr. BOWELL. If my hon. friend will let me proceed, he will, perhaps, be able to understand me. I am speaking now particularly of the clothing. These tenders were advertised for in the newspapers, and the prices given for the clothing were the lowest at that time. After the firms who now have the tenders had been supplying clothing under contract prices, they were renewed without

further tenders, by the late Minister for the reason which has been repeatedly given to the committee. It was thought better to continue the contract in the hands of those who had been making a specialty in the manufacture of that kind of clothing. That is a point, I know, that is subject to animadversion by those who think that in every case tenders should be advertised for, so as to give every one an opportunity to tender. As I understand it, all the larger firms were originally asked to send in tenders. In some cases the lowest tender is not always the best. Those who were in the Public Accounts Committee when this matter was investigated a year or two ago, will remember that contracts were given to parties in this city who tendered at a lower price than those who had previously got the contract, and had given satisfaction. But acting upon the principle of accepting the lowest tenderer, the contracts were awarded to lowest tenderers, but they failed to supply as good a material as their predecessors. For this reason the late Minister recommended to his colleagues the advisability of renewing the tenders for three years, as he indicated. For all the other supplies and necessaries, and they are a very large quantity in addition to clothing, the following advertisement was published in the newspapers of the 15th August, 1891 :

"Sealed tenders, marked on the left hand corner of the envelope 'Tenders for Militia Store Supplies and Necessaries,' addressed to the Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, will be received up to noon of Monday, the 30th of November, 1891.

"Printed forms of tender, containing full particulars, may be ordered from the department at Ottawa, and at the following militia stores, where also sealed patterns of all articles may be seen, viz. :—The offices of the Superintendent of stores at London, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, N. S., and St. John, N. B.

"Every article to be supplied (as well as the material therein) must be of Canadian manufacture.

"No tender will be received unless made on a printed form furnished by the department, nor will a tender be considered if the printed form is altered in any manner whatever.

"Each tender must be accompanied by an accepted Canadian bank cheque for an amount equal to ten per cent of the total value of the articles tendered for, which will be forfeited if the party making the tender declines to sign a contract when called upon to do so. If the tender is not accepted the cheque will be returned.

"The department does not bind itself to accept the lowest or any tender.

"A. BENOIT, Capt., *Secretary.*"

I do not know a better mode of asking for tenders than this to which I refer. The remarks of my hon. friend, the present Postmaster General, only referred to the clothing, and he gave reasons for the course that was pursued.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We are to understand that, practically, the supply of clothing for the volunteers of this country is in the hands of monopolists. As was explained last year by the then Minister of Militia, they had two or three parties to whom they sent circulars and asked them to tender for the clothing, and all the rest of the manufacturers of this country were deprived of the opportunity. He now says that the reason for doing so was that these manufacturers have expended a large amount of money in getting the necessary machinery. Well, how does he know that there are not other people in this country who, being aware that large sums of money have been made in the manufacture of militia clothing, are themselves prepared to invest money in similar machinery in order that they may have an opportunity of making fortunes as well as other gentlemen have made them in the manufacture of clothing for the militia ? Every one knows that large sums of money were made by the Sanford Manufacturing Company in Hamilton. It is a well known fact that the Mr. Sanford who is the head of that firm, made immense sums of money in furnishing clothing to the militia of this country. We cannot get at the bottom of these tenders, it appears, because I am inclined to believe that the manufacturing is still carried on by the Sanford Company in Hamilton, and that it is merely a change of names, so far as the tenders are concerned. The Almonte Woollen Company get contracts for the clothing, and they make arrangements with the Sanford Company in Hamilton, as I understand, to manufacture the clothing. Now, I do not think this system of doing business ought to be encouraged. We have in this country a system of rings growing up, which are established for the purpose of getting high prices, not only from the people but from the Government ; these rings have succeeded in their object, and this is one instance in which they have succeeded. We have the late Minister of Militia standing up here and telling us that there are only one or two firms in this country that are capable of manufacturing this clothing. Well, if that is so, why is it that the Government refuse to ask for competition from abroad ? Why did they not ask for tenders from England ? Because I was present at the examination before the Public Accounts Committee when the clothing business was gone into, and, if my memory is correct, we had evidence adduced that the clothing manufactured in the old country was in many respects superior.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We had officers from some of the Toronto regiments, the Queen's Own, I think, who swore that they would not clothe their companies in the clothing provided by the Dominion Government, and which was manufactured in Canada, so they put their hands in their own pockets and sent to England for clothing for their men. If this does not indicate that the officers of those regiments consider English clothing much superior to the Canadian article, I should like to know what it did mean. We have evidence that it is high time that the Government should change their method of contract ; but it is in accordance with the whole system of government pursued by the occupants of the Treasury benches. The present Minister of Militia read a few moments ago an advertisement which called for other supplies for the Militia Department, and everything has to be manufactured in Canada. I venture to say that not a member of the Government will rise and state that the advertisement was not sent exclusively to Conservative newspapers, and that there was not the slightest opportunity to publish in Liberal journals this advertisement for the public. This is a sample of the whole method of doing business pursued by the Government. They believe in supporting their supporters on every possible occasion, whether it is in the interests of the country or not. I do not think the system of letting contracts for clothing is one that should be followed any longer. The general manufacturers of the country should have an opportunity to tender for militia supplies, equally with a few favour-

ites of the Government, who receive information that on a certain day tenders will be received for clothing Some tenders are accepted for overcoats, others for tunics, and others for pants, and it was shown during the investigation that these contracts were changed around, one firm receiving the contract for tunics one year, and another year the contract for overcoats. What is to hinder these contractors combining—in fact, they have combined—for the purpose of obtaining higher prices from the people for these clothing supplies? I am satisfied that so long as the present course is adopted by this Government injustice will be done to the people of the country, so far as this expenditure is concerned.

Mr. CASEY. So far as I can understand from the present Minister of Militia and the ex-Minister, tenders were called for when the last contracts were let.

Mr. BOWELL. Not for the clothing. I said tenders were asked for when the contracts were first made in Canada, and that afterwards the contracts were renewed.

Mr. CASEY. How long has elapsed since the first contracts were let?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not state from memory. After the first contract had been advertised, upon the report of the officers of the department, the matter was submitted to Council, and an Order in Council was passed permitting the department to continue these contracts for another year, for which term they had been advertised, and to extend them for a period of three years. These are the contracts under which supplies are now served out to the force.

Mr. CASEY. Then these are not the original contracts? I find that some of these contracts are now let to different parties under different names. When did this change occur?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. During a long period of time we obtained the yearly tenders, but during the last three years the policy had been adopted of giving the contract for three years instead of yearly.

Mr. CASEY. Up to that time contracts were let for one year only?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Not by tender.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, up to last year. Last year it was also by tender, but the Order in Council was passed.

Mr. CASEY. Does the ex-Minister say that the contracts were let for one year only, and that tenders were called for each year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. And not merely continued to the same contractors?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Mr. CASEY. Three years ago an Order in Council was passed authorizing the prolongation of the contracts for three years instead of one year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. When tenders are called for annually, it is very strange this difficulty did not crop up. The difficulty stated now is that there is only one set of people who can make proper clothing. For some time they asked for tenders every year, and changed the firms round. It is a very absurd idea to give up buying militia clothing in the cheapest place, which is undoubtedly in the old country. Even if the tenders were restricted to Canadian manufacturers, the amount is too large to be juggled with in this way. $90,000 were voted last year, of which $73,000 odd were spent. $80,000 are asked this year, and contracts for this large sum were quietly continued to the same contractors and new contracts made with them on 1st January last for three years, without taking the slightest trouble to find out whether any other firms could make the goods cheaper. Taking two cloth tunics I find the price is $5 and $6. The Minister said the contracts were let in January.

Mr. BOWELL. $6.05 for artillery, $5 for infantry, and $5.58 for rifles.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the ex-Minister of Militia to say that the contract had been let at a reduced price, but the figures as given in the Auditor General's Report for last year, coincide with the figures for the present year under the new contracts. One would naturally think that the firms—I believe it is all one combine—which has had the contract for several years, should be able by this time, by systematizing their work, and in consideration of the profits they have already had, to do this a good deal cheaper under the spur of competition. Even 50 cents a tunic for 45,000 tunics would be quite a large sum. I think we cannot let this matter go without protest, and I hope that when we criticise these transactions in a friendly spirit—I have reason to believe that we are not talking to such deaf ears as formerly—that the Minister of Militia will see in future that it does not occur again, if he has the good fortune to remain in power.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that long before this we should have made use of prison labour in making clothing for our militia. We have a large number of prisoners in our penitentiaries and if the Government had taken proper steps to turn prison labour in that direction, we could have got military clothing made in the past at a very much lesser cost. I see at page 33 of the Auditor General's Report that there are 41 tunics entered as costing $1,373, or $33 each. What tunics were these?

Mr. BOWELL. The deputy informs me that there are no tunics bought for the men at that price, and that he can only account for it by it being a misprint. It may possible be 41 dozen, but it is quite evident to my mind it is a blunder.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the Government agree to take these tunics for 3 years, based on the price of cloth the time the contract was let? The Minister of Militia will understand that cloth is nearly as subject to a rise and fall in price as wheat is. What arrangement was made for the change in the price of cloth during the continuance of this contract?

Mr. BOWELL. None. The contract is for three years and the prices given are for that whole time. I scarcely think that the rise and fall in the prices of cloth is so great as the hon. gentleman indicates. The cloth in these tunics is specially made for the purpose, and the only change that could take place in its value would be a rise or fall in the price of the wool out of which it is made. As in other contracts let for a number of years, the contractor has to consider when he is making his contract the rise and fall in the market and take the consequences.

If the prices go down it is to his advantage, and if they go up he will lose. I may say now, that it is altogether a misapprehension on the part of the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) when he stated that "difficulties arose." No difficulties arose in reference to these contracts, other than those which presented themselves in the inferiority of the clothing which is supplied in compliance with our contract, and that was the cause of the great complaint that the Queen's Own made, and very properly made, before the committee. It was not the clothing that was supplied by the present contractors with which they found fault, because they admitted that that was quite equal to the English clothing. I admit that the cloth could probably have been obtained a little cheaper in England from the manufacturers who make for the world than in Canada; but that is a question of policy, on which those who take the views of hon. gentlemen opposite are quite ready to condemn the Government. For my part I prefer to see it made in Canada, even though it costs a little more. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for North Brant, who never speaks without attributing improper motives to those who conduct the affairs of this country, I do not hesitate to say that while occupying the position I do, other things being equal, he may take it for granted that I will always give the preference to a friend, provided it is not done at the expense of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think that any one would object to the hon. Minister giving a Canadian manufacturer the preference; but what we object to is this: that his advertisement asking for tenders, is such as to convey the impression that tenders would only be accepted from Canadian manufacturers. By doing that, he places in their hands—and there are only two or three of them—the power to state what price the Government will have to pay for the clothing. I remember being present at the investigation that took place with regard to the clothing, and I was glad to see that Canada was producing an article that could be creditably worn by our volunteers, as it appeared to be both very well made and of very good material; but I think it is desirable to give every one, both abroad and at home, an opportunity to tender; and when accepting the tenders you can if you wish give the Canadian manufacturer the preference. There was some objection taken to the colour of the cloth, some saying that it did not stand the sun and weather as well as the English material. I would like to know if what is made recently is any more durable in this respect than what we had before?

Mr. BOWELL. My predecessor informs me that the information he obtained from the reports of those who have made inspections, is to the effect that the cloth is not only better than that formerly imported, but that the colours stand just as well. A short time ago I made some enquiry as to the colour. The cloth was supposed not to stand the weather as well as the English cloth; but the Patton mills at Sherbrooke have succeeded, not only in making a good cloth, but in dyeing it so that it is nearly if not quite equal to the English cloth in colour—my predecessor says quite equal.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend will remember that during that investigation it was shown that the colour, as he very properly stated, was not equal to that of the English cloth, but it was also shown that some of the clothing which had been issued in that period was an inferior article, which we had had in store for a number of years. But since that time the reports sent into the department while I was still at the head of it, indicated that the cloth and the colour were latterly equal to anything which we have imported from England.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister of Militia state the prices at which the infantry greatcoats are supplied under the last contract, which was issued in January, 1891?

Mr. BOWELL. Cavalry, $7.47; garrison artillery, $7.69; mounted artillery, $11.25; infantry, $5.73; and rifles, $5.73.

Mr. MULOCK. The late Minister of Militia, if I heard him correctly, stated that the last contract was made at lower prices than the former one. He was mistaken so far as greatcoats are concerned; and my hon. friend from West Elgin says that all the other prices are the same as before. Now, it is shown in evidence that the contract for greatcoats, which I think was let in 1888 for three years, was let at the same price at which the contract was let some years before, when the cost of material was somewhat higher. Yet, notwithstanding the fluctuation in prices year after year, the Government continue to give the same prices for these military supplies. My hon. friend the present Minister of Militia, read an advertisement which I at first thought included these greatcoats, and he spoke with great satisfaction of the method adopted for issuing contracts for military supplies; but I find that his observation had no reference to clothing whatever, but that the supply of clothing for the militia is now practically in the hands of a ring; and the reason assigned is that this ring is able to do the work because it has the machinery. How long, then, are they to enjoy this monopoly? Year after year this ring has enjoyed this monopoly, and has arranged and settled the prices with the Department of Militia, and I have no doubt has been year after year making its contributions to the election funds. I have not the slightest doubt of their friend Mr. O'Brien, and I do not think that any one will pass the Almonte Mills either. I understood that tunics were formerly made by the Sanford Company. Now, the contract is made with the Almonte Company, but I understand that the work is done by the Sanford Company in Hamilton as before, the Almonte Company supplying the cloth, so that it is just a change of front. It does not appear the same in the public accounts, but the difference is merely nominal, and the same old fraud is being perpetrated on the country. No attempt has been made to get this work done at fair prices, and the same favourites still control it. Here we have in the Senate a leading supporter of the Administration, under the shelter of a corporate style, reaping enormous profits from the contract for supplying the militia with clothes. We have a prominent member of another firm that supplies the clothing in this House, voting the money, and this money which Parliament votes for the benefit of the militia is being unwisely and improvidently expended by the Administration. This is not the way to administer a public trust. The ex-Minister of Militia set at defiance every rule of propriety in the action he

pursued with regard to the issuing of contracts. Year after year he relet them to his old favoured friends, without so much as letting the general public know about it, sending out a private circular-letter, which, he says, the military men of his department endorsed. I would like to know how they could do anything else. He sent a circular-letter to Mr. O'Brien, his political friend, asking what he would supply clothing for, and one to Doull & Co., of Halifax, and another to the Sanford Co. and the Rosamond Co. I believe, if the truth could be got at, that the supply of military clothing is as gross a fraud as there is in the service for the amount. According to the attitude now assumed by the Government, there never can be a change. Because three or four favourites of the Government say they have machinery for turning out the work, no one else can have any chance and the result is that the same prices have been paid year after year for the last fifteen years. In no other business would we find such a state of affairs, and I do not wonder that the ex-Minister of Militia tries to withdraw from the discussion under shelter of a newspaper or other shelter, in order not to be obliged to commit himself any further. The militia of Canada ought to know that the moneys voted to them have been largely frittered away by means of these improvident contracts, so that part of the money which ought to be available for the improvement of the force is converted into other channels for the benefit of a few favoured persons. That is what is going on, and what I deplore to learn, is likely to continue under the new Minister. It is well for the country to know that.

Mr. BOWELL. Better wait until I say so.

Mr. MULOCK. The ex-Minister of Militia declared it was a sound policy, he endorsed it up to the hilt. If the present Minister of Militia repudiates it, then there is some hope, and if he will say he does not approve of that course, a great deal of the force of my observations will be lost. But if he allows the ex-Minister to commend this practice as being the best one that can be adopted, of course he is simply carrying on that practice and I do not see why we should have had a change in the head of the department at all. I thought when the Government brought about a change that they did it for the public good. I suppose that the old policy was shown to the satisfaction of the Government to need remedy and the Government, wishing to make a change, allowed a man more in touch with business to take charge of the department. I supposed the change was for public good, I hope so still; but if not, the militia of Canada will have a serious grievance against the Administration.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the person who was inspector of clothing some years ago still inspector?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. So much per day. He is an inspector of the Mounted Police, and the Militia Department allow him so much per day.

Public Armouries and care of Arms.... $60,000

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to know upon what principle the drill sheds in the various parts of the country are looked after? I find that it costs $3,000 per year to take care of the drill shed at Ottawa. There are a number of caretakers there at $1 per day each. There are apparently six persons employed for looking after the building, besides the expense of wood and coal, and the cost of taking care of the ground, flowers and so forth. The drill shed in my county, at the headquarters of the battalion, costs only $29 per year, and I should like to understand how it is we have to pay such a large sum for looking after the Ottawa building. It may be all right, but it seems a very large sum, especially when we are not overloaded with money. It seems to me larger than the expenditure on any other drill shed, even in Montreal, and it appears to be strange that so many men and so much material should be required for a building of that kind.

Mr. CASEY. I notice that the pay for taking care of armouries seems to be very high in nearly all cases and remarkably high in some cases. As a rule, also, the further you go east the larger amount is paid for the care of public armouries although the number of volunteers is not so large as in the west. In No. 1 district, with headquarters at London, and including all the western peninsula of Ontario, only $1,968 is paid for the care of armouries. In the next district, Toronto, where there are a very large number of volunteers, $3,097 is paid. When we come to Kingston, where there are not so many volunteers, $4,285 is paid. In Montreal, with a considerable number of volunteers in the city, $6,335 is paid, while the Quebec district caps the lot with a cost of $9,691 for the care of public armouries. I do not think it can be contended that there are as many public armouries in the district of Quebec as there are in Montreal, with its larger population and its more numerous city corps, and yet more than $3,000 difference exists between the two districts, and the district of Quebec costs about five times as much as the district of London, which I believe includes as many volunteers. The fact that the late Minister of Militia represented a constituency adjoining the city of Quebec may have something to do with the case. Now, as to the individual prices paid for the care of armouries, I find a number of men engaged at $1 a day all the year round. There is not work for a man every day of the year in attending to the arms of a battalion, yet I find that the great bulk of the caretakers of public armouries have have engaged at $1 a day. Then I do not understand why some are paid more than others. In the London district, I find that M. D. Dawson is paid $50 a month, that is $600 a year, and three men are employed at $1 a day or $365 a year each. Another salary in Toronto of $600 is paid to W. L. Alger. Further down, I find in Montreal district John Fletcher is paid $2 a day or $730, because they reckon Sundays as well as other days, and so on. But the most remarkable payment I find is in Winnipeg, where Major Street receives $1,000 for the care of armouries in addition to a payment to J. Mason of $711; Col. Peebles, $500; J. Sutty, $507, and Williams, $333. I suppose the payment to Major Street is to enable him to engage caretakers, but I should think even at Winnipeg prices, he could engage a number for that amount. The total amount paid for the care of armouries was about $36,000. That seems to have been the amount paid to the caretakers who look after the arms and clean them and put them in the racks,

and so on, because there was also an amount paid to the officers for the care of arms amounting to $24,000. The two items are kept separate in the Auditor General's Report. That payment to the officers is one of the items to which the Major-General objects as being under a wrong heading, and we all know that these amounts go to support bands, or are kept in the pockets of the officers themselves.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has confounded two things, but it is not his fault because it is the manner in which it is put in the Auditor General's Report. In the London district James Coffin receives $1 a day for this purpose, but the Report of the Auditor General would lead you to imagine that Mr. Dawson, at $600, was there for the same purpose, whereas Dawson is the superintendent of stores.

Mr. CASEY. Then he should not be under this head.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the fault of the department but of the Auditor General. Then Conroy is a messenger in the brigade office, Pratt is caretaker of stores, and so is Cochrane. Williams takes care of the battery stores. In London, the hon. gentleman knows, there is a permanent corps. These officers are receiving $1 a day, and I presume are required the whole year round. But that is a detail I have not looked into.

Mr. CASEY. If these men belong to the permanent corps they ought to be under that heading.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so. I said there were permanent corps stationed at London, the infantry school, for instance; consequently it would require the constant attention of caretakers.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman does not understand my point. Permanent corps have their own caretakers for their own arms; they look after their own arms themselves. But these are armouries belonging to the volunteer force. If these men are caretakers of stores, their names should not be charged under the heading of public armouries.

Mr. BOWELL. In reference to the point mentioned by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), there may be an apparent extravagance in connection with the maintenance of the drill shed here, but I cannot say that it is real. It costs more at headquarters, where there are public armouries, than it does in other localities where there are none, or not so many. The hon. gentleman will understand that the care of the armoury, as in Barrie, for instance, is paid out of the allowance made to the officers. Consequently that would not appear here.

Mr. O'BRIEN. A battalion like mine gets $320 for the care of their arms. If the corps here were paid in the same proportion, they would get $240. But as a matter of fact, the drill shed here costs the Government $3,000. Now, the difference between $3,000 and $320 is very considerable. It seems to me that there is extravagance in connection with these large drill sheds. The number of men does not account for it; the quantity of arms to be taken care of does not account for it; the size of the building does not account for it; evidently there must be some other cause for it. I am quite willing to leave the matter in the hands of the Minister, confident that if there is anything wrong he will put it right.

Mr. CASEY. The drill shed in Ottawa is used for many other purposes. It is used for lawn tennis and many other purposes of that kind, and has to be kept in good shape, and the grounds around it have to be kept pretty. I would again call the Minister's attention to the disproportionate amounts in the item for public armouries, paid in different districts. He says that in London these numerous employés are necessary on account of the permanent corps. Coming to Toronto, I find that we spend $3,097, twice as much there as at London. In Kingston the number of volunteers is not so great. Here, certainly, no part of the military school cost should be charged under this item, but we have no less than 11 men employed at a cost of $4,285. They have nothing to do with the taking care of the drill shed; they should not have anything to do with the stores, and they are charged here with taking care of the public armoury. If they are doing something else they are wrongly charged here. It is quite impossible that these men can be kept busy in looking after the public armoury. Their salaries range from $1 a day up to $600 a year. In Montreal where there are a considerable number of corps, we find $6,335 expended, and there are about 14 or 15 men. When we come to Quebec we have something like 20 men employed, costing $9,771, although there cannot be as many city corps as in Montreal, and the men cannot have as many arms to look after, yet the public armouries in Quebec cost over $3,000 more than the public armouries in Montreal. It is a very queer condition of things. I may be told, as I was in the case of London, that these men are not looking after public armouries at all, that they are caretakers of stores, that they polish their guns in the citadel, that they do this and they do that. But unless they are actually engaged in taking care of arms they are fraudulently charged under this item.

Mr. BOWELL. Not fraudulently.

Mr. CASEY. I mean to say improperly. It is a false pretense to put them under this head. We want to know how that number of men can be employed in taking care of arms in Quebec. I do not expect the Minister can give a full answer to that question at this moment, but when this item comes up for concurrence I shall ask him to give us some further information. In regard to the allowance for the care of arms, I am at one with the General's opinion on that point. In speaking of allowances he says:

"Allowances are drawn annually for drill instruction and for care of arms for which the country receives no real value. They are paid to officials who are incapable of imparting instruction and unable to give sufficient attention to the arms under their charge. In the majority of cases these allowances are looked upon merely in the light of perquisites attaching to the command of a battalion or company. The fault does not rest with the officers but with the system."

Now, the late Minister of Militia knows that I have frequently called his attention to the impropriety of making these allowances for doing what really was not done, and paying money which was virtually pocketed as a perquisite by the commander or paid into the regimental fund. The General goes on to point out in what shape these allowances should be made. I cannot let the item for the care of arms pass without referring to it, and hoping that the present Minister will see that no money is paid for the care of arms under that head which is not

actually spent in taking care of the arms of the different battalions. If the officers require allowances for different purposes, they should be given these allowances under the proper heads, and frankly for the purpose represented, for keeping up their battalions, and not under the head of the care of arms or drill instruction.

Military Stores..... $40,000

Mr. CASEY. The Major-General suggests that fuel should be purchased in larger quantities for all public buildings. Has the Minister seen that suggestion?

Mr. BOWELL. The suggestion was made by the Deputy Minister, Col. Panet. He thought it would be more economical if some department ascertained the quantities of fuel required for all the public buildings, and then tenders were asked for.

Mr. McMULLEN. We pay $600 annually for the renting of a building in Winnipeg. Is there no military building there belonging to the Dominion? How long has this payment existed, and is it likely to continue?

Mr. BOWELL. The building was rented from Col. Scott before the North-West Rebellion, at a rental of $600 per annum, with the right to continue occupation so long as it was required. It is used exclusively as a depot for arms for the militia force. A demand has been made by Col. Scott to increase the rental to $1,200 per annum. He has refused to receive the $50 per month, which has been tendered to him, claiming the higher sum. My information is that the Militia Department can hold the building as long as it pleases under the contract. Having looked into this matter, and an offer having been made to sell the property, at first I was inclined to pay the amount asked, $12,000—it is a very large building—but on second thought I was inclined to the opinion that the money would be better spent in erecting a building on the Government property near the barracks.

Drill Instruction..... $35,000

Mr. CASEY. I have only to make the same remarks I made as to arms. We have been promised a rearrangement, and I hope it will be carried out by the present Minister. I also hope he will look carefully at the General's suggestions and adopt them, as they are common sense and practical.

Drill Pay..... $275,000

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the Minister will explain the cause of the increase of $25,000. I again desire to call his attention to the Major-General's Report. The General points out that a broad distinction has already grown up between the city and rural corps in Canada. The city corps practically work on the lines of the militia corps in Great Britain, serving without pay, inasmuch as on entering they are asked to sign an agreement to turn over their pay to various battalion funds. The General recommends that they should be recognized as volunteers, as men serving without pay, that the British volunteer system should be applied to city corps as far as possible. He admits it is not applicable to the rural corps, which should be treated very much as the militia are treated in England. He makes a great many practical suggestions which no doubt, the Minister will look over at his leisure. The General says:

"The rural militia would likewise benefit by such a change. There is, in that category, the best possible material for a national defensive force, and to it the militia system is alone applicable.

"An effect of the existing anomaly is to make both categories of the Militia dependent for their pay, on a single vote in militia estimates, without distinction as to the manner in which that pay is earned.

"It appears to have been assumed, that circumstances require the pay granted under that vote to be divided in a proportion, which bears no relation to the comparative strength of the two categories. Thus in the current year, the proportion of Vote No. 100 in the Militia estimates, allotted as pay to each category, has been:

"The rural corps.... 44 p.c. of the whole sum.

"To city corps .... 34 do do

or a difference of one-tenth only in favour of the rural corps. The disadvantage under which rural corps labour is sufficiently evident, when it is remembered that their established strength exceeds that of city corps, in the proportion of 3 to 1. It is a disadvantage, moreover, which is annually increasing, by the creation of new city corps. A striking instance of this appears in No. 2 Military District, where in the past year the city militia has been increased by ten companies, representing an annual charge for drill pay of $3,736.48. Under the present system, this sum must be withdrawn from the rural battalions, whose annual quota for drill is thereby proportionately reduced. The only manner in which this defect can be remedied is by separating the two categories of active militia (as already suggested), placing the annual vote for pay under sub-heads answering to these categories, and attaching thereto the establishment list of each. This manner of dealing with pay is found necessary, not only in England, but in countries where the right of Parliament to control expenditure is less fully recognized."

As the General points out the pay of the rural corps in the Toronto district will be reduced by the amount allowed for the new kilted battalion, and whether the new service justifies this injustice to the rural battalions remains to be seen. I trust that the Minister will readjust the pay-sheet in such a manner that the rural battalions will get their fair share of it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to remind the Minister that only two months intervenes between the present and the time when the annual drill should begin. It is time that orders should be issued now so as to give an opportunity for those interested to make preparations. It has been a weak point heretofore in the management of this matter that orders have never been issued in sufficient time to allow officers and men to be prepared for their camp duties. Now that the spring operations are commencing they should know who will drill this year, and when they will drill, before engaging in their work. I would urge strongly upon the Minister that this should be attended to at once.

Mr. BOWELL. I would like the committee to understand that although there is $25,000 additional in the item this year, it is not for the purpose of drilling more men, but only to provide for the increased amount that has been expended last year. The average number of officers and men in the camp for the last 3 years has been 19,570 and the average cost per annum $274,688. The vote was formerly taken only for $250,000, while it was actually costing about $275,000, and on looking into the matter, I thought it better that the full sum should be voted by Parliament. I have deducted that $25,000 increase from other items, so that the total estimate is precisely the same as in other years. I can assure my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) that many of the suggestions he has made shall

have the consideration of the department during the year.

Mr. WATSON. I had hopes when I saw this increase in the Estimates that it was put there at the suggestion of the Major-General, in whose report I find a great many practical suggestions to the Militia Department, which I think this House must approve of. I call the Minister's attention to the condition of the three battalions which we have in Manitoba. The 91st and 95th Battalions have never been in camp since the rebellion, now seven years, and I think it is scarcely necessary to occupy the time of the House by stating that it is hardly possible to find better battalions in the Dominion of Canada than the 91st and the 95th. I find on looking over the report of Military District No. 10 that the total number of men drilled in the Province of Manitoba last year was only 427, belonging to the 90th Battalion. The 91st Battalion has not performed any drill since it was organized. The report of the Adjutant-General says:

"The 91st Battalion has not performed any drill since organized.

"The different armouries were inspected and found in good order.

"Three officers of this corps have taken first-class certificates, and one officer a second.

"Two companies, viz., Nos. 4 and 5, having become non-effective, their equipment has been returned into store.

"Two new companies will be recommended to replace them, one at McGregor, the other at Oaklake, both on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

This battalion has lost two of its companies and that can hardly be wondered at seeing that they have not been drilled for seven years. In respect to the 95th Battalion the report says:

"This battalion has not been authorized to perform annual drill since being relieved from active service in September, 1885, the close of the North-West Rebellion.

"The armouries have been inspected by me. The arms are old and unserviceable, the accoutrements are of an obsolete pattern."

I would infer from the treatment that has been accorded to the 91st and 95th Battalions that the remarks made in this House a few evenings ago in regard to the management of the militia—not as regards the men—were correct, and that the management of the force is something to be deplored. I presume that it is of as much importance to have militia in Manitoba as in any other part of the Dominion, but they should be properly treated and encouraged to take an interest in their work. I had hoped that the extra $25,000 taken this year was for the purpose of allowing these battalions to go into camp. In the whole Province of Manitoba there is not a rifle range furnished for either of these battalions, and the Adjutant-General, in his report, says:

"At present there is no rifle range available for the city corps, the one at Stony Mountain, 16 miles from Winnipeg, having become unserviceable (a sum of money was applied for from the Government in 1889, to place it in proper repair, but was not granted). The range now used belongs to the Winnipeg Rifle Club, and the companies have to pay for the use of it out of their private funds, and as there is so much practice going on by members of the association it is seldom they can get the range for practice."

The Adjutant-General suggests that there should be mounted men at different points along the international boundary, and the Minister can easily see without much explanation what an immense service these men would be on account of their being so close to the line. I find that in the report, the 90th Battalion of Winnipeg stands high in the estimation of the Adjutant-General. There is not a battalion in the Dominion which stands higher than the 90th, and I have not the slightest doubt that if the 91st and 95th Battalions were allowed to go into camp and drill they would stand equally high with the 90th. It was remarked here the other night that probably one of the reasons why some of these battalions were not as good as they might be, was on account of the small pay. I believe that it would be much better if we reduced the number of volunteers in Canada, and have whatever number of men we should have better equipped and better drilled. There appears to be a sort of mock modesty on the part of the authorities with reference to reducing the militia force. If this House will not vote sufficient to drill the number of men at present on the roll, then only the best companies should be selected for camp every year. We are informed by the Minister of Militia that only 20,000 men went into camp last year whereas we have in the neighbourhood of 40,000 in the volunteer force. It is well understood that in a great many cases, although an officer may go into camp, often the great mass of the rank and file never go to camp twice, and anything that they may learn in one year in camp can be but of little use to them if their services should be required. In reference to the 30th Battalion in the County of Wellington, of which I know something, I find that the Adjutant-General says:

"This is a fine battalion. The ranks are well filled with men of proper age and physique. This is doubtless due, in part, to the extra allowance of 25 cents a day per man given by the county authorities in addition to the Government pay."

Here is an evidence that with increased pay a better lot of men can be got to join the battalions. In reporting on the 44th Battalion, the Major-General says:

"Very weak in numbers, of wretched physique, and officers ignorant of their duties. The district from which this battalion is drawn cannot, apparently, maintain its efficiency."

Of the 56th Battalion, it is said:

"This battalion did not improve as much as other corps. The majority of the officers were very slovenly in their dress and appearance on parade. The physique of this battalion was bad. Many mere boys in the ranks. It appears questionable whether the district can maintain an efficient battalion."

Now, these battalions have been inspected, and I have no doubt have been drilled and in camp; and it appears to me a mistake that money should be wasted on such battalions when there are good battalions, composed of good men and well equipped, ready to go into camp every year. I hope, as the hon. member for West Elgin has stated, that with a young man now at the head of the department as Minister, and with a new Major-General, we shall have an improvement in the militia. I think the public and this House must be well pleased with the criticisms which have come from our new Major-General. There is no doubt in the minds of those who have any knowledge of military matters that the force has not been in the past what it should have been. We have been spending a million and a quarter of dollars a year and a great deal of that money has been wasted. I hope that the Minister will see that the 91st and the 95th Battalions are allowed to go into camp. To refuse them this privilege is not treating them fairly and

justly. When they were called upon in 1885 to go upon active service in the North-West, they went and performed good service to the country, but they have never been allowed to go into camp since that time. The hon. member for West Elgin made a comparison between the amounts allowed to the city corps and the amounts allowed to the rural corps, and I find that the Major-General in his report appreciates the best class of men to be secured for our militia force. Speaking of the rural corps, he says :

"Powerful in physique, intelligent and eager to learn, the militia at present contains the unorganized elements of a strong national force. Moreover, in the men of the rural militia, there exists that capacity for adapting themselves to circumstances, and 'handiness,' engendered by practical acquaintance with camp life, in their ordinary avocations which is a most valuable quality for a soldier in the field. What is required is system and organization in every department.

The Major-General, from his short experience here, fully realizes that we have in Canada the material to make a very efficient force ; he speaks in the highest possible terms of our rural militia ; and I hope that in compliance with the suggestions made in the report of the Major-General, the rural battalions, particularly those in Manitoba, which have given good service in the past, will be allowed a sufficient amount of money to enable them to go into camp during the coming season.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I would like to say a few words on this item before it is carried. I joined the battalion which I have the honour to command in 1867, and I have attended several district camps to which my battalion was ordered. I have attended several camps as a staff officer. I have also followed closely the training of the militia in the camps, and I feel it my duty to make a few remarks suggested by my experience in those camps. With regard to the militia service, as with regard to every other branch of the public service, the object we have to attain, the problem we have to solve, is how to reach the maximum of efficiency at the minimum cost. We have a permanent force composed of several corps, and with regard to that the gallant officer commanding makes some important suggestions in his report. With regard to the organization of the nucleus of a permanent force in Canada, my own idea is that all things being considered, subject to the improvements to be made, this permanent force is proving a satisfactory success; but the schools of instruction in connection with it are not, I think, so creditable or so satisfactory. I was myself one of the officers in charge of a military school in Quebec under the old system, and I have come to the conclusion that for the supplying of officers to our militia the old schools really did better service than the new. They were not expensive, and every year a large number of young men attended them and received a pretty fair training. Of course there was this defect in those schools, that the men attending them were not doing garrison duty, because they were boarding around in private houses and earning their living, and learning the interior economy at the schools as best they could. But every year a large number of the young men were equipped at those schools and fitted to be officers and non-commissioned officers; and a large number of those men who did not obtain commissions in the volunteer force, or even become non-commissioned officers, would go into the ranks where they were a great help to the recruits who had not had the advantage of attending the schools. I think that one reason why our schools are not so successful as we expected they would be, is that the expenses are pretty high to the young men who attend them, and I think that this part of the service should be revised. Pride in the uniform is a good thing, but it should not be in proportion to its cost, but to the loyal service done with it to the Crown and the country. I know a great many young men who are debarred from attending the schools on account of the expense. Under the old system the men attending the schools were allowed a uniform, which was not very costly, and on passing their examinations they were allowed $50 more for a second-class certificate and $100 for a first-class certificate. Perhaps it will not be very easy to re-establish those old schools, but I am merely making a comparison. What we want for the success of our brigade camps, is, of course, well trained officers, and also a good body of non-commissioned officers. In this country we have to rely for many years on the volunteer system, as we cannot undertake any heavy expense in organizing a permanent force, and the permanent body we have will suffice for many years. The good-will of the youth of the country to enlist is well known, but we must bear in mind that the service should entail the least possible pecuniary loss on the officers and men. I am in favour of the brigade camps. They are doing fairly well, and I heartily approve of the improvements which the General suggests. I would like to make this suggestion : We cannot expect the militia force to turn out for the summer camps for a great length of time, because the number of days before harvest time is very small, and I question whether we could increase it much. The suggestion is also made by the hon. member for Marquette that we should have the whole force of 40,000 men in camp every year. I do not believe our financial resources would actually allow that.

Mr. WATSON. I said to reduce the force, but to get all the active militia out in camp.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I would not like to reduce the total number, because I do not think it is too large, but would rather have the camp every two years instead. The suggestion I would make is this : I think we could utilize the winter season for a regular course of training for a portion of the militia. For instance 20,000, or half the total number of the force, might be called out in the district camps in the summer. Then in the winter previous we might call out one officer of every company, one non-commissioned officer and a certain percentage of the men, say 10 per cent, and organize them in provisional battalions where we have headquarters and barrack accommodation, and where they would undergo a regular course of instruction, say for forty, fifty or sixty days. Then these men going into the camp in the summer following would supply us with a good staff of instructors and a good quota of well drilled men, who would give an impulse to the whole force in camp. I made a little calculation to show what the cost would be in the winter time of this course of instruction. I am confident there would be no difficulty in mustering the required number of men at an allowance of say 40 cents per day. Add 30 cents for rations and the extra expense for officers and so on, and you would have 70 cents as the whole expenditure which I am sure would

not be exceeded. 2,000 men at this rate would give you an expenditure for 50 days of $70,000 and for 60 days of $84,000. I really believe, if the expenditures on the different items for militia purposes were recast and reconsidered, such diminution could be made as would meet nearly the whole of this expenditure. Thus this system would not increase the amount required each year for militia purposes, and could not fail to have a very good result. Our young men, of course, travel about a good deal and change their occupations, and we cannot have the same men in camp for many years in succession; but I find the man who enlists one year will always return to the camp, if not the following year, the year after, if he can at all do so. In my battalion, out of eight companies strong, 43 non-commissioned officers and men in each, we have always in camp 40 or 50 men who have been there for 15 or 20 years past. If my suggestion were adopted, you would have at each camp a number of well trained non-commissioned officers and men who had gone through the regular course, and who would impart a spirit of discipline and zeal to the whole force. Moreover, supposing you give 2,000 men each winter a course where you have barracks and drill sheds, you could call out in succession the commanding officer and the staff officers of every battalion to take charge under the superintendence of the district staff officers, and that would entail a very small extra expense, as the staff officers of every battalion would be very glad to attend this annual course and get there a training for the camp in the following year. And by calling out this number each winter you would have in a few years several thousand men well trained whom you could depend on for the defence of the country. It is useless to expect that we can add much to our expenditure for militia purposes. If Parliament were willing to increase the amount, I would be glad, as a militia officer, to support that policy, but I know with our financial resources we cannot afford to pay very much more than we are expending now. The question is, as I mentioned in commencing, that we should try and solve the problem of obtaining the maximum efficiency at the least cost to the country, and I think the system which I have suggested, if put in practice, would have very beneficial results and would tend to the greater efficiency of the force.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the Minister of Militia if we can hope to have Battalion 91 or Battalion 95 drilled this year? They have not been drilled for some years.

Mr. PRIOR. I cannot allow this item to pass without referring to some of the remarks of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins). I know that in British Columbia where "C" school of infantry is situated, the Government are doing what they can, but at the same time it is not a school where militia officers can get a first-class training. It is not because the commanding officer and the other officers under him are not perfectly competent. I believe there are no better officers in Canada than they are, but there are not proper appliances supplied to them, and I hope the Minister of Militia will see that they are supplied with all the appliances which should be supplied to a school where the officers of the local militia should receive proper instruction. In Quebec and in Kingston the schools are fully supplied, and the officers who go there get all the instruction which they require, and which they should get when they are attached to a permanent corps. In British Columbia the barracks are good, the climate is good; it is a splendid place, and the physique and the training of the men are good; but until the officers are supplied with the proper appliances, until they are supplied with models of ammunition and models of all kinds of things which are used in modern warfare, it is impossible for them to give the proper training which is required for those who go for a three months, or a six months course, as the case may be. There is another thing. Coming as I do from British Columbia, and from Military District No. 11, and looking over the report of the Militia Department, I was struck by the fact that there was no report from the deputy adjutant-general. That district is supposed to be one worthy of attention, because there is a deputy adjutant-general there and an infantry school is there, though the number of volunteers is not very large. We have 250 men, and I think I am correct in saying they are as good men as any in the Dominion of Canada, but still there is no report from the deputy adjutant-general. I should like to know why this was left out. I cannot believe that he would not report to the department. I know that last year he made rather a lengthy report, showing, I will not say the disgraceful condition of affairs there, but showing the deplorable condition in which the militia of British Columbia were left. I do not know whether it was owing to the apathy of the Government, but certainly it was owing to the neglect of somebody that this state of affairs can exist. I know that the deputy adjutant-general has reported year after year as to what was required to put the militia of British Columbia in a decent state of efficiency, and last year he reported most fully on that subject, but last year nothing appeared as to what was wanted there. Nearly everything he said as to what should be done for the militia of British Columbia was cut out. I do not think that is a fair thing to do. If an officer is put in a position where he is called upon to report to the Government, it is only right and fair that his report should be printed *in toto*. I was surprised that last year only a portion was printed, but I am more surprised this year to find that there is nothing at all in the report in reference to the militia in British Columbia. I cannot believe that Col. Holmes has not reported to the Militia Department. We have put in our full drills in that province, our men are as good as any in the Dominion of Canada, and I cannot see why no report has been made. In regard to what the hon. gentleman from L'Islet (Mr. Desjardins) has said in reference to uniforms, I may say that I believe the uniforms now in use are altogether too expensive, and that is one of the reasons why we have so much difficulty in getting officers. I know that in the artillery it is very hard to find young men to take commissions who are not simply willing but who are able to spend the money required for a uniform. It takes a young man from $100 to $150 at least to get a uniform fit to appear on parade in, and if it is the case of a captain or a major, it will cost from $500 to $700 for the uniform and the full kit. If we were to do away with all the gold belts and gold trappings, and were to adopt some plain blue or red uniform, with plain belts and trappings, the efficiency of the force would be just as good as if we

preserved all the gold lace which we have borrowed from the Imperial Army. I hope the Minister of Militia will see his way, not at once, but gradually, to bring forward some means of altering the present state of affairs, and will see if he cannot give the young men of Canada a chance to serve their country without having such enormous expense entailed upon them. I do not think it is of much use to say anything on militia matters in this House as long as the management of the militia is carried on as it is. I am sure that the Minister of Militia and his staff do their best, but so long as politics have anything to do with the Militia Department, so long will the force be in a state of inefficiency. If any one says anything about the training of the militia, a member who has a city or a rural corps thinks his corps is going to be done away with, and he brings his influence to bear on the Government. I do not think politics should be allowed to interfere in this matter at all. We have now a General who I think every militia man in this House will say understands thoroughly his business, and who is fearless in expressing any opinions in reference to the force openly, and we had better, as soon as possible, leave politics aside in regard to this matter of the militia. I hope that, with the present Minister of Militia and the present General commanding the militia, we shall have a very different report presented to us next year than we have had presented to us this year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I agree with much that has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. So far as the militia is concerned, there should be no politics in the administration of that department. I am glad to know that both political parties are fairly well represented in the militia force, and therefore it ought to be conducted from a business standpoint rather than a political standpoint. Had this course been pursued during the last few years our force would be in a more efficient state than it is now. I look upon the vote we are now discussing as one of the most important we can have, from a military standpoint. There is no use in having a militia unless you drill them thoroughly. I notice that the amount for this year is $25,000 more than last year, and I am glad that it is so. I see that the report of the Major-General bears out what I have myself believed, that this amount of money has not been used judiciously in the past, or to the best possible advantage. In this report of the Major-General I am glad to corroborate what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat, that we are favoured by having a man at the head of the Militia Department who is fearless, and ready to express his views and give his opinions upon the state of the militia, without any bias. Now, in this report he states:

"It is my belief that a considerably larger force could be annually trained than has hitherto been the case, without any increase in the vote for drill and training. I am not prepared at present to recommend any such increase of expenditure. I am satisfied that in the past, the results obtained in the militia training have not been commensurate with the expenditure: and I see only in improved organization a sufficient guarantee of practical results to justify such a recommendation. I shall submit to you, in the proper time, the programme I have prepared for the training of the present year—providing for training of an increased quota of rural militia, without an increase of the vote for that purpose."

I am sure the House will be glad to see the programme which he says is being prepared, and which will enable us to train a larger number of men without any increased expense. I believe it is much better that we should have even 10,000 men properly trained than to have 40,000 half trained. I know that the system that has prevailed in the western part of Ontario, and I presume throughout the Dominion, of taking a battalion out once in two years, and drilling them for ten or twelve days, is simply throwing away money, because the next time the battalion is taken out you will find that nearly two-thirds of the men have disappeared, have moved away or gone out of the service, and you have a fresh lot to drill. I think it would better that these battalions should be drilled every year, and drilled a longer time than twelve days. Take a less number of men if necessary, but drill them thoroughly. Also, I do not believe that the present system is right, of giving such a small allowance to the men as 50 cents a day. Everybody knows that you cannot get a good man, such as you want in the service, to leave his home and employment, and go out for 50 cents a day. Therefore, I think the system could be remedied in these two ways: First, by drilling the men every year, a smaller number of men if necessary; and second, by increasing the pay of the men, so that you may obtain a better class. I also think that some change should be made in another direction. Reference has been made to the arms, accoutrements, &c. I am bound to say that I believe, with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that the system of giving contracts for clothing has been a huge farce and a fraud. I believe the clothing has cost altogether too much, and that the Militia Department, under its present head, should take steps to see if some economy cannot be practised there. If the expenditure under that head is cut down, we can spend more money for drill and make the men more efficient.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister if we may hope that the 91st and 95th Battalions will drill this year?

Mr. BOWELL. The matter will depend in a great measure on the General. I know the practice is to call out the men one year who were not called out the year before. Why the two battalions to which the hon. gentleman has called attention have not been drilled in camp I am unable to say, unless it be from the fact, as I understand, that the companies live such a great distance from each other that the cost of transportation would be too great.

Mr. WATSON. The 95th Battalion, whose headquarters are at Portage la Prairie, can be got together very conveniently by the Canadian Pacific or the Manitoba and North-Western Railways. None of the companies live 80 miles distant: Brandon is the furthest point. They were promised three years ago, and in fact notified, to get in readiness, but at the last moment they were informed that they would not be allowed to go into camp. I think that, in fairness to the men of that battalion, they should either be disbanded or allowed to go into camp. It is not fair to keep these companies for seven years without allowing them to go into camp.

Mr. BOWELL. I belonged to a company fifteen years, and we never went into camp.

Contingencies and general service $38,000

Mr. CASEY. I notice one pretty big item here: advertising the militia of Canada in the anniversary number of the Toronto *Empire*, $300. I do not know exactly what object is to be gained in advertising the militia, although it would be an object to the Toronto *Empire*. This item includes grants to rifle associations. Now, I do not know how it is at present, but some years ago, in this city, there used to be a very peculiar arrangement, by which the members of each of the two battalions formed a rifle association of their own, and the same individuals joined a third rifle association, and so got three grants between them. I would beg to urge upon the Minister in this connection what I did before in connection with the shooting in camps. A liberal allowance of free ammunition should be allowed, not only to the rifle league, as at present, but to rifle associations. Money might be saved from ornamental organizations and increased grants given to these associations. In western Ontario interest in rifle-shooting has almost died out. Formerly we had very good associations in every county battalion and a large one at London, for district No. 1, and at that time first-rate matches were held which aroused general interest. Now the money obtainable is not sufficient to induce the men to come out, and in consequence rifle-shooting has greatly fallen off. I hope the Minister will carefully consider the measures for stimulating rifle shooting. The grants made to some of the rifle associations are very small, being only $50 or $75, but I observe the Metropolitan Association of Ottawa receives $150.

Dominion Artillery Association $2,000

Mr. PRIOR. I ask the Minister of Militia if he cannot see his way clear to increase this grant a little. It has been impossible for three years to send an artillery team to Shoeburyness. If he will look at the General's Report he will find that the artillery branch of the service is considered most efficient. Under the circumstances, the Government might do a little more for that branch. It is impossible to send a team over for the amount voted, but this might be done on $3,000. This would be beneficial, not only to the artillery but to the country at large. When there is a chance of a team going to Shoeburyness, the whole artillery of the Dominion work, and great interest is displayed, because every man wants to get on the team. I hope the Minister will place an additional amount to this vote in the Supplementary Estimates.

Improved Rifle Ordnance. $3,000

Mr. CASEY. How many guns will be purchased for this amount? The General's Report says that our ordnance is not in very good condition, and that not a spare gun-wheel is to be got nearer than Woolwich.

Mr. BOWELL. This item, althought it has been voted for a number of years, has not been spent for some years past. I propose to spend it this year, and endeavour to get one or two guns.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will take this opportunity of enquiring of the Minister of Justice whether any information has been received as to the negotiations pending with the German Empire? The treaty was about to terminate, if I remember rightly, and some negotiations were reported to have been going on with Her Majesty's Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have nothing upon that subject, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 13th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Isidore Proulx, Esq., for the Electoral District of Prescott.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

ISIDORE PROULX, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Prescott; introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Watson.

REPORT.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June, 1891.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

EASTER RECESS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That when Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair at six o'clock this day, the House shall stand adjourned until Tuesday next.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 68) to revive and amend the Acts respecting the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ross, Dundas.)

ORDNANCE PROPERTY IN ANNAPOLIS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. FORBES) asked, To whom do the Government lease or rent the Government ordnance property in the County of Annapolis? In whose name are the leases made out? What is the amount of rent charged? How much rent is due to date?

Mr. BOWELL. Part of the Government ordnance property in the County of Annapolis, N.S., was, on the 1st of May, 1879, leased to Lawrence Hall, of Annapolis, N.S., at an annual rental of £34 10s. sterling. The amount now due of said rent is $742.72. Another portion of the ordnance property in said town and county was, in 1888, leased to the Marine and Fisheries Department for lighthouse purposes at a rental of $21.92, which rent is paid to the 30th November, 1891. The terms of these leases are still in force.

FISHERY INSPECTOR ROLAND FINKLE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, When was Roland Finkle, of Bath, appointed fishery inspector? What was his salary for the years 1890 and 1891? What is his present salary? Has his salary been increased; if so, when was the increase granted? Upon whose recommendation was it granted?

Mr. TUPPER. Roland Finkle, of Bath, was appointed fishery inspector on the 1st June, 1885. His salary for the years 1890-91 was $50 a year. His present salary is $50.

SUMMERSTOWN (ONT.) POST OFFICE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. GUAY) asked, 1. What is the amount of receipts of the post office of Summerstown, Ont.? 2. What is the salary paid to the postmaster?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The revenue of the post office at Summerstown, Ont., during the year ending 30th June, 1891, was $146; revenue from 1st July, 1891, to 6th April, 1892, $186.96; salary of postmaster, $40 per annum.

I. C. R.—TARIFF ON LIVE STOCK.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) asked, When was the freight tariff on live stock, now in force on the Intercolonial Railway, adopted? In what does it differ from the tariff formerly in force?

Mr. HAGGART. The freight tariff now in force on the Intercolonial Railway was adopted by Order in Council of the 24th April, 1890. Take an example of a distance of 100 miles: it differs from the tariff which was changed by the Order in Council of the 24th April, 1890, in the following respects:—

SMALL LOTS LESS THAN CAR LOADS.

—	Rate changed by Order in Council, 24th April, 1890.		Rate under Order in Council, 24th April, 1890.	
	Weight.	Rate.	Weight.	Rate.
	Lbs.	$ cts.	Lbs.	$ cts.
Bulls under 1 year old, each	1,000	2 80	800	2 24
" 1 year old and under 2 yrs	1,000	2 80	1,250	3 50
" over 2 years old	1,000	2 80	1,500	4 20
Cattle and horned animals—				
One animal	1,000	2 80	1,000	2 80
Two animals	2,000	5 60	2,000	5 60
Three "	3,000	8 40	3,000	8 40
Each additional animal	1,000	2 80	1,000	2 80
Calves under 6 months old	150	0 42	200	0 56
" over 6 m. and under 1 yr	1,000	2 80	500	1 40
Cow and calf together	2,000	5 60	1,200	3 36
Horses and mules—				
Colts under 6 months old	1,000	2 80	500	1 40
Horses, mules, &c., 1 animal	1,000	2 80	1,000	2 80
" " 2 animals	2,000	5 60	2,000	5 60
" " 3 "	3,000	8 40	3,000	8 40
Each additional animal	1,000	2 80	1,000	2 80
Mare and foal together	2,000	5 60	1,000	4 20
Stallions, jacks	1,000	2 80	1,500	4 20
Sundries—				
Sheep, lambs and goats	Carried at actual weight in boxes, D 1.		100	0 28
Swine			100	0 70
Suckling pigs			50	0 14

In car loads the difference between the present tariff and the one previously in force is from one-half to 1 cent per 100 pounds or $1 to $2 per car, equal to from 7 to 12½ cents per head, and this only applies to distances up to 60 miles; over that distance there is a slight reduction.

QUEBEC AND POINTE AUX TREMBLES MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, 1. What are the names of the parties who tendered for the carrying of the mail from Quebec to Pointe aux Trembles, in the County of Portneuf? 2. What is the amount of the tender in each case? 3. Has the contract been awarded, and if so, to whom?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 1 and 2. A. Angers, $494; Elzéar Poitras, $525; Hypolite Béland, $540; Roch Rivard, $571; Narcisse Loriot, $594; Théodule Dubuc, $595; Ferdinand Voyer, $598; Samuel Dussault, $600; Octave Naud, $600; Joseph Loriot, $697; Jos. Arthur Bédard, $700. 3. The lowest tender has been accepted.

THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. MULOCK asked, Whether a proclamation has been issued bringing into force the Act passed in the 52nd year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: "An Act to amend 'The Copyright Act,' Chapter 62 of of the Revised Statutes?" If not, what is the cause of the delay in the issue of such proclamation?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The proclamation is not issued. I hope in a very few days to be able to communicate the reasons more in detail than I can now.

COBOURG CUSTOMS BUILDINGS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked: Whether the Government lease any buildings in the town of Cobourg for Customs or other purposes? If so, from whom do they lease them, and what rent do they pay yearly?

Mr. OUIMET. None are leased.

BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL moved for:

Statement showing: 1. The quantity of beet-root sugar manufactured in Canada for which a bounty has been granted and paid, in pursuance of the Act passed during the last session of this present Parliament. 2. The names and addresses of persons and companies to whom such bounty has been paid, and the amount paid to each of them. 3. The total amount so paid. 4. The total quantity of sugar-beet grown in Canada, and delivered at the beet-sugar factories during the years 1890 and 1891, respectively.

He said: My intention is not to speak now on this question. I will only ask the Government to kindly cause the returns mentioned in the three motions I have just made, to be prepared as early as possible; for I intend to ask for the opinion of the House on the continuation of the granting of bounties to beet-root sugar, as soon as these returns are furnished.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to this motion, but this return will be simply a duplication of the information which has already been laid on the Table in answer to the motion made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) a short time ago, except that portion of the motion which refers to the quantity of beets that were

brought into the factory. That information we have not in our possession, and I am informed that it cannot likely be obtained from the factory itself, for the reason, my officials inform me, that during their investigation a short time ago, into the manufacture of sugar from beet-root, they did not find any record of the quantity of beets brought into the factory.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIM OF JOHN F. ROBERTSON.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for :

Return of all petitions, reports, correspondence, telegrams and other documents relating to a claim for compensation or damages made by John F. Robertson by reason of injuries sustained by him in a railway accident on the Prince Edward Island Railway in the year 1882.

He said : I wish to call the attention of the hon. leader of the House to the facts connected with this case, so that justice may be done by the Government to the party on whose behalf I am speaking. In 1882 there was a serious accident on the Prince Edward Island Railway, owing to the breaking of an axle in one of the railway carriages. John F. Robertson and his wife were passengers on the train on that occasion, and both received very serious injuries from which they were confined to their beds for a long time. Mr. Robertson's injuries were such that for some years he was quite incapacitated from doing business, and when he got out and about, he retained counsel, and application was made to the Government on his behalf. At the time, the Supreme Court of Canada had decided the cases of McFarlane *vs.* the Queen and McLeod *vs.* the Queen, determining that there was no liability on the part of the Government for injuries sustained by a passenger travelling by a Government train, even if the accident were caused by the negligence of one of the Government employés. The counsel acting for Mr. Robertson, in the face of these decisions, very wisely did not file a petition of right. There would have been no use in doing so, because whatever opinion one may entertain as to the correctness of the judgments of the Supreme Court, until they were reversed by the Privy Council they were binding in Canada. So that the counsel for Mr. Robertson applied to the Government privately. The matter was referred by the Railway Department to the Department of Justice, and the opinion was given by the then Deputy Minister of Justice to the effect that if the accident was caused by a latent defect in the axle, of which the employés on the railway had no knowledge and no means of knowing, there was no liability ; implying that if the accident had been caused by a defect of which they did know, the Government would be liable. Mr. Robertson alleged that the axle was broken at the time the train started on its journey, that the employés on the train had means of knowing that, and did not act on that means of knowledge, and therefore were negligent, and that if the railway were the property of a private company it would have been liable for all the injuries the passengers sustained. However, the opinion of the Minister of Justice, of which I was kindly favoured with a copy last year, went upon the point, that if the accident was not the result of negligence, the Government were not liable. In 1887 the Exchequer Court Act was passed, and that Act appears to some extent to have altered the law itself, and it is to the condition of things arising out of that Act that I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention. Judge Burbidge has decided under the statute, that although the Government were not liable for any injury caused to a passenger by the negligence of their employés previous to the passage of the Exchequer Court Act, they are liable since the passage of that Act. I hold in my hand his decision in the case of the City of Quebec *vs.* the Queen. At page 260 he gives the text of the 15th and 16th sections of the Exchequer Court Act, under which he holds that a new liability arises on the part of the Government. After setting out those sections, he says :

"By comparing section 15 with R.S.C., c. 135, s. 75, it will be seen that the jurisdiction which the court had formerly exercised in respect of any matters that might have been the subject of a petition of right is continued with a general definition of the cases in which such petitions will lie. By section 16 (*b*) the court is given the jurisdiction formerly exercisable by the official arbitrators in respect of claims for compensation for lands taken for, or injuriously affected by, the construction of public works : by section 16 (*c*), the jurisdiction formerly vested in such official arbitrators with respect to claims arising out of any death or injury to the person or property on any public work, with a limitation to which I shall have occasion to refer ; and by section 16 (*d*) and (*e*), a jurisdiction similar to that vested in the Court of Claims by the Revised Statutes of the United States, section 1059."

Then he goes on to comment upon several branches of the case, and at page 269 he expresses his opinion in this way :

"I take it, however, that whatever opinion may be entertained of the point of view from which this question is to be regarded, it is necessary to give the words used in clause (*c*) of 50-51 Vic., c. 16, s. 16, the meaning that expressly or by necessary implication attaches to them ; and I do not doubt that they recognize the Crown's liability for certain torts committed by its officers and servants for which a remedy had heretofore been provided by a proceeding on a reference to the official arbitrators, and for the redress of which it was for the first time by such Act provided that proceedings might be instituted in this court.

"It appears to me, too, that I would fail to give effect to the language of clause (*c*) if I limited its application to the special cases where a liability for torts is created by statute, to which reference has been made. Such cases of statutory liability, as we have seen, fall within and are provided for by clause (*d*) of the section under discussion. There is nothing, I think, in the conclusion to which I have come in any way in conflict with the judgments in McFarlane *vs.* the Queen or McLeod *vs.* the Queen, which were decided under statutes differing very materially from that now under consideration. On the other hand, it is supported by the judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that have been cited."

Judge Burbidge subsequently, in the case of the Queen against Brady, arising out of an accident at Banff Park, followed this judgment, and from his judgment there was an appeal to the Supreme Court. I believe, however, the point now brought up was not decided one way or the other, but the case was settled on another ground altogether. So far as any judicial decision has been given by the recognized courts on the provisions I have referred to in the Exchequer Court Act, the law now stands that the Government, since 1887, is liable for injuries on public works arising out of torts or negligence on the part of Government officials. Now, the position we stand in is this. I take it, Judge Burbidge's decision only affects cases which have arisen subsequently to the passage of the law. It does not include, or was not intended to include previous cases, and certainly the case before him did not oblige him to make any reference to cases which arose previous to the passage of the law. So that we stand in this position, that if a man suffered an injury or

an accident on a particular date in 1887, he has no remedy; but if he suffered accident under similar circumstances on a Government road the day after, he would have a remedy. The hon. gentleman will see that that would be a case of gross injustice, which the Government would at once interfere with and prevent. Now, in this case there is a question of fact on which the liability of the Government ought to depend. Was or was not the axle which caused the accident partially broken before, so that there would be negligence on the part of employés in sending a train out with a broken axle? If that is found to be so by a competent tribunal, then, I submit, this man has a case which the Government will recognize. In the case of McLeod and the other passengers on the train which suffered the injury, and which was before 1882, before the Robertson case, and in which the Supreme Court gave judgment that the Crown was not liable, the Government, notwithstanding, intervened and paid them very reasonable sums of money. McLeod, I think, got $15,000, and the others sums ranging down to $1,000 each. But in all cases where the injuries were severe, the Government considered that, if not legally liable, they were morally liable, and recognized that by paying something which the parties accepted. In this case we have a wrong, and we are without remedy simply because the injury happened before a particular day. If it happened after the Exchequer Act passed, we would have had our remedy in that Act; and I am quite sure, when I bring these facts to the notice of the Minister of Justice, he will see that some recognition of this man's case should be made. That he suffered serious injuries is beyond peradventure. He was a passenger under contract by a ticket. His wife and he were being conveyed from one point to another on the Government road. The axle broke, the car turned over two or three times, and his wife was seriously but, fortunately, not permanently injured, and the husband was permanently injured, in fact, has never been the same man since, and his case is one which, I think, ought to receive recognition at the hands of the Government. All he can do is to throw himself upon the mercy of the Government. At any rate, I have advised him, and I believe his solicitor did, that in his, as in the case of the Queen *vs.* McLeod, it is useless to file a petition of right, and all he should do is to appeal to the mercy of the Crown. To that he has appealed through me, and I respectfully submit his appeal. All the circumstances of the case, and the fact that Parliament has passed a law recognizing the liability of the Crown in certain cases, impel me to the conclusion that this man's case should receive recognition, at any rate to this extent, that the fact upon which the moral liability of the Government ought to depend, ought to be investigated, and if found in his favour, his claim should be recognized; and I present the case in his behalf. The facts are all in the Department of Railways, and I think they will be found to be just as I have stated them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The principle to which the hon. gentleman refers is a very important one, and I desire to say a few words upon the motion before it passes, just for that reason. I presume the hon. gentleman has carefully considered the subject. From the motion he has made today, I should suppose that the case did not come within the principle he relies upon as having been laid down in the case of the City of Quebec against the Queen, but that it comes within the class of cases, in which McLeod *vs.* the Queen is the leading one, as to the remedy against the Crown for wrongs arising out of a contract. If so, it will be worthy of consideration, whether that doctrine has not been modified or overruled by the decision of the Privy Council, in the case of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company against the Queen, in which the same defence was relied upon by the Crown, unsuccessfully with regard to a lease. I do not want to say more upon that point, because I may have to argue the other side if this case goes on, but I want to say a few words upon the question of the change of law as represented by the Exchequer judgment. Now, I think that the section upon which the case of the City of Quebec and the Queen turns is not intended to relate so much to the cases of wrongs arising from a contract, although perhaps it covers those as well, as to accidents in the management or construction of public works by persons who have no contractual relations with the Crown. It was not intended by Parliament to change the law upon that subject. The section which the judge says did extend the jurisdiction of the court, and the right of the subject before the Exchequer Court, was previously contained in the Public Works Act, and was limited simply to giving power to refer these matters to the board of arbitrators, and the effect was not to give any right against the Crown, but simply to afford the opportunity of having an investigation. The learned judge of the Exchequer Court thinks that the Act now gives a remedy against the Crown which did not exist before, in regard to damages caused by the faulty construction or operation of a public work. The contention of the Crown is that it was intended to give jurisdiction to that court only where the right of the subject already existed, and that it was not intended to enlarge the right. The judge has further decided that, in a case against the Crown, where there was no contractual relation between the party and the Crown, where it was a case of a lad who was put off the train, he being a trespasser, the Crown was liable. We took an appeal in that case, but the point was not decided. It went off on another point, so we have never had any decision upon this subject except that of the Exchequer Court judge. If it should be decided that the law has been changed in that important feature, the matter will have to be carefully considered by the department. The cases which occurred before the present law came into force will have to be carefully considered, and Parliament will no doubt have to restore the Act to the same position in which it was before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no doubt that the decision of the Privy Council in two different cases conflicts with the decision which was given by the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of the Queen *vs.* McLeod, but, while a wealthy man might take such a case home to the Privy Council, this man Robertson is not a wealthy man, and cannot afford to run the chance that, the decision of the Exchequer Court being one way, and the decision of the Supreme Court the other way, he might succeed before the Privy Council. He has either to submit in silence or to be relieved by the mercy of the Government, and it is to that mercy

I am appealing. It seems to me unjust and unreasonable that, if the Government go into the business of carrying passengers between two points, and if in so carrying them a man is injured through the neligence of their employés, that man should not have a remedy. As a matter of fact, the Government have not acted on that harsh view of the law in other cases. They have always acted upon the merits of the case, as far as I know, and have done justice to the parties on the merits, and in any of these cases which have been brought by petition of right in the Supreme Court of Canada and decided against the suppliant, the Government have said that, although the letter of the law may be against you, we will pay you the damage you have sustained. I think the Government ought to act in that way in any case of this sort. These are the only two cases I know of. This man Robertson was for years, in consequence of the injury he received, unable to attend to his business, and, though he is somewhat better now and able to move around, he is really injured for life, and I think his case should receive the kindest attention of the Department of Railways. I hope the Minister of Justice will see his way to advise such action to be taken as will enable this man to try his case somewhere or other, if the Government does not do him justice. It would be a gross injustice if he should be deprived of that right simply on the grounds which have been alleged.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not see how the case could be investigated further than it has been.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It might be left to arbitration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would have no objection to such a reference being made to the Exchequer Court, but it would depend altogether upon the decision in the McLeod case.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland), for Mr. McDOUGALD (Pictou), moved for:

Return containing a statement of expenditure out of income made for permanent improvements, extensions, additions and betterments, exclusive of works of ordinary maintenance and renewals, on account of the Intercolonial Railway from 30th June, 1881, to 1st July, 1891. The return to show such expenditure in summary form for each branch of service as nearly as can be conveniently ascertained from the accounts.

He said: In explanation of this motion, I wish to say that the opinion is generally prevalent in the Maritime Provinces that for some years past, under the method of book-keeping adopted in reference to the Intercolonial Railway, very considerable expenditures, which by private companies are charged to capital account, have been charged against ordinary income. This opinion is confirmed by the reports of the Minister of Railways. In several of the annual reports, Mr. Schreiber has called attention to the fact that expenditures have been made during the year and provided for out of ordinary income which could not be properly considered as works of ordinary operating or maintenance. In one report, 1886, he mentions a specific sum of $150,000, which was charged in this way. We have been unable to gather from the published reports the amount of the expenditures of this nature, and the object of this motion is to obtain a return which will show the amounts which during the last ten years have been charged to ordinary income, and which might properly be charged to capital account.

Motion agreed to.

THE WEST INDIAN MISSION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) moved for:

Copy of all reports made by the Minister of Finance relating to his official visit to the British West Indies in reference to a more extensive trade with those colonies; also, the speeches which the Minister of Finance made at Kingston and elsewhere in the West Indies on the subject of trade between the British West Indies and Canada, together with any correspondence which may have since taken place upon the subject with the Colonial Office and with the West Indian authorities.

He said: I make this motion for the purpose of formally calling the attention of the Minister of Finance, and the Minister who leads the House, to the subject. The Minister informed us that this correspondence would be brought down, if there was any. I mentioned some of these papers which clearly do exist, and which are not yet in possession of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I made a short explanation the other night about this subject. I said I was under the impression that no report had been made by the Minister of Finance relating to his visit to the West Indies in reference to more extensive trade. I am inclined to think that is still the case. However, there can be no objection to the motion being passed. I am sure the whole House will sympathize with the hon. member's desire that any speeches which the Minister of Finance may have made, should be laid upon the Table of the House, because they always contain a great deal of information, and are matters of great satisfaction to the House. I am sure that we shall be delighted to bring them down if they have been preserved in such a manner as their importance entitled them to be preserved, and to be made a part of the records. I do not think that any correspondence has taken place with the Colonial Office or with any one else upon the subject. In case there should be any correspondence with the Colonial Office or with the West Indian authorities, it will be brought down.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I may say, in reply to the jocsoe observations of the Minister of Justice, that there are communications with the Colonial Office that are mentioned in the correspondence brought down last year, that are not yet before us. With regard to the merit of the speeches to which I have referred, we will be better able to judge when we have an opportunity of reading them. That they exist, or did exist, is a fact; what their merits may be we cannot say, and I think it would be premature to criticise them until they are in our possession. Some of us may not have the same faith in the supereminent abilities of the Minister in that particular, that is possessed by his colleague. Our faith in that respect may not be a saving faith, but that possessed by the Minister of Justice very clearly is of that character. But let me say this further, that I know that the uniform English practice, where speeches are made in connection with a mission, is for these speeches to be reported and communicated as part of the official proceedings. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the correspondence that has, from time to time, taken place between the

Governors and the Colonial Office, he will find that is the invariable practice; and I supposed that this Government, when they send an official representative abroad, would, to some extent, follow that same rule and hold him to the ordinary official responsibility. But, Sir, I know that parliamentary government has not a great deal of merit in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that they enjoy an immunity in this respect not allowed to Imperial officers. So it may be that these papers have never been communicated to His Excellency or to His Excellency's responsible advisers. I assume that the rule here would be the same as it is in the United Kingdom, and that when a Minister goes abroad and acts officially on behalf of any Government, he owes to that Government an extra ministerial responsibility, similar to the responsibility which is possessed by a person appointed to that particular position alone. But if the ordinary English principle of official responsibility has been disregarded here, it is important that we should know it; it is important that wherever there is a very wide departure from constitutional usage and constitutional principles, there should be a reversion on the part of the Government to first principles, and it is important that the House should take its observations anew, and ascertain precisely where it stands, and, perhaps, correct the vagaries into which the Government and their officials have fallen.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of the instructions issued to Prof. Saunders when he was directed to enquire into the question of the growing of sugar-beet and the manufacture of beet-root sugar in Canada, or since that date up to the time when his report was laid before this House.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

Copies of all correspondence, memorials and documents exchanged between the Government or any member thereof and any persons, companies or corporations, as to the granting, or the continuing of the granting of a bounty for sugar made in Canada from the sugar-beet grown and cultivated in Canada.—(Mr. Beausoleil.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Montreal Board of Trade.—(Mr. Curran.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Care and maintenance of drill sheds, rifle ranges, buildings, &c..... $28,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that Major-General Herbert in his report recommended that a different course be adopted with regard to the care of arms. The impression I have gathered from reading that report is that a great many of the arms in charge of the volunteers are sacrificed for want of proper care, and for want of proper places in which to keep them. Suggestions have been made with regard to the adoption of improved arms for our volunteers, and if they are obtained I think it is an absolute necessity that proper places should be provided where they can be stored with safety. General Herbert recommends that there should be an officer attached to each battalion to have the entire charge of the arms, who should be held responsible for their being properly cleaned and taken care of. I would like to know whether there is any intention, on the part of the new Minister of Militia, to make any alterations in the direction of General Herbert's recommendation?

Mr. BOWELL. Although this question was discussed the other night, and although it is not properly under the consideration of the committee now, I have no hesitation in repeating what I then said, that it is one that will receive my most earnest and careful consideration. I have long been of the opinion which the hon. gentleman has expressed; but a difficulty always surrounds a change of system, particularly in the rural sections, where the companies are so scattered, of obtaining proper places at anything like moderate expense. But I can assure the committee that this is one portion of the Major-General's report to which I shall give my attention, with a view to effecting the improvement, if it is possible to do so within the means at my disposal.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was asked by a number of volunteers who called on me before I came to the House, to bring to the attention of the Minister what they considered to be something in the nature of a grievance. Last year the number of men allowed to drill was cut down very largely, to their very great regret. There is a very strong military spirit existing, particularly in the city corps, and the men are very proud of their different corps, in drill, dress parade and everything else, and they called my attention to the fact that they have been allowed hitherto to drill more than their proper quota. In 1889 they were allowed 449 men, in 1890 that was cut down to 321, in 1891 they drilled 344 or 23 more, which the Militia Department afterwards sanctioned, and last year they were cut down to 325, which they think is far below the number they are entitled to.

Mr. BOWELL. There was a practice that had crept into the service of battalions having more men for drill than provided for in the regulations. The Minister of Militia, whenever his appropriation would allow him to do so, paid the extra expense. In fact, he went beyond his appropriation in almost every case, and allowed it. The present Major-General, being a strict disciplinarian, refuses to sanction the payment of more men than the number provided in the regulations. As regards the volunteers of Prince Edward Island being cut down in number, I fancy that arose from the want of money. For a number of years past we have voted only $250,000 for drill purposes, and the cost for the last three years has averaged $275,000. The difference has been paid out of whatever amounts could be saved in the other appropriations. The Auditor General pointed out that that was not strictly in accord with the rules of Parliament and the Audit Act, and I told him I should endeavour to keep within each individual estimate, if possible,

and would cut down the estimate of those items, the full amount of which has not been expended, and add the $25,000 to the item of drill, as that amount was necessary to drill the number annually drilled during the past years, numbering about 20,000 men. Personally, I should be very much gratified if the Government could see its way clear to appropriate $150,000 more than they do, as from the information I have received, even exercising the greatest economy, it would cost about $400,000 to drill the whole force.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Of course if the hon. gentleman is not provided with money by the House, he cannot expend it. I would just like to read the paragraph in the letter I received, in case I have not explained it sufficiently:

"Previous to the present year four companies of the 82nd Battalion, three of artillery, and the Charlottetown Engineers were ordered for drill, whereas this year only four companies were ordered in all, two of artillery, one of engineers, and one of the 82nd Battalion. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia do not appear to have suffered in this manner, because the number called out there is in excess of previous years."

I thought I would bring this to the attention of the committee, so that next year the complaints of these gentlemen may be attended to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is it the intention of the Government to furnish helmets to the volunteer force?

Mr. BOWELL. That is another instance where it would require a great deal of money.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have brought this matter before the attention of the department on several occasions. I believe it is the desire of the officers of the force that a helmet should be furnished. Every gentleman connected with the force will agree that it is in the interests of the militia that these helmets should be furnished. If it is for want of money that they are not procured, it has been intimated from both sides of the House, without dissent, that we are willing to vote the money. The hon. member for Frontenac pointed out on several occasions how this provision could be made at a very small cost, and I hope the Minister will consider the matter. There is no reason why this expense should fall upon those officers who give their time and money in maintaining the force.

Mr. BOWELL. How long will these helmets last?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. About ten years.

Mr. BENNETT. If a grant should be made for that purpose, the County Council of Simcoe, who have supplied the men of the Simcoe battalion with helmets, should be reimbursed the cost.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the department in the habit of furnishing the bands of battalions with uniforms?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand they are furnished with the regular uniform and nothing beyond that.

Royal Military College of Canada.....$75,000

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister how many graduates there were from this college during the past year? It appears to me that there are 18 altogether. If that is correct, that there were only 18 graduates from this college last year, I would call the attention of the Minister to the financial aspect of the case. During the last year, not having any reference whatever to the capital invested in buildings, either for the college or for any of the staff—and that capital amounts to a good deal—having reference only to the actual cost of maintenance for the year ending the 30th June, 1891, we find that there was expended in that way $69,248.49.

Mr. BOWELL. From that you should deduct the fees paid, and that will show the actual expenditure. The hon. gentleman is correct in stating that the expenditure amounted to $69,248, but the annual subscription fees and payments for issue of clothing, &c., amounted to $21,306, making the total cost of the college, $47,942.

Mr. MULOCK. No doubt that is correct, but the expenditure for the maintenance of the college was $69,248, and there were only eighteen graduates. I find that, including the staff, Major-General Cameron and the professors, there are about eighteen professors, and looking at the Auditor General's Report, which is my only source of information, I find there are some twenty non-commissioned officers and others employed there in addition to the eighteen professors, making at least forty persons who are engaged in carrying on the work of this college. As there were only eighteen graduates last year, and the college cost $69,248.49, it appears that it cost us $3,847.12 for each graduate we turned out during the year. I do not think any comment I can make can add to or detract from the startling result I have given to the committee. I am told that these graduates, having got the education which this college affords, in large numbers leave the country, so that we are educating them for other parts of the world. I am told that, whilst it was originally part of the policy in connection with this college that its graduates should receive to some extent inducements to enter the service of Canada, that has not been adhered to. I am told, for example, that, while there is a departmental order that instructors in the permanent corps should be graduates of this college, that order has not been lived up to, and that men have been appointed instructors to the permanent corps without having first received that qualification they should have received, that they have been appointed to instruct, and that, after they were so appointed, they have been sent to the college to learn their lessons in order to be qualified. A couple of weeks ago, I received a communication from a person bearing on this subject, and he enclosed an extract from a newspaper published in Canada, setting forth a number of names of gentlemen who had recently joined the Military College at Kingston, and amongst those are three gentlemen who are described as being at that time instructors in the permanent corps. They are Lieut. C. Fiset, of St. John's, Que., Lieut. A. V. Fages, of St. John's, Que., and Lieut. A. E. Carpenter, of Fredericton, N.B. These three, according to the newspaper extract I have, had the appointments and were at that time engaged as instructors in the permanent corps, and were afterwards sent to the Military College to qualify themselves and to learn how to instruct. If there were vacancies in the permanent corps for instructors, when these unqualified persons were appointed, it seems to me that the department should have appointed those who had graduated, those who had at this enormous expense received the instruction which the college supplies, and should have let

others wait until they had obtained their proper technical qualification before they were appointed to these offices. I do not know whether the Minister can inform the committee how many students there are in attendance at the college, but the output shows that the cost of 18 graduates is between $3,000 and $4,000 a head. I do not know that it is material, nor does it at all get over the main feature of this charge—for I think it must be considered a charge of looseness and extravagance—to say that half of the cost is borne by the cadets. Whatever they pay goes into the common fund, and the administration of this college results in the cost being at the rate I have mentioned, no matter who are the paymasters. This state of affairs, I think, should not be allowed to continue, and I hope that the new broom we have will sweep away a little of the dust that seems to be hovering over the whole department.

Mr. BOWELL. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). He seems to be under the impression that the amount which he says has been expended, is all borne by the country. He should have deducted the $21,306 which were paid by the cadets. It is true that it costs the amount per head mentioned by the hon. member to carry on the school, but it does not cost the country quite as much as that.

Mr. MULOCK. How much do you make it?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not make the computation. But you may take the sum of $47,942 instead of $69,248 and divide by the number of graduates. In reference to the appointment of officers to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I can say to him that I have inaugurated a new policy, and refuse positively to appoint any one to a position, either in the infantry schools or elsewhere on the permanent force, until they have acquired that qualification which is provided for them in the military school. An irregularity may have crept in in the past, but it is never too late to mend, and I intend to begin at once in that direction. In reference to the employment of the graduates of that college, it is to be regretted that we have not sufficient places to provide for the whole of them; but I find, in looking at the returns which have been placed in my hands, that out of 175 graduates, 100 are now in the employment of this Government, or in the Imperial Army. I think this is a very important fact, because it is important, as long as we are part and portion of the British Empire, that young Canadians should have a fair share of the honours that are given in the Imperial Army. The cadets to which I refer, and which have been gazetted to commissions, number: 2 in the Cavalry, 20 in the Royal Artillery, 32 in the Royal Engineers, and 26 in the Infantry, making a total in the Imperial service of 80 graduates of our college. This speaks well for their qualifications. As Canadians, we ought to be proud of the fact that so many of them are employed in that service. In addition to these, 9 ex-cadets have been appointed to commissions in the Mounted Police, 3 are in the Schools of Artillery, 2 in the Schools of Infantry, and 2 on the staff of the Royal Military College; which, along with the 80 holding positions in the Imperial Army, make a total of 96 cadets, who have obtained permanent employment. In addition to these, one is now Assistant Superintendent of the Government Cartridge Factory, one is Architect in the Engineer's branch of the Militia Department, one is on the superior staff of the college, and one is in the Royal Artillery, making the total number of 100;—so that they have been tolerably well provided for in the Imperial Army and in our own service. I may add that there are a number of these graduates who are employed in the Department of Railways and Canals, some on the railways, and more on the canals. It has been the policy of the Government to utilize the services of these young men who have proved themselves capable and have passed creditable examinations, wherever we can do so.

Mr. CASEY. How many hold commands in the military force?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know.

Mr. CASEY. Do you know if any do?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot speak positively. They all hold commissions, that is, when they pass examinations they leave the college with the rank of lieutenant.

Mr. CASEY. But they are not actually in the ranks of the volunteers?

Mr. BOWELL. Some are.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. Minister, without a formal motion, find out and have that brought down?

Mr. BOWELL. I will try.

Mr. MULOCK. Even taking the Minister's mode of dealing with the figures, it appears that the cost *per capita* of each graduate during the past year, was, as I have stated before, $3,847.12. If we divide that cost between the country and the graduates, it appears that the country bore the amount of $2,666 per head, and the cadets paid each $1,181.12, so that the cost to the country was at least $2,666 per head, to say nothing of what each graduate had to contribute besides into the common fund. I have not made a calculation as to the total cost of the maintenance of this college since its establishment; but assuming that it has been running for some twelve years at an annual expenditure of about $70,000 a year, you would have $840,000.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Longer than that.

Mr. MULOCK. I was throwing off a few years at the commencement when the expenditure must have been lighter than it is now. I presume that this rate of expenditure was not in full swing for the first few years.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it was established in 1876.

Mr. MULOCK. In order not to make an overestimate, I was making an average calculation, and estimated that this rate of expenditure has been going on for twelve years; because the Minister says there has been 175 graduates of the college since it was established. I was endeavouring to ascertain, in a rough way, what the cost has been per graduate of these 175 men. The expense during 12 years, at the average rate of the past year, has been $840,000. In addition, a very large sum has been expended on capital account. So it is fair to say that the country has spent $1,000,000 during this period to turn out 175 graduates, or, in other words, at a cost of $5,754 per head. If we only took cognizance of those graduates who have continued in connection with Canada, the number

175 would have to be reduced one-half for those who have gone into another service. True, it is a service in which we are deeply interested, and I would not be inclined to criticise that expenditure merely because the cadets have joined the Imperial service, but still, for the purpose of understanding where our money goes and where our men go, it is fair to bear in mind so far as direct benefit to Canada is concerned, if benefit accrues, from these men remaining in our service in this country, that one-half of the 175 have gone away, and the remainder have cost Canada, on an average, $12,000 per head. That is the position we occupy as regards the maintenance of this college.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a pretty hard way of calculating.

Mr. MULOCK. It will be found, on investigating the accounts, that I have been over-liberal. The average cost will prove to be more than the figures I have named. I thought, two or three years ago, the Government were making a very great mistake in expending so large a sum in purchasing a residence for the commandant. His salary is not sufficient to warrant such an expensive establishment. $12,000 was paid for the house in the first instance, a dwelling which was described as somewhat palatial in its extent. This was an expenditure on capital account which we were in no way called upon to incur, and each year we find the Public Accounts burdened with items for its maintenance. Every time a public building is purchased for the public service there arises an annual charge for maintenance and repairs. These add to the investment of capital, and these items are a fair charge against the institution with which they are connected. The Government are loading down this institution with professors and instructors. I suppose there is one servant in the college for every two cadets, and I presume there are 50 employés in the college to-day. Will the Minister say how many undergraduates there are in attendance?

Mr. BOWELL. I will give the hon. gentleman the information shortly.

Mr. MULOCK. I will leave the matter in this position, simply calling the attention of the new Minister of Militia to the abuses that exist there and which demand his immediate attention.

Mr. DENISON. I wish to say only a word or two. The hon. gentleman seems to imagine that the men who graduate from the college all go to the British Army and are lost to Canada. Of course that is not the case, because they are merely continuing their education there. They are continuing it in an excellent school, a practical school, in which they have a chance of serving in all quarters of the globe, and obtaining a practical knowledge of the duties of a soldier. They do that much in the same way as graduates from our universities go to other universities to complete their studies. All this is done at the expense of England, and causes a real saving to this country. These men would be only too glad to come back to Canada if she requires their services. They do come back, in fact, all the time, and we have them in our military college as instructors. There is one suggestion I brought forward last session, or the session before, which it is desirable the Minister should see his way to adopt, and it is this: the British Government gives four commissions to the graduates of the Royal Military College. If the Canadian Government would encourage the candidates by giving four prizes, by way of employment in the Railways and Canals Department, or some other department, where they would be useful, or if, instead of four, they gave two such positions, this system would allow those who did not desire to enter the army, at once to step into the Civil Service where they would prove useful men, because they are highly trained in all matters of an engineering character. I think it would be beneficial if something of that kind were adopted.

Mr. BOWELL. The number of cadets in the college I find to be 63.

Mr. MULOCK. So there are 16 or 17 professors, the commandant, nearly 20 non-commissioned officers and employés, or on an average of two-thirds of an employé for each cadet. The ex-Minister smiles: it is a laughing matter to him, I am sure, but not to the taxpayers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I happened to be in the House when the question of a residence for the commandant was under consideration. The Opposition found very serious fault with the proposal to purchase a residence at a considerable distance from the Military College. It was then urged that the commandant's residence could be erected within the grounds of the college, or in close proximity. I understand, however, it is two miles distant. I notice by a reference to the Auditor General's Report, that street-car fares and other expenses are charged in connection with the residence. It also appears that the country has furnished the residence and supplied it with necessary articles. At C-25 of the Auditor General's Report, I find items in connection with the residence as follows:—Cooking stove, $85; supplies for the same, $15.17; stove and pipes for stable, $25; fire guards, $2; fixing pipes, $1.50; hardwood, 4 cords, $21.60; bunch wood, 1½ cords, $4.38; coal, 15 tons at $6.25, 6 at $6.40, 6 at $6.55, 5 at $6.70, making a total of $204.95. Then, waterworks, one year, $34.41; gas, at $2 a thousand, $115.40; meter, $2.02; telephone, one year, $80. Now, all these items for the commandant's residence in Kingston, have cost us, in addition to his salary, $604.43 for last year. I cannot understand why we are called upon to pay all these expenses for the commandant's residence. Was it an understood arrangement, when he was appointed to perform the duties of his office, that we were to supply all the necessaries of his residence, down to the stove, and the stove for his stable? For my own part, judging from the remarks dropped from the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), I think it is quite clear that this college, from the way it has been run at Kingston, is a white elephant on our hands. It has cost the country altogether too much money, altogether more than is necessary: and if it can be run in a more economical manner, I earnestly hope that the present Minister of Militia, supporting the character for economy that he has gained, will either wipe it out, or put it on a different footing. The hon. member for York states that there are 18 officials, and in addition there are 12 to 15 servants, that makes 30, with some other minor officials in connection with the college. We have only turned out the very limited number of graduates that was stated to the House last year; and the entire number in attendance at the college, the Minister of Militia says, is 65. It

appears to me, that if that institution was under proper care and economical superintendence, it ought to be run for a very much less sum than it is now. I would like to know from the Minister, what is the salary of the commandant at present?

Mr. FOSTER. $3,163.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood he was engaged for $4,000.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The salary is $3,200, and there was an allowance of $800 for house-rent and fuel. Then they purchased the house and stopped the $800.

Mr. McMULLEN. If I understand the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), they have not stopped the furnishing of supplies. How is it that the supplies are all charged in the way they are here?

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed this charge for supplies is an exceptional sum paid for some reason or other. The cook stove was a range that was put in, and the pipes and fixtures, of course, would be in connection with it. I understand that he was to be paid a fixed salary, and that quarters were to be furnished for him; whether it was in the city proper or near the barracks, was a matter of very little consequence. In future I shall take care that these charges are not incurred by the Government unless the commandant, under his agreement with the Government, is entitled to them. That is the only explanation I can give. I remember distinctly the discussion that took place when this residence was purchased for the commandant, and it was then shown that the rent which had been paid was more than the interest at 4 per cent on the amount that was paid for the building, so that as a business transaction it was no loss to the country. The House can understand that repairs would have to be made to any residence which would have to be provided for a gentleman like Major Cameron, or any one occupying his position. If he has a superior building, the repairs are not likely to cost so much as would the repairs of an inferior building. Under all the circumstances, considering the matter from a financial standpoint, there is no actual charge upon the country over and above that which we would have to pay under the former arrangement. Whether the school should be continued, or whether some attempt should be made to reduce the expenditure, is a matter which shall receive the attention of the Government. There are many reasons why the school should be continued, although from an economical point of view it might be argued that the school should be abolished altogether. But if we are to have a school, it must be one that will be a credit to Canada in any part of the world where the cadets may go; otherwise we had better not have any school at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear the statement made by the Minister of Militia with regard to eliminating such charges as are set out in the Auditor General's Report in connection with the commandant's residence. I think it is better, where we engage men in that way with stated salaries, that they should provide these things for themselves. Now, with regard to the house. The Minister looks upon it as a fair investment at 4 per cent. Any person that has any knowledge of property and of keeping buildings in repair, is aware that it will take 4 per cent at least to keep buildings in a habitable condition: and by the time you pay the insurance and make the necessary repairs to the buildings every year, you will find that you will not be able to do it for very much less than 4 per cent. For instance, that building cost $12,000, 4 per cent upon that sum would be $480. Now, you will find that it will cost a considerable sum each year to keep that building in such a condition as that the commandant will be satisfied to live in it, and you will virtually have to pay double that sum, or $960 a year. From all I can gather with regard to the handling of this institution, it appears to be a very expensive ornament to our militia force, and I hope that under the vigorous and searching investigation of the new head of the department, we will have a very much reduced expenditure.

Mr. FLINT. I do not think the Military College presents as good a record to the country as the Militia Department and the members in this House, who are members of the militia force, would like to make it appear. I think the department themselves, or their officers, must be to a certain extent to blame for this fact. We have positive information given to the House and to the country concerning this institution, that it is costing from $40,000 to $50,000 a year. This is certainly a subject worthy of note. We have here the report of the Minister of Militia and Defence, which contains the comments of the General Officer Commanding on the state of our military affairs. That report is recognized on all hands as being a very searching and valuable one to those who wish to look into the expenditure and ascertain the condition of the military service; and I think that the General will receive the thanks of the Government and the people for his comments, which are so frank and apparently so fair. I regretted to notice, however, that he was not asked to report on the Military College. I had a sincere desire to study the affairs of the college, for the purpose of information, and in order to assist the Government and the House as far as I could in reaching sound conclusions in regard to its management. I think it would be interesting and valuable to the people of this country that, in his next report to the Government, the General should be asked to report on that college. I think it probable that he has suffered some inconvenience from the incompleteness of the report placed in his hands by the commandant of the college. Considering that this institution costs us from $40,000 to $50,000 a year, the report upon it placed in his hands is certainly very inadequate. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) searched in vain through the very few pages of the report to find some of the items most necessary to enable him to look into its affairs. I think the commandant of that institution should furnish the Government and the people with a full report of it, along with some supplementary pages bearing on its history, so that those who are the friends of the institution, as I claim to be myself, would be in a position to defend it if it is defensible, and that we should find there the information which is only now twisted and coaxed from the Minister, I do not say unwillingly, but because he has it not ready under his hand. Those who have prepared the report are certainly blameworthy for not having furnished the Ministry and Parliament with all the requisite information on these subjects.

I looked at the report to ascertain the total number of students in attendance and graduating in each class, and the average cost of each, but in vain. There is not a second or a third class college in the Dominion that will not give a better report of its doings. I hope that when we discuss the militia estimates another year, we shall have such information in our hands in regard to the Military College as will enable us to reach a conclusion whether the money spent in maintaining it is a wise expenditure, or whether it is, as it appears on its face to be, a waste of money. It appears that each cadet costs the country from $2,000 to $3,000 a year. Probably there are pupils in the school who do not take the full course, and on this account there should be a deduction; but owing to the paucity of the information given to us we are really not in a position to judge as we ought to be.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot agree in one respect with my hon. friend who has just sat down. He says he is a friend of this college. I believe this college was instituted with the best of motives—with the intention of turning out a trained and highly-skilled body of officers to instruct our volunteers and to form the nucleus of a larger body of well-trained officers who should be available in case of need. But, Sir, although that college was instituted during the time my friends were in power, I am compelled to say that experience has proved it to be a costly and useless fad, and I cannot call it by any other name. We have had it in operation for fifteen years, and the average yearly number of graduates in that time has been under a dozen. I have not gone back through the Public Accounts to see what it has cost every year, but this year it has cost the sum mentioned by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), amounting, after the deductions mentioned by the Minister of Militia, to about $2,660 per graduate; and it must be remembered that those graduates have been there four years and have cost about as much every year as they have this year, making a total of something over $10,500 for each of the dozen graduates turned out this year.

Mr. MULOCK. Eighteen graduates.

Mr. CASEY. Well, that increases the cost. The fact is that we are now educating the sons of wealthy men, and educating them at an expense that would keep them at Oxford or Cambridge and secure for them a thoroughly good general education. It is practically a college for the sons of the rich, kept up at the expense of the tax-payers all over the country, be they rich or poor. The hon. Minister is correct in saying that the cadets have to pay a portion of their expenses; but the institution is so costly in operation that besides the $2,660 which it costs us each year for each graduate, the sums paid by the fathers of those cadets are sufficient to prevent those of moderate means from sending their sons there. It is the dearest college in the country to the parents of the students, as well as the dearest college in the country to the state. I do not deny that a fair education is given there, though I do not think it gives as complete an education in mathematics as can be got at the Provincial University, at Queen's College, or at several other institutions in the country. But I deny that there is any justification for making a present of this enormous contribution of $10,000 for each cadet to the parents who are rich enough to send their sons to that college. it is virtually a present made by the tax-payer to the parent of the cadet, and the education, although a very fair one, is paid for at an infinitely extravagant rate by the country. Now, the Minister of Militia says that a hundred out of one hundred and seventy-five cadets in that college either hold Government positions or are in the Imperial Army, and nearly all are in the latter service. Thus, nearly half of those it costs us $10,000 apiece to educate are in the Imperial Army. What good does that do us? The hon. member for West Toronto says they will be only too glad to come back in case of need, but it does not rest with them to come back. They have to go where they are sent, and if the Imperial Government orders them elsewhere they must go there. They are as much attached to the Imperial service as if they had graduated at Sandhurst or Woolwich. More than that, he said they are, as it were, continuing their education, like the graduate of a college taking a post-graduate course in another college. Nothing of the kind. That might be true if they entered the Imperial Army for a fixed term and then returned here into our service. But they leave us for good, they not only learn their duties as soldiers, but acquire habits which unfit them to command Canadian volunteers. A man accustomed for a long term of years to command regular soldiers is not the man we want as battalion or company officer in Canada. He should not stay longer in the regular service than is necessary to learn the technique of his profession, and then come back and give his services to the country which has paid so enormously for his education. No cadet of Kingston should be allowed to accept a commission in the British Army without signing an agreement to come back at the end of a certain term of years, and then give his services to the Canadian volunteer force. If this entrance into the Imperial Army were limited to a short period of training like that, nobody could object, but I do absolutely protest against the tax-payers of Canada educating men at a cost of $10,500 each to fill positions in the Imperial Army. That army can afford to educate its own officers, and it is none of our business to educate officers for them. The Minister makes a great point of the fact that some of the officers are employed in the Mounted Police. Well, in the last fifteen years we had nine officers, graduates of Kingston, serving in the Canadian force, and two on the staff of the Military College itself. In return for the millions spent on this college we have eleven officers altogether serving on the Canadian force. Then we are told there are some in the Department of Railways and Canals. Well, we did not institute the Royal Military College of Canada for the purpose of educating engineers to serve in the Department of Railways and Canals. If that college had any object at all, if it was not a mere fad on the part of somebody, its object was to educate instructors and officers for our Canadian volunteer force, and in that it has utterly failed. I asked the Minister how many actually hold commissions in the volunteer force. He says they all get a certain rank on leaving the college; but how many have got commissions? He could not tell, nor could his deputy. It is a pretty state of things that, after all this expenditure, neither the Minister nor his

deputy can tell us whether one or how many of these expensive cadets of the Military College are doing any service in the military force in Canada. The whole thing is an utterly disgraceful failure. If it were really useful, it would not now be, in the fifteenth year of its existence, only turning out 12 graduates a year. If it had suited the genius of Canada, from 40 to 100 graduates would be turned out every year who would take commissions in the volunteers and do some service in return for the money spent on them. If you want a military college, why not have one to which volunteer officers could go and get an inexpensive training in drill and manœuvres and other matters which they need for the branch of the force to which they are attached. You do not need to give an officer of infantry volunteers any elaborate instruction in civil engineering and the use of heavy guns. The training is far above what is required of any infantry officer in the British Army, and then, what do we do with them? We do nothing. We give them away to the British Army. We let them go to the States, where they get occupations as civil engineers, and we loose sight of them altogether. It is a most disgraceful thing and a sign of the utter failure of the college that after all these years it is turning out so few cadets, and the Militia Department does not know what becomes of any of them except those who have commissions in the British Army and those who are employed in some branch of our service for which they were not intended when sent to the college. It would be true economy and patriotism, even after all we have spent, to shut it up and apply the building to some other use. The whole system should be changed, and it should be made a college from which volunteers of this country could be recruited with men highly trained in the duties belonging to their particular branch of the service. At present it is nothing but an aristocratic first-class school for the sons of rich men, and it is no part of our duty, as the Dominion Legislature, to provide such a school for that class of students. It is directly contrary to our duty. It is a waste of public money. I shall not go into details of the expenditure of the college, but I wish to impress on the Government what has fallen from the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) as to the accounts for maintenance and repair. It does seem to me that a college so well built in the first place, should not require, and, I believe, does not require, such a large amount of expenditure annually on repairs.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did General Herbert make a report on this college or not?

Mr. BOWELL. The deputy tells me he is not aware whether there was a report or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt, whatever, that the statements made by the Minister of Militia to-night, do point to a very grave defect in the working of this college. Of the 175 graduates to whom he has referred since the establishment of the college, it appears that 80 have found employment in the Imperial service, and a few more than 20 have found employment in the Canadian service. My friends beside me are quite right in stating that that was not the intention of those who founded the college. That college was founded, as was stated at the time, for the double purpose of supplying a number of trained officers for our own service in the first place, and in the second place, it was considered that it might be of very great service that a number of paid engineers should be at the disposal of the Government for use in various public works. There are many advantages to be found in having trained engineers, trained in an establishment like that, employed on the great works in the construction of which we have been engaged for a long time. But that college was planned originally for 120 cadets, and it was supposed that 24 or 30 would be admitted each year—I think it was 36 the first year and 24 thereafter. Now I understand the total number has sunk to 63. There is no doubt that that number is very far below what it should be, in view of the establishment now maintained in the college, and I am not altogether surprised at the criticisms of some of my hon. friends, as to the cost of this institution. Unless we should find that there are a sufficient number of persons in Canada interested in getting their sons into this institution to bring up the number to 24 or 30 per annum, these discrepancies will continue to exist. I have for many years insisted that the Government should carry out the pledge which was made by Mr. Mackenzie when he inaugurated this college, that a larger number of the qualified graduates should be employed in the Canadian service. The facts stated by the Minister of Militia, though I suppose it is no fault of his, showed very clearly that that implied pledge has never been carried out. This college has been sending out graduates for thirteen or fourteen years, and in that time we have found employment in Canada for only 22 or 23 out of 175 who passed. Leaving out the 100, I believe you will find that 50 or 60 of the remaining 75 have become citizens of the United States. That is not at all a state of things which conforms to the idea under which the college was founded, and I may take this opportunity to press upon the attention of the Minister of Militia the advisability of causing a certain number of employments in the military or the Civil Service to be placed at the disposal of the department for the best qualified graduates from year to year. We would thus derive a very considerable advantage from this college; but it is clear that, if the total number has been reduced from 120 to about 60, there will be a great objection raised on the question of the expense of the college.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to say that, in drawing attention to this matter, I do not want it to be thought that I was moved by any hostile feeling towards the college, but simply I was assuming that it was in the public interest that a college of this character should be maintained, if it is to be maintained, on an economical basis, and I feel that, in pointing out any abuses in connection with that college, I am doing good service to the public.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated that the college was intended for 120. The memorandum I have is that the present number is 63, but, if the dormitories are provided for, we would have a great many more. We have taken $50,000 for a few sessions past which has never been used, and I suggest that that might be struck out altogether until we can see whether a larger number can be accommodated at a smaller cost.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Two things require consideration in this matter. One is the economic point, and the other the use to be made of these young men after they have graduated. Our North-West Police force being of a semi-military character, there is an excellent opportunity to give employment to a number of these men whose scientific training would make them very serviceable in connection with that force. We know the eminent services which the West Point graduates have rendered in the United States, and this force could have absorbed a very considerable number of the graduates of this college, as well as the Departments of Railways and Public Works. It would be of no small consequence to the country, and would do away with a good deal of the opposition which this institution has met with of late, if the Government were to direct their attention in that direction, and were to endeavour to secure the employment of these parties in the public service where the public service would be benefited by the experience and information which they possessed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find we purchased a sword for $40 for presentation. I would like to know something about that. I would like to know to whom that sword was presented. I also see there was an advertisement in the Ottawa *Citizen* that cost $50. What was that for?

Mr. BOWELL. I really cannot tell you what the presentation sword was for.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this item should be held over until we find out why General Herbert has not reported on the condition of this college. What is the use of having a General if he is not to report on the Military College?

Mr. BOWELL. If you will look at the last paragraph of the Major-General's report you will see that he attaches to it a report made by the commandant of the school. There can be no object in holding over this item. But I will made enquiry and inform the committee when we go into committee again, why the General has not made a report.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that the item pass and that when the next item comes up, if any member desires to refer to the college again, the subject shall be open to discussion. Is that understood?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think that is a good way. We have been discussing, half the afternoon, items that are already passed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask whether it has been the custom in past years to provide boats and yachts for this school?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. There are 70 young men there, and they have got to be kept employed, they must have sources of amusement and enjoyment to keep them out of mischief in their idle hours. They are provided with an athletic gymnasium. Every one who has ever been in charge of a school knows that sources of amusement must be provided for the attendants.

Mr. McMULLEN. There must be plenty of yachts and boats for hire in the city of Kingston.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This is not in the city of Kingston; the college is two miles away.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Mr. BOWELL

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 19th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEATH OF THE HON. ALEXANDER MACKENZIE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that the first duty which the House owes to its own history and to the country, on re-assembling after the vacation, is to notice the great loss which the House has sustained, and which Canada has sustained, by the death of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). If it devolved upon me to-day—if it devolved upon anybody, indeed—to state the great public services, the estimable character and the worth of the late hon. member for East York, I would greatly prefer that that duty should have fallen to some of those among whom he served in public life when he was at his prime, because, when it was my good fortune and my honour to enter this Parliament, the hon. gentleman had ceased to take that active part in public affairs in which, for many years, he occupied so commanding a position and did himself so much honour and the country such useful, zealous services. Fortunately, however, for me, Mr. Speaker, the history of the country supplies what is deficient in myself in this regard. The achievements of the late hon. gentleman, his zeal in the public service, the great position which he attained, not only officially in this country in connection with its public affairs, but in the estimation of the people of Canada, are all part of the records of this country now. I can only say, on behalf of gentlemen who are co-operating with me in this Parliament, that I am expressing their sentiments when I state that the services which I have mentioned and the qualities which I have referred to evoked from us the greatest esteem—those of us who were in the House when he was active in political struggles and those of us who had not then entered on our duties here—and that we feel as deeply, as I am sure hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House must feel, that a great tribute of respect is due to the memory of the gentleman who devoted his great abilities, great zeal and great talents disinterestedly to the service of Canada. We feel, therefore, that it is incumbent upon the House out of respect, not only as I have said for its own history, but out of respect for the public feeling in Canada, that instead of transacting the business which is on the Order Paper to-day, we should ask an adjournment, and that the adjournment should take place until Thursday next in order that as many members of the House as feel able to do so may be present at the funeral obsequies which I understand are to take place in Toronto to-morrow. With these observations, Mr. Speaker, which I am sure but very feebly express the senti-

ments of the House, but which are very cordially given not only on my part but upon the part of those of whom I am the humble spokesman; I beg to move:

That when this House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Thursday next, in consequence of the lamented death of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, late member of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada, and out of respect to his memory.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, twelve months have not yet elapsed since death removed from among us the great man who had been for more than a quarter of a century the leader of the Conservative party, and the most prominent figure in the national life of Canada. His demise was mourned over by the whole country, friends and foes forgetting the differences of opinion which had divided them only to remember these greater qualities which commanded universal admiration. This day we have to deplore the loss of one who was for many years the chief opponent of Sir John Macdonald, and who was in many ways as richly, although differently endowed from himself, and who was undoubtedly in the estimation of all, I believe, the strongest character whom Canada has seen for many a day. On this occasion again I am glad to know—indeed I knew it even before the Minister of Justice spoke—that all parties, friends and foes alike, unite in a common and very very sincere grief. Although upon this occasion grief cannot assume the same intensity of expression which it assumed on the other occasion, there are various obvious reasons for that. It was Sir John Macdonald's good luck that he was struck standing at his post, that he died in harness, that he was removed under the very gaze of the public eye from the field of active strife to eternal rest; whereas it was Mr. Mackenzie's misfortune that he survived for many years his own self. For many years he has been prostrated by illness; and though his heart continued as warm and his mind as active as ever, his physical frame was fatally shattered. He was condemned to silence, his services were lost to the country, and the public had long been reconciled to the painful idea of his death. There can be no doubt whatever that to one of so strong and energetic a nature, these years of inactivity and of prostration must have been years of intense suffering and that death whenever it came was looked upon as a relief. At last, in the very hour of Easter day, of that day which in the faith of Christians is the symbol of victory over death, his long imprisoned soul was released from its shackles, and he now lives forever. Already the Canadian people appreciate the magnitude of the loss they have suffered; and, indeed, Mr. Mackenzie was a unique man in his day. Living in an age which was not particularly distinguished for staunch adherence to principle, he always was the unbending champion of right, as God gave him to see the right. Living in an age where success was very often held to be the primary consideration success was never with him a primary nor even a secondary consideration. He strove for the right as he saw the right, and indeed it is a matter of history that when he was in office he could have conciliated public opinion and perhaps continued to enjoy power if he had consented to deviate ever so little from those principles of political economy which alone he held to be true. But on this occasion his stern character again asserted itself: he risked everything, and he lost all, and he did it cheerfully. Such examples are rarely met, if ever, in our own day; and to find any parallel you have to go back to the days of Puritan England, when men fought and bled for principle, holding any kind of compromise in scorn. Such were the principal qualities which distinguished, I believe above all others, Mr. Mackenzie's career. Indeed, his strong qualities as a public man are well known. There was, however, another aspect of his character little known to the public and perhaps entirely misconceived, but well known to those who had the privilege of his friendship. He was supposed to be stern, cold and ungracious; but the very reverse was the truth. He was richly endowed with that quaint humour peculiar to his own race, little to be suspected under a somewhat reticent exterior, but to which the unrestraint of intimate life acted as a stimulant, and which then broke forth into copious and rich fancy. To those who had the privilege of his hospitality he was one of the most agreeable of men; and with that he had a kind heart, a most kind heart indeed, which always responded generously when properly appealed to. In many ways Mr. Mackenzie was an exceptional man. I may say—and I am sure that in this all will agree with me—that he united many qualities seldom found together, and which combined made him one of the truest and strongest characters to be met with in Canadian history. I second the motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to make a few observations to the House on the important subject now before us. It was my good fortune, Sir, to be very intimately connected with the late member for East York. I knew him before I became a member of this House. I enjoyed his confidence and his friendship during his public career in Parliament; and I am sure, Sir, that when he ceased to be able to discharge the duties in which he took a prominent part in this House, the country felt that it sustained a very great loss. I do not think, Sir, that there has been in my day, nor do I know that there was in any earlier period in Canadian history, a representative of the people in this House who in a larger degree enjoyed their confidence as a man. I am confident of this, Sir, that however much many of those outside of Parliament and those who are representatives in Parliament may have differed from him, no one questioned his high character, his disinterested motives, and his fidelity to his convictions, whether they were held to be right or wrong. He implicitly believed that that cause which he espoused, those principles which he advocated, were those which if they could be made successful would best serve the interests of the people of Canada. Mr. Mackenzie in early life had not the opportunities for intellectual culture and education that were enjoyed by some others; but no greater mistake could be made than to suppose that he was a man of very great natural ability and nothing more. I do not think I ever met one of a more retentive memory, or one who was more industrious as a student than the late member for East York. He had an extraordinarily retentive memory, and there were few things embraced in English historical or political literature with which he was not conversant. Few men sit in this Parliament or have sat in it at any former period, who were better informed than he was. All know his very great debating ability. Few sat in

this Parliament when he was in the prime of life and are here now who do not remember his extraordinary readiness as a debater, and few will say that he ever mingled anything like personal bitterness with the subject of controversy, however warmly he may have espoused the side which he believed to be for the best. I am sure, Sir, that all hon. gentlemen in this House, whether they are members of the Conservative party or members of the Reform party, will feel that the country has lost a representative of extraordinary ability, of very great integrity—a man of very keen and tender sympathies, whom it will be very difficult to replace in this House for a long time to come.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 21st April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Newton Ramsay Colter, Esq., for the Electoral District of Carleton, N.B.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

NEWTON RAMSAY COLTER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Carleton, N.B.; introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Gillmor.

LAW OF EVIDENCE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 69) respecting Evidence. He said: This Bill is not a long one, but it contains the clauses which I referred to in moving the second reading of the Criminal Law Bill, that is, the clauses which will regulate the taking of evidence in criminal suits, including an amendment to enable a defendant to testify in his own cause, and other provisions relating to evidence in proceedings over which this Parliament has jurisdiction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT CHATHAM.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the Collector of Customs at Chatham (Mr. J. G. Pennefather) has been superannuated? If so, the date of his retirement, and the amount of superannuation allowance granted him yearly? Who has been appointed in his place, his age and amount of salary, and the amount of salary paid the recent occupant?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Pennefather has been superannuated. The said superannuation took effect on the 1st of April last. His salary at the time of superannuation was $1,200 per annum, and his annual allowance is $840. Having served the full time, that is, over 35 years, he claims the maximum superannuation allowance. Mr. Rufus Stephenson has been appointed his successor at the same salary, $1,200 per annum. His age is 57 years.

J. B. LEPAGE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. CAMPBELL) asked, Whether J. B. Lepage is in the employ of the Government? If so, in what department is he employed? What are his duties, and what is his salary? If not now in the employ of the Government, when did he retire, and why?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Lepage is in the Department of the Interior. His duties are connected with the Surveyor General's Branch, in the engraving branch. His salary is, I believe, $75 a month and a fraction over. I find I have not the memorandum of the answer with me, but that is my impression. If it is incorrect I will inform the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts and to provide that the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ontario shall be as follows:—

The Chief Justice of Ontario	$7,000 per annum.
Three Justices of Appeal, each	6,000 "
The Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench	7,000 "
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division, each	6,000 "
The Chancellor of Ontario	7,000 "
Three Judges of the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division, each	6,000 "
The Chief Justice of the Common Pleas	7,000 "
Two Judges of the High Court of Justice, Common Pleas Division, each	6,000 "

If the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, the Chancellor of Ontario or the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas is appointed to the Court of Appeal, the Governor in Council may direct that he be paid a salary not less than that previously enjoyed by him as such Chief Justice or Chancellor.

2. That the salaries of the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench and of the Superior Court in the Province of Quebec shall be as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench	$7,000 per annum.
Five puisne Judges of the said court, each	6,000 "
The Chief Justice of the Superior Court	7,000 "
Thirteen puisne Judges of the said Superior Court, whose residences, within the judicial districts respectively assigned to them, are fixed in the cities of Montreal or Quebec, each	6,000 "
Sixteen puisne Judges of the said Superior Court, each	4,500 "
The Judge appointed to perform at Quebec the duties of the Chief Justice of the said Superior Court, if the Chief Justice resides at Montreal; or the Judge appointed to perform such duties at Montreal, if the Chief Justice resides at Quebec,—in addition to his other salary	1,000 "

3. That the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of Nova Scotia shall be as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the said court..	$6,000 per annum.
Six Judges of the said court, each..	5,000 "

4. That the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of New Brunswick shall be as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the said court..	$6,000 per annum.
The Judge in Equity	5,000 "
Four puisne Judges of the said court, each	5,000 "

5. That the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the Province of Prince Edward Island shall be as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the said court..	$5,000 per annum.
One assistant Judge, being also Master of the Rolls in Chancery.	4,500 "
One assistant Judge, being also Vice-Chancellor	4,500 "

All fees heretofore payable to the said judges are abolished.

6. That the salaries of the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Manitoba shall be as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the said court	$6,000 per annum.
Three puisne Judges of the said court, each.....	5,000 "

7. That the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court for the Province of British Columbia shall be as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the said court	$6,000 per annum.
Four puisne Judges of the said court, each.....	5,000 "

8. That the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories shall be as follows:—

Five puisne Judges of the said court, each	$5,000 per annum.

9. That the thirteenth section of the said Act is amended:

(*a*) By inserting after the word "Toronto" in the seventh line thereof, the following words, that is to say: "Provided that no judge shall be paid at any such rate for more than ten courts in any one year, and that for attending each additional court he shall be paid six dollars for each day's absence from his place of residence, together with his actual disbursements for conveyance."

(*b*) By inserting after the word "side" in the tenth line thereof, the following words, that is to say: "or extraordinary or additional term of the court."

(*c*) By inserting after the word "term" in the twenty-third line thereof, the following words, that is to say: "or extraordinary or additional term."

(*d*) By inserting after the word "dollars" in the fifteenth line thereof, the following words, that is to say: "To each of the judges in the Court of Queen's Bench and to any judge of the Superior Court acting as Assistant Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench or appointed to replace a judge thereof in case of incompetency, absence, suspension or leave of absence, for every extra day of a term, and for every day's attendance elsewhere than at his place of residence, at any délibéré fixed by the Chief Justice, or the senior judge, six dollars."

10. That there shall hereafter be paid to each Trial Judge of an election petition under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act for each day he is absent from his place of residence, six dollars, together with his actual disbursements for conveyance, and no more.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Works, for the fiscal year 1890-91. -Mr. Ouimet.

THE LATE DUKE OF CLARENCE AND AVONDALE.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a despatch which he has received from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reply to an address to their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, expressing the sincere and deep sympathy of the people of Canada with their Royal Highnesses on the occasion of the lamented death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 20th April, 1892.

(Copy.)

Lord Knutsford to Lord Stanley of Preston, Canada.

[No. 80.]

DOWNING STREET, 31st March, 1892.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's despatch, No. 81, of the 11th inst., and to acquaint you that I have communicated to their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales the addresses accompanying it which were presented to you by the Senate and House of Commons of Canada on the occasion of the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale.

The Prince and Princess of Wales have been much touched by these expressions of condolence, and have desired me to request that Your Lordship will convey to both Houses of the Legislature of the Dominion their best thanks for the sympathy expressed in these addresses, which has been an additional solace to them in their bereavement.

I have, &c.,
(Sgd.) KNUTSFORD.

Governor General,
&c., &c., &c.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 13) to further amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. The Bill, as originally presented, has been reprinted. The changes are not radical, but simply the form and language have been made more suitable to the case. The first section, which is the same in the original Bill, is simply to conform to the resolution of the marine conference held in Washington, by providing that the Act will extend to the use of electricity or gas in navigation. The second clause is simply for this purpose: Some time ago it appeared that steamers were plying between ports in Canada and ports in the United States, carrying passengers, and it was feared that some of them were not in proper condition. The Steamboat Inspection Act was, therefore, made applicable to such steamers, but it has been found that in doing so we obliged ourselves to apply every provision of the Act in every case though such inspection be not necessary. There was no power in the Governor in Council to make a certain feature of the ship subject to the provisions of the Act. For instance, take the engines and boilers, we had to make the whole ship subject to the Act though the engineer was perfectly efficient and there was no necessity to apply that portion of the Act. This amendment gives the Governor in Council power to apply parts of the Act, and not needlessly embarrass a ship which has a regularly certificated officer, and so on. Under the provisions of the old Act, the engineers required to have certificates from us, and therefore the question of nationality came in, which would lead to a very awkward position of affairs if we insisted on it. We had no choice. When we find their engineers duly certificated, according to their own laws, we have no desire to insist that they should have certificates from us.

On section 3.

Mr. TUPPER. At present the Board of Engineers or Inspectors must meet whether there is business for them to transact or not, and they must meet at a certain place every year, and all this expense is charged to the Steamboat Inspection fund. It has been my effort to keep that expenditure down, as far as possible, in order to prevent the necessity arising for increasing the rates on

steamers in order to supply money which would be required. Sometimes the rate is 7 cents a ton on a vessel, and it was originally 10 cents a ton, and the amount varies according to whether the expenses are increased or reduced. I found last year that I was bound by the law to convene these officers, and their expenses were paid out of the fund. Under this section, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have power to say when and where the meetings of the board shall take place. That is the only difference.

Mr. WELSH, I do not altogether approve of this clause. I think there should be a time named, so that we should understand when they are to meet. I think it is putting great power into the hands of this board and into the hands of the Governor in Council, and, as a shipping man, I think we should have the duties of engineers prescribed in the Act, and all the rules and regulations affecting the steamboat interest. I do not approve of putting all the power in the hands of the board or the Governor in Council. We do not know what arbitrary rules and regulations may be approved by the board or by the Governor in Council, and the steamboat interest might suffer. If it were stated here in this Act what they intended to do, what the duties of the engineers were and what other matters they intended to decide, this House might have an entirely different opinion from that of the board or of the Governor in Council. I think this is putting the shipping interest at the mercy of people who perhaps do not fully understand the requirements of the day, and at all events it is very vague.

Mr. TUPPER. I think I can satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. Welsh) that there is no danger in this clause, nor is there any great change made. We do not propose to interfere with the advisory powers of the Board of Inspection, and, as I said before, the point is to enable us to so regulate these meetings that they shall not occur unnecessarily and that the expense levied on the shipping interest shall not therefore be so large as it would otherwise be.

Mr. LAURIER. How many inspectors have you?

Mr. TUPPER. Speaking from memory, I think there are ten.

Mr. LAURIER. And they meet at Quebec?

Mr. TUPPER. They meet at Toronto.

Mr. WELSH. I think the inspectors in the Maritime Provinces are very satisfactory, but I may say that I hope the Minister of Marine will not require to come down here year after year to patch up these Acts. It would require a couple of legal men to decide now what steamboat men have to do. I hope to goodness there will be such amendments made to the law that no more will be required for twenty years.

On section 4,

Mr. CHARLTON. Why is this power to be delegated to the Governor in Council? It is a very important matter and it should be defined in the Steamboat Inspection Act. We are too much in the habit of relegating our powers to the Governor in Council. We do not question the ability of the Governor in Council to do this, but we think this matter should be thoroughly discussed and clearly understood, and the views of steamboat men in this House should be given as to the number of boats which a steamboat is to be allowed to carry.

Mr. TUPPER. This is a very important provision. It sweeps out of existence a number of rules under the 29th section of the old Act. In regard to the assumption of this power by the Governor in Council, in actual practice in matters of this kind affecting the navigation of steamers and the equipment of boats for the safety of life, the Governor in Council, and the Marine Department particularly, are governed almost entirely by the opinions of experts. In England the Board of Trade represents almost entirely the Marine Department in this respect, and there frequently changes are required in connection with the changes in construction and building of vessels. Then, new rules and regulations are issued at once which govern all concerned, subject to the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act. In Canada—as I submit, unwisely—when Parliament was endeavouring to assume similar powers, instead of putting the exercise of those powers practically in the hands of the nautical advisers of the Crown by leaving it to the decision of the Governor in Council, they put it in the main statute. In my brief experience, we have found that, as to the inspection of boilers for instance, it entailed a great loss to steamship owners if the rules which applied some years ago were still enforced, when they did not at all apply to the boilers which are constructed now. That view was pressed on the Government, and it was found that the existing legislation could give no remedy until Parliament met, and that, even in regard to ships constructed according to modern requirements and according to the rules of the Board of Trade in England, they could not get the proper certificate until Parliament here met to consider the matter. Now, I ventured to come to Parliament a year or two ago in reference to that very question, and Parliament entrusted the Government with that discretion, and a board of steamboat inspectors was allowed to frame these rules subject to the approval of Council. Now, instead of there being a long number of sections, in force in the statute concerning the machinery of a ship, the proper provisions are included in the regulations framed under an Order of Council, and there has been not only an entire absence of embarrassment on the part of the owners of steamships in that connection, but no dangerous consequences have resulted. Therefore, in that regard, the Marine Department have, practically, under the Governor in Council, the same discretion that is exercised in these matters by the Board of Trade in England. Now a very strong case comes up. We give to no one discretion, neither to the Marine Department, nor to the officers of the department, nor to inspectors, and it was found absolutely necessary to tie up, as they are now tied up, certain steamers in connection with the River St. John navigation, which in the opinion of the very eminent and very capable inspector at that port, Mr. Coker, were fitted up with the necessary appliances for the safety of life on those waters, and on tidal waters. For instance, the statute says that the lifeboat on each steamship must be constructed in a certain way, that it must be a metallic life-boat: that was a part of the old rules that were in

force years ago when that statute was before Parliament, and it was also found in the rules of the British Board of Trade. Now, I have been applied to, time after time, to allow these vessels to be given a permit where the officer was satisfied there were sufficient appliances on board for the safety of life in case of accident. But I had no discretion. I had to answer that this was a matter under the control of Parliament, that Parliament had not entrusted me with discretion in the matter, and I could not, without consulting Parliament, take the responsibility involved in departing from the law. And so I had to wait until the law of the country was changed. I propose now to give that permission, so that on the inspector at St. John being satisfied that a boat is properly equipped, with appliances for the safety of passengers, she may be cleared. If hon. gentlemen object to that I shall at once take a different stand, and wait until this Parliament has formally adopted such a law. Now, then, all I ask Parliament to do in this connection is, that in so far as equipment with boats and life-buoys is set out in this provision of the Steamboat Act, they should put this responsibility on the shoulders of the Marine Department and the Governor in Council, where the responsibility in reference to the inspection of steamboats and the machinery of steamboats now lies. I will say, in conclusion, that in this respect we will be doing as is done in England where the Board of Trade framed these rules, but unfortunately we did not follow their example, but put the rules in the shape of a statutory enactment.

Mr. HAZEN. I think the change proposed in this Bill is not only a very proper one, but a very necessary one. The Minister has pointed out that in consequence of the law being as it is at the present time, the steamboat business—and that means the whole of the business on the River St. John—is being very greatly injured during the present season: the steamboats are delayed in going on the route, thus causing great damage to business in that section of the country. Though the Steamboat Inspection Act has been on the Statute-book for some nine or ten years, the fact is that this provision of it has never been strictly enforced. That Act requires that steamers over a certain tonnage, I think and that relates to every steamer that carries passengers on the River St. John—shall be supplied with metallic life-boats and also with buckets made out of metal. I may say that up to the present time that provision of the statute has never been enforced.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman mean generally, or specially with reference to the boats on the River St. John?

Mr. HAZEN. I mean specially with reference to boats on the River St. John. I do not pretend to speak with regard to the others, as I do not know. But I say that so far as those boats on the River St. John are concerned, though that Act has been on the Statute-book for nine or ten years, up to the present season that provision of the law has not been enforced, and these vessels which have not had metallic life-boats, and which have not had metallic buckets, have been allowed to go up and down the river carrying passengers and transacting other business, and have received the certificates that it was necessary for them to receive from the steamboat inspector for the Province of New Brunswick, before they were allowed to transact business. Now, for some reason which I do not know, this year the attention of the steamboat inspector for the Province of New Brunswick was expressly drawn to this provision of the law, and he was obliged to tell the owners of these boats running from the city of St. John up to Fredericton, that until they provided their vessels, as required by law, with metallic life-boats and buckets made out of metal, he would have to withhold their certificates, and would not allow them to start on their voyage up the river. The result of that action is that at the present time there are lying in the city of St. John, or were a day or two ago, a number of vessels engaged for business of carrying passengers and freight, freight which was waiting for them at different points along the river, but they have not been able to proceed up the river and transact that business which is necessary to be transacted in the interest of the country, and which has been transacted under the same conditions for the last nine or ten years. Everybody who has given attention to the matter knows that there is no necessity for boats of that sort to carry metallic life-boats; that provision is not necessary in the interest of passengers who travel on those boats. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) knows that boats registered under the American Record Register, or at Lloyds', or under the Bureau Veritas, boats going to distant parts of the world are allowed now to carry wooden life-boats instead of metallic life-boats, as they were required to do some years ago. The provision is antiquated, it is obsolete, there is no necessity for it, and the passengers are much safer in the inland waters, and I think in ocean waters also, on boats fitted out with wooden life-boats instead of metallic life-boats, because in case of accident wooden life-boats are very easily repaired, while a metallic life-boat has to be sent off to a blacksmith shop or other place where special skill can be obtained to put it in repair. The same thing is true of metallic buckets: they are not necessary on board steamers of this sort. Wooden buckets are all that is necessary in case of fire. Further than that, I have heard a gentleman, experienced in these matters, say that wooden buckets are preferable in every case, because in case of accident they may serve as life-buoys and can be thrown out to men in distress. If they get out of order they can very easily be repaired by almost any man capable of using tools, whereas it requires a skilled workman to put metallic buckets in condition when they get out of repair. The result of that law is, it being a statutory enactment, and no discretionary power being left in the hands of the Governor in Council, that the business on the St. John River has this year, to a great extent, been paralysed. Had there been a provision of the sort proposed on the Statute-book, people there who are interested in steamers could have applied to the Governor in Council, and he could have made the necessary change in order to enable these steamboats to go on their way and do business. But the law being a statutory provision, the Minister of Marine was obliged to tell the people who came to him for relief that he had no discretion in the matter, that the law must be carried out so far as he was concerned, and that he could not change it by any regulation of the department or by Order in Council. I must say that I am pleased to hear the Minister

say that it is his intention, unless objection is taken to his proposal by the House, not to enforce that regulation for the present; and that if the inspector of steamboats there, Mr. Coker—who, as he says, is a most competent man in every respect—says that a boat is properly equipped for the safety of passengers, he may allow it to start, though it may not have metallic life-boats and buckets, anticipating that this law will be passed, as I trust it will be, by the House. These regulations were especially obnoxious and especially burdensome when applied to a river like the St. John. Any hon. gentleman acquainted with that river knows that if a steamer should strike a snag, or a fire should break out, the vessel could within a few minutes be run to either bank, and the passengers could get ashore without danger to life. If a boiler explosion occurred, we all know that metallic life-boats would be of very little use. There are scarcely any of the river steamers carrying passengers up the St. John and the different lakes connected with it, but possess at different points along the shore their own boats, or boats belonging to the company, well equipped with oars, which could be used as life-boats, and these boats may be found at different points within one or two miles distant of one another, where they are used for taking passengers and mails from the shore to the steamers. I, therefore, sincerely trust that no hon. gentleman will raise the slightest objection to what the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said, that he proposes to telegraph at once, and he cannot do it too soon, that if the inspector of steamboats at St. John is of the opinion that the boats now on the steamers and the buckets are, in his judgment, sufficient for the protection of life and property, he may give the boats certificates and allow them to proceed, although they may not have metallic life-boats and buckets, which they have never had, although this law has been on the Statute-book for the last nine years. The matter is one of very deep interest to all the river counties in New Brunswick, and to all the people of St. John. The law, if carried out, will prove generally vexatious and annoying there, and all the more annoying because for many years it has not been carried out; for just as the owners are ready to send the steamboats up the river and commence the season's business, the inspector, doing no more than his duty—I do not complain with respect to him,—has his attention drawn to this provision of the Act, that unless a steamboat is provided with metallic life-boats, which they are unable to secure at present and which would have to be made to order, and could not, therefore, be procured for months, it cannot proceed, and the whole business of the river counties may thus be paralysed for the whole season.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The speech of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) is a singular commentary on the legislation of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and of the readiness with which hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to give their support to every proposition that the Government submits to this House for its consideration. I think the objections just made by that hon. gentleman show the importance of this House giving something more than a holiday to its mind when measures relating to matters of importance are submitted by the various departments of the Government. I think the observations of the hon. gentleman show that it is quite time that this House should give a little attention to the discharge of those duties which devolve upon it respecting the subject of legislation. What does the hon. gentleman say? The hon. gentleman says that this measure which was brought down to the House by the Government some eight years ago, which was submitted to the House and sanctioned by hon. gentlemen opposite, which received the support of the vast majority of the followers of hon. gentlemen opposite, is a measure that has not yet been put into operation, and if it had been put into operation, it would have practically paralysed the commerce and business of the country carried on by means of steamboats. That is the declaration which the hon. gentleman has made. I should like to know whether it is not time, if that is so, that this House, instead of acting as a mere registering body, endorsing all measures submitted to it by the Administration, should give a little attention to its business, and exercise something like judgment in the consideration of measures submitted by the Administration? Now the hon. gentleman proposes legislation by telegram. He says that the Minister, with the sanction of this House, should telegraph that this law should remain inoperative—I am not objecting to the law being allowed to remain as it has remained eight years—for a short period longer, until it is seen what action this House will take on the subject. But it seems to me a very extraordinary state of things that we are asked every session to amend laws relating to the administration of affairs by the various departments, and we are from time to time assured by the supporters of the Administration that laws are being allowed to remain a dead letter under the statute, that no attempt has been made to make them operative, and that if they had been made operative they would have proved disastrous to the country. That is the commentary of the hon. gentleman; that is the statement which the hon. gentleman has made. Did not the hon. gentleman know, did not other hon. gentlemen know, that this measure, if put into operation, would be mischievous? Did they not know all about the character of the life-boats that were required under the law? Did not the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Hazen) himself know, in fact he must have known, that if this measure was put into operation the disastrous effects, which he says are now flowing from it, would have flowed the very moment an attempt was made to obey the law. I think the observations of the hon. gentleman constitute the most severe criticism that could be passed upon the legislation which has been submitted to this House from time to time by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think the criticisms of the hon. gentleman go to show that those measures which the Minister of Marine, in the discharge of his duties as Minister, has felt it necessary to submit to this House, must have been inadequately considered in the department before they were submitted to Parliament for its sanction. It is high time that Parliament should give a little attention to its own business and take less on trust than it has been in the habit of doing during a few years past.

Mr. HAZEN. I have listened with pleasure, as I always do, to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); but if there is anything in what he says, and perhaps there is, it refers more

particularly to the hon. gentleman than it possibly can to me, because when this Act was before Parliament the hon. gentleman was sitting in the House, and I did not at that time have the honour of being a member. So the hon. gentleman's criticism as applied to me possesses a great deal more force when applied to the hon. gentleman himself, and those associated with him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We criticised the measure and were voted down.

Mr. HAZEN. While the hon. gentleman's remarks are intended to be a criticism on the action of the Minister who introduced the measure, while he reflects on the supporters of the Government because they did not discuss this legislation when it was going through the House, I do not think—of course I cannot speak from recollection, not being here—when the Bill went through that this provision received the slightest criticism from the hon. gentleman or those who were sitting on the opposite side of the House at that time. If it is proper to assail the Government supporters because they improperly allowed this legislation to pass, I think the course must be equally improper on the part of hon. gentlemen who allowed the measure to pass without opposite criticism.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member had better look at the debates on that question before he makes that criticism.

Mr. HAZEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that this feature of the measure was criticised by himself or by hon. gentlemen opposite? I do not understand the hon. gentleman to say so. The hon. gentleman says I had better look at the debates. I may tell the hon. gentleman that he had better look at the debates himself and see what occurred. The hon. gentleman has not done so, nor have I; and when he makes the remarks he has offered with respect to the Government supporters without taking the trouble to look at the debates, it is equally fair to apply his remarks to himself and those sitting around him. But, Mr. Chairman, further than that, with regard to his criticism of the members on this side of the House I may say that so far as the River St. John is concerned, that in the year 1882, when I believe this legislation was passed, I think without one single exception every county on the St. John River was represented in Parliament by gentlemen whose political views were not in harmony with those of the Administration of the day. If, therefore, there is any point in the charge that members from that locality neglected their duty, the hon. gentleman is striking a severe blow at those who where associated with him from the St. John River counties in the Province of New Brunswick at that time, and who did not endeavour to prevent the passage of that measure. But times have changed. This is not a measure which we want to discuss from a party standpoint, and the little by-play between my hon. friend and myself will be taken for what it is worth, of course. I desire to say in fairness to the gentlemen who were in Parliament in those days, that there was a time when the Lloyds, and the Bureau Veritas, and the American Record Register, required these life-boats to be of metal. That day has passed, and wood has taken its place; but at the time this Bill was passed, it was, I think, thought that metal was perhaps better than wood for a life-boat. The hon. gentleman has stated that I, living in the city of St. John, must have known that the Bill if put into operation, would work an injury to our business on the River St. John. I am free to confess that I never knew there was such a provision in the Bill, and further, I desire to say that the steamboat owners and others interested did not know there was such a provision in the Bill, and it came to them almost like a clap of thunder out of a clear sky when they were informed this year that such was the law, and that they would be required to comply with it. The provision is useless, and I sincerely trust there will be no hostility to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries carrying out his idea of allowing the inspector to use his own discretion until this Bill now under consideration becomes law.

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the remarks which have fallen from my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen). I think the best way to remedy this evil is to alter the clause in the Steamboat Inspection Act so as to allow life-boats to be made of wood or suitable metal with life-lines attached. It is quite easy to remedy the defect in the law as it at present stands, and had I been in the House when this Bill passed, I would have taken objection to it. As the member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) says, it came like a thunder-clap on them when they were told that they would have to change their life-boats and use metal instead of wooden ones. Suppose a metal life-boat is on board a ship at sea, and it gets damaged I would like to know how was it going to be repaired; whereas if a wooden life-boat gets damaged, it is very easy to repair it at sea. The law as it at present stands is a bad law, and it should be remedied by making it optional to use wood or metal. Hon. members in this House may not all be sailors, and they may not know the technicalities connected with the business. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) finds fault with my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) for being in the House and allowing this clause to pass without objection. He must remember that every lawyer is not fully acquainted with life-boats, and I presume my hon. friend from St. John would not himself know so much about them, if some one had not posted him on the subject.

Mr. HAZEN. That is so.

Mr. WELSH. I thought so. I hope, now that this matter is brought before Parliament, that the clause will be amended by inserting "wood" or "metal." I would ask hon. members, whether they are sailors or soldiers, whether they would rather depend on a good metal bucket or on a good wooden bucket.

An hon. MEMBER. It depends on what is in it.

Mr. WELSH. I say I would depend on the wooden bucket. Now that this matter has been brought forward, I trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will adopt the suggestions offered to him and alter this clause in the original Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Minister proposes to amend an Act which his predecessor introduced some eight or ten years ago.

Mr. TUPPER. Sixteen years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Some criticism has been indulged in by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), on the ground that the objections were not pointed out when this Act was introduced. The

hon. gentleman will see that it was introduced by the then Minister of Marine, who stated that it was an Act simply incorporating the regulations adopted by the Board of Trade in England, and nobody would think of objecting to the measure under these circumstances. The criticism which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) administered was, that for a number of years past we have been deluged with Acts, from the Marine Department particularly, amending the statutes in force, and that they were introduced improvidently very often, and had not that consideration given them which the importance of the legislation justifies. I understand that the Act now before us, which is a re-enactment of the regulations of the Imperial Board of Trade, is objected to on certain grounds. The hon. Minister does not propose to remove the objection by substituting "wood" in addition to metal, but he proposes to repeal the section altogether and vest the power in the Governor in Council to make regulations in lieu of the provisions of the section. I have always been opposed to that kind of legislation, and I think this House ought to pause before delegating to the Governor in Council powers which heretofore it has exercised itself. The Minister will see, if he will turn to the statute before him, that the statutory regulation was not a hard and fast regulation in every particular. In some respects the House delegated a discretion to the Minister, and whether that discretion is large enough or not I am not prepared to say: but if the Minister tells us that the discretion is too limited and desires to have it enlarged, I would suggest to him to legislate in that direction. I would call his attention to the 7th sub-section of the section now under consideration, which says:

"The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may authorize the use in individual specified cases of boats of different dimensions from those heretofore specified."

That is confined to the dimensions of the boats, but if he also incorporates the material of which the boat is built he has all the power he wants and Parliament still retains the power which I think it ought to retain, unless very good cause is shown against it. I submit that as a proposition which ought to be our controlling guide in legislation: *primâ facie*, Parliament should retain the control over all these matters. If a thoroughly good case is made out by the Minister of a department and he shows Parliament that the public interest demands that such power should be delegated to him, well and good, but these instances will be rare, and they should be backed up with very powerful arguments before Parliament should yield to them. In this case I have no objection to what the hon. gentleman has said. It is evident that nautical men on both sides of the House agree that the boats might be in some cases of wood as well as of metal. He could attain that object by investing himself with the discretion which I speak of. I want to point out to the hon. member for St. John that this Act does not say anything about the buckets. It does not give the Minister any power in regard to them, and it does not change the statutory declaration that the buckets shall be of a certain material. Therefore all this talk about buckets is outside the question. If that section of the Act relating to buckets, section 34, requires to be amended, you had better amend the Act in that direction, or give the Minister power to substitute a different kind of material for metal. All I ask is that you should not continue this vicious system of withdrawing power from Parliament and vesting it in the department. When the law is on the Statute-book, merchants, shipowners, mariners and others have access to it at all times and can find out what it is; but if the law is made by the department, it is almost impossible for an average man to find out what it is. These rules and regulations are subject to alteration at the whim of the Deputy Minister for the time being or at the whim of some one who has the ear of the Deputy Minister, and without any consultation with those chiefly affected by it, who wake up some morning to find legislation made by the department which nobody knew anything about.

Mr. TUPPER. Of course, I do not grudge the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) his opportunity to scold the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and altogether the scolding was very good-natured. But he attempted to put on my shoulders some blame which I thought at the time I would just as soon not have left there. There is nothing so very extraordinary in the fact that the inspectors assumed that there was a discretion in regard to the material in these life-boats. The remarks of the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), will indicate the reasons for inspectors having hitherto assumed that these clauses were not so hard and fast. He has drawn the attention of the House to the fact that in the 7th sub-section Parliament did leave discretion in the Department of Marine, as to altering all the statutory provisions except as to the material. It said that it was possible to dispense with the provision that a boat should be of a certain length, width and depth; and I think the hon. member for Queen's, and the hon. member for Bothwell himself, will admit that a layman would not be very reprehensible for reading the 7th section as practically having that effect. But I may state how this was drawn to my attention. The fact was that the inspectors in Canada assumed hitherto that they possessed a discretion in connection with the administration of their duties, and it was not known to the department, when the certificate was given, whether all things were complied with, or whether there had been any incorrect understanding or appreciation of their duties. There is nothing extraordinary in that, and the moment it came to the attention of the department that a discretion of this kind was being exercised, then enquiry was made whether the opinion of the inspectors in this particular was correct—not from an amending spirit, or from any whim of a Deputy Minister of Marine. As a matter of fact, the Deputy Minister had nothing to do with the subject until it came to him in the ordinary way, that is, on the report of the nautical inspectors of the department, after this subject was brought formally to their notice. These are the facts, and they make absolutely necessary an application to Parliament. The committee have entirely misunderstood my position. I am not concerned whose mistake this was, if it is a mistake at all. I have no doubt that at the time it was considered a wise provision, and at the time there was apparent unanimity in its favour. In passing, I find that in 31, 32, 36, 37, 40 and 44 Victoria, statutes were passed on this very subject, and

there will be, I do not care under what Government, frequent applications to Parliament in connection with the shipping law. In the Imperial Parliament you will find an enormous number of representatives of the shipping interest, experts and representatives of the Admiralty, and yet there the statutes are full of amendments to the Merchants' Shipping Act; and the complaint made on behalf of the steamboat owners as to the difficulty of finding what the law is, might very often come from the professional man in England, who requires to search considerably to find out the various amendments to the Shipping Act. But the case of the ship-owner is not so bad. He receives full notice of all these amendments from the Board of Trade of England, and they are put in the most conspicuous places: in fact his attention is called to them time and again. In Canada, we attempt to do the same thing. We publish in the *Gazette* the rules and regulations, and the Marine Department, to my certain knowledge, follows the subject up again and again. The reason this law was to a certain extent inoperative in some districts was that the inspectors assumed, and not unreasonably, that they had some discretion in the matter, and they gave their services to the shipowners who read the law as the inspector for the district read it. The committee have not appreciated the one great question before them now. It is not a novel one. Regardless of the particular merits of metal or wooden boats, and I am not an authority in either, I am asking Parliament that the Marine Department of this country shall be credited with the same ability to handle the shipping regulations that the Board of Trade possesses *quoad* British shipping. It is a proud boast, and has been alluded to, that this Parliament is able to judge of the shipping interests of Canada as well as the British Parliament is to judge of the shipping interests of Great Britain; but I am asking, if the Marine Department is to be held responsible when difficulties occur in connection with shipping, and something has happened that should not have happened, that that department shall be just as free to meet emergencies and follow improvements in connection with the construction and equipment of ships as the sister department, the Board of Trade, to-day, is in England, and I point out to the committee that none of these things are found in the English statute. They are rules adopted carefully on the advice of experts, and they are changed, not for a particular ship or a particular case but as occasion arises for the change, and the Minister of the day or the authorities concerned are then properly held responsible. It is still free to every member of this Parliament, as it is in England, to suggest changes and amendments not appearing in those regulations, or to attack the existing regulations. I am not asking Parliament to take a new step or adopt a new principle, for, as I have pointed out, Parliament, without any injury to any interests in Canada that I am aware of, did entrust the Department of Marine with this discretion and these powers in connection with just as important, if not a more important, part of the ship, and that is the machinery of the ship, the boiler of the ship, and so on, all requiring the knowledge and attention of experts whom this Parliament pays. Those rules are now made by Order in Council. Again, I would call attention to the argument of the hon. member for Queen's, which, I think, strengthens my position on this, the chief point. He alludes to sub-section 7, and he said that by the insertion of a word there I could have accomplished all that I desire. Yes, but by the insertion of the word "material," there is not a particle of necessity for the sub-sections preceding number 7, and therefore in principle the hon. member for Queen's and I are one. But the language I would ask for the clause would be a little different, because the hon. member for Queen's, by amending sub-section 7, leaves it to the Minister of Marine to authorize the use, in individual, specified cases, of any kind of a boat he thinks fit. We are one in principles only, I do not wish to go as far as the hon. gentleman. I wish to blot out the power of the Minister of Marine altogether. I leave that, not to the Minister of Marine at all, but to the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council, in these cases, never would act but on the advice of men who have a technical knowledge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The difference is a little more, because Parliament lays down what should be the provisions governing boats carried by steamers generally, and a great many details are gone into, but they give the authorities having special control over them the discretion to limit or enlarge, in individual cases, on the responsibility of the Minister, the lengths and breadths Parliament has fixed. But the Minister has taken away the entire section and given the entire power to the Governor in Council.

Mr. TUPPER. I appreciate the hon. gentleman's position, but in fact there is no difference between us, because I say that though Parliament has intimated in No. 6 section 7, its particular idea of the length and breadth of a life-boat, the Minister may, by sub-section, sweep that out by a word. I say, therefore, we are only splitting hairs. I submit if there are hon. gentlemen who agree with the hon. member for Queen's, my position is far better, because we come then at once to the position which is taken by the Board of Trade in England, and I do not see that there would be any great danger in following the example there, and placing this discretion, not in the Department of Marine or Ministry of the day, but just as we have done in connection with the boilers, in the Governor in Council.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears from what has fallen from the hon. gentleman that for nearly forty years at least, legislators of the old Canada and the Dominion have chosen to frame legislation on this subject in a wholly different way and on wholly different lines. I understand that this is for the preservation of life. Heretofore, not once but every time the matter has been before the House, it has been considered and pronounced upon by the House. The House has not chosen to delegate this important matter either to an individual Minister or the Government of the day. On the contrary, the House appears to have deemed it in the public interest to specify with a great degree of minuteness not often found in legislation, the particular safeguards to be adopted. Now we are asked to ignore all that is suggested by this course of legislation, and to say that the Parliaments have been entirely in error, that they belong to a past age, that they were slow-going people, institutions not up to the spirit of the times, and that their proper course would have

been to hand this most important duty over to the Government of the day or the Ministers. For my part, I would rather approve of the course that has taken place instead of, as now appears to be aimed at, casting upon the Cabinet the responsibility involved in the proposed legislation. The Minister argues that because sub-section 7, section 29, of the Steamboat Inspection Act authorizes him in a particular case to suspend the act—

Mr. TUPPER. In all cases.

Mr. MULOCK —in individual cases. There is no general delegation of authority to the Minister, and to authorize him to act there ought to be a particular case stated wherein these general regulations do not apply, and can hardly be intended to apply. Some such case as that ought to be made when we warrant a Minister in taking to himself the power conferred upon him by sub-section 7. The Minister argues that because sub-section 7 authorizes him in certain cases to suspend the Act, he, therefore, would have the power, by passing a general Order in Council, to suspend the whole Act in all cases.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not asking Parliament to enable me to suspend the Act. There will be regulations of course with reference to life-boats. The Governor in Council will make such regulations.

Mr. MULOCK. First of all you are repealing it.

Mr. TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not understand. The Governor in Council may make such regulations as are deemed advisable. That is in substitution of present regulations.

Mr. MULOCK. This is the law at present. The Statute of 45 Victoria describes the form of the life-boat, the material of the life-boat, the equipment of the life-boat, the appliances for launching her, and so on. Those details are part of the law of the land. They are referred to in section 29 of the Steamboat Inspection Act. Section 29, having declared what shall be the proper equipment, sub-section 7 goes on to say that, in specified cases, the Minister may suspend those provisions. Now, supposing application is made to him to suspend those provisions, must he not, first of all, be satisfied that the case is one within the meaning of the Act or one that Parliament did not contemplate? For example, it might happen if a vessel were plying upon some inland water where these provisions could not, according to the opinion of any man of common sense, be applicable. In such a case perhaps the Minister would feel warranted in suspending the section. Does he contend that under sub-section 7 he could pass a general Order in Council relieving all boats from the provisions of section 29? He is asking Parliament to give the Governor in Council that power. The Minister would have to proceed in the same judicial way and to see what duties were cast upon him under section 29. He would not be authorized to exercise the power under sub-section 7 arbitrarily, without rhyme or reason. Now, however, the hon. gentleman says there shall no longer be given any hint to the Minister or to the Government by Parliament as to any safeguards, but he says it is to be the Governor in Council, which of course means the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or, when he is taking a less active part in the duties of his department, the Deputy Minister. That means that Parliament is handing over to an officer who is not responsible to Parliament, but is simply an official receiving $4,000 a year, the duty of dealing with a matter which Parliament itself should deal with. That is wholly contrary to the spirit of the times and to the legislation of the present day. When the hon. gentleman refers to England, does he mean to say that the Board in Canada is as good as the Board of Trade in England?

Mr. TUPPER. I say it is much better.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not dwell upon that because our views on that subject are opposed, but we are legislating for the shipping interests of Canada, and I protest against the assignment of any power of Parliament to the Governor in Council except under very exceptional circumstances, and I agree with my hon. friend from Queen's that the difficulty can be got over by a slight amendment to sub-section 7. When this Bill was introduced, we understood that the necessity for it arose from some difficulty in St. John as to how life-boats and buckets should be built, but it appears now that that is only an excuse, that that is not the real cause for the introduction of this measure, but is simply a herring drawn across the track to divert public attention.

Mr. TUPPER. The information from St. John came after the Bill was introduced. The difficulty we found to exist was that these rules were statutory instead of being made by Order in Council. We could have promptly met the difficulty in St. John if we could have made rules, but as these were statutory rules, we could not interfere with them.

Mr. MULOCK. We have now before us the fact that the real reason for this measure is that the hon. gentleman wants to aggrandize power to himself, and this is an unwarrantable procedure and one which the House should not sanction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This subject is very important, and more important on account of the manner in which the hon. gentleman proposes to deal with it than on account of the subject-matter of the Bill itself. I think it should receive the attention of the Minister of Justice, and that it is the Department of Justice, rather than the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which is responsible for the character of the legislation proposed. There is a very great point of difference between the legislation in the United Kingdom and the legislation in Canada as to regulations which are made outside of Parliament, in allowing the Sovereign in Council to make regulations which are to have the effect of law in the United Kingdom or in Canada. We know that in the United Kingdom on account of the centralized character of the Government, Parliament is very severely pressed for time to legislate, and many of the regulations which have been made there have been justified on the ground that there are so many matters brought under the attention of Parliament that, unless such powers were had to make regulations, it would be utterly impossible to adequately protect the public interest if Parliamentary legislation had to be waited for. But this excuse for allowing departmental regulations or Orders in Council to take the place of parliamentary legislation does not apply to this country because Parliament meets here

every year, as it does in the United Kingdom, and, having infinitely less business to attend to, there is no difficulty whatever in considering every proposition which experience may suggest to any department of government as necessary in the public interest. It seems to me that the proper rule—and it is the rule recognized by those who have most carefully considered the subject to apply to cases of this kind—is that, where the Government have not the necessary information to submit to Parliament to enable it to make a declaration upon a subject requiring action, the Orders in Council or departmental regulations may be substituted for parliamentary action until there is accumulated sufficient data to enable the Government to propose to the House such legislation as may be required. Now, in the case before us, there is no indication on the part of the Minister that this is a matter requiring to be altered from time to time, or at all events more frequently than from year to year, and it is for Parliament to consider it in such a way and to adopt such legislation as to make permanent regulations for the public necessities. The hon. gentleman does not propose that, but he states that on the inland waters the requirements of commerce may be different from its requirements on the open seas, but surely the hon. gentleman must have accumulated the necessary experience and should have a series of resolutions to be embodied in a statute leading in the direction he desires. Why should Parliament be asked to abnegate its functions and hand this over to the Governor in Council? If the hon. gentleman can submit these regulations to the Governor in Council, why cannot he submit them to Parliament to be embodied in a statute? The hon. gentleman has not, up to this moment, undertaken to submit to this House a single proposition to show why permanent regulations cannot be embodied in the law so as to meet the requirements in this particular. The first declaration has not been made. He has not pointed out that this cannot be done; he has not said that he has not accumulated the necessary data in the department to enable him to propose legislation. Now, when it was proposed, years ago, in this House, to publish, along with the statutes, the Orders in Council and departmental regulations having the force of law, the understanding was that those were to be published with the statutes in order that Parliament might have an opportunity of seeing how far the Government were superseding, by those regulations and Orders in Councils, legislation on the part of Parliament in the ordinary form. That was the understanding, and that subject was discussed in this House more than twenty years ago. It is of the first consequence that Parliament should not abdicate its functions, and that the Government should exercise ordinary industry in accumulating the necessary information to warrant legislation on the subjects before legislation is had. Now, the hon. gentleman says he wants to repeal, not the whole law, but enough of the law to create general confusion. He proposes to ask power, not to make departmental regulations, but to make regulations having the effect of law by Orders in Council, and he proposes to do so by repealing a part of the law by which those regulations are made at the present time. The hon. gentleman does not say that the matter is of such a shifting and changing character that legislation cannot be had, but he asks us to withdraw from Parliament the portion of the power that it now exercises, and to vest it in the Governor in Council without any necessity being shown to justify such action. Surely the hon. gentleman ought not to propose so retrogressive a course as this.

Mr. TUPPER. Progressive.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Surely the hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that vesting in the Crown the whole power of legislation, and withdrawing it from the two Houses of Parliament as parts of the legislative body, is a progressive measure. The hon. gentleman will not pretend to argue that to supersede Parliament, and to establish so far the principle of absolute monarchy——

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say that; I said it was antiquated to put those rules in the statute.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these rules binding as a part of the law? If they are, then there is only one justification for dealing with them otherwise than by statute, and that is, that you have the necessary information to warrant you so to deal. The purpose of dealing with them by Order in Council is to give the department the opportunity of accumulating the necessary knowledge to enable it to propose to Parliament a systematic and well-considered regulation. But the hon. gentleman is asking us to withdraw this power without making out any case. He has already admitted Parliament has the necessary knowledge to deal with the subject, and after ten years he proposes to withdraw that power from Parliament, and to vest it in the Governor in Council. I say it is an improper proceeding, it is wholly contrary to the spirit of parliamentary government, it is a course that ought not to be recognized, and I am surprised to see the Department of Justice acquiescing in it.

Mr. TEMPLE. As I live on the River St. John, I would like to say a word upon this subject. I am sorry to see the opposition that is made to the proposal of the Minister of Marine. His proposal is made in the interest of many steamers that are now loaded in the dock and all ready for transporting freights up the River St. John, but they cannot proceed so long as the law remains in its present shape. It seems that the inspector gave them no notice that he intended to enforce this provision of the law until the vessels were all ready to start; so that not only is freight waiting to be transported, but the mails also which are destined to places up the river, are delayed on account of notice having been given to the owners that they must provide certain metallic boats upon their steamers in case of accident. Now, I have never known an accident to occur on the River St. John, and I have lived there for over forty years. They have always carried wooden boats, which have proved amply sufficient to guard against loss of life. At present, as I understand the law, they have to provide a metallic boat of twenty odd feet, for each steamer; and in order to launch such a boat in case of accident, the vessels would have to carry double the number of hands they employ now. I think this provision of the law is a very great hardship to the steamboat owners. I would remind the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that in 1882 when that law was passed the position of affairs has changed in this House. At that time the

river counties from St. John to Victoria County were all represented by Liberal members, but now they are all represented by Conservatives. This makes a very great difference in passing laws of this kind for the St. John River. I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will cease their opposition to this Bill, and allow the Minister to amend it as he thinks best in the interest of the public.

On section 5,

Mr. TUPPER. This provision is made on the advice of steamboat experts. It is considered dangerous for the same person to act in a double capacity of engineer and master, or as engineer and fireman, except in cases where the boiler is fired from the engine room.

Mr. HAZEN. I move that section 34 be hereby amended by adding the words "or wood" after the word "leather" in the fifth line of the section. Mr. Coker has declared that wooden buckets are more desirable than either leather or metal ones, because, in the first place, they are more easily mended, and, in the second place, they would act as life-preservers. On board of vessels registered at Lloyds and Bureau Veritas wooden buckets are now allowed in place of metal and leather ones, which were used some years ago.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has alluded to what an officer of my department has told him. Mr. Coker has not done his duty in that respect, for he has not reported that information to me. I will not take the responsibility of accepting this amendment at the present time. It may be a very dangerous one, and I can see, without possessing expert knowledge, that in case of fire, wooden buckets would not be so good as metal or leather ones. I can see that at the outbreak of fire leather or metal buckets would be available while wooden buckets might be destroyed. I may, however, be wrong in my opinion. There has been no suggestion made to me with reference to buckets, and before Parliament legislates on this subject, it should be in possession of all information necessary to enable it to arrive at a correct and safe opinion. I am not in a position to advise Parliament on this subject, as I have not had an opportunity to consult those best qualified to judge. I do not believe that the amendment suggested is in operation under any system where there are regulations in connection with steamboats; and, under these circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman should allow his amendment to stand, so that I at least may have an opportunity of looking into the subject, as I shall be very glad to do, and he may bring it forward at a later stage.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry the hon. Minister desires to consult his inspector before he makes up his mind as to whether wooden buckets would serve the purpose on board of vessels. We have in this House members whose opinions are as reliable as any opinion the hon. Minister may obtain from an inspector. The buckets commonly used on vessels are made of oak. They are less liable to destruction by fire than are buckets of leather, the latter being much more easily injured and rendered unsuitable for conveying water than buckets of oak. Buckets usually stand on deck with water in them, and I think the hon. gentleman's fears, that the first thing destroyed by fire would be buckets full of water, is entirely groundless. I have no doubt that in the opinion of hon. gentlemen familiar with the matter, good, solid oaken buckets on the deck of a vessel are the best buckets that can be used either for extinguishing fire or for other purposes. It has been urged with great force that they would not only serve the purpose of extinguishing fires, but might be used for life-preservers, whereas buckets of leather or metal are liable to sink. It is the opinion of all interested in the subject that this change should be made, and it strikes me as little short of an absurdity that the Minister should request that this matter should stand over until he can consult some person, whose authority is no better, and whose opinion is, in fact, less reliable than that of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Welsh), who is largely engaged in the shipping business, and who is as good an authority as can be found in the Dominion. Then we have the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen), representing the steamboat interest on the St. John River, who undoubtedly has consulted many of those parties, and who spoke knowing their wishes, and he submitted an amendment in their interests, one which will meet the view of every vessel-owner in the country, asking that in addition to buckets of metal and leather, wooden buckets should be permitted to be used. It is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman does not accept the amendment without further delay. If the hon. gentleman desires this Bill to pass he should not suggest this delay, which is a needless one.

Mr. TUPPER, It is not proposed to pass the Bill through this House at one sitting. I am surprised to hear that it is absurd to be cautious in dealing with an important matter of this kind. I am very sorry I cannot take the hon. gentleman's advice in shipping matters. With all due respect to his opinion, I do not think it is better than my opinion, and I value my own so little that I declared I am not prepared to accept off-hand an amendment of such an important character as that proposed. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) may be perfectly right, and the amendment may be a wise one. All I ask is that the House may be placed in possession of the advice of the department, whose officers, whatever may be the value of their opinions, follow very closely subjects of this kind. I certainly object to the amendment being submitted at this stage. There will be another opportunity for it to be submitted. All I urge is, and it will be agreed to by a large majority of members of the House, that we have not sufficient information on the subject at present before us. I am not at present stating that the amendment may not be accepted.

Mr. HAZEN. The position taken by the Minister of Marine is a very fair one. His attention not having been called to the matter, he requests that the amendment may stand over until he has consulted his officers, who have had experience in these matters, and who are able to decide whether such an amendment is in the interests of the shipping business or not. Under these circumstances I will withdraw the amendment at present, with the understanding that I will have an opportunity at another stage to bring it before the House.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly. I propose to leave the Bill in Committee, and, therefore, we will come again to consider this amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister intimates that he intends to express an opinion upon this amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) at the next sitting of the Committee, and he may give his consent to such a clause as this being in the Bill. If he is going to do that, then the House shall pronounce as to what shall be the material of the bucket but shall have nothing to say as to what shall be the material of the life-boat.

Mr. TUPPER. The argument of the hon. gentleman will be just as forcible on a subsequent occasion, if he defers it. For instance, I might meet the objection he is now making by repealing both.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The only objection I think is this: that the Minister sat in his seat and smiled very pleasantly while my friend from St. John (Mr. Hazen) was complimenting him upon his Bill and showing what an improvement it was on the old Act, and that it was absolutely essential for the St. John boats that there should be wooden buckets. I pointed out that the Bill did not give the power to have wooden buckets at all, and then the hon. gentleman from St. John moved this resolution properly enough, and I was prepared to support it, but the Minister says he will not receive it at all. He should renounce the commendation of the hon. member from St. John.

Mr. TUPPER. I cannot renounce the commendation. I will accept it on the boats but not upon the buckets.

On section 6,

Mr. TUPPER. This clause provides that the inspector who inspects the boats shall collect the fees instead of the chief customs officer. The Auditor General has raised the question as to the difficulty of auditing the revenue accounts, and it is to meet his wishes that this change is made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As I understand the law now, the fee which the steamboat owner has to pay must be paid to any one of the chief collectors of any port in Canada. If the law is changed and the inspector is made to collect the fee, I think it will be more inconvenient. There is only one inspector for the whole Maritime Provinces, and he may be travelling around in different parts. I do not see how the fee is to be paid to him, while if it is paid to the chief collector the man is at hand to receive it.

Mr. TUPPER. The inspector will find the person who owes the fee. I think that the change will make it more convenient for a steamboat owner, because the certificate is not given until the fee is paid.

Mr. MULOCK. Why could not the certificate be left with the custom house officer, and be given to the owner when he pays the fees?

Mr. TUPPER. I am not anxious about this clause if there is objection to it, and I will let it go if you like.

Mr. MULOCK. The owner may not be present when the inspection takes place, or he may not have the money ready, and he has got to hunt up the inspector to transmit the money.

Mr. TUPPER. Very well; I will drop that clause.

On section 8,

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister to explain why in this case he asks Parliament to declare what safeguard should be adopted while in the other case he did not? This section says that the vessel must be provided with certain anchor equipment, steering gear, and so on; and the hon. gentleman might as well argue that that is a matter of detail which would be better managed by this progressive institution the Governor in Council than by the Act. I do not wish him to infer from my observation that I desire these matters also to be transferred to the Governor in Council, but it seems to me there ought to be some consistency in the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not understand why the owner of a tug-boat should be joined in responsibility with the owner of the vessal which it tows, as this action provides.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the law now. The only change I am making is obtaining authority to charge a fee for the inspection, in accordance with section 53 of the main Act. A scow carrying passengers must be inspected, but the law omitted to provide for the payment of a fee in that case.

On section 9,

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask if there is any provision in the original Act that these Orders in Council relating to this subject shall be laid on the Table within a certain number of days after the House meets?

Mr. TUPPER. They are published officially in the *Gazette*, and the department, for convenience also, publishes printed slips containing them.

Mr. FLINT. It seems to me that in addition to that the Orders should be consolidated and placed on the Table of the House, as many members do not see the *Gazette*.

Mr. TUPPER. I will make a note of the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and endeavour to meet his wishes.

On the preamble,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a couple of small points which I think he had better consider before he reports the Bill. He has eliminated the 29th section altogether, and he takes power to make similar provisions by Order in Council if he thinks fit, while he leaves the 30th section of the Act in force. Now, these two sections relate to subject-matters almost the same. The hon. gentleman gives the Governor in Council power to make regulations with respect to boats, and he leaves the regulation with respect to life-preservers as a statutory enactment. I am opposed to his giving the Governor in Council power to make these enactments, but if he does it in one case he should do it in both. It seems to me that a man should not be required to read an Act and then an Order in Council before he can ascertain what the law is. I think the hon. gentleman will also have to amend the 58th and the 60th sections. The 58th section provides:

"If any damage to any person or property is sustained in consequence of the non-observance of any of the provisions of this Act, imposing any duty on the owner or master of any steamboat, the owner shall, in all civil proceedings, and the master or other person having charge thereof shall, in all proceedings, whether civil or criminal, be subject to the legal consequences of such default."

Now, after the hon. gentleman's Bill passes, the provisions the non-observance of which will make the master liable to a criminal or civil prosecution, are made an Order in Council, and he should amend the section so as to cover that change. The same remark applies to the 60th section, providing for penalties incurred for breach of the provisions of the Act or of the Order in Council which shall be substituted.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Militia—Permanent Forces..... $475,000

Mr. BOWELL. Before we proceed with this item, I desire to set the committee and myself right with reference to some remarks I made on the items charged to public armouries, and also with reference to the 41 tunics to which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) called the attention of the committee. I was under the impression at the time that it was an error. I have learned since that the 41 tunics were purchased for the Band of the Governor General's Foot Guards, and that they cost $33.50 each; so that it was not an error. I stated also that I was under the impression that the Auditor General had mixed the accounts by including the storekeepers' and paymasters' accounts under the head of public armouries, which is certainly a heading under which these items should not appear; but I ascertained from the Auditor General that this is the manner in which the accounts were sent for audit to the department, which accounts for the fact of their being published in this way.

Mr. CASEY. The item now before the House in regard to our permanent corps seems to be of sufficient importance to require rather more attention than has usually been given to it. It was hoped when we instituted these permanent corps that we would not only provide a considerable force of well-trained men ready for any emergency, but also a large number of thoroughly trained instructors for the ordinary battalions of volunteers. It seems to me, from the report of the Major-General, that neither of these anticipations have been fulfilled. These corps do not afford any considerable number of well-trained soldiers, seeing that nearly half of them are not in the force long enough to have acquired that thorough training. I will quote as briefly as possible from the General's report in support of these two statements of mine, and I will have to quote almost in extenso because it is so condensed that it will not bear further condensation. In speaking of the actual strength of the drilled men in these corps, the General says:

"Deducting transfers and re-enlisted men, the waste of the year is shown to be 497 out of a total establishment of 966 non-commissioned officers and men. This waste may be reduced by 42 on account of men tried by court-martial for desertion, who become available again, at the end of their sentences; and the net loss for the year placed at 455 men, or 47·10 per cent of the establishment. It follows, therefore, that the greater part of the men in the ranks must be recruits, of less than one year's service. This is further proved to be the case, since 353 men are returned in that category, or 34·47 per cent, while if the deficiency in the total strength were completed, to the full establishment, the proportion would rise to 41·30 per cent. The presence of so large a proportion of recruits, at the schools of instruction, is a serious disadvantage to their efficiency, since the small staff of instructors has to be constantly employed in drilling them, while their ignorance of discipline is apt to act as a bad example to the attached men of the active militia."

That is to say, that almost half the establishment has disappeared during the year for various reasons, which he refers to later:

"Of men under two years' service there are 524, or 54·24 per cent. These men with a few rare exceptions are incapable of imparting instruction. There remains, therefore, only 45·76 per cent which can be looked to, to provide instructors. Deducting from this number 28 per cent, representing 270 employed as artificers, officers' servants, bandsmen and others employed on duties not connected with instruction, we have only 17·76 per cent, from which selection can be made of trustworthy non-commissioned officers, for the administrative work of the permanent corps, and as acting instructors for the active militia. Practically, the proportion is even smaller. Briefly, the result drawn from these figures may be stated thus:

	Per cent.
"Under 2 years' service	54·24
Employed on duties not connected with instruction	28·00
Non-comissioned officers employed in the active duties of the permanent corps	16·56
Balance nominally available to furnish extra instructors	1·20
	100·00"

Now, Sir, that is sufficiently severe condemnation of the schools and other permanent corps as a means of providing an efficient force for use in an emergency. About half are not really efficient men, and the discipline is such as to have a bad effect on men of the active militia sent to these corps for training. He goes on to discuss how many are available for the purpose of instructing the volunteer battalions, 1·20 men in these corps are available for instruction; that is to say, about ten men in the whole force of 910, as it stood on the 30th of June last. It appears that more than one-fourth of these corps are employed in duties not connected with instruction. That is a very large percentage, and, he says, the balance available as instructors is merely nominal since the corps are always below their strength. Of course, if they are below their strength even this miserable percentage of 1·20 disappears. Those statements of the General bear out my allegation that these permanent corps have failed either to produce and drill an effective and always ready force of trained men or to provide instructors for the active militia. The General goes on to point out some reasons for this state of affairs:

"As I have pointed out, a large number of men in the permanent corps are withdrawn from the regular instructional duties, which consequently fall more heavily on the remainder, and I cannot but attribute to this cause some part of the dissatisfaction with military service, denoted by numerous desertions and discharges by purchase. When, as in these corps, the establishment is reduced to the narrowest limits, there is no room for mere show; and in the attempt to maintain it, there has been a serious sacrifice of efficiency. Steps will be taken to remedy this fault."

I hope the General will have the support of the Minister in taking those steps. It appears that in this, as in many other branches of the service, efficiency has been sacrificed for display. The General goes on to point out the lack of uniformity in the system of instruction. He says:

"The establishment of a uniform, practical and sound system of instruction, both in drill and administration, is absolutely necessary."

And he adds:

"While I cannot express myself as satisfied with the condition of the permanent force, I must bear witness to the excellent work it has done in spite of many disadvantages."

The good results achieved, he says, are due to the active exertions of certain officers, while the faults of the schools are rather owing to the system than to any lack on the part of those who conduct them. In another paragraph, he points out the necessity for a wider and more thorough military instruction of those attending the schools. He says:

"My object is to make the schools of instruction, not simply places for the acquirement of an elementary knowledge of drill, but centres of military thought, where officers of the militia can find encouragement and assistance in the study of military history, tactics, administration and other subjects. I see no reason why volunteer officers in Canada should not attain the same eminence, as experts in various branches of military knowledge, as many busy men serving in the English volunteers have done."

I shall not quote the whole paragraph. It is all worthy of attention but not necessary for my argument here. After referring to the disorganized condition of the schools in Winnipeg some time ago and the reformation he has effected in it, he speaks of "C" Battery of Artillery at Victoria, and points out that it is impossible, under the present arrangement, to get the troops in British Columbia, and drafts have to be made in the eastern provinces to keep the corps up to its proper strength. I think, in view of the peculiar conditions existing in British Columbia and the high price of labour there, it would be on the whole cheaper and in other ways preferable to let us recognize the fact that members of the permanent corps in British Columbia must be paid more than the soldiers who are enlisted elsewhere. If men are drafted from the eastern corps and sent to British Columbia, and find the ordinary rate of pay so much higher than that they are receiving in the battery, the temptation to desertion must be great, and it would be better to pay a higher rate of wages and to secure recruits in that country. The General refers to desertions and discharges by purchase, and so on. I will call attention to the figures in this respect showing a most extraordinary state of things, and proving, to my mind, either a grossly bad management or a very bad system which the officers are not able to remedy. The number of those discharged by purchase last year, that is to say, those who were tired of the service and who managed, either themselves or by means of their friends, to purchase their discharge, was 103, being more than one in ten of the total force. The number who deserted was 153, being about one in six of the total force, and it seems to me that, when the service is in such a condition that one man in six deserts every year, there must be something rotten in that service. The total number of those who were discharged by purchase or deserted was 255, or more than 25 per cent who disappeared from the force during the year. Certainly, it is evident that the service has not been made as attractive as it should have been made to young men with a taste for soldiering. I find, also, that the convictions by court-martial amounted to 128 during the year, showing, on the average, that about one man in seven has been punished for some serious breach of discipline or for insubordination. That is a very serious state of things. Now we come to look at results as to the actual training of officers, non-commissioned officers and men belonging to the active militia who attend the schools. We find that only 298 officers and men have been trained in connection with this force of 910 permanent soldiers. That is a very small proportion in view of the expense of these corps and in view of the fact that one of the objects of their establishment was stated to be to secure the training of officers, non-commissioned officers and men. I cannot hold the present Minister of Militia responsible for this state of affairs except in a technical sense, because he has only recently taken charge of that department, but I think it is only right to call his attention, and the attention of the House, to the glaring failure of these establishments. I desire also to speak in regard to the expense of these corps. Looking through the Auditor General's Report, which gives detailed accounts of the expenditure, it seems that no system has been followed in the purchase of supplies. We find that almost every article differs in price at almost every post. It may be that the contracts were let in Kington for "B" Battery, and in Quebec for "A" Battery, and so on, but it is evident that no general system was adopted of letting contracts, because I find that the prices for general supplies, including even clothing and boots, vary in the different corps. I find, for instance, that the price of such a staple article as coal oil varies from 12 and 15 cents in London for the school of infantry there, to 52 cents per gallon for the Mounted Rifles in Winnipeg. The price of coal oil at different places I find to be 12 cents, 15 cents, 20 cents, 28 cents, 24 cents, down to 15 cents, 52 cents, and then 32 cents and 35 cents. If coal oil can be had for 12 or 13 cents in London, it can be laid down in any part of Canada for much less than the price here given. Then the price of coal also varies excessively. The price in Quebec was $4.98, in Winnipeg it was $8.85, and even in Victoria, which lies almost at the mouth of some of the finest coal pits in the country, coal varies from $7.50 to $7.75. I do not know whether that is the local price there, but there are certainly great discrepancies in these amounts. I might go into a great many articles, but I will only call attention to the system of buying piecemeal in order to condemn it, and to urge that everything should be bought by contract as far as possible, and in large quantities for the whole force, and that, if the cost of transportation were added, it would show less discrepancies than are shown in the Auditor General's Report. Another question is the cost of water. I find that "C" Battery, Victoria, paid $151 for water during the year. The cost of water for the Fredericton infantry school is $300 a year. It cost $367 to supply the battery at Kingston, and $450 to supply the school at Winnipeg. But in Quebec, under what is called a special rate, we have the enormous sum of $2,000 for the supply of water to the battery. Perhaps the Minister can explain that, but it seems extraordinary that the cost of water should be about five times in Quebec the cost of water in any other place in the Dominion. As to the provender for horses, hay and oats, I see that the accounts are given for so many rations, as they are called, without distinguishing the hay from the oats. The rations, of course, are so much for hay, and so much for oats. It is impossible from the figures to get at the exact price of hay and oats in most cases; though I see

separate purchasers, in some cases, pay as high as $24 a ton for hay, which seems to be an extraordinary price. Straw, in most cases, is bought at from $15 to $18 a ton. I am sure the farmers in the immediate neighbourhood of these schools must be making very handsome profits, if these things are bought direct from the farmers.

Permanent Forces--Pay and maintenance of "A," "B" and "C" Batteries, Schools of Artillery at Quebec, Kingston and Victoria, B.C..... $180,000

Mr. BOWELL. This question has already been elaborately dealt with by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). Many of his remarks deserve a good deal of consideration, but on other points he betrays a want of knowledge of the facts, and I may frankly state that I am in somewhat the same position myself. If the whole facts were known I am sure the hon. gentleman would change his opinion. As an illustration, I may say that I am just now informed by the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., that the price which he himself pays for the coal which he uses in his own dwelling, is $8 per ton, though he lives only sixty or seventy miles distant from some of the largest coal deposits on the Island of Vancouver. I suppose that is to be accounted for by the fact that a monopoly exists in the coal-fields on that Island, and when we consider the very high rate of wages that is paid in that country, and the fact that there is no competition, we can understand that the coal companies may charge just what prices they please. Somewhat of a similar explanation might be made with regard to Manitoba. The hon. gentleman knows that all the coal taken to Winnipeg has to be brought 600, 700 or 1,000 miles, and the fact that there is very little competition in railways, added to the distance, explains why coal is so high in Winnipeg. My attention, and the attention of the department before I came to it, had been called to the large amount paid for water supplied in the city of Quebec. It must be borne in mind that that water supply is not confined to "A" Battery alone; other forces are also supplied. I think this item includes the supply of water to the fort and the cavalry, and indeed to the whole military force in that city.

Mr. CASEY. Who occupies the fort besides the battery?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a cavalry corps and a cavalry school. I am inclined to think that, though it appears to be for the water supply for the battery alone, the item includes the whole service for that city. Probably the hon. gentleman from Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier), who was mayor of that city when this arrangement was made, may be able to give some information on that point. This much I do know, however, that the price paid for the supply of water to the different corps and forts in that city, is much lower than the price that is paid by the ordinary citizen consumer. I am not now discussing whether they charge too much, or how far they have to bring the water. The General's report is one prolific of discussion; he has given a great deal of attention, I have no doubt, to the whole subject. But it is questionable whether the House is prepared to adopt a suggestion, which has already come under my notice, in regard to securing the services of men for the full term in the permanent force. It is pointed out by him, that unless there is some system of pension adopted somewhat similar to that in the regular service, these difficulties will continually arise, particularly in a country like Canada, where labour is scarce. If we are to adopt the pension system for all the officers and all the men of the permanent corps, we shall soon have a large charge on the revenues of this country. As to retaining the men on the force in British Columbia, there is some force in what the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the pay. There is no great inducement for men who have gone from Eastern Canada to that province to join the force on account of the higher wages paid in other walks of life. We have not only to consider the rate of wages paid, but the food and the expense of living do not fall upon them any more than they do upon any recruit in any part of the service in old Canada where living is cheaper. But I repeat, the inducement of higher wages might be such as to lead them to desert or to leave the force. The question will receive all the consideration that I can possibly give to the subject in order that we may remedy, if possible, the defects that have been complained of by the General in his report. I cannot, however, concur in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, that this is owing to mismanagement in the department, particularly in reference to the permanent corps, for the very reason which he himself has given, reasons which have been advanced by the General. A great difficulty surrounds the maintenance of a permanent force in Canada, by reason of the small rate at which men are paid, and the great facilities that present themselves for leaving the force on all occasions whenever men think themselves improperly used, or when they have been court-martialled for crime. Those facilities are so great, that I doubt not the enforcement of strict military discipline will result in the continuous reduction of the force by desertion, or in other ways. I have no good hope of suggesting any scheme by which that can be avoided, unless the country is prepared to pay the men two or three times more for their services than is paid at present. The whole question is surrounded by a great many difficulties, and I can only express the hope that in the future we may be able, possibly, to carry out many of the suggestions of the General so as to accomplish what he has in view, and what, I am quite sure, the hon. gentleman from West Elgin also has in view, that is, to make the force as effective as possible, without making it too burdensome on the tax-payers of this country.

Mr. CASEY. In regard to desertions, no doubt the discrepancy in the pay of the men as compared with the pay which men get in other employments, has a good deal to do with it. The General points out in his report that the undue amount of labour continually falling upon the active members of the force in consequence of the withdrawal of large numbers of them as bandsmen and servants from the actual work of the force, must make the service more unpleasant than it otherwise would be.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman mean the active volunteer force, or the permanent force?

Mr. CASEY. I mean the commandant part of the permanent force as distinguished from bands, &c.

Mr. BOWELL. The only way to avoid that is to increase the number and make the companies

larger, so that you can take from them the bandsmen and the fatigue men, which are taken from all corps. When you take the bandsmen and the fatigue men and the servants from a corps of only 42, you have very few left to drill.

Mr. CASEY. I am not speaking of the fatigue men. My point is that there are so many men employed as bandsmen, officers' servants and artificers that the number available for fatigue duty is largely reduced, and consequently their turn on the "roster" comes more frequently and the men become dissatisfied. As to the question of pay, a very material advance would need to be made in pay to secure efficiency. It is possible to obtain very good men for $200 per year and "found," especially if you treat them well and make the service pleasant to them. We are at present paying $150 per year, and if $50 more were added, or about $50,000 for the whole force, the pay would be sufficient to induce average men to engage in the service. The fact that one man in six has been convicted by court-martial during the year furnished a proof of mismanagement. Such a state of things would not prevail unless there was some mismanagement in the force. Courts-martial are the results of niggardliness towards the force, or overwork or something of that kind in most cases; they cannot altogether be accounted for by the innate "cussedness" of the soldier. The Minister of Militia did not deal with the question of purchasing supplies. I desire to impress on him, and the House, the necessity, in order to effect economy, of purchasing supplies in considerable quantities, of securing them from one or two firms in the whole Dominion, who would supply the different points, and the purchasing by this system could be done much more economically and efficiently than by the different commanders under the present system. The General makes a similar suggestion in regard to public buildings, and the same principle is equally applicable to the supplies for the different corps. The only way to secure these supplies economically is to purchase them in large quantities and under the influence of public competition, and I hope the Minister will give his attention to this question and arrange a plan for making contracts for these stores by wholesale. With respect to Quebec citadel, I do not understand that the cavalry school is situated there. You might as well convert them into horse marines as to have them drill at Quebec citadel. The whole $2,000 for water supply is charged in the Public Accounts to the battery. The Minister does not appear to know who else obtained a share of it. As to its being a special rate, it must be a specially high one, for it is four times as high as that charged for any other corps. Even if two corps were covered, it would still be quite as much for each of them as is charged in connection with any two other corps in the country. This item requires explanation. Perhaps the Minister of Militia could explain it.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is well that considerable attention should be given to all the expenses in connection with the force, and as we have a new Minister of Militia now installed, he will no doubt be glad to receive every item of information and criticism that can be offered in connection with the position of the force. I was rather surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) with respect to coal oil. At Kingston, according to the Auditor General's Report, C–37, we paid $36.11 for 129 gallons of oil, or at the rate of 28 cents per gallon. Any one acquainted with the value of oil during last year will understand that this is an enormous price. One would suppose it was American oil. The committee is entitled to some explanation as to why it is necessary to pay such extravagant prices. If it was purchased at retail and charged at the outside figure, we could clearly understand how we were paying such a price. It is desirable that such extravagance should not be repeated. It is absurd that we should pay as high as 54 cents per gallon for coal oil, and even in Kingston, where American coal oil can be as cheaply laid down as any point in Canada, 28 cents per gallon for oil for the military college.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

"A," "B" and "C" Batteries, Schools of Artillery at Quebec, Kingston and Victoria, B.C.... $18',000

Mr. McMULLEN. I have drawn the attention of the Minister of Militia to some irregularities with regard to the prices of supplies, and I would like him to give some idea with regard to the course he intends to adopt in the purchase of supplies in the future.

Mr. BOWELL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he thought the prices paid for some supplies were too high, and particularly the price paid for coal oil at Kingston, but I did not understand him to say that there had been any irregularities in securing the supplies. The deputy informs me that in every single instance supplies have been purchased by tender, and that the lowest tender has been accepted. I can quite understand that the price of coal oil in Winnipeg and British Columbia should be high, on account of freight charges, but why that should apply to Kingston I do not understand. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the department will exercise strict vigilance over these contracts in future, so that I may be able, when questions are put to me next session if I should live long enough, to answer the questions in reference to all these supplies. I quite concur in the remarks made by the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in reference to the supplies for all these schools. I think that the suggestion made by the Deputy Minister in the report with reference to the coal supply is one that deserves attention. I am in hopes that by asking for supplies for all that may be required for this section of the country, and for Quebec as well, we may be able to save some money by it.

Cavalry and Infantry Schools..... $290,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not wish to detain the committee by going into details connected with this item, but I certainly think we should have the Minister's views with regard to the future, and whether he intends to run them in the same way as the past. He knows there have been exceptions taken under some heads of this expenditure, and we should like to have his word that he would pay

his personal attention to this matter as well as to the others.

Mr. BOWELL. This involves a larger question than I am prepared to enter into at the present time. I think the hon. gentleman entertains views that are entertained by some other members of the House, that it would be advisable to abolish some of these schools, that they are not accomplishing what we anticipated; while others object upon the general principle of doing anything which would have the appearance of establishing what might be termed a permanent force. That is a question which will receive consideration in the future. I am of opinion that these schools have done a great deal of good in encouraging a military spirit, and in forming a nucleus around which a larger army from the reserve militia might centre, if necessity should require. The question which has arisen will receive my attention, as to whether some means can be adopted by which volunteer officers may be enabled to obtain their certificates at a less expensive rate than they do at present: not, perhaps, by adopting the old system which existed, when I passed an examination as well as many other officers who addressed the House, but some modified system by which I am in hopes it may be possible to reduce the expenditure under this head, and which would be of a more immediate and general benefit to the volunteers themselves. Further than that, I am not in a position to say at the present moment. For the information of the committee I may add, that the estimate for these corps is:—For the Cavalry School at Quebec, $30,000; Mounted Rifle Corps, Winnipeg, $62,000; Infantry Company, London, $47,000; Toronto, $47,000; St. Johns, P.Q., $47,000; and Fredericton, N.B., 47,000; making the total of $290,000.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not propose to enter into a general discussion of this subject, but there are one or two suggestions that I would like to make to the Minister. I would be very sorry to see any organic change made in the present schools of instruction; but, at the same time, I think great economies might be accomplished. In the school at present while there is a nominal strength of so many hundred men, there is a deficiency of men for the very purpose for which these schools are established, that is, instruction. The establishment is too much looked upon as a corps rather than as a school. While it is very desirable that the corps should be efficient, it is not desirable that the efficiency of the corps should be maintained at the expense of the usefulness of the establishment as a school. For instance, a number of men are taken from off the strength to serve as mess waiters and other kinds of supernumeraries. Of course there must be some men employed in these ways; but I would suggest to the Minister whether it might not be reasonable to make an allowance to the officers in lieu of servants, so that no enrolled men should be employed for those purposes at all. In short, the enrolled men should be employed solely in the duties of the school, and any fatigues should be either provided by an allowance to the officers for the purpose, or ordinary men should be employed to do the work. It is absurd to enroll men and teach them their duties as soldiers, and then employ them at all sorts of fatigue duties about the school. The more men there are the more temptation there is to the officers to employ them in those duties that do not belong strictly to their work as instructors. If you had forty men efficiently drilled, they would do all the work that one hundred do under the present system; and if you confined them strictly to their duties as instructors, you could afford to pay them better, and then they would be more likely to stay in the corps. In this way you would accomplish at less cost very much better results than you do at present. Another suggestion I would make is this. The whole school might be turned out into a common or field or camp ground in the summer. You would not then be confined to a small number for the want of room; instead of having twenty men, which is now the maximum of the school at Toronto, you could have a hundred and instruct them at a proportionately less expense. There are many such things that might be done which would increase the efficiency of these schools. The primary thing to be kept in view is that these schools are established for the purpose of instruction, and the moment you sacrifice the power of instruction to the object of simply having an efficient corps, you at once depart from the purpose for which the institution was established.

Experimental Farms.....$75,000

Mr. McMULLEN. We require to have some explanations from the Minister of Agriculture with regard to this item. His attention was very pointedly drawn last year to some expenses connected with this farm, and I think some general idea should be given as to whether those expenses are to be continued on the same scale, or whether the farm is now in such a complete condition that we may hope for a reduction in the future.

Mr. CARLING. I should be very glad to give any explanations the hon. gentleman may wish or the House may require. I do not think we can reduce the expenditure at the present time. The $75,000 that was expended last year was barely enough to carry on the different farms with efficiency; but we expect in the course of a few years to be able to make certain returns to the Receiver General that will possibly reduce the general outlay for these farms. Of course, we have only had the farms in operation for the last four or five years and there has been a great deal of initial expense that will not have to be repeated; but I expect that in the future some additional works will be undertaken with the sanction of the House, though I hope that by means of the returns I have spoken of, we shall be able to reduce the total expenditure by quite a number of thousands of dollars. I shall be glad to give any further explanations desired.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see by the Auditor General's Report that a very large amount was expended for painting. For instance, W. Howe received $1,390 for painting roofs, blinds, &c. Is the hon. Minister prepared to say that this kind of expenditure is at an end, or shall we have a repetition of it next year?

Mr. CARLING. I do not expect that that amount can be expended every year, but the hon. gentleman must know that painting will have to be done every four or five years. The amount charged here is, I suppose, for new work, new buildings constructed on the farm.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know whether the stallions referred to last year are still under contract?

Mr. CARLING. They are still under contract. We have not come to that item yet.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think, before we enter upon these estimates for the experimental farm, the hon. gentleman should do what we asked another hon. gentleman at the head of another department to do, that is, give some general idea of the policy of the Government for the coming year with respect to these farms, and tell us what has been the expenditure in round numbers during the current year, and what have been the receipts, and what is the deficit. The hon. gentleman ought to be able to tell the House what benefit we are deriving from this vast expenditure. I decidedly object to entering upon these estimates, year after year, and criticising these little details time and again without an exposition from the head of the department of the policy of the department with respect to it and its working. We should know what we are doing.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). What is the reason there is such a large sum in the estimates this year? When the central farm was established, $130,000 was expected to complete buildings, stock and plant. Now, there has been a very large amount more than that expended. It was supposed that $240,000 would establish all the stations along with the central farm. I would like to get some statement showing how it is this amount of $75,000 appears in the estimates this year. Last year we were told that the amount then voted was to complete buildings on the whole of the farms, and I think the Minister of Agriculture made a statement long ago that $35,000 to $40,000 would be the whole annual expenditure. I believe some time subsequent to that he stated it would take $50,000, yet still we find $75,000 asked.

Mr. CARLING. Do I understand the hon. gentleman wants a full statement of the expenditure made on the five different farms?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). What I want to know is, how it is the Government required $75,000 instead of $35,000 to $40,000, as was estimated at first?

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. member for South Huron and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., are well aware of what has been done in the different farms, as regards the very extensive reports published at the request of this House and distributed in all parts of the Dominion. These reports give a detailed statement of what has been done and what is intended to be done, and I think I can appeal to hon. gentlemen to say that the establishment of a central and branch farms has been a very great service to the agriculturists of Canada. I think my hon. friend from South Huron will know the vast amount of seed which has been distributed to all the leading farmers in the Dominion. Any member of this House who wished to distribute new varieties of seed had only to apply to the chief director of the farm to have specimens of seed, of oats, barley, peas, wheat and new varieties of grain. The farmers are most anxious for the seed, and it has been distributed in all parts of the Dominion. We have very satisfactory reports from those farmers who received seed as to the benefit it has been to them and the benefit it is likely to be for the whole country. Last year we distributed 4,728 samples of oats, new varieties, that were tested on the farm here and considered to be of the very best kind. These oats, in small quantities of three pounds, have been distributed to all parts of the Dominion to leading agriculturists. We distributed 2,804 samples of barley, 2,221 spring wheat, 959 samples of corn, 149 samples of rye, 233 samples of potatoes, altogether 12,285 samples distributed to the leading agriculturists in the different constituencies, and we have reports from a very large number of these as to the results; and the results have appeared, I believe, in the report of the chief director of the central farm. We have also been studying the different kinds of food best suited for the raising of stock. We have been experimenting with the feeding of cattle, with the feeding of swine, and we also have dairy establishments where we have been making experiments with butter, and we found that the improvement of butter-making in Canada has been so great, mainly owing to this, that some 20,000 pounds were exported this last winter and reported as number one quality, and we expect that with the new system of dairying the butter trade, which had fallen off so much in Great Britain, will be much increased. We soon hope to have Great Britain as a chief market for our export of butter. Then, we are experimenting with fruit trees. We have every kind of fruit trees on the farm, and we expect very soon to be able to show what can be done in the way of fruit raising in this particular locality, and also in the different stations throughout the Dominion. We are testing the different varieties of fruit here and in British Columbia, and we are trying to see what success can be met with in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and also in the Maritime Provinces. These are some of the subjects we have dealt with, and successfully dealt with, and I believe they are received with very great approval in the different sections of the country where the farms are established, and in this locality especially, where more people have the opportunity of visiting the farm and seeing what we are doing than in any other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am not competent to discuss, nor have I the intention of discussing the different subjects the hon. gentleman has mentioned in regard to the practical work of the farm. There are, no doubt, gentlemen on both sides of the House who will do that. What I invited the hon. gentleman to state to the House was more the financial part of the operations. I would like to know what has been the total expenditure on all the farms. I would like the hon. gentleman to divide that, and to say what the capital expenditure has been on the central farm, on the Manitoba farm, on the Maritime Province farm and on the North-West farm; I would like him to state what the actual expenditure has been for the current year on those farms; I would like to know what the actual receipts have been for the current year, and what has been the loss or the profit, leaving the capital expenditure out of consideration. I submit that, before the House is asked to vote such a large amount as this which is asked, as my hon. friend has pointed out, somewhat in defiance of the principles which were laid down by the Minister when

he introduced this matter to Parliament, we ought to know where we stand financially up to date, as to capital expenditure, as to current expenditure, and as to receipts.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is asking for a great deal of information which was unexpected. Last year that information was asked for by an hon. member and was brought down. It was then stated what had been the total amount expended on each farm and the annual expenditure on each farm. That information is now in possession of the House. I did not expect that I was going to be asked for that information now, but I think an hon. member has asked for certain information to be brought down in which that is included, and that will be brought down in a very short time, but I have not that information at my disposal at this moment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then, I think it is most unfortunate and most regrettable that the hon. gentleman has not that information at his disposal, and, with due respect to him, I think he ought to have it at his disposal before he asks the House to vote this amount. He ought to be able to submit to the House a proper statement of the receipts and expenditure of the department for the previous year.

Mr. CARLING. That is not what the hon. gentleman asked.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes; but in addition to that he ought to have a proper appreciation of that expenditure in order that we might learn whether the amount asked is too much or too little, and for that purpose we should have a statement of the total expenditure. There is not a man in the House but who will admit the reasonableness of that. The hon. gentleman says that last year a statement of that kind was brought down. I do not know where it is now, but we should have it before us at this moment. Before we were asked to vote this money we should have been placed in full and ample possession of the results of the expenditure of the money we have voted in previous years, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman cannot state the capital expenditure up to date as well as the expenditure for the current year. I should have thought he had these things at his fingers' ends, and he should have them. The House should have had before it this information before entering upon the discussion of this expenditure. No doubt the discussion of the practical working of the farms will be very interesting, but that is apart altogether from what I have asked as to the financial condition of each of these farms at the present day. If the head of the department says that he cannot state that, how can he expect the individual members of the committee to be able to state it? How are we to know it if the head of the department himself does not know it? I am interested as a citizen of Canada in all these farms, and I am especially interested in regard to the farm in the Maritime Provinces; and I expected to have received a statement of the capital expenditure up to the present time, of the expenditure during the last year and the receipts, of the number of employés who were engaged, whether the expenditure had been increased or reduced, such a statement, in fact, as a head of a private firm would make to the members of his firm. I say that this haphazard way which has become too frequent, of asking the House to vote $75,000 or $100,000 without that information, is absurd. The hon. gentleman's information should be put in such a form that he could inform the members of the committee, and not only the members but the thousand and one farmers throughout the country who could refer to *Hansard*, what these expenditures have been. I do not know whether the expenditure is justified or not. But we all ought to be informed on this subject, and the hon. gentleman ought to have anticipated this request. It is a reasonable one, and he ought to have been prepared to give the information.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman is unfair.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no intention of being so.

Mr. CARLING. I do not think the hon. gentleman expects, when an item in the Estimates is called in regard to the Intercolonial Railway or some canal work or other public work, that he should get the information as to the expenditure up to the present time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I certainly would expect it.

Mr. CARLING. I do not think he would ask the Minister to state the expenditure for the financial year. Every item expended for the financial year is in the Auditor General's Report, and is in the hon. gentleman's hand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is for 1890-91.

Mr. CARLING. The expenditure for this year has not been increased. But I contend that the hon. gentleman is unfair in expecting me at this moment to make such a statement as he asks, when, as I have already stated, an hon. gentleman asked in the House last year the total expenditure from the commencement of these farms up to the present time, and that statement has been laid upon the Table. A similar statement has been asked for the present year, and it is being prepared and will be brought down to the House in a day or two. I do not think it is fair to ask that I should have all that ready at any moment.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want the hon. gentleman to understand that I am not actuated by any spirit of unfairness in this matter. What I have said refers to all other departments as well as to the hon. gentleman's. When the militia estimates came up the other night I made the same statement. The hon. gentleman who had that department in charge presented a report from the General, making ten or fifteen recommendations, and I said the hon. gentleman ought to be in a position to tell the House which of these recommendations he was prepared to ask the House to adopt, and if there were any he was not prepared to ask us to adopt, he should give us his reasons why. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the Secretary of the Navy at home, or the Secretary of the Army, or the head of any of the great spending departments, would come down and ask Parliament for so many millions a year without making a full and detailed statement of the expenditure for the previous year, and the proposed expenditure for the next year, giving the House ample and accurate information with regard to all these matters? The hon. gentleman says that in a day or two he hopes to place us in possession of information which we ought to have before we vote this money. Why,

we are not here merely to record the wish of the Government; when we vote money we want to vote it intelligently, vote it on accurate information, on official information which we can rely upon and hold the Minister responsible for. I make these remarks in no spirit of unfairness; the principle applies to every department; every head, before he asks Parliament to vote a large sum of money, should lay before us detailed and accurate information with reference to the expenditure in the past, and a full declaration of the policy as to the proposed future expenditure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It seems to me that fault should not be found when a question of this kind is asked. As the Minister has pointed out, motions are made for the very information asked for by my hon. friend. My hon. friend thinks proper, when a subject like this comes up, that the Minister should be in a position to make a statement similar to that made by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech. If the head of a department were to do that, it would obviate the necessity of calling for these special reports. The Minister, by giving a statement from year to year, stating, for instance, in what year a farm was established, what has been expended on it, and for what it is proposed to expend an additional sum, would be given the House, in a concise shape from year to year, informatien which would be of great benefit to the country, and he would give it in such a way that the press would take notice of it and distribute it to the people. When it is presented in the shape of a retûrn, individual members may take notice of it, possibly it may find its way into the press, but it is not made generally known in the way it would be if the Minister made an annual statement in concise shape. In reference to the Intercolonial Railway and other roads, it seems to me reasonable and natural that there should be given by the Minister in charge of that department, from year to year, a statement letting the whole country know what that road has cost from beginning to end, what amount has been added to capital account year after year, what the assets are upon that road, what the expenditure has been, what the deficit has been, &c. This, I understand, is what the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., has asked for, and he thinks the proper way would be for the Ministers in the future, not having done it in the past, when we strike an item of this kind, to rise and give a brief statement somewhat like the statement of the Finance Minister with reference to the finances of the country in his Budget speech. It seems to me that it is proper that it should be done, and nothing unreasonable has been asked by the hon. member for Queen's. I think it would be of interest to the country. The Minister himself would find it beneficial; more public interest would be taken in the matter, and if there is anything in regard to which the management has not been what it should be, the Minister will get the benefit of the criticisms bestowed upon it by the public. The position is not taken against the Minister of Agriculture for the first time, it is not taken in a captious mood, it is taken as a general principle, and it ought to be followed by all the Ministers at the head of spending departments.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I must take exception to the doctrine laid down by the two hon. gentlemen who have just spoken. It is a new doctrine entirely in this House, and I think it is a new doctrine in the British House as well. It is an idea which is put forth to-night for the first time, that when the Minister of Agriculture comes down with an item of $75,000, not one dollar of which is for capital expenditure, not one dollar of which is to buy land, or to build a house, or anything of that kind, but is simply a sum which he proposes to expend during the coming year in working out the farms—that he must take occasion to deliver a set lecture, giving a history of the establishment of the farm from the beginning, telling all the results up to the present time. I do not think that is requisite, it has never been required; I think it would introduce a very unwholesome system into the House. The Minister is here to give information upon subjects which are, for the time being, before the House, and it would be altogether gratuitous for him to go over the whole ground in the way the hon. gentleman asks him to do. For instance, the Minister of Railways comes down with a vote for the working of the Intercolonial Railway. If this demand is to be carried out, the first thing the Minister must do is to make a statement giving a history of the Intercolonial Railway from the time it was first started till the present, giving the amount of capital expended each year, the amount of capital expended during the whole period, going over a great mass of detail which the House might not wish to hear. It seems to me the only thing that can fairly be asked from the Minister is to discuss at this time what is involved in this $75,000 and how he proposes to expend it. In discussing that point it is germane to discuss the expenditure of the past year, and if the hon. gentleman wishes to know about the capital expenditure, what the farm has cost in the way of capital expenditure, although that item is not under discussion, it is fair for him to ask it. But the Minister cannot be expected to keep all these things in his pocket when he is discussing an item of this sort, and no one knows that better than the hon. gentleman. When I come down, as I shall a little later, with the steamship subsidies, the hon. gentleman's theory will demand that I should take up the history of steamship subsidies in this country from 1867 to the present time, what has been expended and what have been the results. I do not think the House requires it, I do not think it would tend to the sharp and quick management of the business of the country. The item which is before the House is one about which discussion has to take place; any question with reference to that, it is certainly in the province of the hon. gentleman to ask, and of the Minister to answer; and whatever other information on cognate subjects which he may have at his fingers ends. But to ask on an item of $75,000, expenses for the coming year, which has nothing to do with capital expenditure, a history of the capital expenditure on the experimental farm may be very interesting, but it is not altogether so pertinent to the question that hon. gentlemen opposite should rise and lecture the Minister of Agriculture because he does not have that information in his hand. We must be reasonable in all these matters.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the hon. gentleman has not made a very strong defence.

Mr. FOSTER. As strong as I could, but I could not compare with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). From the remarks of the hon. gentleman one would suppose that four or five hours would be required to give these details.

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say it would.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not required.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not required.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But it is thought to be a proper thing that such information should be given, and more than that, a Minister fully up in his department would be able to give off-hand the information now asked for. That the country requires it is evidence by the fact pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture himself, that year by year, in order to obtain that information, motions have to be made asking for returns showing it. That involves expense, and work on the part of private members of the House. Private members are really looking after the interests of the country and compelling Ministers to do their duty. It is suggested by the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that, without the pressure of independent members of the House, the Minister himself should take sufficient interest in his department, and have sufficient acquaintance with it, to voluntarily vouchsafe the information required when the item comes up for discussion, without being asked by a formal resolution, to do so. This duty need not occupy more than a few minutes. Does the Minister of Finance mean to say that the Minister of Agriculture should not have on his mind, or on a slip of paper, what the total cost of these experimental farms has been from the beginning? Does the Minister of Finance mean to say that the Minister of Railways should not have on his mind the amount of the capital account of the Intercolonial from its inception to now, and also the deficiency between receipts and expenditure on the road for the past year, or two years, or ten years? I think the Minister of Finance will admit that if a Minister understands his department thoroughly, these are the very points on which he will be expected to give information. The very fact that members have to move special resolutions in order to obtain this information shows the need of the Minister being in possession of it, and giving it to the House, without its being moved for by formal resolution. All the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has said is, that this is the proper time to give the country information on these particular points, all information with respect to the cost of working and the policy to be pursued with respect to these experimental farms. That is all that has been asked. In order to do this, it is not necessary to speak two or three hours. It could be given in the form of condensed information, which would be of value to the country, and which the Minister himself, if he were an efficient Minister over his department, ought to be in a position to give.

Mr. CARLING. I am sure there is every desire on the part of the Agriculture Department to furnish all information, and to hold back nothing with respect to the experimental farms. Reports have been brought down yearly. Last year a report of 300 pages was submitted to the House by the chief director of the farm, giving every particular about the management of the central and four other experimental farms in the Dominion. The Auditor General's Report, which has been brought down, contains every item of expenditure from 1st July, 1890, to 1st July, 1891. Hon. members are in possession of that document, and also the information which that hon. gentleman asks.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). All the House would, therefore, like now would be for the Minister to state what information was contained in that report last year. As the hon. gentleman says we are in possession of it, he, as Minister, will know all about it.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman assuredly does not expect that I can, at a moment's notice, place my hands on the papers brought down to the House, giving the total capital expenditure up to the present time. That was given by the department to the House, and it is in its possession at this moment. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) asks for similar information to that brought down last year, as to the total expenditure, on each of the farms. That information, I believe, is in the hands of the House; if such is not the case, it will be supplied in the course of a day or two. It has been truly said by the Minister of Finance, that this item of $75,000 is for the annual expenditure, and it is not on capital account. Last year, 1890-91, the expenditure was nearly $75,000, and it was found after very careful enquiry that we cannot do with less for the coming year. We hope we will be able to conduct the farm as efficiently in 1892-93 as we did in 1890-91 within the estimates we are now asking. I am sure the reports submitted to the House and the country are as full as those of any department, and the hon. gentleman has only to take up the report of the chief director of the experimental farm of last year to obtain all the information required. A similar report for the present year is now in the printer's hands and will be distributed to the members in the course of a very few days. We have endeavoured to push it forward as rapidly as possible, but of course it is impossible to secure for it precedence at the hands of the printer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If I wanted a complete vindication of the position I have taken before the Committee to-night, I have it in the remarks of the Minister. As was stated by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), if the head of the department ought to know anything at all, he ought to know what the expenditure has been up to date, what the expenditure of the past year has been, whether there has been a net deficit or surplus, and he ought to be able to tell Parliament whether he hopes that the coming year will be for the good or for the bad. What does the hon. gentleman say? He says: Any hon. gentleman, if he reads 300 pages of the report brought down last year, and if he goes down to the printing office and reads the manuscript of 300 pages more which I hope will be printed in a few days, he will have all the information. I believe that it is not the intention of the hon. gentleman to treat this committee with disrespect, but he must see, in the very fact that he alone has had that manuscript in his possession, that he is himself the only person who knows the result of the working, and the expenditure for the past year. That very fact is conclusive to show that before he asks the House to vote the money for the current year he should tell us what these other 300 pages embody. I say that his answer is treating Parliament with disrespect. I am aware that we have fallen into a careless system in this Parliament, but I deny the accuracy of the

statement made by the Minister of Finance that such is the practice in England. Any man who follows the *Hansard* Debates in England knows, that when the Army or Navy Estimates, or when Mr. Chaplin comes down with his Agricultural Estimate, or when any other Minister comes down with an estimate, he always makes a full and complete statement to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. On the item before it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not on the item alone, because there is no particular item, but it is upon the expenditure connected with that department, the expenditure that he is trustee of. Parliament votes money in a lump sum, and Parliament appoints a man to control that expenditure, and Parliament has a right to have a report from that Minister. Before Parliament is asked to vote money for the coming year it ought to know what the Minister has done with the money entrusted to him the previous year. That is done in England, and if it were not done they would not get through their estimates at all because they are much more jealous there of voting money than we are here. I do not propose that the hon. gentleman should give a history of all the business since it began.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what you asked for.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not at all. What I asked him to give was a statement of the capital expenditure of each farm up to the present date; the current expenditure and receipts for the past year on each farm, showing whether there has been a deficit and if so, how much on each farm. The Minister of Agriculture must know these particulars, and I suppose the Minister of Finance does also know them, but there is not a gentleman outside of the Government, who can at the present moment state whether the Minister of Agriculture intends to appropriate any, and what part to capital expenditure. We have in our hands here a brochure purporting to be a report of the Minister for the coming year. I went through that report in order to glean, if I could from its few pages the information which I thought I would get from the head of the department, but there is no such information in it. There is not a word in that report to show what the expenditure has been on any one of the farms. It is bald and meagre, and reflects little credit on the department that got it up. I repeat the protest I have made on this vote, and I say it is neither fair nor right that the hon. gentleman should ask this money to be voted until he is prepared to make a proper explanation to Parliament. He himself says: I have the information in manuscript form, and I have sent it to the printer, and after you vote the money you can see it for yourself. That, I contend again, is disrespectful to Parliament, and the hon. gentleman sees that he has given a complete answer to his own argument on the position I took when this debate commenced.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I do not believe that we have ever had a complete statement of what the real capital expenditure on this farm has been. I have called time and again for it, but it never has been forthcoming in this House. It is fresh in the memory of every hon. gentleman present that last year I fought the Minister of Finance and the then Postmaster General to get a certain statement. The Minister of Agriculture was not in the House and could not come into it at the time, but I never could get a correct statement of the amount of money spent on capital account. I hold that if the farm is to be of full benefit to the farmers of this country, we should know what has been spent on fencing, draining and road-making. The work of the farm proper should be kept by itself, as well as the work of the horticultural department, and the experimental department and the other departments, so that we should know what has been spent on each. It is true that we have the Auditor General's Report, but that gives a lump sum for labour and other matters, and there is no detailed account. I have always believed that on a farm like this, that the farm proper, apart from the experiments should come very close to paying its own expenditure. I want the Minister of Agriculture, and the Government, and the House, to understand that I am not opposed to the farm; but I want the accounts of the farm to be kept in such a manner that any intelligent farmer in taking the report can tell how much labour has been spent on a certain quantity of land and how much has been spent to bring about the results in each department. Then with respect to the sending out of grain. I grant that it is one of the greatest benefits—a benefit that we can perhaps hardly estimate—that the farmers are deriving from this experimental farm, but I cannot understand how it requires such a large number of men to do the work. Although we did send out over 72,000 packages, that could be accomplished if two men put up 50 packages each during the 150 days of winter, and that would not be too much work for them. We have a statement of some 39 men kept on this farm, a number of teamsters, and 19 labourers kept all the year round, 313 days. We ought to have a statement of what these men are employed at. The Minister makes up the dairy department along with a statement relative to the farm, but the two ought to be kept separate. I do not want to have those two departments mixed, because there is a vote of $20,000 for dairy purposes which we will discuss when it comes up in proper time. Last year I asked and I ask again, that the capital expenditure on the farm should be given, as well as the annual running expenditure. It is impossible for the farmers of Canada to derive the benefit that the farm is calculated to give unless these things are presented in such a way that a practical farmer can understand them when he gets the report. The work of all the men employed on the farm is mixed up together. Each of these men should have his own department, so that the country could get a statement of the cost of each.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman will look at the last report brought down to this House, page 50, he will find the annual expenditure of each farm.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is for last year, not this year.

Mr. CARLING. This is for 1890-91. He will find there so much spent on horses and harness, so much for cattle, so much for implements, drains, tiles, blacksmithing, seed grain, stable manure, exhibition expenses, and so forth.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Will the Minister state how much of that is for permanent improvements or capital? How much for actual annual expenditure?

Mr. CARLING. I do not consider that any of this is for capital expenditure. The capital expenditure is made by the Department of Public Works. On page 50 the hon. gentleman will find the items of expenditure for the central farm, and on page 51 the items for each of the other farms; and every item of expenditure has been brought down in the Auditor General's Report to the very latest date.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman now state what the capital expenditure is on each farm?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say at the moment. The information was asked before, and is in the possession of the House at the present time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can he say what the expenditure of last year was in comparison with the expenditure of the previous year? That is in the report at present in the printer's hands.

Mr. CARLING. The expenditure will reach the sum of $75,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). For all the farms?

Mr. CARLING. For all the farms.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Exactly $75,000, no more, no less?

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman must know that nothing is kept back from the House. Everything is brought down in the proper way, through the proper channels.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) must be hard to satisfy, after the information which has been given to them and the country with respect to these farms. Last year we voted money to distribute throughout the country 300,000 copies of the report, which gives the very information these hon. gentlemen are asking for. I do not think the country is so ill-informed of what is going on at the experimental farm as to feel that any injustice is being done by our voting this $75,000. At present we are asking that 100,000 copies of the report now in the printer's hand be struck off for distribution throughout the country. The hon. member for South Huron is, I believe, connected with the experimental farm at Guelph; at any rate, he was one of the commissioners appointed to look after it; and I would ask whether he gave the information in the report on that farm which he asks for to-night in regard to the experimental farms of the Dominion? I think not. It is true, part of it is given. It gives the labour of all the students, and it states how much was paid for that labour, and how much certain lines cost; but in the aggregate that farm cost $37,000, while the various farms of the Dominion, five in number, and carrying on much larger operations, are only costing $75,000. Considering the great work that is being done, I do not think the country will grumble at that expense. For my part, I think the only thing the country has to complain of is that a larger sum is not voted for this object. When we consider the valuable work done, we must admit that this is the best money spent by this Parliament. One item will afford an illustration of the benefit the country receives. Mr. Robertson, who was before the Agricultural Committee, announced to us no longer ago than to-day, that, by means of new information, they were able to tell the cheese-makers how they could get one-twentieth more cheese out of the milk than they have done in the past. What does that mean? We sold over $9,000,000 worth of cheese last year, so that it means in round numbers an increase of $450,000 on that single item. The same information enables the farmers to make butter such as that which last year was shipped from Ontario and sold at from 24 to 25 cents a pound, and when we remember that, by virtue of the operations carried on there and the information given, we are building up a valuable trade in England, I think we should not grumble at the expense. There is a very strong demand for more instructors to extend their operations, especially in the dairy line. I know from my own knowledge, there are applications from different parts of the country to send instructors to different points which they have not been able to reach yet. Applications have been made to the Minister of Agriculture to send these men, but the complaint is that not sufficient money has been voted to do so. Not to say anything of the experiments in feeding and raising new varieties of grain and potatoes and other products, if you take the one line of cheese, you have a return to the country of ten times the cost of the farms. It would be better if we extended their operations and voted more money for this purpose than abuse the Minister of Agriculture and the Government for expending what they have.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not for a moment wish to be placed in opposition to the grant for the experimental farm. The hon. gentleman need not fancy he is going to create the impression in this House or the country that we have any desire whatever to frustrate, in the slightest degree, the beneficial operations of the farm, but we want the farmers to benefit by these operations to the fullest extent, and we criticise the expenditure of the people's money so that they will get an adequate return. The year before last when the discussion of the expenditure was before the House, the Minister of Agriculture was not able to give the committee the report of the agricultural farm because it was not then printed, and though we sat the whole night discussing the question, he refused to forego the passage of the item until such time as that report was brought down. The First Minister then came in at six o'clock in the morning, and urged that the demand of the Opposition for the submission of the report was a reasonable one, and the item was dropped until the report was laid on the Table. We are now in the very same predicament as we were then. With regard to the remarks of the Minister of Finance, who took exception to our asking for a statement of the expenditure on capital account, if the Minister will read the item he will find that it is for the establishment and maintenance of the experimental farm. What does he mean, then, by telling us there is no money intended for the establishment of a farm there? Why put it that way if he did not intend it? I notice that we have spent $1,341 on the establishment of a dairy. Now, the expenditure last year was $75,000 and that $1,341 was included in it. Will the Minister say he intends to spend a sum equal to that on the dairy for the next year? Is that an expenditure on capital account? Will he tell the committee that he is going to spend the same sum next year? The two

items are clearly mixed. I would ask the Minister of Finance, who railed at us for asking something unreasonable, whether, if we were discussing instead an item for the construction of a post office or other public work, we would be refused the details of the expenditure? Why, the Minister would give the committee every item of information. Have we not the same right to have the details of the expenditure on the Government farms as in the case of any other public work? Notwithstanding the fact that there are items in the account submitted to the House last year for expenditure on capital account, is he prepared to say that we have closed the capital account? Has he no intention whatever of expending any more money on capital account? Is he not going now to ask the House to vote for an expenditure in connection with capital account?

Mr. CARLING. There is no item in this $75,000 to be expended on capital account. If there is anything more to be expended on capital account, it will come down in the estimates of public works. There is none in this money we are asked to vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. Turn to page 203 of the Auditor General's Report and add up the items expended on dairying. I notice for the plant he has paid $1,341. Is that annual expenditure or on capital account?

Mr. CARLING. There was a special item voted in the Supplementary Estimates last year for dairy building and appliances, which was not included in the $75,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is included here.

Mr. CARLING. It was a special vote in the Supplementary Estimates not included in the general votes for the experimental farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). If the hon. member for North Grey will look carefully over the report of the Guelph farm he will find the expenditure on the farm proper is kept by itself, he will find the expenditure on experiments kept by itself, the horticultural department by itself, and he will find in that report, notwithstanding the large amount of student labour—and the hon. gentleman has drawn on his imagination in saying there are 300, for there was never more than 100 in the college at one time—he will find that the professor of agriculture gave a statement that he had run the farm proper and had a surplus of $1,700, notwithstanding the fact that some $4,000 of student labour had been applied to that farm, which cannot be applied economically. With respect to the agricultural farm, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has mixed up the two items. There are $20,000 last year voted for dairying exclusive altogether of the $75,000 for the farm, so that they bear no relation to each other in the estimates. And I would ask, whether or not any of the butter manufactured in the experimental dairy was sent to the English market?

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand anything, it appears to me that the information is precise on every subject, as it is given in this book. The question was asked by the hon. member if any of the butter had been sent to the English market. If he had been in the Committee on Agriculture he must have heard Professor Robertson say they had been sending it there all season, and he stated where it was sent, how it took in the English market, and what probability there was of making a very important market there for this product. As regards the mixing up of the two items of expenditure, I do not think I said anything about that. It was the general work of the farm that I referred to, and the items of information that the hon. member asked for are in the report. I have the report before me, and if the hon. gentleman turns to page 50 he will find, with all the details, that the aggregate expenses of the central experimental farm amounted to $44,801; the Maritime Province farm, $6,993; the Manitoba farm, $10,478; the North-West Territories farm, $8,072; and the British Columbia farm, $9,204, and then the total is given, showing an aggregate expenditure last year of $79,448. I do not think anything in the shape of book-keeping could be plainer than that. I also think it is very clear as to the cost of the experiments, the feed, the labour and so on.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to take exception to the remarks of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I repudiate the idea that any hon. gentleman on this side of the House has ever objected to the work of the experimental farms, or has tried to belittle the operations carried on there. But I submit that the question of the cost of carrying on these operations is a fair subject for criticism, and hon. gentlemen on this side should not be blamed for exercising what is not only their right, but their duty of subjecting these items to the severest criticism. I agree thoroughly with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, as to what he has said in regard to the experiments that Professor Robertson is carrying on. I thought his evidence given to-day before that committee was of great importance and value, but that is not the question now before this committee. We are now asked to vote $75,000 for the establishment and carrying on of experimental farms, and the hon. gentleman will find that an additional sum was asked last year, and is asked this year, of $20,000 for the dairy experiments, so that that has nothing to do with the matter which is before the committee. I think the Minister has not met the question which was raised by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) who said that, when these farms were established, the Minister made an estimate which he said would not be exceeded as to the cost of supporting these farms. Now we find that double that amount is asked for. The hon. gentleman to-night asked, and reasonably asked, for an explanation as to why this additional amount has been incurred. No one on this side has said that there was anything wrong in the increase, but we have a right to know the reason for that increase, and we insist upon knowing the reason. The Minister tried to answer by saying that a large quantity of seed had been sent through the country, but that does not account for more than a very small part of that expenditure. A very liberal estimate of the expenditure on seed would be $600 or $700 or $800. Then the Minister said they were making dairy experiments. The same objection lies to that statement as to the statement of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) because for this an additional sum of $20,000 is asked. I submit that the hon. gentleman ought to give some explanation on the point which has been raised. It is an explanation we have the right to demand, it is one which the House wants and the country wants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, before this is adopted, the Minister ought, in all conscience, to have given us the report on the experimental farms. There is no subject which is attracting more attention, or which deserves to attract more attention, than the progress of these experimental farms. In this report which I have had placed in my hands, I find a solitary page devoted to the subject of experimental farms. The hon. gentleman tells us there is a report being printed which will be submitted in a few days. Under the circumstances, I think it will appear to every reasonable being that that report should be placed in our hands before we are called upon to discuss this subject. More than that, every one knows that the position of our farmers in various parts of the country has been seriously affected by recent legislation in the United States. In this report, I notice that the hon. gentleman makes a very short allusion as to how two-rowed barley is likely to succeed in Canada. A very small quantity has been sent forward by the department, some 300 or 400 bushels, and that has been very well received by the English farmers. I would like to know what are the prospects of introducing two-rowed barley in Canada? If it were possible to do that successfully, it would relieve our farmers from many of the difficulties they are now suffering under, but we require more than the very meagre report we have here. Many farmers of high standing have told me that under our climatic conditions, it will require an extremely exceptional year before you can hope to produce that quality of barley in fit condition for the English market. That is a subject of first rate importance, and we would like to hear from the Minister of Agriculture the opinions he has received from the various professors who have experimented on this quality of barley and what conclusion the department have come to on that very important subject. If it should prove, as the hon. gentleman seems to indicate, that we can substitute the two-rowed barley, for the variety which has been ordinarily cultivated here, we should be glad to know it, and I would like to have the information in regard to it, and also as to the various experiments which have been conducted under the Department of Agriculture as to the shipment of eggs and other produce to England. On these matters the report of the Department of Agriculture is dumb. There are only a few lines as to two-rowed barley. I think the Minister of Agriculture should be in a position to give the House a general résumé of the experiments which have been carried on in that direction by the officers of his department. Nothing is more important to us than to find how far we can supply the markets which we have lost in the United States by other markets in England. I hope the report on this subject will be very full and exhaustive, and I think we should have that in our hands before we discuss this item.

Mr. CARLING. I have information from Professor Saunders, director of the experimental farm, that wherever six-rowed barley can be successfully grown in Canada, two-rowed can be successfully grown. I have now in my hands a report made by an expert in the old country as to the two-rowed barley that was sent over there. We sent over 400 bushels of two-rowed barley, properly cleaned as required by the English maltsters. The expert says:

"The stability I have proved to be exceedingly good, indicating soundness of material. The extract was equivalent to 87 pounds per quarter; and, coupling all the preceding facts with the judgment I formed of the malt, irrespective of its use, I assay its value 35s. to 36s. per quarter. I may say that had I wished to obtain a greater extract, so as to attain the maximum amount possible, I could readily have increased it, but I deemed it, under the circumstances, preferable to secure quality rather than quantity. The beer after racking has remained entirely satisfactory, and the very numerous people who have tasted it have been almost without exception of opinion that it is extremely good. Should you wish to have fuller and more complete notes of a more technical class, either as to the nature of the water employed in the brewing and of the malt itself, I shall be happy to place them at your disposal. I assume the above report is sufficient for your present purposes, and I have much pleasure in testifying, as a practical brewer, to the value that good malt of this class would prove to the brewers who understood its use."

36 shillings per quarter is equal to 92 cents per bushel. We have ascertained that barley can be shipped from the city of Toronto, or any other point in Ontario, to the consumer in England, covering all expenses, for 27 cents per bushel of 48 pounds, which would leave 65 cents per bushel net to the farmer. Now, this is a report from a very competent man, who values the barley at 35 to 36 shillings per quarter, and we have information that we could sell millions of bushels of the same quality that we sent over. Part of that barley was grown on the experimental farm, part of it near Gananoque, and some of it in western Canada. From all the information we have, we believe that if the farmers will take care of their ground, will properly clean the seed and see that it is well harvested and well cleaned, fit for the maltster, and such as they prepare in England, we can always realize good prices. But all our farmers have not been so particular in cleaning their barley and in putting it through the threshing machine. A great deal of our barley is cut in threshing, which makes it perfectly useless for malting purposes. If our farmers would take greater care in getting clean seed, and having the ground well prepared, and having the barley well cleaned, there is no difficulty whatever in getting a good price for it; and unless they do that, they will have to take an inferior price. Six-rowed barley is not in great demand in England; it is not so heavy, it is not so plump, as the two-rowed barley, hence the desire of the English maltsters to have two-rowed barley in preference to six-rowed barley. But unless it is thoroughly cleaned there is no use sending it to the English market. The English people want a good article, and they are prepared to pay a good price for it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the average per acre grown on the experimental farm, and on the other farms?

Mr. CARLING. The two-rowed barley on the experimental farm has varied from something like 30 to about 70 bushels per acre, according to the soil. Two-rowed barley has yielded 3 or 4 bushels per acre more than six-rowed barley, and if our farmers would see that nothing but good seed was put into the ground, and if their barley was well harvested and well cleaned, they would be sure of a good market.

Mr. McMULLEN. I got two-rowed barley year before last, and sowed it in the same field, with the same manuring and same attention as the six-rowed barley, and my experience has been this: It will pay any farmer in Canada to grow six-

rowed barley and pay 30 cents a bushel to send it to Buffalo to market rather than to grow two-rowed barley and send it to England; it will not yield within one-third of what six-rowed barley will yield. I am talking from personal experience. It has got to be sown earlier in the spring than six-rowed barley, it takes a longer time to grow, and the result is that you cannot reap it in time to preserve the colour the same as you can with the other barley. Everything considered, I maintain that any man can sow six-rowed barley with the expectation of paying 30 cents a bushel to get it to the American market, and he will make more per acre than by sowing two-rowed barley. I have it in my barn now, and there are people all around me who will not sow it because they are satisfied it cannot be grown successfully, at least in our section of the country. The statements of the Minister that it yields from 50 to 70 bushels an acre is a surprise to me. I would like to have the name of any man who will say that he has grown 50 or 60 bushels per acre of two-rowed barley.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I have also had a little experience in growing two-rowed barley. I have grown it for three years. I began with ten acres three years ago. In that year the experiment was not satisfactory. The last two years I doubled my acreage and the result has been most satisfactory. The second year I sold the growth of my crop as seed for 75 cents per bushel, and the last year I could have sold my entire crop, had I kept it, for seed, but sold on the market for 50 cents a bushel in the fall when the ordinary barley was only bringing 42 cents. During the past three years it has been grown by a great many farmers in my neighbourhood, and the result has been precisely the reverse of the experience of the hon. gentleman. Last year my whole crop averaged 45 bushels per acre, and I have heard of many other crops in the neighbourhood which were said to have turned out 50 bushels to the acre, although I had no opportunity of verifying the statements.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Less than three weeks ago I was talking with one of the largest grain dealers in western Ontario, and he told me that he did not know a single buyer that had bought barley to send to England, who had not lost heavily upon it. He said that while it was true that two-rowed barley could be raised, and he could get some samples, he could not obtain a sufficient quantity. This was the experience of a man who had been in the grain trade for over 20 years. This is not the first time that attempts have been made to raise two-rowed barley here and export it to the old country. I know that two shipments were made several years ago. They were sent to the old country market, but the shippers lost heavily on them and never tried future shipments. I have no doubt but that grain buyers have done their very best to establish a market there, but they have failed, and have lost money. With respect to the yield of the two-rowed variety: I have tried it for three years. One year I got a little more of the two-rowed than the six-rowed, but for the other two years I did not get a crop within five or six bushels to the acre of the six-rowed, although they were planted in the same field. Another great drawback to the two-rowed barley is that it is 8 to 10 days later than the six-rowed.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the experience of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is not the experience of the farmers throughout western Ontario, especially in the part of the province in which I live, because the universal testimony there is that the two-rowed barley, which the hon. gentlemen opposite seem so anxious to decry and prevent being grown here, yields from six to ten bushels per acre more than six-rowed barley.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. WALLACE. I am quoting from farmers, and I can give the names of 20 farmers whose testimony is in that direction.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, give us the names, and we will put them down.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Chas. McNeill, Vellore P. O., 20 acres, yielding more than 50 bushels per acre, which is many bushels in excess of the six-rowed variety. The hon. gentleman can write to Mr. McNeill and ask him to verify that statement; also to Mr. Andrew McNeill. Mr. Charles Mc Lean, Vellore P. O., is another. I observe that the hon. gentleman is not taking down the names.

Mr. McMULLEN. They will appear in *Hansard*.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. McLean, who is a next door neighbour, has even a better record. Others include Sam. McClure, Elder's Mills P.O.; Lochiel Cameron, Elder's Mills P.O.; and Wm. Faar, Woodbridge. With respect to the statement of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) that grain buyers lost money on two-rowed barley, I refer him to Mr. Dundas, of Lindsay, who informed me that he had gone over to the old country and returned from there last January; that he had made sales of every bushel of two-rowed barley he could get at very profitable figures, and he would be prepared to buy all the two-rowed barley he could purchase during the next season. He also stated that there was an excellent demand for it in the old country; that the barley had been very satisfactory to the purchasers there, and very satisfactory to himself, although he has paid from 4 to 6 cents a bushel more in Canada than was asked for six-rowed barley. If these are facts, they prove that two-rowed barley is more productive than six-rowed barley and that the price is higher. I can easily understand the motives of some hon. gentlemen opposite who are doing in this House what they have been doing all over the country, trying to prevent the farmers increasing their prosperity. I remember in May and June last, when the prospects of the agriculturists were very dark indeed, it appeared as if the darker the prospects of the farmer the brighter were the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite. In this way, as in all others they saw their prosperity in the depression of the farming interests, and they are pursuing the same course to-night.

Mr. McMULLEN. The remarks dropped by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace), in regard to members of the Opposition, are quite untrue. There are no hon. members who would be delighted to see the farmers prospering so much as would members of the Opposition, and the only reason we find fault with the policy of hon. members opposite

is simply because it is ruining the farming community and pauperizing them. With respect to two-rowed barley, the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) has spoken from what he has heard. I spoke from what I know and from my personal experience. He has only given what some other people have told him, and perhaps they have not told him all the truth. I know that two-rowed barley requires to be put in much earlier in the year than the other barley, requires a much richer soil, more attention, and is a harder crop to raise. Moreover, it will not come out so early as the six-rowed barley. It will yield one-third per acre less than the six-rowed variety. I am prepared to prove that by positive experience, because I sowed it on the same ground, cultivated it in the same way, and gave it the same general attention, and I am prepared to give testimony before a committee that the two-rowed will not yield within one-third of the six-rowed. In some sections the two-rowed may be sown with advantage, and I shall rejoice indeed, if we can raise it successfully and find for it a good market in Britain or elsewhere. What we want is to secure the raising of grain by the farming community in a way that will tend to enrich them, because they want it badly enough. That is my experience with respect to two-rowed barley, and I speak by the book, while the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) has only stated what he has heard.

Mr. CARLING. The report of the department states that 10,015 farmers in different parts of the Dominion furnished the results of their experience with two-rowed barley, and reported that it yielded 3⅓ bushels per acre more than the six-rowed. Specimens of barley were sent with the report. The evidence of the 10,015 farmers should be equal to that of the hon. gentleman, who is not a farmer.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). From what report is the hon. gentleman reading?

Mr. CARLING. From the experimental farm report.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Of this year?

Mr. CARLING. I am reading from last year's report, page 42. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the yield this year has been better than last year and more favourable.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure all hon. members will be pleased to hear that the experiments that have been carried on in the growth of the two-rowed barley, have proved so successful. There is no person in this House, no person in the country desiring the welfare of Canada, who will not rejoice that a new species of industry is to be added to our other industries, a new production is to be added to the other productions of the country. I was struck with a remark made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), with respect to the superior advantages derived from raising two-rowed barley. He informed us that in the experiments made, which had proved successful where he lived, farmers had realized from this barley 4 cents, 6 cents, and in some cases 8 cents per bushel more than the value of six-rowed barley for export to England, and that, by engaging in this business of fostering the growth of two-rowed barley, we were able to secure a price for that production ranging from 26 cents down to 22 cents less than we could secure for the six-rowed barley, which was raised with so much ease, if we had free access to the American market. That is according to the statement made by the member for West York (Mr. Wallace). We once had a market in the States for millions of bushels of barley, it was one of the leading agricultural productions of this country, but now we are struggling to introduce the growth of a grain which may or may not be adapted to the country, in order to supply the loss of the American market to our farmers. The best statement made in the House to-night as to the advantage of raising this barley for export is, that we are getting a few cents a bushel more than we are getting in the United States for the six-rowed barley, even though there is a duty of 30 cents a bushel on it, which by so much lessens the price to the Canadian farmer. Hon. gentlemen had better turn their attention to securing our natural market for the kind of barley the country is adapted to, and which can easily be sold in the United States. Our friends on the opposite side are amusing the people of the country with this talk of two-rowed barley, just as they amused them for a couple of years with the talk of reciprocity with the United States. They dissolved this House a year in advance of the time, because they wished to refer this treaty to a Parliament which was not a moribund one.

Mr. FOSTER. Speak to the item.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am speaking to the item. I advise the Government to cease amusing the people by will-o'-the-wisps, and to get down to the principle of securing for the people of this country the natural and profitable markets that they should enjoy and can enjoy again, instead of amusing them with this talk about two-rowed barley on the English market; a market 3,000 miles away, as compared with the market at our doors.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the hon. gentleman is accusing the Government of amusing the people of Canada with will-o'-the-wisps, the same as he amused the people of Buffalo a few days ago. I wish to refer to the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that the two-rowed barley realized about one-third less bushels per acre than the six-rowed barley, and also to his statement that if we are to get a yield from the two-rowed barley it must be sown at a much earlier period, and that the seed must be clearer and the ground in a better condition. If the hon. gentleman will take the experiments given in this report, where the two different seeds were sown on the same ground at the same time, and treated in the same way, I think he will admit that he is mistaken. Return for six-rowed barley:

——	Date of Sowing.	Date of Harvesting.	Yield per Acre.
			Bush.
Baxter's Six-rowed	April 25	July 31	25
Indian, from Spiti Valley	do 25	do 25	21¼
Mensury	do 25	do 31	20¾
Odessa Six-rowed	do 25	do 31	18¼
Petschora	do 25	do 29	19¼
Rennie's Improved	do 25	do 30	25¾

The following is the return for two-rowed barley :

—			Date of Sowing.	Yield per Acre.
				Bush.
Beardless			April 25....	26¼
Danish Chevalier			do 25 ...	23¾
Danish Printice Chevalier			do 25....	26¾
Early Minting			do 25....	19
English Malting			do 25....	24¼
Golden Melon, imported		1888.....	do 25....	20½
do	do	1890.....	do 25....	16
Goldthorpe	do	1890.....	do 25....	14½
Peerless White	do	1888.....	do 25....	22½
do	do	1890.....	do 25....	18¼
Prize Prolific	do	1889.....	do 25....	28
do	do	1890.....	do 25....	27½
Saale	do	1889.....	do 25....	24¼

This shows that in every case where the six-rowed and two-rowed barley were sown on the same day and in the same soil, and got the same treatment, the results have been the same of the two-rowed barley. The member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seemed to wander off on the National Policy and unrestricted reciprocity and the British market, but it is not necessary now to answer him on that subject. I know that Mr. Stopes, who was before the Agriculture Committee, gave most specific information upon an experiment with two-rowed barley made in England, and the information he gave was that Canadians could grow the two-rowed barley, and if it were of the same quality as he tested, they could realize, according to the time they sent it to England, from 75 to 89 cents a bushel. Surely that would pay much better than by exporting six-rowed barley at from 43 to 57 cents a bushel. In every instance which was given to the committee the yield of two-rowed barley was quite as much as the yield of the six-rowed barley, and it commanded a higher figure in the English market than the six-rowed does in the United States. All the reports which have been presented to the committee show that the experience has been that an important trade can be done in that line by the Canadian farmer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the report he has in his hands, and from which he quotes. He says there were ten or eleven hundred reports sent in last year, but I find he has only printed 15 or 20 of them, and I fancy these have been the best ones. If he will turn to page 41 he will find the following table :—

—	Number of Reports with Samples.	Yield per Acre.
		Bushels.
Ontario	872	25½
Quebec	48	20¾
Nova Scotia	13	26½
New Brunswick	23	22·14
Prince Edward Island	11	26½
Manitoba	62	39
North-West Territories	22	27½
British Columbia	1	45½

The Minister stated to the House that the experience was that it yielded from 40 to 50 bushels per acre, and the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) says that it yielded in his case 45 bushels an acre. I ask the hon. gentleman to turn to this report and he will find that there was only one yield of 45 bushels per acre in the case of one sample sent to British Columbia. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will say something in defence of his own report, because it is quite clear he was trying to mislead the House.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). I am more than surprised at the hon. members of the Opposition telling us that two-rowed barley will not answer in Canada. In the section of the country where I live it has worked admirably, and the crops last year were in every way satisfactory. In 1890 I sowed six acres. I cannot say that the result was altogether what I would have liked, but that was perhaps my own fault. In the following year I sowed 21 acres, and I got 52 bushels to the acre, of a very fine sample, and it was sent to the old country. I do not yet know the result of that experiment, but I have no doubt that it will answer the purpose of malting in England as well as the six-rowed barley does in the United States. I am not surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), because for some years past, ever since I have been in this House, he has been treating this House and the country to similar remarks. His only hope, it appears to me, is that the farmers of Canada will see adverse times, to help his party into power. I have faith in two-rowed barley, and I intend to increase my acreage of it this year, believing that it will continue to pay me as well as it has done in the past.

Mr. CARLING. I stated that from information I had received from the chief director of the farm, the yield on the experimental farm was from 30 to 70 bushels to the acre. I have a communication which was sent to the farm by Messrs. Hogg & Co., of Beaverton, along with a sample bag of two-rowed barley that yielded 60 bushels to the acre in 20 acres. This sample was sent to England as a specimen, and the price realized there was 35 shillings per quarter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but I understood him to say that the reports received of the product of two-rowed barley showed that the yield in the country was from 30 to 70 bushels to the acre. I would like to enquire what quantity was sent to England?

Mr. CARLING. We sent 400 bushels.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where was that purchased?

Mr. CARLING. Part of it was grown on the experimental farm, part of it in the district of Gananoque, and part of it further west. Five or six different lots were collected from so many farmers, brought to the experimental farm, cleaned, and sent to the old country. It weighed 52½ pounds to the bushel.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman give us the names of the farmers from whom he purchased it?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot do that now. Mr. Pike, of Markham, was one.

Mr. HUGHES. I am very much surprised that the success of two-rowed barley in Canada is at all doubted. It is true, the year before last a great many farmers sowed it too thickly and too late, and the crop did not do itself justice. But the experience of last year, I should imagine, would satisfy the most pessimistic men of the Opposition. In Victoria County, south as well as north, there were hundreds of acres sown with it. One farmer, Mr. John Dames, of Oakwood, had 80 acres, of which 10 or 15 acres yielded 75 bushels to the acre. It was all sold at 50 cents a bushel. He had 40 acres of six-rowed barley, which yielded from 30 to 35 bushels to the acre, and brought nearly 40 cents a bushel. Mr. William Cannon, of Oakwood, had about 2,000 bushels of two-rowed barley. I could give the names of forty or fifty farmers in Victoria County who grew two-rowed barley successfully in large quantities. It was a very amusing sight to see the farmers coming to market with their barley. When one saw a good, honest Conservative face coming along, one knew that he had the British or "Tory" two-rowed barley; but when a dark Grit countenance was seen approaching, one knew that he had the Yankee or "Grit" six-rowed barley. The Hogg Bros. of Oakwood, purchased thousands of bushels of two-rowed barley to sell again for seed, and up to the present time they have disposed of nearly all the seed they could purchase in that locality at very satisfactory prices. We are told that Great Britain is not the natural market for this barley. Why the Americans are themselves shipping barley at the present time in large quantities to England. For a number of years they have grown more than they require for malting purposes. Any one who has studied the markets and the crops of the United States knows that for years the annual product there has largely increased. The reports of the American Secretary of Agriculture indicate every year a large increase in the yield, and a corresponding decrease in the price. I understand that Mr. Matthews, of Toronto, has established a malting house in the old country for six-rowed barley, and is going to test the question of placing six-rowed Canadian barley on the English market in the form of malt. The objection is made to two-rowed barley that it requires to be sown early, but the farmers of Canada are intelligent enough to attend to that. This barley does not need any richer ground than the other. Mr. Dames grew both on the same farm, and his yield was from 30 to 40 bushels of six-rowed, and 50 to 75 bushels of two-rowed per acre, and he received an average of from 10 to 12 cents a bushel more for the two-rowed than he did for the six-rowed. It is a cleaner crop to handle than the six-rowed, is easier to raise and just as easy to save. I remember years ago in Darlington Township in Durham, and also in Ontario County two-rowed barley was grown and grown successfully, but the farmers abandoned it owing to the fact that the maltsters could not mix it properly with the six-rowed barley. However it has come in now, and if farmers can keep the seed free from the six-rowed barley, I am satisfied they will have one of the most productive and valuable crops in this country. We have heard this same cry of "failure" from the Opposition before. I remember when quite a young lad reading their speeches in opposition to the cattle trade with the old country, which started some years ago. It would never succeed they said and the American market was the only one we had. I am satisfied that in a few years our barley will be as successful as our cattle shipments, not only two-rowed but six-rowed.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). The United States exported from Atlantic ports 166,000 bushels of barley, and from Pacific ports 248,000 bushels last year. That was all that was exported from the United States, according to the British agricultural reports of 1891. Judging by these returns, our barley will have to be of better quality than the average marketed now in the British markets. In 1889 the highest weekly average was 21s. 3d. and the lowest 19s. 5d., and the average for the year was 25s. 10d. In 1890, the highest weekly average was 32s. 3d., and the lowest 22s. 6d., and the average was 28s. 8d. If we could grow barley and send it to the British market equal to the average of barley grown in other countries and in Great Britain, it would only bring us 48 cents per bushel, when we deduct 27 cents for sending it there: and I hold we cannot send barley equal to the average placed on the British market. In 1887-88 I stood in the Glasgow market three weeks, and examined their barley very closely, and I assure you, Sir, it is of a quality I never saw equalled in Canada. I find that there are seven teamsters. Are they engaged the whole year on the farm?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). They have 7 teams. How many are kept occupied?

Mr. CARLING. They are working teams and the team that drives the buss to the city every day.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I find there is considerable teaming done besides that. I find 108 days' teams engaged on the farm amounting to $335, besides the teams that belong to the farm. What are they engaged doing?

Mr. CARLING. They were engaged during the busy season. The hon. gentleman will understand that in a farm of 400 or 500 acres, if we want to get work rapidly done we must employ extra teams for a short time.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). At what?

Mr. CARLING. Seeding or ploughing.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I run a farm myself of 450 acres. I keep three teams, and I crop 120 acres, and keep ahead with the work. Of course experimental work may require an extra team, but I think six teams ought to do all the work of that farm.

Mr. CARLING. I think you will find that the teams of the central farm all work as steadily and as long as on the hon. gentleman's farm.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see that 19 labourers are employed over and above the teamsters and cattle men and gardeners. I find that 7 teamsters are engaged the whole year, and 108 days' teaming besides, and 4 cattle men, and besides these there are 19 labourers.

Mr. CARLING. I am told by the chief director that 6 of these men are looking after experimental work, some are employed in distributing seed of which we send out many thousand packages, and some are looking after cattle.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There are 19 men besides the cattle men and the gardeners and the teamsters. What have the 19 labourers to do?

Mr. CARLING. Some of them are weeding and assisting and doing experimental work on the farm. I cannot give particulars of every man's work. Every man employed does his work thoroughly as well as any man in any part of the country.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Is that staff kept up during summer and winter?

Mr. CARLING. There is a less number during the winter than in the summer.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). This shows the necessity of what I stated, that the farm proper should be kept apart from the experimental and horticultural department. It would give greater satisfaction to those engaged in conducting the farm and to the farmers of the country. If this farm is to be of any guide to the farmers, it should be conducted pretty much on the lines the farmers themselves have to follow with regard to their own farms; to be a guide to the farmer, we should know every item of expenditure. I hold that on an experimental farm such as this, while there should be a sufficient amount of stuff bought for what is distributed amongst the farmers in order to keep up the fertility of the soil, the proper course would be that which is pursued by successful farmers, and that the manure ought to be made on the farm which is to be put on the farm.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the amount last year expended for labourers alone who were engaged on this farm was $15,286. The Minister should give some additional information as to the reason why such an enormous amount is paid for labour, and whether he intends to continue that enormous expenditure on the farm next year.

Mr. CARLING. This expenditure for labour includes all the labour on the farm with the exception of the heads of the different branches.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister is mistaken. The Auditor General's Report at page B-202 gives the different officers and assistants and so on, and then the labourers are given and the amount paid for the labourers amounts to $15,286, apart altogether from the officers and the assistants.

Mr. CARLING. The name of every one of the labourers is set out and what he does, such as teamster, gardener, stableman, and so on.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is a certain amount here for drugs and chemicals. Where are they purchased?

Mr. CARLING. They are imported from Germany.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is a large quantity of hay and straw here. I see that 15 tons of hay were bought. I think there should be some experiments made in regard to keeping horses on grain and straw. There should not be any more animals kept than the farm can properly keep. A year ago, I saw a large amount of straw lying outside, and I am afraid it had not been properly taken care of. Then I find there is a waggonette, and I should like to know where that was purchased. There is freight on that waggonette of $33. The waggonette itself cost $468. Then there is carriage and waggon supplies, $134, and six robes for the waggonette, $70.50. This waggonette and the other things seem to have cost nearly $700. Where did this come from?

Mr. ROWAND. We had a statement last year that certain experiments were to be tried by which an animal would be kept on each acre of land.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I should like to have an answer in regard to the waggonette.

Mr. CARLING. I suppose the same thing was done on this farm as on the farm in Guelph, in which the hon. gentleman is interested, that a waggonette or omnibus is used for going backwards and forwards to the city to carry officers and people connected with the farm. I think that is done on the farm the hon. gentleman is connected with, which he says is conducted in such an economical manner, and which I think cost nearly $63,000 last year.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). We are not discussing the Guelph Agricultural College, but I want to know where this waggonette was purchased. They have students at the farm at Guelph, and I have yet to know any part of the civilized world where students get such a cheap education as they do there.

Mr. SPROULE. I might call attention to the fact——

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have asked for an answer to my question.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman the only one who has a right to speak on this subject?

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. My question is whether it is in order to entirely disregard questions asked by members and treat them with contempt?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DENISON). The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has the floor.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not understand the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) had asked a question——

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I asked where it was bought.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the agricultural farm at Guelph was run upon proper principles. He also discussed manure and a waggonette and some other things, and he said we would not find any institutions to equal the one at Guelph.

Mr. CHARLTON. He has not had an answer to any of his questions yet.

Mr. SPROULE. I find that at Guelph the cost of the garden and lawn was for foreman's salary, $499; assistant, $440; second assistant, $216.90; teamster, $305.25; labourers, $1,183.34; and all this to keep up the lawn, and yet that is an institution which is kept up on such fine principles. The item of labour is about the same as it is here. Then the total expenditure for maintenance of this establishment which is run on principles different from those here, which is much less expensive, which covers less area, where far fewer experiments are made, amounts to $24,371. The expenditure on the farm proper is $4,754.60, and on experiments $3,265.20. Then the experimental dairy costs $600 for labour, besides the salary of the assistant, and the amount expended for instruction is $1,187.94,

making an aggregate net expenditure for maintenance in all departments of $37,227.94; and that is run under a commission of farmers, of which the hon. member for Huron is one. Then we have the amounts for seeds, fertilizers, manures, live stock, waggons, salaries, maintenance, furniture, even down to binding twine, for which $39.10 was expended. For repairs and blacksmithing, $450; furniture, $43; implements, $293. Advertising, printing and posting are paid on the same expensive scale. So the hon. gentleman has no right to say that in that college farmers get instruction cheaper than in any other place in the country. I find that they had last year, 146 students instead of 300, as I erroneously stated when I spoke before. In my judgment the province pays a very large amount of money for the returns it gets from that college. It appears that there was only one team of horses for 146 students, I think that team must have been ploughed to death. And all this is done under the able management of a board of experienced farmers of which the hon. member for Huron is one. I think that he is hardly in a position of criticise the management of the experimental farm here. Any one who will read these two reports must come to the conclusion that the hon. member for Huron is not so great an expert in farming as he pretends to be.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I am glad to learn that the hon. gentleman has been studying the report of the Guelph College. I want to know from the Minister where this waggonette was purchased?

Mr. CARLING. It was purchased from Moreland & Co., London, Ontario. It is a very good carriage, and very cheap.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Huron complains of the expenditure for labour on the experimental farm. I want to remind him that at Guelph they pay $1,000 for labour in keeping up a lawn.

Mr. EDWARDS. As diversity is the spice of life, I propose that we discuss a humane question, and take up the item for dehorning cattle at the farm.

Mr. ROWAND. I have not yet got any explanation from the Minister of the result of the experiment of setting apart 40 acres for the keeping of a certain number of animals. We were told they were trying the experiment of keeping one animal on one acre.

Mr. CARLING. I am told that 25 head of cattle were kept on 40 acres for ten months.

Mr. CASEY. How about this waggonette? The Minister said it was a good and cheap one. I know perfectly well that for the price paid for this waggonette, you could get a first-class covered carriage.

Mr. CARLING. How many would it carry?

Mr. CASEY. It would carry six.

Mr. CARLING. This carries sixteen.

Mr. CASEY. Oh, I see, the Government are running a van to the farm. It must be a sort of circus waggon to run to and from the farm. Perhaps the Minister will not object to repeating his explanation as to this waggonette for my benefit, as I was not present when he gave it before.

Mr. CARLING. It is used just as waggonettes are used in other institutions; it runs between the experimental farm and the city, two or three times a day, to convey people connected with the farm to and from the city, and also to convey packages.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see how it can be made useful to the farm, although it may be convenient for the official staff. I look upon it as an unnecessary piece of extravagance. The difficulty we have experienced in getting information from the Minister only emphasizes what I said the other night as to the injudiciousness of throwing upon the director of the experimental farm other important duties. I have no doubt that gentleman is a very able man, but no single man can do more than he is supposed to do, and the consequence is that a great deal of what he is supposed to do must be done in a slip-shod manner. Now, it is proposed to load him with other duties as Commissioner at the Columbian Exhibition. I am afraid that next year we shall have even more difficulty in getting information about the proceedings at the farm than we have this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. In my opinion the experimental farm is conducted in the most extravagant way. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that on the agricultural farm at Guelph something over $1,000 was expended for labour, but here we have $15,250 expended for labour. The Minister says that this waggonette is run from the experimental farm to the city twice a day. I notice that over $200 is paid out for cab-hire in connection with the farm. How is it that there is so much cab-hire when there is a waggonette run twice a day between the farm and the city? Now, any person reading this report from beginning to end can come to no other conclusion than that money is uselessly expended. We are anxious that the experimental farm should be a success, we are anxious that the farmers may get the benefit of the experiments made there; but as the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) has said, if they are going to benefit by those experiments they must be conducted in some degree according to the usual custom of our farmers throughout the Dominion. If the Government operate that farm in a way far different from the way in which farmers run their farms, the experiments cannot be of much value in the way of giving farmers an idea of advantages to be derived from adopting a particular system of agriculture. The only advantage the farmers have had so far has been in the samples of seed sent out and also from some experiments in dairying. These are all good in themselves, and it is to be hoped that the farmers will benefit by these experiments, but while we are willing to encourage anything that will tend to enlighten the farmers and help them to develop the resources of their farms, we are not willing to continue an unnecessary expenditure. There is an expenditure of $15,500 on labour for the experimental farm alone, in addition to all the teamsters and officials and attendants. The extravagance displayed is absurd, and should be cut down at once.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see an item for stabling horses, 21 weeks. Where were the horses when we paid for stabling?

Mr. CARLING. These horses come in from the farm and stay in the city part of each day, when they are stabled, especially during the winter months.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see the cost of maintenance of the farm is $39,000 in round numbers and the revenue is $2,400. Is this a correct statement of the sale of the products of the farm? The discrepancy is a very great one.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman will understand that the bags of grain sent all over the Dominion are not charged for; that samples of wheat, barley and oats are sent to farmers in the different provinces for the purpose of improving their crops and giving them better varieties. We do not sell any, because we desire to improve the value of our cereals.

Mr. CHARLTON. I can understand that the farm would not be a revenue-making establishment, and my enquiry was simply for the purpose of getting information. Is a record kept of the quantity of grain, seeds, and plants distributed, and can their value at a fair market rate be arrived at?

Mr. CARLING. A record is kept of all the seeds sent out, and a report is secured from each farmer as to the results.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I understand there is an engine and grinder on the farm. How is there an item for $63 for grinding?

Mr. CARLING. The grinder was out of order, was broken, and had to be repaired.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I keep a large number of horses and cattle, but I have not spent one cent for grinding food for many years. If this farm is to be run economically, a similar line should be followed. There is an item of $40 for gravel. Is that the cost of the gravel, or the cost of drawing it?

Mr. CARLING. The cost of drawing it.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). This work could be done during the winter when the horses were not otherwise engaged.

Mr. CARLING. They are engaged then in drawing manure, of which we cannot get sufficient.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). With respect to the revenue, I observe $466 for berries, of which Mr. Borthwick paid $263. How is it so many berries were sold to this gentleman? Is there any opportunity given to all parties to purchase berries, or how are they sold?

Mr. CARLING. Two or three of the leading fruit dealers are written to, and those who give the highest price receive the berries.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have a letter in my possession making great complaint with respect to certain parties receiving all the benefit. I hold that every person should have an opportunity to buy berries on taking a certain quantity, and that it is not just to sell all to one or two firms, and not allow others the chance of competing. There is an item of $578 for cattle. What kind of cattle were they?

Mr. CARLING. They were bought to experiment with.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Then there is an item of $474.70 for milk. At what price was the milk sold?

Mr. CARLING. Five cents in winter and four cents in summer.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is an item of $125.25 for butter. Last year the promise was made that part of the butter made at the Ottawa dairy would be carefully packed and sent to the English market. Has any been sent there?

Mr. CARLING. No, not from the experimental farm dairy.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Was all the butter sold here? I have no fault to find with selling the butter, but we are seeking to establish a good market for our butter in England, and a good quantity should be sent there. We have no guide as to the quality of the butter manufactured, so long as it is sold in the local market. But if we had a quality established in the English market, we would be able to make a comparison. In future, a certain quantity should be sent there.

Mr. CARLING. 20,000 pounds of butter, which was made in Canada under the supervision of the dairy commissioner, were sent to England this year.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). What price was obtained?

Mr. CARLING. 125 shillings per cwt., which was equal to 24 cents per pound net.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I believe that it is in the interests of the country that we should have all this information. I think that the creameries in the west which are not under the care of an inspector, get something like 24 and 25 cents for their butter. There are a good many things here that are rather expensive. I find $15 for making a plan of the farm, and for survey and plan of drain, $60. If there was a good practical manager on the farm he should be capable of doing all that himself.

Mr. SEMPLE. While giving the Government credit for the distribution of seed grain, yet it must be remembered that we have a very imperfect knowledge of the operations of it last year, on account of the report not being before us. However, we can see in the Auditor General's Report that the expenditure has been very large and extravagant. There was no doubt there was a mistake made when so many stations were put in operation in different parts of the country. I notice that for the experimental station at Agassiz, British Columbia, there was an expenditure of $7,732.34 and the revenue derived was only $79.05.

Mr. CARLING. That farm has just been established.

Mr. SEMPLE. I find that among the salaries there is one Dun Lee, a Chinaman I suppose, who laboured 804 days and received $818. Another remarkable item I find is, an item for the rent of a horse $240 for twelve months. I would like to ask how the Chinaman put in so many days' work, and also some information about the horse?

Mr. CARLING. I am told the Chinaman was the only man who could read or write English, and he signed the pay-sheet for the others. With reference to the horse I think it is a misprint and that it should read rent of a "house" instead of a "horse."

Mr. SEMPLE. I have made a calculation and I find that the hay appears to have cost about $46.42 a ton, which seems to be an extraordinary figure. Taking into consideration the enormous expense of that station and the small return from it, I would ask, does the Minister intend to keep the British Columbia station up?

Mr. CARLING. The station at Agassiz has only been established for two years and we were not able to raise the hay required. I am told by the director that we never paid higher than $25 a ton for hay. It is of course the intention of the Government to keep up that station at Agassiz, as it is a very important station. It is one of the most important stations in the Dominion. We want to show what can be produced in British Columbia. It is going to be one of the best fruit districts in the Dominion, and I fancy there is no place in Canada where such a variety of fruit can be grown as in British Columbia. Fruit will be one of the chief articles produced there, although we will raise good stock and other articles which are of interest to that part of the Dominion and the country generally.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see that $118 is charged for papers and magazines for the central farm, and $13.25 for papers. What kind of papers are they?

Mr. CARLING. They include all the horticultural and agricultural papers; also chemical papers and journals that may be required for the use of the officials.

Mr. SEMPLE. The expenditure on the farm at Indian Head was $10,828.25, and, leaving out the grain raised, the revenue amounted to only $449.45. It is well known that in a country like the prairie province no experiment is required to teach farmers grain growing. Every farmer who has practical experience understands it.

Mr. CARLING. Has the hon. gentleman read any of the reports of the Indian Head farm?

Mr. SEMPLE. I have the cost here.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman says that it is of no use to experiment there. I would ask if he has read the report? If he has, I think he will change his opinion.

Mr. SEMPLE. We do not need an experimental farm to teach the first principles of grain-growing. These farms are well enough for testing the best kinds of grain to be grown; but the expenses of this farm at Indian Head compared with the small revenue, make a very bad showing. The Brandon farm, too, leaving out the grain, yielded only $105.11 of revenue.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman looks at the reports, he will see that part of that money was spent for stock for the farms.

Mr. SEMPLE. It is true, if we had the report of last year before us, we could discuss these matters more satisfactorily, and we might not require so much explanation. All we have to go by is the Auditor General's Report. Taking the three farms, the Agassiz, the Indian Head and the Brandon, they represent an expenditure of $27,279.56 and a revenue, leaving out grain, of only $232.61. This shows to my mind that a great mistake has been made in establishing so many experimental farms in different parts of the country.

Mr. CASEY. It is all very well for the hon. Minister to say that we should look at the report. My hon. friend who has just sat down has looked at the Auditor General's Report, and he finds that a large amount has been expended and very little revenue received. The hon. gentleman asks the reason for this expense, and he is asked by the Minister why he does not look at the report. The hon. Minister should know that he is asking us to look at a report which he has not yet laid before us. In his leisurely, placid, indifferent manner, he has allowed matters to jog on from the 30th of June until now without laying the report on the Table.

Mr. CARLING. Our report is made up to the 31st of December.

Mr. CASEY. It is a long time since the 31st of December.

Mr. CARLING. It takes some time to print it.

Mr. CASEY. That is not the reason it is not on the Table. The hon. gentleman has been too much occupied with experimental voters' lists to pay attention to the experimental farms since the 31st December last; and in the usual slipshod way in which that department is carried on, we are here discussing the management of the farms for the past year without having the materials for that discussion. We have two amateurs running the experimental farms- an amateur Minister of Agriculture, whose former business has certainly given him no aptitude for the position he holds, and the director of the experimental farms, who must have acquired his practical knowledge of farming since he became director. The whole business has been experimental—we have an experimental Minister and an experimental director, and the result has been a lavishing of money to very little use. I venture to say that if a committee of representative farmers were allowed to go through that experimental farm and expressed their unbiassed opinion of it, it could only be the same as that which I now express, that the whole thing has been a costly and wasteful piece of experimenting from beginning to end. There has been a lavish expenditure on buildings for officials and farm purposes, costing twice as much as they ought to cost. There has been a great deal of pottering experimenting with wild grasses, and with such weeds as lambs' quarter, which grows in everybody's garden—all sorts of fads and fiddle-faddles, over which there is a great deal of chuckling in the reports. There has been a perfect deluge of copies of this report of 1890, which I have read carefully, and I honestly say there is not in that report as much information of practical use to a farmer as he would find in six months' subscription to an agricultural paper. Look, for example, at the experiments on barley—two-rowed barley yielding from 16 to 27½ bushels to the acre. Does anybody suppose that these yields, collected from the produce of a-tenth of an acre, can be taken as a guide to the production of those kinds of barley on ordinarily good land and with ordinary practical treatment? Everybody knows that a very large part of that farm is almost entirely unfit for agricultural purposes. I knew it long before it was purchased, and had many a walk over it. I have seen the potatoes nearly uncovered by a strong wind, so light is the sand in which they were planted, and this practical Minister of Agriculture or director chose this sand heap as the place to make a practical experiment for the benefit of average farmers on average land. As to the Brandon farm, I think the Minister ought to be able to explain why it was necessary to expend this $11,000. Not having a report, we must draw on the immense sources of inform-

ation lodged in the heads of the two gentlemen who are furnishing us with information to-night.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see they have a thresher now on the Indian Head farm.

Mr. CARLING. A tread thresher.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see that there is $175 besides paid for threshing. I see that there is a certain amount of furniture paid for. What is that for?

Mr. CARLING. That furniture was bought for an office and for a room to entertain strangers.

Mr. CASEY. I find experiments made in spring wheat with the purpose of introducing new and more productive kinds of wheat. I find a great number of varieties of spring wheat experimented on, one of which brought the tremendous return of four bushels to the acre. The highest return was 20¼ bushels to the acre, and not one of the samples weighed 60 lbs. to the bushel while some weighed as low as 50¼ lbs. Amongst those were White and Red Fife, two kinds of spring wheat known to farmers for generations and which, owing to the absurd location of the farm and the kind of cultivation received, produced the tremendous return of 18¾ bushels to the acre in the one case and 12 bushels in the other. And the one weighed 55¾ lbs. to the bushel and the other 56¾ lbs. Can anything be more absurd than to conduct a series of experiments for the purpose of showing people that two kinds of wheat they have grown for years can be made to produce such absurd results? Any medium farm in the Dominion could show better results than are shown by this attempt to instruct our farmers as to the kind of wheat or any other grain they should use. Another experiment was with wheat sown in drills 2½ feet apart. I do not quite see the advantage of making experiments in growing spring wheat in this manner. If the results of this farm are to be of any use, the crops there must be cultivated as they would be in practical farming and should show results which a practical farmer could imitate, and not in rows 2½ feet apart. Nine varieties of wheat were sown in this manner on sand loam which was manured in the spring of 1890 with from 18 to 20 tons of stable manure per acre. Each variety occupied 6 rows, covering a space of one-twentieth of an acre. These 9 specimens in 6 drills of 2½ feet apart produced, with the 18 to 20 tons of stable manure per acre, the following results: Campbell's Triumph yielded 5¼ bushels per acre. This was Campbell's triumph but not Professor Saunders's triumph. Ladoga produced 7¼ bushels per acre and it weighed 57¼ lbs. to the bushel. Red Fern yielded 5½ bushels per acre and so on, the highest yield for any variety being 8 bushels to the acre. What, in the name of common sense, was the meaning of these experiments? Wheat planted in drills like Indian corn could not yield any sort of reasonable crop per acre and would not afford any results which would be of any use to anybody. It was one of the fiddle-faddle experiments tried there for what reason I cannot imagine, excepting to furnish material to fill out a report. Even with this hand culture of these kinds of spring wheat, it was impossible during 1890 to raise wheat up to the standard weight on the model farm. Experiments in rye I shall not refer to, out of regard to the feelings of the Minister of Finance. Experiments in winter wheat have also been conducted on this model farm. The idea would not occur to anybody less thoroughly practical than the Minister and the learned director, of trying experiments in winter wheat in this neighbourhood. Everybody knows that this section is not fitted for growing winter wheat. To spend money, time, energy and science in struggling with the problem of raising winter wheat in this Laurentian country, is something which could only have occurred to the extremely great mind of those who are conducting the farm. I find that the yields were better than those of spring wheat, but still nobody can suppose any results obtained in this peculiar climate of Ottawa would be of any use to farmers even 15 or 20 miles from this most favoured spot. I need not go on to the experiment of mangles, turnips, and so on, as they do not show anything which every farmer does not know from his own experience. The managers of this farm have been going, child-like and blandly, over experiments made scores of years before. They have been repeating old experiments, which every farmer has to make in the course of long cultivation. Experiments in beet-root are of a certain value, as the cultivation of this root is not much gone into and not much known in this country. Experiments in the growth of grain are of very little value. I was over that farm last summer at the time when the crops were ripe. I am thoroughly satisfied, if the farmers of Canada got no better crops than those I saw on the model farm, which is supposed to be the beacon light for the whole Dominion, the practical farmers could not live. It was simply an exhibition of how poor crops could be raised by scientific management on a poor piece of ground. These results are not embodied in the book which is here, which does not contain the results of last summer's operations.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see there was grain sold from the Indian Head farm. Was that for seed?

Mr. CARLING. Most of it has been sold for seed to the farmers in that neighbourhood.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). What system is adopted in selling this grain?

Mr. CARLING. It is charged at from 5 to 10 cents a bushel more than the ordinary price of grain.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Is the quantity limited?

Mr. CARLING. To one bag.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. The other day, in the Committee on Immigration and Colonization, we had a very interesting address from Professor Saunders on experiments, and I think these experiments are very necessary, and I think the people should have the advantage of these experiments. While we were discussing the question, we found that some of the members from the Province of Quebec thought they had a grievance because they did not get a distribution of seeds from the farm in proportion to their population, but Mr. Saunders showed them that they get a due proportion. Now I find that we in Ontario have a grievance, and the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has shown that the Conservatives have the preference in regard to the two-rowed barley. He says the Grits are growing the six-rowed

barley, and the Conservatives are growing the two-rowed barley. I think some localities are better adapted for this than others. Those who have been growing two-rowed barley have been giving their special attention to it, with the results which have been shown here to-night. The hon. member for West York has stated that Mr. McNeill, in Vaughan Township, raised 45 bushels to the acre. I know that in my constituency, not far from this place, we have had six-rowed barley grown to the extent of 46 bushels, and in another case it averaged 54 bushels. You cannot tell which is the best from that, though it would appear that the two-rowed barley is best adapted for the English market, although it is only for feeding purposes because it is a larger and heavier grain than the six-rowed. I am sorry that our barley is going there simply for feeding purposes. I am satisfied that our oats would sell for as much as our barley according to weight, so that we are not gaining any advantage that we would not have by growing oats or peas or corn for feeding purposes. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) told us that the Grits said that England was not the proper place in which to sell our cattle. He is the first from whom I ever heard such a statement. Fifteen years ago I was one of ten who started to ship cattle to England. Six of us were Grits and four Conservatives, but we did not disagree on political questions, but went in to make money out of it, and we did make money out of it. We did not get assistance from the Government. We did not ask or require assistance at that time, and it was only last year that we got any assistance in the shipping regulations which they then passed, and for which we are grateful to them for.

Mr. MULOCK. I see that at Indian Head and another farm in the North-West, you have been sowing seeds of trees. Will the Government say what success has attended that enterprise?

Mr. CARLING. I am informed that the native seeds have succeeded remarkably well.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you mean native to the North-West?

Mr. CARLING. Native to Manitoba.

Mr. MULOCK. Have you not tried seeds of any Ontario trees?

Mr. CARLING. I am told that 200 or 300 varieties have been tried, but none have succeeded so well as the native tree.

Mr. MULOCK. What do you mean by native?

Mr. CARLING. Manitoba maple, Manitoba ash, and Manitoba elm. A number of the seeds were obtained and cleaned and distributed to the different farms in the North-West, to see how they would turn out.

Mr. MULOCK. Are the seeds referred to in the report of the Auditor General only the seeds of Manitoba trees, or do they include Ontario seeds?

Mr. CARLING. These seeds were all from Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. MULOCK. I see that you have been experimenting with oak. Is that Manitoba oak or our own oak?

Mr. CARLING. Manitoba oak.

Mr. MULOCK. Is that good for timber?

Mr. CARLING. It is quite a large tree.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be well to have experiments with the various woods found in our Canadian forests. For example, take the black walnut. The black walnut is supposed to be a tree that will only grow in bottom lands or where the climate is comparatively mild: but I have reason to know that that is an entire mistake. I find that it grows in northern latitudes in the Province of Quebec. I think it would be well for the experimental farm to make the experiment.

Mr. CARLING. I am told by the director that the black walnut tree is succeeding very well here. There are a number of them at the experimental farm. We have sent both trees and nuts to the North-West, but they have not succeeded so well. In Prince Edward Island they have been much more successful.

Mr. MULOCK. Whether the North-West is favourable to the cultivation of the black walnut or not, there are parts of eastern Canada that are favourable. In the western States it is becoming a regular industry, and the same may be said of some parts of the eastern States—not with reference to black walnut so much as to the softer kinds of wood that are used for pail timber, &c. For example, in Massachusetts and other New England States where the original supply of wood for manufacturing purposes is exhausted, manufacturers have adopted a regular system of growing their own timber. In ten or fifteen years its growth is sufficiently large to make timber for use in manufactures. I think the time has arrived when the Government might very well direct the attention of our farmers in that direction. Black walnut itself is a most profitable crop, it is a very rapid growing tree, and the wood in the tree is worth at least fifteen times as much as that of pine. It is worth in the tree perhaps $80 a thousand, as against pine in the tree which is not worth more than $4 a thousand. I think a great deal of attention has been given by the people to the south of us to the cultivation of trees for these purposes, and we cannot do better than follow such a good lead. If black walnut is cultivated for the purposes of timber, it must be grown under certain conditions, which, of course, the department will ascertain before they embark in any such enterprise. I think, that the farmers who can afford it will find that there is far more money in growing walnut than in growing grain or anything else. There are spare bits of land on almost every farm, that could be utilized for the growing of trees, which, perhaps, could be of very little use for anything else. Take, for instance, the Muskoka district, and the rocky districts between here and Peterborough, the land there is of very little use for agriculture, but it might be very valuable for the purpose of growing trees. Whether or not trees of this kind will flourish in the North-West, they certainly will in older Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. Have they been tested in the Muskoka district?

Mr. MULOCK. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BOWELL. I know they grow in the south-western section of Ontario.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister states that they grow at the farm, and Mr. Joly, the late Premier of Quebec, is cultivating them with great success somewhere in the vicinity of the city of Quebec. I

understood that they grow well as far north as Barrie, so the experiment might be extended.

Mr. CARLING. We are experimenting with all the different kinds of forest trees here, and at all the other experimental farms. We have four or five hundred varieties of forest trees, including walnut and chestnut now under experiment.

Mr. MULOCK. It would be well to bear in mind, if you are going to grow your trees from nuts at the experimental farm here and then transplant them, that it is not giving them a fair chance. A nut bearing tree is very difficult to transplant, as a rule. While the experiment might be successful if commenced with nuts, it might prove wholly unsuccessful if the trees were transplanted. Now, I wish to ask a question with regard to Ladoga wheat. I observe that the Government gave some attention to the cultivation of Ladoga wheat in the North-West. The Minister will remember there was a good deal of difference of opinion amongst millers and grain men as to the value of Ladoga wheat as compared with Scotch Fife. It was advanced as an argument in favour of Ladoga wheat that it matured earlier. I would like to enquire whether the reports that you have in regard to Ladoga wheat in any way throw light upon the controversy that existed some years ago. The Minister will remember that the millers' section of the Toronto Board of Trade passed a resolution disapproving of the efforts of the Government to encourage the growth of Ladoga wheat in lieu of Scotch Fife, whilst I believe the similar section of the Montreal Board of Trade pronounced in favour of the Ladoga wheat. I would like to know how the controversy has been settled.

Mr. CARLING. It has never been recommended in the department that Ladoga wheat should replace Red Fife; but it has been found that the Ladoga wheat will stand the climate in some parts of the North-West better than the Red Fife, and it matures some ten or twelve days earlier than the Red Fife. It is very much sought after in the district of Prince Albert and in the northern part of Manitoba. We are now experimenting with a car load of Red Fife and a car load of Ladoga wheat, at Toronto. Our chemist has tested it at the experimental farm, and he shows clearly that there is as much gluten in the Ladoga as there is in the Red Fife. Bread, made from Ladoga wheat, is considered equal to that made from Red Fife, although somewhat darker in colour. Experiments with it have also been carried out throughout Ontario. We find that the yield of Ladoga is not so much per acre as the yield of Red Fife, but it answers this purpose, that it ripens earlier and has succeeded in the North-West where Red Fife has not; it is well thought of, and has been asked for by many farmers in the North-West. Altogether, I would not recommend that it should replace Red Fife, because there is no better wheat than Red Fife, but it is more suitable than it in some districts.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that one difficulty arises from the fact that the two-rowed barley cannot be malted with the six-rowed. I have heard it suggested that the difficulty can be overcome and a good market for our six-rowed barley obtained in Liverpool, if we can get some maltsters there to take it up and malt it. English maltsters have become so accustomed to the two-rowed that they are averse to experimenting with the six-rowed. But, surely, if all that is necessary to get a market for our six-rowed is the securing of some firm to malt it, it is a difficulty that can be overcome. There is a pretty settled conviction that we are endeavouring to grow two-rowed barley which will not grow in Canada. I know the Minister points with satisfaction to the reports, and I only wish they were borne out by the average experience of a few years. But it must be borne in mind that last year was especially favourable for cultivating two-rowed barley, that the season was a long growing one, that the ripening season was postponed to the end of July, and the grain was not dried out. It is not likely in twenty years that we shall again have as favourable a barley season as 1891; and, of course, the character of the season benefited all kinds of grain crops. While I would not wish to discourage the two-rowed barley enterprise if likely to be successful, I feel that we are undertaking a task which is destined to be a failure. When the July sun comes the growing time of barley is at an end, and then filling takes place. In England they have a long season, and thus their barley grows to be heavy, 56 pounds or over, but it is not so in Canada. The six-rowed is a lighter variety, and seems, on an average, to be the best we can raise. I happened to have a conversation with an old experienced farmer not living very far from Toronto. He raised barley, not for market, but to sell for seed, and he is a little more than an ordinary farmer in that way. He is, indeed, one of the best farmers in Canada, and he obtained the gold medal of the province, on one occasion, for his farm. I shall have no objection to giving the Minister his name. if he desires it. This farmer assured me that he had been growing two-rowed barley for 20 years for seed purposes, and only once had it come up to the weight of 56 lbs. That is an experience which tells us pretty plainly that we are not going to be able to raise two-rowed barley of the weight required for the English market. Therefore, I think the Government would be acting wisely if they could manage to secure facilities for malting our six-rowed barley, which we can cultivate to advantage here, and thus surmount to a certain extent this barley difficulty. I am not aware whether barley can be malted here and exported to England, but a person in the trade made the suggestion to me, which I give to the Minister, that we should endeavour to arrange for our six-rowed barley being malted in England.

Mr. CARLING. 20,000 quarters of six-rowed barley have been shipped to England this winter, and it is being tested by English maltsters. When the test has been made, we shall be able to ascertain whether it is suitable for the English market. I am of the opinion that it will not suit the trade in the old country, because the two-rowed variety gives a much better yield, contains a larger quantity of saccharine and makes a larger quantity of beer than does the six-rowed. I have spoken to American brewers and they prefer the two-rowed, but they cannot get it in quantity except in California. I consider the two-rowed is the best barley, taking everything together, for it gives the largest yield and brings the best price. The difficulty is to get our people to make the change. They have been growing the six-rowed so long that our Canadian barley is nothing to what it was 20 or 30 years ago.

I am satisfied, I repeat, that the two-rowed barley is of the best quality, is the best suited to the English market and also to the American market. It is to be remembered that two-rowed and six-rowed cannot be brought into the same malt-house without keeping them apart, because they will not malt together, and if malted a very inferior article is produced.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have any experiments been made on the North-West farm with respect to the growing of the sugar-beet?

Mr. CARLING. Experiments have been made on the central farm this year, and they have produced from 20 to 30 tons per acre in small plots, of a very good quality, averaging quite as much saccharine as the beet in Germany and France. The average is about 14 per cent of sugar, which is about the general average in Germany.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I approve of the action of the Government in spreading seed barley, and I believe so far as this barley question is concerned, that it would be well for the Government to spend $12,000 or $15,000 during the coming year to appoint some individual to bring the barley to the British market, and have it thoroughly tested. That would decide at once whether we could raise two-rowed barley for the English market. I would like to know how the silo is succeeding at the central farm, and whether they have tried anything but corn? In some parts they have tried oats, peas and clover.

Mr. CARLING. I believe they have tried oats and clover and mixed feed, but none of them has given the satisfaction that corn has.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Has the silo been a thorough success at the farm this season?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, it has been a thorough success.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I see in the report from the professor on dairying that he believes ensilage was as good cut two inches long as shorter. The best silo ensilage I have ever seen, was half an inch. Has the tuberculosis among the cattle on the farm been eradicated?

Mr. CARLING. It has been thoroughly eradicated.

Mr. MULOCK. Was an investigation made as to its origin?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. McEachern, the chief veterinary surgeon, was brought up to inspect the cattle and his instructions were carried out. The origin of it has not been ascertained yet.

Mr. MULOCK. What breed of cattle did it break out in?

Mr. CARLING. Different breeds, one Shorthorn and Jersey, and Polled Angus.

Mr. FEATHERSON. Do you remember which was the first affected?

Mr. CARLING. I think it was the Shorthorn. He had been on the farm two or three years.

Mr. MULOCK. The explanations of the Minister are very unsatisfactory. Nobody could find fault with him because disease broke out under the circumstances mentioned, but I think it was his clear duty on the immediate discovery of the disease to have at once instituted an enquiry as to its cause and origin. We are told now that this disease manifested itself shortly after the first animal was affected, and the inference is that these animals acquired it through having come in contact with these diseased cattle.

Mr. CARLING. Suspected cattle were at once isolated, no stock has been sold from the farm, but some have been shipped to the other farms in the North-West. There has been no development of disease in those sent away or in any of those remaining.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I remember that last year, when some of us were visiting the farm and examining cattle, we came to the conclusion that this one Shorthorn bull was in an unhealthy condition, and we so reported to some of the officials. He was slaughtered two weeks after our visit. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) told them that he believed the animal had tuberculosis, and I understand that the slaughter of the animal proved that he was correct. I would like to know whether those that took the disease were stabled along with this animal, or were they with the milch cattle in the other stable.

Mr. CARLING. The bulls are all kept in a separate building, and I am informed that none of the other bulls have had the disease.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I understood that two Shorthorn cows also had it. Were they purchased from the same herd as the bull?

Mr. CARLING. One of them was, and the other was purchased from another herd in a different part of the country.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I must say with respect to all the animals besides those that were destroyed, that the greatest care must be exercised or there is not the slightest doubt that the disease will break out again. That animal was very far gone last year, and I have heard that he was used as a breeding animal in the spring.

To promote the Dairying Interests of Canada..... $20,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There is a Mr. Dillon who has been paid for services from the 4th of May to the 30th of June. What was he engaged in?

Mr. CARLING. As travelling instructor, visiting cheese factories.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). There were four or five engaged in lecturing and giving instructions?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Did they go to the factories and see the milk manipulated as they went around lecturing?

Mr. CARLING. They went to the factories and demonstrated how to treat the milk.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I believe myself that is the most thorough and most beneficial method, to go to the factories and creameries and show how the work should be done. There is more benefit derived from money expended in that manner than in any other manner I know of.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be advantageous if the Government would increase the vote for this purpose. I know that applications have been made for these instructors from different parts of the country, and the Minister refuses to send them because he has not the money to pay their expenses. They are doing a very valuable work,

which the country appreciates and which the farmers want, and I think we ought to supply the necessary money to carry it on effectively.

The Haras National Co., for the use of 6 stallions for the Experimental Farm. $6,000

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I suppose these horses are kept to improve the stock of the country for export purposes. Now, we have heard a great deal about Great Britain being the best market for Canadian horses. I have examined the records, and I find that for the last three years Great Britain has imported only 1,026 horses more than she has exported. I believe myself, that we can never establish a thoroughly successful trade in horses with Great Britain owing to the long voyage across the Atlantic. Germany supplies the largest number for the British market, and Denmark also supplies a large number. Before the passage of the McKinley Bill the United States imported 25,000 horses more than they exported, but after the passage of that Bill, that number has been reduced to 15,000. The horses used at the experimental farm are not the kind to improve the breed of the country, neither for carriage horses nor for farm horses.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I would like to ask if these horses are eligible to enter for the Chicago Exhibition under the standard regulation there laid down?

Mr. CARLING. I am not able to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Dominion Millers' Association.—(Mr. Stevenson.)

OFFICIAL DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). (Translation.) I beg to move:

That the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House, during this session, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the suggestion of the Debates Committee, this report recommends the appointment of Mr. Desjardins, shorthand writer, to replace the late Mr. Marceau.

Mr. LANGELIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a most important question. This report, I understand, suggests the appointment of Mr. Alphonse Desjardins as French shorthand writer at a salary of $2,000 a year. I have nothing to say against the gentleman personally. He is very well known in Quebec, is quite respected, and I am sure that, if all that is necessary were to publish a summary of the debates of this House, there would be no question in reference to him. The gentleman referred to has been publishing the report of the debates in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, but that was only a summary and was not the same thing as we have here and for which we pay. In Quebec they had only a summary, and after each speech was reported, the report was handed over to the member who made the speech to see whether it was a fair summary or not. But that is not what we want here or what we pay for. We pay $2,000 a year for each shorthand writer. Two thousand dollars for a session is a very big salary, we must admit, and I was under the impression that Mr. Desjardins, although a very respectable man and a very competent man to publish a summary of the proceedings, was not a shorthand writer. I did ask the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) if the committee, or if he himself, understanding the French language, was aware whether Mr. Desjardins was a shorthand writer or not. He stated that he was relying on the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White).

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). The hon. gentleman has twice made a statement which is not exact. I said that one of those who mentioned Mr. Desjardins as being qualified was the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), but I said I had relied on several members who knew Mr. Desjardins better than I did, because I did not know him or his ability as a stenographer, but the testimonies I received from those who did know him were such that the committee unanimously thought they were justified in appointing him. As to the testimony of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), I only mentioned him as one of the newspaper editors who were supposed to be an authority on the matter, and I did not confine myself to that testimony. Before recommending the appointment of Mr. Desjardins, the committee enquired as to his capacity and qualifications, and the conclusion was, from all we knew of him, that he was one of the best qualified men we could appoint.

Mr. LANGELIER. I must say that that is not the fact. When I first spoke to the hon. gentleman on this subject I was not quite sure in reference to Mr. Desjardins' qualifications, but I have been to Quebec twice since then, and have taken information from those who know him, and I am told that Mr. Desjardins cannot write more than 50 or 60 words a minute, which is completely insufficient to take shorthand notes of the speeches in this House. If we pay $2,000 a session for the shorthand reporter of the French debates in this House, we have the right to get the best work for our money, and there is no lack of good shorthand reporters in the French language. There are some in Quebec who can write easily 200 words a minute and there are some in Montreal, and those I spoke to told me it was quite out of the question to suppose that Mr. Desjardins could do the shorthand reports of this House. If you want abridged reports it is all right, but I think it should be the first duty of the committee to ascertain whether Mr. Desjardins is able to write at least 150 words a minute, because that is the least rapidity at which a shorthand writer should write in order to

report the debates of this House. I am informed that the committee have not done anything of the kind, and do not know what he can write or what he can do in that respect. They simply give him a pension of $2,000 a year. When the Debates were established, it was never understood that we were to give a pension of $2,000 a year to a friend of the Government. I am told that the reason why more competent shorthand writers have not been appointed, is that they do not belong to the Government party. If the reporting of the debates is to become a matter of Government patronage, we should know it at once. In that case we might waste our money, but we should know that we are doing it. I repeat that the reporting of the debates in French would be a farce if it were to be done by men not able to write more than 50 or 60 words a minute.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) Should the question raised by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) have a good result, I would be much pleased, as the French Debates of the House of Commons would gain importance thereby. I have known personally the gentleman newly appointed to the staff of the French Debates, Mr. Desjardins, while I was a member of the Quebec Legislature. I know personally that this gentleman took down verbatim every one of the speeches pronounced in the House, although he was only obliged to give a condensed report of them. I would not praise him beyond his due, but I know a former member of the Quebec Assembly, Mr. Gagnon, who while he was a Minister in the Mercier Government, complimented Mr. Desjardins from his seat in the House. I do not wish to say more than I should. I do not like to weary the House with my speeches. But I would like to see the French Debates maintained even at the cost of heavy expenditure, if necessary, as an encouragement for those who dare to speak French in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, since the Debates Committee have chosen a new stenographer, I believe—and I am sure that I am right—that Mr. Desjardins will be able to do justice to those who will have the courage to speak French in this House. I believe he will be able to take down verbatim every word they say. I wish to add a word with regard to the French translation of the Debates. As well as his colleagues, the chief translator, Mr. Beaulieu, has a driving task which knows no respite. Has not the House of Commons the means of paying, for the French Debates, officers who should not be overburdened and who should not each one have to do the work of several men? I speak in French. I express my opinion. I am not an orator, but as to the Debates, if the House wants them, let us have them translated. It is a step in the right direction to adopt the report of the Debates Committee. If we must speak English and cease enjoying the privilege granted us by the constitution of using our mother tongue, let us know it, and we may then do well to abolish the *Hansard* altogether, both English and French.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully agree with the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) in his statement that we should have the very best shorthand writers to report the speeches which are pronounced in French in this House, and I am quite certain that the committee who have charge of this important branch of the service of the House of Commons, would not have undertaken to select Mr. Desjardins or any other gentleman to report the speeches which are delivered in French without taking the necessary information and getting the recommendations which were considered to be sufficient as to his qualifications as a shorthand writer. I am told by members of that committee that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) who, as we all know, has vast experience in these matters, has gone to the trouble of ascertaining for himself the qualifications of Mr. Desjardins, and I am informed that from the information he has received, he is fully convinced that Mr. Desjardins is quite competent to fill the position which the committee have assigned to him. I am, moreover, informed that Mr. Desjardins, during the ten years that he practised stenography in the Local House of Quebec, took down verbatim in shorthand every word of every speech delivered by any hon. member who spoke in the Legislative Assembly, but his means of publishing the so-called Quebec Legislative *Hansard* were very limited indeed. He had to rely upon his own means to publish the report of the speeches as they appeared, or as they were reported in the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. Then from the full notes which he had taken in shorthand he made a *résumé* or synopsis of the speeches which had been delivered, reserving to himself the discretion of publishing *in extenso* only the most important of those speeches. Now, I am quite certain that Mr. Desjardins, from all the information which I have been able to collect, is fully competent to perform the duties which have been assigned to him, and that he will do justice to the position in which he has been placed. I have no doubt that all the gentlemen who compose that committee, and who attach just as much importance to the correct publication of the speeches delivered in French as of the speeches delivered in English, have taken pains to satisfy themselves that Mr. Desjardins is just as well qualified to report French speeches as the English reporters are qualified to report English speeches.

Mr. LAURIER. The fact that Mr. Desjardins has been selected by the committee is hardly evidence of his competency, if we may judge by the remarks of the hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers). The hon. member for St. Maurice has referred to the translators who also are appointed by the same committee, and I understand him to say that the work of translation is done, not by these seven or eight men who compose the staff, but by two men alone, inferring thereby that these two men might be competent and that the others were not so. As to the qualifications of Mr. Desjardins I have nothing to say, because I have no knowledge, but we cannot attach much weight to the argument of the Postmaster General who says, that because he has been selected by the same committee who selected the translators he must therefore be competent, in view of the statement made by the hon. member for St. Maurice. I have been disposed to approve of the nomination of Mr. Desjardins, because I understood that the president of the committee had personally satisfied himself of his qualifications. I understand now, however, that he recommends him without having taken the trouble to enquire personally into his qualifications.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I have enquired into the qualifications of Mr. Desjardins since objection was raised by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier), and from the testimonies I have received I have no doubt that he is well qualified.

Mr. LANGELIER. From whom did you receive the testimonies?

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). From several members of the Local Legislature who have seen him at work. Since that time he has been practising stenography, and from all the information I can gather he is well qualified. I do not know how to take any better means of judging his fitness.

Mr. LANGELIER. How many words a minute can he write?

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I know he can write fast enough to perform the work satisfactorily.

Mr. LAURIER. It would have been a very simple matter to test him before the committee.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Hochelaga). I think the testimonies we received from those who have seen him at work, are worth as much as that of the member for Quebec West who knows nothing about Mr. Desjardins's qualifications except from hearsay.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) There would be a very easy way of settling this question. Personally I have not the slightest objection to Mr. Desjardins; but, as well as the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) I also have gone down to Quebec since the report was presented to the House, and have heard several people speak of Mr. Desjardins. Quebec lawyers and stenographers told me that he could not take down one hundred words a minute. Now, if he does not write one hundred words a minute he is hardly capable of taking down evidence in a court of justice, much less is he able to take down the debates in this House. As I said in the beginning, I have no objection to his appointment, but I think a way of solving the difficulty would be to submit him to an examination. If he should not prove competent let him not be appointed; if he be so, then appoint him. As to what the hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers) said of the French Debates, he is perfectly right. I am ready to vote for the complete abolition of the *Hansard* in both languages.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) I have a personal knowledge of Mr. Desjardins's competency, and during the nine years that I have been a member of the Quebec Legislature, I know that this gentleman took down all the speeches verbatim As to my other remarks concerning the French translators of the Debates, I would not say that they are unable to fulfil the duties of their position, for I know some of them who are excellent translators; but I maintain that several of them, among others, the chief, Mr. Beaulieu, have a task beyond their strength, and surely this is not justice.

Motion agreed to on division.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 71) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act. He said: The first section of this Act amends section 7 of the present Act. The present Act is applicable to all parts of the Dominion except the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin. We propose to change that, and the amended law will be applicable to all parts of Canada except Keewatin, the North-West Territories coming under the provision of the license system.

Mr. LAURIER. What part of the Act?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The whole Act. There is a proviso as follows:—

"Provided further, that the Minister of Inland Revenue may, where for any reason he deems it in the public interest to do so, refuse to issue any license authorized by this Act."

The present Act provides that all parties applying for a license, who have complied with the rules laid down, can insist upon getting a license. It was thought in the interest of the revenue that the Minister should have power to refuse a license,—for instance, when the applicant had already forfeited a license for violating the law. Then there is a change in section 5 of the Act of 1891, with regard to the bottling of spirits. That Act restricts the bottler as to what he may put upon the bottle. We find it necessary to go further and to make it obligatory that he shall put upon the bottle the name and address of the bottler. The other change is with respect to section 274 of the Inland Revenue Act, regarding the manufacture of cigars. As the law now stands cigars may be manufactured in packages of three or six or upwards. It is proposed to change the law in this respect, and declare that while cigars may be put up in packages of three or six or more, they shall not be sold from the factory in lots of less than 100. The reason for this change is that the extension of the privilege under the present law has enabled manufacturers to do a retail business. These are all the changes in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a despatch which he has received from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies in reply to an Address to Her Majesty praying that Her Majesty would take such steps as might be necessary to denounce and terminate the provisions contained in the most-favoured-nation clauses of the Treaties with the German Zollverein and the Kingdom of Belgium.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE.
OTTAWA, 21st April, 1892.

(*Copy.*)

Canada—General.

Lord Knutsford to Lord Stanley of Preston.

DOWNING STREET, 2nd April, 1892.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to inform you that Her Majesty's Government have given very careful consideration to your despatch, No. 276, of the 22nd October, 1891, in which you transmitted an Address to Her Majesty from the Senate and House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, praying that Her Majesty would take such steps as might be necessary to denounce and terminate the provisions referred to (in the Address) in the Treaties with the German Zollverein and the Kingdom of Belgium.

2. I duly laid the Address before Her Majesty, who was pleased to receive it very graciously, and to command that it should be referred to the Departments of Her Majesty's Government which are concerned with the subject-matter. This has been done, and it is now my duty to communicate to you the following reply:—

3. The two clauses referred to are Article XV in the Anglo-Belgium Treaty, and Article VII in the Anglo-Zollverein Treaty, and the undoubted effect of these two

clauses is to prevent lower duties being charged in British Colonies on the importation of goods the produce of the United Kingdom, than are charged on similar goods the produce of Belgium or Germany. Moreover, under the most-favoured-nation clause contained in most of the treaties in force between Great Britain and foreign states, this privilege which is enjoyed by Belgium and German goods in the British Colonies, is extended to the goods of all the various countries parties to those treaties.

4. The Parliament of Canada desires the abrogation of these clauses on the grounds, amongst others, that they are incompatible with the rights and powers subsequently conferred by the British North America Act upon the Parliament of Canada for the regulation of the trade and commerce of the Dominion, and that their continuance in force tends to produce complications and embarrassments in such an Empire as that under the rule of Her Majesty, wherein the self-governing colonies are recognized as possessing the right to define their respective fiscal relations to all foreign nations, to the Mother country and to each other.

5. In so far as the right here claimed consists in fixing rates of customs duties applying equally to all foreign nations, the Mother country, and the British Colonies, Her Majesty's Government do not contest the statement. But if the statement is to be taken as extending to a claim of right to establish discriminating treatment between different foreign nations or against the Mother country or in favour of particular colonies, Her Majesty's Government are obliged to point out that the claim is stated too broadly; for no such general right has hitherto been recognized, nor is it clear that it would be admitted by foreign countries.

6. It is unnecessary now to examine the question whether a self-governing colony is capable, with the assistance of Her Majesty's Government and by negotiation in the usual diplomatic course, to enter into special fiscal arrangements with a particular foreign state, or the question whether such a colony is competent without imperial legislation, similar to the "Australian Colonies Customs Duties Act, 1872," to grant discriminating duties in favour of particular colonies. For these questions, important as they are, may be dealt with independently of the Anglo-Belgian and Anglo-Zollverein Treaties, to which the Address of the Canadian Parliament specifically relates.

7. I have to point out that the denunciation of these two Treaties would not of itself confer upon the Dominion the freedom in fiscal matters which it desires to obtain, and I am disposed to doubt whether the extensive changes that would have to be made have been fully realized in putting forward this proposal.

8. Many of the Commercial Treaties entered into by this country contain most-favoured-nation clauses, and these Treaties apply in many instances to the Mother country and to all the colonies. In order, therefore, to confer upon the Dominion complete freedom in its negotiations with foreign powers it would be necessary to revise very extensively the existing Commercial Treaties of the British Empire, and a great break up of existing commercial relations, of which Canada now enjoys the benefit, is involved in the suggestion.

9. Within the last year the system of Central European Tariff Treaties has been inaugurated, and under that system it is more important than ever that this country should not lose the benefit of the clauses in the Belgian and Zollverein Treaties which secure most-favoured-nation treatment in tariff matters to British produce and manufactures, including the produce and manufactures of Canada and the Colonies generally,—clauses which it might be difficult to secure in any new convention.

10. It should be borne in mind that the Dominion of Canada has already a trade of some importance with Central Europe. Taking Germany alone, imports into Canada reached more than three quarters of a million sterling in 1890; exports to Germany had increased from a very small amount to £100,000. This export trade includes cereals, meat and cheese; and in all these articles considerable reductions of duty are made by the new treaties.

11. For these reasons, which I feel sure will commend themselves to the Parliament of Canada, Her Majesty's Government have felt themselves unable to advise Her Majesty to comply with the prayer of the Address which you have transmitted for submission to Her Majesty.

I have, &c.,
(Sgd.) KNUTSFORD.

Governor General,
&c., &c.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

Mr. PERRY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the papers which the House ordered to be brought down with respect to the Prince Edward Island tunnel have not yet been laid on the Table. The Minister said they would be brought down at an early period, and that the proper time to discuss the question was on the Estimates. So far they have not been brought down and I have heard nothing of them, and I must admit that I am desperately afraid the session will slip away before the hon. gentleman will fulfil his promise. Does he actually intend to bring down the papers or not?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no hesitation in saying that I intend to bring them down. They will be down to-morrow or the next day.

FISHING VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 11) respecting fishing vessels of the United States of America.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should like the hon. gentleman to state whether the introduction of this Bill in a permanent form is the result of any conversation that took place between the Canadian delegates and the Secretary of State at Washington.

Mr. TUPPER. None whatever. It had no reference whatever to this.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has no other object, in introducing the Bill, than that of saving the trouble of introducing it year by year?

Mr. TUPPER. As I explained to the House before.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman wil recollect that when the Bill was first introduced very strong assurances were given to the House that the Bill introduced would be of a temporary character. I am the more induced to recall this assurance because of the statements which were made in the early period of those troubles arising out of the application of the United States to have the right of transhipment and purchase of bait. The hon. gentleman will very well recollect that it was then intimated by the present leader of the House, and by the present Minister of Finance, who at the time was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that if we permitted those privileges to be conceded to the United States fishermen, it would be practically surrendering the whole question, that it would be giving them a basis of supplies, and if we permitted them to make our ports the basis from which they could carry on the fisheries, we would be practically surrendering to them the whole fisheries question. I did not share in the views which hon. gentlemen then advanced, but I should like to have had a more formal recantation of that prophecy so made by themselves on that occasion, when they are now practically conceding in permanent form all that which they declared that time would, if granted, prove ruinous to our fishing interests. I notice also that the leader of the House stated a short time ago, if I caught his remarks aright, that the amount we receive from those licenses almost equalled the expenditure in that respect. My curiosity was so

much excited that I looked up the question in the Public Accounts, and I found, as a matter of fact, that we received $9,000 in 1891.

Mr. TUPPER. $14,080 for 1890. It amounted to $9,000 or $10,000 last year.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The amount shown in the Public Accounts as received for licenses under the *modus vivendi* is $9,877. It is quite evident to the House and the country that this sum falls immeasurably short of the expenditure in that regard, and, therefore, the statement of the leader of the House I take this occasion of rectifying, so that there may not be any misapprehension on our part. If the assumption on which he based the celebrated despatch some years ago is correct, and on which it was contended that this concession would amount practically to a surrender of the whole of our fishery rights, we stand in this pitiable position: that to-day we are passing a Bill permanently to provide for those concessions for a sum of $8,000, $9,000 or $10,000 annually, and that, if the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite are to be accepted as true, we are giving the Americans practically the whole fisheries of the North American continent. I myself took occasion to object to these statements at the time because I thought they were exaggerated and far-fetched, and not consistent with exact facts; but I take this opportunity of recalling that to the House and to the country, so that it may be known what we are doing in this respect.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was introduced for second reading objection was taken on the other side of the House to the proposal to enact this law so as to make its operation dependent upon an Order in Council. I fully sympathized with the objection that was then taken, and I think it is an unfortunate thing that this House should delegate such an important power to any Governor in Council, or to any Government that may be in power in this country. It seems to me that a matter of such great importance as this should not pass out of the control of Parliament. I think that this House should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion at least once a year, as to whether this important concession should or should not be renewed. I think there is a tendency in all our legislation to have a great deal too much Government by Order in Council, and this Bill is carrying the principle to a much greater extent than it has been carried on any previous occasion. Not only that, Sir, but it does seem to me that an Act of this kind is to a great extent establishing a precedent which we may find it much more difficult hereafter to set aside. So long as we pass this Bill every year, so long as the consent of Parliament representing the country is required for this concession, the country and the House knows what is being done, and no precedent is laid down and no vested right established. If we pass a Bill of the kind now before the House, making it so far as this House is concerned a permanent concession, I believe we are making a great mistake, not only as regards our own constitutional rights, but also as regards this very important concession to the United States. I am sorry that the Government are proceeding with this Bill in the form in which it was originally introduced, because I believe that the objection is well founded on both the grounds I have stated, and it is one which ought to prevail. Of course, if the Government are determined to proceed with the Bill in its present shape, I suppose that anything which I, or any member of the House may say, will have very little effect. I for one do protest most strongly against giving a concession of this kind to the gentlemen who may sit on the Treasury benches in such an important matter as this, and I also protest against doing what I think may fairly be considered as giving a colour to the establishment of a vested right, in a matter which we have always proclaimed and held to be a special privilege of our own.

Mr. TUPPER. There is. I submit, an entire misconception of this measure and its object, and I say that in view of the remarks which have just been addressed to the committee. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has alluded to this as involving a permanent concession. That I consider an extraordinarily strained view to take of the Bill before the House. So far from being a permanent measure or constituting a permanent concession, the preamble of the Bill and its language shows that it is simply vesting in the Governor in Council in any year, that which Parliament has authorized them to do without objection or division for two or three years, on the mere statement that for state reasons it was deemed expedient to grant this. It might appear from the remarks of hon. gentlemen that this was an extraordinary request to make to Parliament, but I may mention as it comes to my mind at the moment, a case in point in the English Parliament; a Parliament which is just as jealous of its right as distinguished from the rights of the Crown as any Parliament can be. Last year, without any hesitation, the Imperial Government obtained from Parliament the authority, in the Behring Sea matter in which this country was interested, to take a certain position under an Order in Council, not merely for one year, but to continue it if they thought fit by Order in Council. That was the institution of what is known as the *modus vivendi* in Behring Sea. The Order in Council passed, as we know, limiting that until 1st May, but now, without consulting the Imperial Parliament at all, the English Government by Order in Council may further continue that arrangement. Incidentally, the Government of this country is placed in the position of assuming in the interests of Canada, in connection with the administration of a most delicate trust, the protection of the fisheries, the adoption of a certain policy from time to time. The Government has stated, when asking for this power, that for obvious reasons it is far better that there shall be power to take the position which Parliament has assented to in the past, without coming to Parliament and explaining exactly the reasons. I again submit that the control of Parliament is in no way interfered with. This power of the Governor in Council is not for all time to come to adopt any policy or to commit Parliament to that policy. It has only power to introduce a certain policy in reference to our relations with the United States, in the protection of the Atlantic fisheries for a year and for no more. If Parliament comes to the conclusion, or if the public opinion of the country is so shaped that there is objection to the continuation of that policy, there is nothing in the adoption of this Bill that fetters the action of Parlia-

ment, because Parliament can say at any time that there should be or should not be a renewal of the relations. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the papers laid on the Table of the House show that we are in the very midst of negotiations on very important subjects with the United States Administration, some of which relate to the fisheries, and if there were a reason before, there is just as strong a reason now for bringing into force the policy that has been adopted, and without any injury to the interests which are concerned in this matter.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit that the hon. gentleman has given no satisfactory reason for asking the House to depart from the policy which we have hitherto pursued with regard to this matter. I would remind the hon. gentleman that this Act which we have passed annually, is in consequence of an abnormal state of things existing between Canada and the United States. After the failure of the Washington Treaty in 1888, it was deemed advisable to adopt the *modus vivendi* which was suggested by the British Commissioners, and accepted by the American Commissioners; and from year to year afterwards we have renewed that privilege. Now, we do that simply because we are satisfied, until our present relations with the United States with regard to the fisheries are revised, to relinquish some of the privileges which we enjoy under the Convention of 1818. For my part, while I am desirous of maintaining the most friendly relations possible with the United States, and of seeing this Act continued every year, I object very strongly to giving the Government power to issue the licenses as a permanent part of our policy. I think it is right and proper that the American fishermen should understand that it is after all a privilege which we grant, and not a right.

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, if you authorise the Government every year to give that privilege——

Mr. TUPPER. The preamble says that we simply grant the privilege when it may be expedient.

Mr. LAURIER. Then, if it ceases to be expedient, the Government will have to come back with a Bill to repeal the law which will be on the Statute-book, whereas by continuing the system which has hitherto prevailed, of having annually an Act on this subject, the American fishermen will understand that the privilege is one for which application must be made every year to the Government and people of Canada. To depart as far as is proposed by the Bill is, I think, almost equal to renouncing the privileges of the Convention of 1818. I do not say that it would not be wise to revise that convention; I think it would be; but since we have not done that, and the two countries are not agreed to reconsider the Convention of 1818, I think, in the interest of policy and the protection of our own rights, we had better continue the system of having an annual Act, instead of adopting this measure.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) should suppose that the Government is entirely proof against the force of any suggestions that may be made for the improvement of the Bill. I presume that any political feeling that existed in regard to this question at any time is now gone from it, and I am sure that we should be very glad to accept any sound suggestion for the improvement of the measure, and for making our relations with foreign fishermen on the fishing grounds more agreeable and peaceful than they are, at the same time preserving our rights as fully as we can. I do not see, however, I confess, that my hon. friend's objection to the Bill, on the ground that it is legislating by Order in Council, is a very strong one. I can understand the force of that objection, and I am disposed to defer to it very often when the substance of an enactment is proposed to be framed by the Governor in Council. Various considerations may govern such a proposal. Occasionally we find that an enactment requires more precision than is possible for the House at the time; technical information may be required; and upon these grounds it may be that Parliament prefers to leave the adoption of the precise form of the enactment to the Governor in Council, who may be advised on it from time to time by officers technically qualified. It may be that from time to time elasticity is required—that an Act requires to be applied to certain subjects or not applied to certain subjects, and that the best means of securing flexibility is by leaving the Act to be brought into force or curtailed by Order in Council. But with regard to this Bill, the committee will see that all the provisions to be brought into force are contained in the Bill itself. It is simply left to the Governor in Council to say whether from year to year the status shall be continued. We are not fixing the terms of the enactment by Order in Council: the terms are fixed by this House; and there is simply power given to the Governor in Council to say whether those terms shall be continued from one year to another without coming to Parliament for a special enactment. Now, there is, I submit, good reason for that—the reason that was presented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other day. As a matter of fact, ever since this enactment was adopted by this Parliament, the Governor in Council has been obliged by the nature of things to exercise his authority in advance of the assent of Parliament, for the reason principally that the outfit for the American fishing vessels has to be begun very early in the year, before this Parliament can meet. Unless the fishermen know early in January whether they are to have the privilege of calling at our ports for bait and supplies, and for transhipment, the privilege is entirely useless to them by the time a statute can be passed by this Parliament; and from year to year we have to say in advance, taking the risk of Parliament sanctioning our action, and taking into consideration the circumstances existing at the time, whether the privilege of these licenses shall be granted to American fishermen. That being the state of things, we are simply requesting Parliament to authorize the Governor in Council so to say in advance of the sitting of Parliament. It is not as if the proclamation were permanent. On the contrary, the licenses to be issued under our proclamation will expire every year, and when this Parliament meets in January, or early in February, and ascertains that in the meantime these licenses have been authorized by proclamation, we are entirely in the hands of this Parliament to say

whether the Act shall be continued or not, whether the proclamation shall be renewed for another year or not. We are simply taking power in the meantime to say, at the only time when it is of the least value, whether or not these licenses shall be continued for the coming season. I should be very sorry for one to adopt any measure on this subject which should appear, much less be, a permanent surrender of our contentions with regard to the treaty, and I do not recognize this Bill as having that effect at all. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is correct in saying that my colleagues and myself took very strong grounds on this subject, and I have not to withdraw one single word I said or wrote on that subject on former occasions. What I said with regard to the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 I stand by, and I say now, as the hon. gentleman says I said then, that to admit that what is given by this Bill is a matter of right to the fishermen of the United States, notwithstanding the Treaty of 1818, would be to give away the whole protection of that treaty. But there is the greatest difference in the world between selling, even for a small and inadequate price, a right to a neighbour, and conceding that that right belongs to him by virtue of the instrument that he formerly claimed under. On the contrary, I contend, as has been fully expressed in this House on former occasions, that our rights under the Treaty of 1818 are strengthened from year to year by the fact of the fishermen of the United States taking out these licenses, and purchasing that which, down to 1888, they claimed they had a right to under the Treaty of 1818. It may be, as the leader of the Opposition says, that it might be well to revise the Treaty of 1818. We have always expressed our willingness to revise it. We have always taken the position that whenever a new bargain is desired, we are prepared to discuss the terms, but not to surrender the interpretation which has been held on the part of the British Government and the Governments of the provinces and of Canada, ever since the treaty was made. It is true, as the leader of the Opposition has said, that in 1888, when a somewhat unusual state of things existed, an unsuccessful attempt was made to settle all the questions relating to our Atlantic fisheries. But both sides recognized the fact that our failure to settle matters in 1888 was not a permanent failure, and there is no disposition on the part of either country to abandon faith in our yet reaching a friendly adjustment. There is no disposition on the part of either Government to refuse to sit down and revise the arrangement of 1818, and events since 1888 indicate that questions even more important than this may be settled from time to time, by friendly conference between the two countries, and that, therefore, a settlement of these questions relating to the Atlantic fisheries may be reached without unfriendly feeling and without any very considerable delay. I think that the state of facts now existing with regard to the seal fisheries in the Pacific indicate that that result may be had, and I am sure anybody who has considered the question fully will realize that it is best for all of us, in the meantime, to provide a means of administering our rights in the fishery grounds in a way that may not give offence, break the peace, or create undue disturbance, and that it is better we should submit even to parting temporarily with our rights from year to year for an inadequate consideration, as I admit this is, provided we keep intact our assertion of the interpretation which we have stood by so long, and which I hold now is just as important for the interests of the country as in 1885, 1886 or 1887 when these questions were all more burning and of more pressing importance than they are to-day.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister pointed to the necessity of preserving good relations with the United States, and in that respect the House is entirely with him The only question is whether this Bill does not involve such a surrender of our rights as may injuriously affect our future negotiations with that country with regard to the fisheries. The hon. Minister thinks this measure is saved from being a surrender by the fact that we charge something for the use of our ports by American fishermen, and that the selling of these privileges saves the principle to which we still adhere. Now, I think with my leader, who has already pointed out the difference, that if you allow American fishermen to obtain these privileges every year, without regard to any temporary state of circumstances such as those which existed while negotiations were pending, they will acquire the habit of coming to our ports for the privileges, and believe they have a right to them on the payment of a very small fee: and we know how prompt American statesmen are in taking advantage of anything that has become customary, even although it may not have been admitted in principle. I say that the constant use of our fisheries from year to year, not under a *modus vivendi*, but under a permanent Act of Parliament, will impress on their minds the idea that they have the right to use these privileges, if not for nothing, at least on payment of a small fee. This impression will reach Washington and affect our relations. In the second place, I understood the Minister formerly, in his correspondence on this subject, not only to contend for the principle that American fishermen should not use our ports in those waters, but further, that if they were allowed to use them or any terms the damage to our fishermen would be tremendously great. Now, the damage to our fishermen caused by the competition of these American fishermen will be just as great, whether they pay a license of $1.50 or go in free. Whatever may be the force of the Minister's contention that we are not surrendering a principle, the fact remains that we are surrendering the interests of our fishermen, by allowing competition on the payment of a trifling fee. How he will make that consistent with his former utterances, I do not know. As to the question of principle, it seems to me that although, perhaps, the fee charged may save the absolute principle and may save our right to maintain that we have never admitted the contention of the United States on this subject, it is a surrender of the principle to this extent: that it is admitting that this House is willing, for an indefinite time whether negotiations are pending or not to allow the entrance of these fishermen on certain terms. It is as complete a surrender of the right to fish after paying a small fee as could possibly be made except by a formal treaty. There is a very great distinction between annually empowering the Government to make such an arrangement and putting it into a permanent

Act of Parliament. The Minister of Marine says you can come down next year and repeal it. But that is a very different thing from being in a position to start *de novo* and say whether you will renew it or not. It is a different thing to repeal an Act placed on the statutes as the embodiment of the policy endorsed by this House, and to refuse to renew an arrangement only made for one year. The hon. gentleman must see the difference himself and know that his argument was utterly wanting in that respect. There is no comparison between the power to renew an annual arrangement and the power to repeal an Act deliberately placed on the Statute-book without limitation as to time. The Minister of Justice has made a very just distinction between the question of terms and the question of policy. He has pointed out that it is for Parliament to say whether they approve of the policy of admitting Americans on such terms, and then it properly lies with the Governor in Council to fix the exact method of granting a license and the way in which it should be put in force. That is a very proper distinction. But by the Act we are asked to pass we will pledge Parliament for an indefinite period, and I object to pledging Parliament for the future, without regard to circumstances, to a policy. I object to giving the Governor General in Council power to decide on the question of the policy as to whether these terms should be granted every year or not. The House is asked to divest itself of the power to change the policy and is putting it into the hands of the Governor in Council, and that I think is quite sufficient to justify the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries let the cat out of the bag in his reply to the hon. member for Muskoka. He said it was advisable, in consequence of negotiations now going on or which might be going on, that the Government should have the power without explaining their reasons to Parliament, to adopt this policy and continue it from year to year or stop it when they pleased. He said it might not be advisable to explain all the reasons to Parliament. I do not think that is a contention that is very flattering to the House. I think the House still feels that, whatever the details of the measure may be, it should be consulted as to a certain line of policy, and that it is a very unwholesome precedent to allow the Governor in Council to decide on the line of policy to be followed from year to year. As to the negotiations, I was quite interested in the remarks made by the Minister. First we were told that we were on the eve of negotiations, and then he told us that we were in the midst of negotiations. We have been led to hope that the trade negotiations and the fishery negotiations would be carried on at the same time. It would be very interesting to the House to know whether any negotiations are going on as to these two questions, or as to the fisheries question separately. Since the hon. Minister says we are in the midst of negotiations, I think he should go further and say when the negotiations commenced, whether there is any hope of arriving at a satisfactory conclusion, and so on.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). In considering this Bill, we ought not to lose sight of the fact that a very large number of our fishermen are employed in American vessels and form an important part of the crews of United States fishing vessels. It is an every-day practice for a captain with some of his crew to go over to Gloucester or some other fishing port in the United States and then to sail with their vessel to the Maritime Provinces and get the balance of their crew. Every year, much earlier than this, these vessels come down to the coast and ship their crews. Hitherto there has been a great deal of uncertainty among the fishermen as to whether they would be able to get on board these vessels or not, and to avoid the difficulty, they go to the United States, paying their passage there, and ship on board these vessels, whereas, if more certainty were introduced into the mode in which these licenses are issued, these people could remain in their own homes until the American vessels came there and shipped them. This Bill, I think, contains no release of our rights, but enables the Government to meet the difficulties to which I have referred. The Minister of Justice has stated that very frequently applications have been made to the Government, and that they have often issued licenses, even before the Act was passed authorizing it, and these applications often proceed from our own people.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have heard the principle of this Bill defended on many grounds, but the one suggested by my hon. friend from Shelburne (Mr. White) has at least the merit of novelty. If I understood him correctly, he contended that it was desirable to embody the principle we have been assenting to year after year, while still keeping control of it, in an Act vesting it in the Governor in Council in a permanent form, because the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces have been in the habit of going to Gloucester and because there would be more certainty about it then. So this is a Bill to facilitate the exodus from the Maritime Provinces to the fishing centres of the United States. I do not think that the suggestion will be accepted by the Government who are promoting the Bill. There is no use denying the fact that this is a grave and serious departure from the practice which we have adopted for years past, and whether Parliament assents to it or dissents from it, it is well to thoroughly understand it. When, in 1887, the Chamberlain-Bayard Treaty was adopted, it contained no provision conceding these privileges to the United States fishermen at all, but a protocol was added to that treaty and it was suggested that, pending the ratification of that treaty by the United States Senate and in order to remove all possibility of ill-feeling and misunderstanding between the two nations while the Senate was considering the treaty, we should concede to the United States fishermen certain privileges we had theretofore denied them. That was the origin of these concessions, and that protocol went on to say:

"Under these circumstances, and with the further object of affording evidence of their anxious desire to promote good feeling and to remove all possible subjects of controversy, the British plenipotentiaries are ready to make the following temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding two years, in order to afford a *modus vivendi* pending the ratification of the treaty."

That was the origin of the proposition. It was in the first place recommended to Parliament because it was temporary, in the second place because the period was arbitrarily fixed at two years, and in the third place because it gave breathing time for the ratification of the treaty by the Senate and would prevent any misunderstanding or friction

during that time. But the hon. gentleman who now leads the House and his friends stated that they were careful not to recede from the practice they had adopted in previous years of arbitrarily excluding the Americans from their privileges. The Minister now says that this is not a permanent Bill. It is a permanent Bill in this sense, that heretofore the Bills with this object have been passed for one year only, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has had to come back each year and say why he asked for an extension.

Mr. TUPPER. Was not the first Bill for two years?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, for the special object and the special purposes which I have stated. Every year since that time, the hon. gentleman has been obliged to come to the House and explain why he wished this provision continued for another year. Why was this done and what reasons were given for this extension? It was because the hon. gentleman hoped and continued to hope that there would be a commercial treaty negotiated between this country and the United States and that, in view of that great and desirable object, it was eminently proper that we should continue to concede to the United States fishermen the privileges we had given them for a temporary and specific purpose only. It was in the hope and on the ground that this concession would promote amicable feelings and further the object that we were supposed to have in view, that Parliament, year after year, assented to these concessions. But is that the ground which the hon. gentleman takes now? Where do we stand to day? The hon. leader of the House says he adheres to the interpretation of the treaty which he gave in 1887 in several of his despatches. But the hon. gentleman did more than that. In the despatches which he penned previous to 1888, he not only laid down what he perceived to be the interpretation of the treaty of 1818, but he laid down several propositions, one after the other, importing that it was absolutely essential for the protection of the North American fisheries and the reservation to our own citizens of the rights which we had under the treaty of 1818, that the Americans should be excluded. We did not differ on both sides of this House as to the interpretation of the treaty; we did differ as to the policy of the Government in carrying it out. I need not read to the House the words of the hon. gentleman, because almost everybody recollects them, but he strenuously urged that to concede these privileges to the American fishermen would be, in effect, giving up the whole question. Now, the hon. gentleman, if I understand him aright, proposes, to a large extent, to take from this House the controlling right of determining from year to year whether we will renew this concession, and to vest it in the Governor in Council. Now, the hon. gentleman stated in his despatch, as afterwards adopted and made a Minute of Council:

"But that which Mr. Phelps calls 'literal interpretation,' is by no means so preposterous as he suggests, when the purpose and object of the treaty come to be considered. While it was not desired to interfere with ordinary commercial intercourse between the people of the two countries, the deliberate and declared purpose existed on the part of Great Britain, and the willingness existed on the part of the United States, to secure absolute and free from the possibility of encroachment the fisheries of the British possessions in America to the people of those possessions, excepting as to certain localities, in respect of which special provisions were made. To effect this it was merely necessary that there should be a joint declaration of the right which was to be established, but that means should be taken to preserve that right. For this purpose a distinction was necessarily drawn between the United States vessels engaged in commerce and those engaged in fishing."

Then he goes on to say:

"The fisheries could not be preserved to our people if every one of the United States fishing vessels that were accustomed to swarm along our coasts could claim the right to enter our harbours, to post a letter, or send a telegram, or buy a newspaper, to obtain a physician in case of illness or a surgeon in case of accident, to land or bring off a passenger, or even to lend assistance to the inhabitants in fire, flood, or pestilence, or to buy medicine, or to purchase a new rope."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a quotation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That last is a quotation. The first part I read is the hon. gentleman's own language, viz:

"The fisheries could not be preserved to our people if every one of the United States fishing vessels that were accustomed to swarm along our coasts could claim the right to enter our harbours."

Now, I want to bring the House to the point where we are to-day. That policy was adopted, and with very poor results. Then came the treaty for a temporary and specific object alone, and under that treaty the *modus vivendi* went into operation for two years. Then we extended it in the hope that it might be made the means of conciliating public opinion in the States, and a basis on which negotiations might be made for more extended trade relations. Now, if I understood the statement of the Minister of Finance the other day, all possible hope of obtaining trade relations with the United States has been abandoned by that side of the House to-day. We stand in this position: that we are re-enacting this law, and are divesting Parliament of its control over this question, and are giving to the Governor in Council sole and absolute control over these matters, and so we are giving up, from their standpoint, the slightest hope of negotiating any treaty whatever. We do not stand in that position on this side of the House. We have a strong hope, and a well-grounded hope, that when the proper time comes and the proper men are at the helm, we can negotiate a new treaty. While, therefore, it would not be impolitic for us to renew the *modus vivendi* from year to year, retaining by Parliament its absolute control over it, I think myself, that side of the House having abandoned all hope of negotiating any treaty with the States, that we occupy a most extraordinary position. Therefore, so far as I am personally concerned, I protest against the policy which takes away from this House the control it ought to keep, and surrenders that control up to the Governor in Council for the time being, in a matter affecting national rights and international obligations.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The hon. gentleman has made a long speech against the measure, and finally winds up by asserting that he does not oppose keeping the *modus vivendi* in force from year to year. He thinks that is quite right and proper, so that, after all, his argument is not against keeping the *modus vivendi* in force, but simply against the Government. Now, the argument of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) against transferring from the Parliament to the Governor in Council the power to make laws by Order in Council, has much force in it. I think there has been of late years too great a tendency in that

direction. We have now actually a volume of Orders in Council having the force of law, as large as the volume of the statutes. I think this tendency is to be deprecated in many respects. These Orders in Council that are issued always have reference to matters of domestic concern, to regulations concerning the management of the departments, and matters of that character. But this matter is of great importance, it is of international concern, and I think it is important that the sense of Parliament should be obtained upon it year after year, and therefore the Order in Council should not be passed secretly without our knowing anything about it. The Minister of Justice in the remarks he has made to the House has given good reasons why the Governor in Council should have power to issue these licenses in this particular case, because the decision to issue them should be announced early in the year before Parliament assembles, and sometimes, from various causes, the sessions of Parliament begin late in the year; and, therefore, the Governor in Council or some other authority, should have the right to issue these licenses. I think that reason has much force in it; and the objection of the hon. gentlemen opposite to give the Governor in Council this power, would be overcome if we put in this Bill a clause requiring that this decision of the Governor in Council should be forthwith communicated to both Houses of Parliament if then in session; if not in session, then within ten days from the commencement of the next session. That will call the attention of Parliament to this important international matter, and will enable Parliament to pass an opinion upon it from year to year as it may think desirable. At the proper stage of this Bill I intend to move a clause to that effect.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is a very important measure and ought to receive the very careful consideration of the House. I have listened to the observations addressed to the House on the subject by the Minister of Justice, and I have been unable to see that the issue of these licenses is in any sense a recognition by the American Government of our exclusive right in the fisheries, or indeed a recognition of our sovereignty in the disputed portion of the fisheries. Sir, I would like to know if an American fishing vessel were to come into the waters of Canada, or what we regard as such, and into bays more than six miles wide, and were to keep more than three miles from the coast, whether the Government would feel themselves at liberty to enforce the Canadian view as to Canadian sovereignty against that ship. If not, then it appears to amount to this, that permission has been granted to the American fishermen to come within three miles of the coast under this license, which they would not have, in their estimation, if no such license were issued. Now, in what way does the obtaining of a license better our position? In what way is it a recognition of any disputed claim existing between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada? It seems to me there is a great deal of misapprehension on this subject, and that misapprehension is in no little degree created and perpetuated by the observations which are annually addressed to this House upon the subject, by the hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches. I repeat again that the issue of licenses to American fishing vessels is in no way a recognition on the part of the party who receives that license of our pretensions in the waters which the American Government hold do not belong to us, and if they are not a recognition in those waters, then those licenses do not in any degree accomplish the object which the hon. gentleman has in view. There are many grounds on which the Americans have set up claims to joint interest in the fisheries on the Atlantic coast of Canada. One claim they put forward is, that they were colonies at the time that Nova Scotia was acquired from France and at the time the Treaty of Utrecht and the Treaty of Versailles were agreed to and ratified; and that, having assisted in the acquisition of the territories upon our Atlantic coast, and in obtaining control of the fisheries, they have a joint interest and property in them, and that this joint interest and joint property were in some degree recognized by the Treaty of 1783. I do not admit that that is a sound contention. I hope no Canadian on either side of the House will be ready to admit that that is a sound contention. Why, the British army assisted in the conquest of the valley of the Ohio, the British army assisted, and the British treasury assisted, in obtaining possession of that valley from the Crown of France; and when the Treaty of 1783 was made and boundaries were established, those territories which had been acquired by the mother country and by the colonies went to the colonies, and those territories which now form part of Canada and the rights incident thereto remain a part of the British possessions. The United States, upon the ground of jointly assisting in the acquisition of those fisheries, can no more set up a claim to joint sovereignty than we can to the valley of the Ohio. There is no distinction between the two acquisitions in this respect, and the Treaty of 1783, which settles the boundaries between what remained to Great Britain and what was acquired by the United States, also settled the limits of the respective rights of the two countries. But when we look at the historical events that happened prior to the American revolution we will see how the erroneous view respecting this question, which has always had possession of the minds of American statesmen, came to be established. Under the Treaty of 1713, and again under the Treaty of 1763, the French fishermen were excluded from fishing within 30 leagues of the coast, and it was assumed by the Government of the colonies that this rule was laid down in these treaties in consequence of the doctrine that the fisheries were appurtenant to the neighbouring territory, and even the fisheries on the Grand Banks and elsewhere must be regarded as belonging to the country which was in possession of the land in the neighbourhood, the bays and harbours from which these fishing operations were carried on. This has been the doctrine of Denmark. It was a doctrine disputed by England with Denmark for two or three centuries before these events happened. The English Government has maintained the view uniformly from the days of Elizabeth, that fisheries in the open sea could not be made dependent or appurtenant to adjoining territories, and the state papers of the time show that in 1713 and again in 1763 the French were excluded from fishing within 30 leagues of the coast, because it was held to be in the interest of the English Government to protect the shores by a special provision of this sort against surprise and conquest. That

was the ground taken, and not because the fisheries in the neighbourhood were appurtenant to the lands. That the latter view was the one which took possession of the colonists is shown by the Treaty of 1778 between France and the new republic. There it was expressly provided that the rights to fishing, not merely in the bays on the coast and in the vicinity of the land, but on the Grand Banks, and in the open sea, should be divided between France and the United States, if they could acquire possession of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. It was also agreed that the territory of Newfoundland, in case of conquest, was to be divided between the two countries, in order that the French might be possessed of part of the island and acquire a right of sovereignty over the fishing in the open sea, on the Grand Banks, and in the vicinity of the territory which they had acquired. But I say this was not the English view, and it will be observed that when the treaty came to be negotiated, the English Government denied the new republic any right to those fisheries in consequence of having been participators in the conquest of Nova Scotia, of Cape Breton and of Prince Edward Island. They admitted a liberty to fish, they denied altogether a right: and the words of the treaty are: They shall have a right to fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, a right to fish on the Grand Banks, and they shall have liberty to fish in the vicinity of the bays and harbours on the coast of the British possessions. These liberties came to an end with the war of 1812-15. The liberties acquired under the treaty terminated, and the privileges of the Americans on the coasts of the Maritime Provinces rest to-day on the Treaty of 1818. What I think it is always important to bear in mind is that there is no definition given of "bay" or "harbour" in that treaty. It is assumed, and the American representatives and American counsel before the Halifax Commission admitted the point, that "bay" and "harbour" and "coast" meant there what they mean according to the general rules and principles of international law. There is no declaration that a bay, to become an exclusively British water under the provisions of that convention, should be a bay not more than six miles wide. There is no statement of that sort. We are obliged to look at the rules of international law to see what waters adjoining the coast are part of the possession of the sovereign who holds the land, and the extent of the bay or harbour on the Atlantic coast of Canada cannot be any less than it would be if similar waters were upon the coast of any other sovereign state. When we look at the United States we find they claim jurisdiction and sovereignty over Chesapeake Bay, which is over 12 miles in width. They claim jurisdiction and sovereignty over Delaware Bay, which, at its entrance, is 18 miles in width. They claim jurisdiction and sovereignty over Cape Cod Bay, which is more than 30 miles in width. They claim jurisdiction and sovereignty over Pamlico Sound and Albermarle Sound, which are large bodies of water very much more than six miles wide at their entrances. Now that being so, it does seem to me to be of the first consequence that we should do nothing that would in any way leave the impression upon the minds of the American public that we abandon any portion of our rights which under the rules of international law might fairly be claimed by us. A land-locked bay very much wider than six miles may fairly be claimed. It may be necessary in the public interest to claim it. It may be claimed because it could be commanded from the shore by modern artillery to a much greater extent than formerly. It may be claimed also because it may be a matter of necessity to the maintenance of the sovereignty of the state that the ships of any other state should be excluded from these waters. The rule which applies to an ordinary coast-line does not in this respect apply to waters that are land-locked. You have to-day the Government of the United States undertaking to uphold the doctrine that we cannot claim the sovereignty of bays more than six miles wide; and you have that same Government undertaking to obtain control of a portion of the open sea that is more than 2,000 miles in extent. I do not say that that claim is a defensible claim; it seems to me that it is a preposterous one; but the fact remains that there are large bodies of waters upon our coasts over which we have claimed a sovereign jurisdiction, and which claim you are prevented from raising, in some measure at all events, by the constant renewal of this *modus vivendi*. I have said before, Sir, and I say it now, that I am ready to consider the provisions of the Treaty of 1818 as they would be practically modified by the modern policy of navigation. The old navigation laws have disappeared, and since 1849 a different policy has prevailed throughout the Empire, and to some extent it may be that these provisions of the Treaty of 1818 are not any longer capable of being adjusted to the modern requirements of commerce. The telegraph and the railway have come into existence since that time and the relations of these fishing operations to commerce have undergone changes. You impose certain obligations under the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, as a matter of effective police. You can only justify their continuance to-day upon the ground that they are necessary to an effective police now. I do not think that is so. Certainly the restrictions that were recently imposed with regard to commercial matters seem to be extremely vexatious; but whether that be so or not, it is a question altogether separate and distinct from the question of the sovereign rights of this country, and while I am prepared to agree to a broad and liberal policy with regard to matters of commerce, I am not willing in the smallest degree to concede any sovereign right or to compromise any sovereign right of this country in dealing with the neighbouring republic. Now, Sir, that is what I complain was done under the Treaty of 1888 when there were concessions made that ought not to have been made. I would like to know whether the Bay of Fundy is not as much within the exclusive jurisdiction of Canada as the Chesapeake Bay is within the jurisdiction of the United States? Do not we own the territories on both sides of the Bay of Fundy? It is true there was a question raised years ago and decided by the arbitration of Mr. Bates, but the decision of that question did not take away from us any rights which we possessed. The hon. gentleman is establishing by this Bill a *modus vivendi* which will be permanent in its character. It takes away from this House that yearly supervision which it has exercised heretofore over the subject, and it permits rights to grow up by acquiescence. The hon. gentleman says: Why, we are protecting

the country against the doctrine of acquiescence when we require a license; but, Sir, I repeat again that the hon. gentleman does not require a license, and will not undertake to enforce this law against vessels coming in bays, say ten miles wide, and keeping more than three miles from the coast. Unless you are prepared to do that in the case of every land-locked bay on the coast of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, your measure accomplishes nothing except to give to the United States a very large privilege for a mere trifle and by doing so you admit that these powers are not necessary for the purpose of police. It is true, Sir, that under this measure a license may be issued which will permit the parties to come within the three miles, but when an American vessel is in the centre of one of the large bays, carrying on fishing operations four or five miles from the coast, will the hon. gentleman undertake to enforce the law against that ship which has no license? The hon. gentleman will not venture to do it, and in not venturing to do it he is not venturing to do anything to uphold the authority of this country as against the pretensions of the United States. It seems to me, Sir, that this measure is one which is calculated to weaken the rights of Canada in this matter of the fisheries. If a *modus vivendi* is established it ought to be established for a particular purpose. When this was first proposed it was defended on the grounds that negotiations were pending, and that it was necessary to conciliate and to allow the Americans this liberty until the negotiations could be consummated. Now there are no negotiations pending. There is no step taken towards the settlement of the difficulty between us, and yet the liberty of supplies for fishing is to be granted, and a *modus vivendi* is to be established which is to lead to nothing. The hon. gentleman will see, further, that the *modus vivendi* that has recently been established between Great Britain and the States is a *modus vivendi* looking towards pending negotiations. A treaty has been agreed to, a board of arbitration has been established to which disputed rights are referred, and these parties are about to engage in the negotiations with a view to a settlement of the matter in dispute. This *modus vivendi* is a means contributing to an end in that case, but in this case the *modus vivendi* leads to nothing; it is the end itself. It is not created or established with a view to accomplish some other purpose. There are no negotiations pending, no treaty to be consummated, and it is simply a backing down from the position hitherto taken. It is an admission that you have a right which you dare not defend, and which you are proposing to confer upon the Americans for a mere trifle, which on their part concedes nothing to you of the pretensions which you have hitherto put forward. You are in exactly the same position, so far as that is concerned, as if you had conceded to the American Government their claims altogether. Your license is a license which they recognize only within the waters which they have not disputed to be yours, and which concedes nothing to you with regard to those waters which they say are a part of the high seas. It seems to me, Sir, that our position is every year becoming weaker and weaker. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, by undertaking to establish a permanent regulation under which these licenses may be annually issued, are withdrawing the subject from the attention of Parliament with a view to its being lost sight of altogether.

On section 2,

Mr. TUPPER. I propose to insert at the end of the first line these words: "On like terms and conditions as those issued under the provisions of this Act." These words were not in the previous Bill, when we were acting in unison with the colony of Newfoundland; but without them if the policy at present prevailing in Newfoundland continues, American vessels might obtain these privileges there for nothing, and we might find ourselves allowing United States vessels to enter Canadian ports on licenses issued in Newfoundland for which no consideration was given. To guard against that I propose to add these words.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand, this amendment is to provide that if licenses are issued in Newfoundland free of cost, they shall not be accepted in our ports.

Mr. TUPPER. No, that was never the intention. We co-operated in a plan embodied in this Act; but since Newfoundland decided not to co-operate with us in this policy, it has issued licenses free to United States vessels.

Mr. LAURIER. And you do not propose to accept them?

Mr. TUPPER. No, we would not recognize licenses issued free to United States vessels.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a new departure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, it is a new departure and an important one, and possibly a very unfortunate one, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman whether it is desirable to proceed with that amendment just now. Our relations with Newfoundland are of such a strained character at present that they should receive at a very early day the consideration of this House, and I may say that it is my purpose at a very early day to invite the attention of the House to that subject, with a view of seeing whether some *modus* may not be discovered by which the former friendly and amicable relations between us may be resumed. I do not propose to discuss the matter now. The hon. gentleman wished it for public reasons to remain in abeyance, and I do not wish to precipitate a discussion that might be injurious to the public interest. But if I do not receive an assurance that it is so, I will, at a very early day, invite the attention of the House to a consideration of those relations. As a matter of fact, the fee which we charge for these licenses is little more than nominal.

Mr. TUPPER. It amounts to about $100 on an ordinary vessel, and sometimes to $200.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It amounted last year to $10,000 for the whole of the fisheries, and that is a nominal sum for the privileges which we have conceded. I hope there is not a gentleman on either side of this House who would call $10,000 a value for those concessions. I understand that they are given from other motives and for other reasons altogether. I know that when we came to value these privileges a few years ago, we valued them more in hundreds of thousands of dollars than in tens of thousands, and I would be very sorry to let it go forth that the sum which we charge for them is held to be remuneration for them in any sense or way. It might hereafter come up against us preju-

dicially. But assuming it to be, as I take it to be, more in the nature of a nominal fee, intended to secure a recognition of our rights by those who take out the licenses, although it is disputed that it has that effect, we would not be acting wisely, if we refused to recognize licenses issued by Newfoundland, perhaps at half-price, or on different conditions: and I take it that it is not desirable just now, in view of the negotiations which I understand are pending, to introduce a clause which might possibly tend to alienate further from us the good-will of the people of Newfoundland, which we all desire to hold. This might be considered somewhat in the nature of a challenge; and seeing that the feeling is already strained almost to the extent of breaking, it is not desirable that anything should be done to increase the tension. Therefore, I ask the hon. gentleman not to press this important change without giving us time to consider it.

Mr. TUPPER. Of course there will be time to consider it before the Bill is proceeded with finally. Certainly, the hon. gentleman labours under a misapprehension with regard to the motive of the Government in introducing these words. There is not the slighest desire to insert them from any hostile spirit. There is not a hostile spirit existing on the part of the Government of Canada towards Newfoundland, in that sense or in any other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is thought to be.

Mr. TUPPER. There is not, unless the maintenance of the rights of Canada is thought to be hostility; and we are endeavouring, as the papers will show, to resume the friendly relations between the countries which existed when there was no misunderstanding. But this measure in no way concerns that important subject, and the only object in suggesting these words is to prevent the privileges, which hon. gentlemen opposite have described as so important and valuable, being possessed by United States fishermen without their paying even that nominal sum—without their paying one single, solitary dollar. If these hon. gentlemen who have been discussing the subject made one point clear, it is that we were not sufficiently valuing the great privileges on our coast, and that for this small fee we were granting tremendous concessions and perhaps injuring our rights under the Convention of 1818.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Giving up, as you called it, in 1888, the whole question.

Mr. TUPPER. What I want to prevent is a United States vessel going to Newfoundland and obtaining free license, which our vessels cannot obtain, and then coming back and enjoying on our coasts the same privilege. We never came to Parliament with a proposition like that. What we say to Newfoundland is: If you will co-operate with us, we will carry out the original plan, but if you will not—and you certainly do not if you grant to the United States these privileges for nothing and refuse them to Canadian vessels—it will be impossible for us to recognize those free licenses which may be granted in the colony of Newfoundland. We must put words of this import into clause two, or we would be giving privileges to United States vessels without a farthing in return.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the hon. gentleman will allow the amendment to stand and give the House time to consider it. For my part, it seems to me by this amendment we are going to check the very object of the Bill. This measure is one of conciliation. Hon. gentlemen opposite press this Bill as a measure of conciliation. They are aware of the feeling of irritation which arose in the United States through our applying customs regulations to American fishermen, under our interpretation of the Convention of 1818. In consequence of this irritation, the Treaty of 1888 was, unfortunately, not negotiated, but the British Commissioners were so much impressed by the feeling of irritation in the United States, that they at once offered, pending the negotiation of the treaty, to undertake that the Canadian Government would not only not go back to the system adopted against American fishermen of subjecting them to vexatious customs regulations, but that for a nominal consideration American fishermen would get all the privileges they demanded. Licenses were then issued by the Newfoundland and the Canadian Governments allowing American fishermen all the privileges denied them by the Treaty of 1818, and if an American fisherman took a license from the Newfoundland Government he could enjoy these privileges on the coasts of Canada, and a similar concession was allowed by the Newfoundland Government. Now the hon. gentleman is going to depart from this. He stipulates that if the licenses issue by the Newfoundland Government are not exactly on a par with our own regulations, they will not be recognized in our country.

Mr. TUPPER. The licenses which the American fishermen will obtain from the Newfoundland Government, on their face and terms, grants only privileges in the ports of Newfoundland. They are entirely different from the licenses granted under the *modus vivendi*, as they limit vessels to the ports of Newfoundland, so that the Americans can have no reason to urge that they are misled.

Mr. LAURIER. I accept the hon. gentleman's correction, but it only shows the necessity for further argument. Let him give his amendment as a notice, so that we may have time to consider it before it is adopted.

Mr. TUPPER. I shall be happy to meet the hon. gentleman's suggestion. We will go through the clauses and let the Bill remain in committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has said that the licenses granted by the Newfoundland Government were being granted without fee.

Mr. TUPPER. So I understand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it by statute that these licenses are issued?

Mr. TUPPER. Simply on the terms of an Order in Council, free licenses are granted to vessels of Newfoundland and the United States on equal terms. There is a bond given that certain provisions of the Bait Act will be recognized.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman state that those licenses are being issued to the American fishermen this year free?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because my information is different.

Mr. TUPPER. I shall put the hon. gentleman in possession of the information I have. I move that the following clause be added to the Bill:—

Clause 3. The authority of the Governor in Council for the issue of such licenses shall forthwith in each year be communicated to the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, if Parliament is then in session, but if not then in session, within ten days of the commencement of next session.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 58) to authorize the conveyance to the Corporation of the city of Toronto of certain Ordnance lands in that city.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

FISHERIES.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the Minister if, in regard to the subject we were discussing a moment or two ago, the House may hope to be placed in possession of the despatches to which I have referred on previous occasions, the despatch of Lord Knutsford of the 11th February, and the proposal made by this Government to the Government of Newfoundland?

Mr. TUPPER. I am now, as I was then, in daily expectancy of the requisite authority to lay these papers on the Table of the House, and I will do that as soon as I receive the authority.

Mr. LAURIER. Are you not tired expecting?

Mr. TUPPER. Sometimes I do get tired.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then there will be no reason for our waiting in expectation of these?

Mr. TUPPER. On Monday I will be able to speak more definitely on the subject.

THE BYE-ELECTIONS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When may we expect the return for which I asked, giving the reason for the delay in the issue of the writs in the bye-elections?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I called the attention of the Secretary of State to that about a week ago.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Immigration—Agents in Canada.....$40,125

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before we discuss the items of this vote, we ought in all conscience to have a statement from the head of the department in reference to the policy of the Government in respect to immigration. As I have very frequently had occasion to call the attention of the House to this subject, the hon. gentleman must know that his department stands convicted by the late census of having most grievously misled—I will not say deceived—the people of this country by the statements which have been laid before the House during all these years. According to the reports of the department, about 900,000 immigrants were brought to Canada during the last ten years. If there be one particle of foundation for these statements, if the slightest dependence is to be placed on the statements which have been made by the hon. gentleman and his predecessors in this regard, then, as I have repeatedly pointed out, the result has been that in the last ten years we have lost a million and a-half of people out of Canada; but if, as I suspect, the census returns will show that the whole of the returns made to us by the Department of Immigration have been based on a huge mistake, to use the mildest term, have been based on a most deplorable error, we should have the explanation of the head of the department as to the immigrants who have been settling in Canada. We have also a right to know what policy the Government are going to adopt in the future in regard to immigration. On all that, we should have a very full statement from the Minister and from the Government generally before they demand from us any sum or sums of money for the purpose of immigration, and I hope the Minister will be prepared to make that statement. I find nothing in his report shedding any light on the subject. I find there a series of meagre references to what has occurred, but no explanation and no reason is given to us as to why the department should have been so egregiously mistaken as to the returns they have made of the immigrants settled in Canada during the last ten years as the census returns show them to have been.

Mr. CARLING. The returns which have been made to this House as to the number of immigrants settled in Canada were correct and accurate and made by officers of the department. Every year when these returns have been brought down, they have been certified by the officers stationed at the ports of entry, and the same system which has been adopted by the present Government was followed by the Government of which the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was a member. We have no reason to doubt that the information we have obtained from our officers and from the collectors of customs in the different ports in the Dominion, is accurate as a record of immigration, but not including emigration. With regard to the number of people who may have left the country, of course we have no record. A record of those who may have left the country has not been kept, and I think it has been admitted by the officials of the United States that any attempt to keep a record of the number of people who pass to and fro between the two countries has been a failure. That has been admitted by one of the leading members of the Government in the United States. With regard to the immigration policy of the Government, it is, so far as I am aware, to continue the same policy which has been in existence for the last few years. The Government are offering every inducement they possibly can to intending immigrants to this country. We have advertised the advantages of Canada on the continent of Europe and also in Great Britain, and there has been no time since I have had the honour of being at the head of this department when we have had a better prospect of immigration and of obtaining a good class of immigrants, than we have this year. Last year we endeavoured to let those of our people who had gone to the western States know that we had advantages to offer in Canada that were better than those they had in the western States, and I am glad to say that last season we had between 2,000 and 3,000 settlers who came in from South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska and other parts of the western States and the chances are that this year we will have a very

large immigration from the United States. The number of immigrants that came in last year was very satisfactory, and, considering all the difficulties we have had to contend with in the North-West, in the past, I am glad to say that the people seem to appreciate the offers we make, and, as I have said, we expect a very large immigration this year, not only from Europe, but also from the United States. I think the hon. gentleman is aware of the inducements that the Government offer to intending settlers. To every head of a family taking up 160 acres, a bonus of $10 will be given and a bonus of $5 to every member of the family over twelve years of age. That offer is now made, in addition to the 160 acres of land, to immigrants coming from Great Britain and Ireland; and although not many have, so far, taken advantage of that liberal offer, we have reason to believe that in consequence of the information given to people in the old country a large number coming in this year will take advantage of it and become settlers in the North-West. I have information from all parts, from Iceland and from Great Britain, and from the continent and from our agents in the United States, that this year a very large number of immigrants will come into our country. I might state that the Government have decided, after very full consideration, that it would be wise to transfer the immigration branch of the Agriculture Department to the Department of Interior. Nearly all the immigrants that come to this country go to the west for the purpose of taking up free homesteads and free grants of land. As the Department of Interior has a large staff of officials connected with the lands in the North-West, including a land commissioner, land guides and land agents, able to give every information that immigrants may require, it is thought well to make this transfer, and by doing so we hope to save a good deal of money. Instead of having two staffs, we will have in the future but one staff, who, with some additions, will be able to discharge the duties that will devolve upon them. That is one of the changes that has been arranged and will be carried out. I believe that the efforts of the department and of the Government will be devoted to doing everything that can be done to advertise our country, and to show the advantages we possess over almost every other country; and we hope that in consequence of the publicity that has been given, and the inducements that are offered, a very large immigration will find its way into our North-West, and that that country will soon be filled up with a rugged and industrious population.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is precisely what we have been told time after time for the last ten years, almost *verbis ipsissimis*: and with the statement I hold in my hand I must say the hon. gentleman does himself very little credit, and does his department no credit at all, if that is all the explanation he has to give to us of the fact that whereas his department alleged that 886,000 immigrants were brought into Canada within the last ten years, our census returns show that our total population has only increased by 500,000. The hon. gentleman tells us that he has no means of ascertaining, and his department has no means of ascertaining, whether it was true or false that the immigrant settlers in Canada amounted to 112,458 in 1881, 133,000 in 1882, 103,000 in the succeeding year, 79,000 in 1885, 84,000 in 1886, and so on. Well, Sir, if that is all the explanation the hon. gentleman has got to offer us, he would do infinitely better to save the $200,000 which he now proposes to expend on immigration. The hon. gentleman's policy and the policy of his friends has resulted in this: that, while they claim to have brought 886,000 immigrants into Canada, we will find when the census returns according to nationality are laid before us, that of the 886,000, not 200,000, may be not 100,000 of all these people who have been brought here more or less at our expense, have remained in Canada. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman and the Government, having considered this question, would have been prepared to submit to us some rational explanation of what has occurred, and also that they would have been prepared with some better policy for the future. Their policy has been a total and radical failure from start to finish. They have brought no immigrants of any value to this country, except a few who have displaced our native population. I believe that if the results of the immigration policy were examined, it would be found that the only immigrants who have come to Canada and have remained here, of a class whom we desire to have in Canada, are persons who come in without any reference whatever to the Immigration Department. The examination I have been able to make into the question leads me to believe that, almost the entire number of immigrants which are alleged to have been brought here by the Government, have been brought more or less at the instigation of the various transportation agencies, railroad and steamboat companies, and they have had no sort of intention of staying in Canada, but have made Canada merely a temporary halting place before they proceeded to the United States. That, I believe, is to a great extent the whole history of the expenditure that has taken place, amounting to several millions during the past ten years. But there is another side to this question which the hon. gentleman has entirely ignored. Now, I have often contended in this House and elsewhere that we are committing an atrocious piece of folly in bringing immigrants from foreign countries, at a great expense to the people of Canada, who, to all intents and purposes, such of them as remain here, simply thrust our own people out of employment, or simply drive our own people over the border. I will be far more disposed to assist the Government with a grant if they would use it for the purpose of keeping our own people in our own country, and promoting the settlement of the North-West by our own countrymen from the older provinces, in place of bringing European immigrants over here. It appears to me at this present moment to be a monstrous piece of absurdity for us to pay for the introduction of European immigrants here, while at the same moment it was known to every man in this Parliament that tens and hundreds of thousands of our own people are yearly leaving our older provinces and seeking homes in the United States. I submit that the true immigration policy for the Government to pursue is to direct their attention to facilitating the settlement of our own people from older provinces in the North-West Territories. I have no objection whatever to men from any other country, men of good health and good habits, coming and settling in our own

country ; but I have the strongest objection to seeing our own people driven out of this country, as they are being driven out, and seeing them replaced by a wholly inferior class from the more or less pauperised countries of the old world. I do not know what result is likely to arise from the proposed transferrence, of which the Minister speaks, of a branch of his department to the Department of the Interior. The mode in which the Department of the Interior has been managed up to the present time, is not calculated to inspire with implicit confidence the members of this House in the wisdom of the proposed change. Up to the present time the Department of the Interior has been nearly as unsuccessful as the Department of Immigration in promoting settlement in our country. The results of the sale of land in the North-West, the results of settlement in the North-West, the extent to which we have deprived ourselves of all control over that territory, are anything but reassuring. On the whole I am inclined to think, if that is to be the policy of the Government, they will do far better to place the money in the hands of the Local Governments in the North-West. They have, at all events, a direct strong personal interest, so to speak, in promoting the settlement of this country, and I am inclined to think they would exert themselves to the best of their power to promote it. I doubt very much whether the Department of the Interior, although it may have certain conveniences such as the hon. gentleman has alluded to, is likely to make any more of a success than the Department of Immigration has done in the way of settling up the North-West, and so far I must say that all we are at present achieving by this expenditure is simply to bring a number of people, more or less unfit for settlement in Canada, into this country. They drift to our large cities and towns, and there, as I have seen, and as everybody who has had anything to do with the charities of these large places know, they form a section of the population of a very undesirable class. There is a small part who no doubt form desirable citizens, but a very large number of them indeed are men whom Canada could do very well without, and who at the very best are exceedingly inferior to the people who are daily and hourly leaving under the present Administration. I must say that I think that the whole of this money we are asked to vote, judging the future by the past, is likely to be entirely wasted unless most radical changes are introduced by the Government in the mode of administration.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to offer a few remarks, before this item passes, upon the policy of the Government in securing immigration. If we bring immigrants into this country it is necessary, as a preliminary step, to take measures to promote their welfare and comfort, and the policy of the Government should be one conducive to their prosperity, and one calculated to make the country a desirable one for them to live in, one calculated to assist them when they come here to make progress in the accumulation of property, and a policy that would minister to the necessities and wants of the citizens. That there is something wrong with the condition of affairs in this country is evidenced by our census returns and the various sources of information open to us with respect to this matter. We have, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, a very unsatisfactory exhibit made by the last census returns, an exhibit which I am sure must strike with pain every member of the House to whichever side he belongs. The increase of a little less than 12 per cent in our population in the face of the fact that we had received 886,000 immigrants during the ten years, is a very startling revelation. We started at the commencement of the decade closing in 1891, with a population of 4,324,000. The natural increase of population in a country like Canada I estimate at 25 per cent, which is a low estimate. The population of the United States increased over 30 per cent during each decade from 1790 to 1830 ; the natural increase of population between 1830 and 1840 was 29 per cent and a fraction over, and the natural increase in population between 1840 and 1850 was over 25 per cent. So I assume that our natural increase is at least 25 per cent in ten years. If that is the case we should have added to our population 1,081,000, if we had no immigration whatever. But in addition to that natural increase, we have received 886,000 immigrants, or we have received 380,000 more immigrants than our total increase of population during ten years, and this makes no allowance for the difference between the birth rate and death rate of these immigrants, which in ten years would have swollen that number by 50,000 at least. This, however, is not taken as an element in the calculation. When we come to analyse these figures we find that we have lost 380,000—to say nothing of the difference between the birth rate and the death rate of the immigrants we have received—so that, adding the natural increase, we have lost 1,500,000 of our population in round numbers, or, to be more correct, 1,460,000. This is a condition of things that requires consideration. A young country like this with unlimited resources, with millions of acres of fertile lands not yet brought under cultivation, with enormous mineral resources, with enormous timber resources, with the best fisheries in the world, with a good geographical position, one of the provinces having the best commercial position on this continent with respect to the other commonwealths—with all these social, commercial, and climatic conditions, and with an energetic and virtuous population, I say that, under all these circumstances, to present such a showing as we do, with a paltry increase of 504,000 in ten years, an increase of less than 12 per cent, calculating that during that time we received from the old world 886,000 immigrants, it is a state of things that requires most serious consideration. It is time to stop and see what is the matter. This is not a party question ; the life of the nation is at stake. If this condition of things is to continue it is no use to talk of party squabbles and party divisions, because we shall soon have no country unless we can remove the evils now existing and in progress, which threaten to destroy the community. Something has to be done. We are not going to cure this great evil by the voting of a supply of money to induce immigrants to pass through this country on their way to the United States. We must do something to keep our own citizens here. We must do something to keep immigrants from the old world who come here, and unless we can do these things we might as well close up our experiments of creating a nation here. What has to be done? The hon.

Minister tells us that he has taken pains to inform immigrants that we offer greater inducements here than do the western States. Have we greater inducements to offer? I saw a statement the other day given by the owner of a consignment of horses at Suspension Bridge. He was sending several carloads through to New York to be sold for use on ice waggons in that city. He shipped them from Iowa, and he could place them in New York at prices which would enable him to pay $25 per head more in Iowa than he could in the Province of Ontario. The freight from Iowa to New York is $10 per horse. The freight from Ontario to New York is $5 and the duty $30 per head, making a total of $35, and the freight from Iowa to New York being only $10, the advantage possessed by the Iowa farmer was equal to $25 on each horse. Now, that is what is the matter. The States are practically our only market for horses, for sheep and for barley. It was shown here last night that two-rowed barley can be sold in England for 4 to 8 cents per bushel more than six-rowed barley would bring for export to the United States, but the fact was not denied that six-rowed barley with the duty taken off, could be sold for export to the States for 24 cents a bushel more at this moment than two-rowed barley would bring in England. We are languishing in Canada because we are excluded from our natural market, and because we are shut out from our communication with the great commonwealths on this continent. We are debarred from the market of 60,000,000 people at our doors, and we are looking for markets in the West Indies and throughout the world.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 68) to revive and amend the Acts respecting the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ross, Dundas.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Chairman, at the time the Chair was vacated at six o'clock I was engaged in making a few remarks on this proposed vote for promoting immigration into Canada. The object of promoting immigration is to increase the population of the country, thereby developing its resources, adding to its wealth, and adding to the greatness of the country through the increase of numbers and productive capacity and power. While we are thus engaged in the business of promoting immigration, the Government are pursuing a policy that is at the same time driving away the population of the country. I took the liberty to call the attention of the House to certain facts in connection with the increase of population in this country; or rather, to speak more properly, with the loss of population in this country; because the increase of population has been very small, not as great as the natural increase, leaving out of the question the immigration into Canada. I pointed out that the loss of population between 1881 and 1891 had been, in round numbers, 1,500,000 souls, that our population according to the census returns had increased 504,000 in round numbers, and that it was claimed that we had received an immigration of 886,000 souls. I pointed out also that the natural increase of the population during that period was nearly 1,100,000 souls, and that we had lost our natural increase, and had lost very nearly 380,000 of the immigration besides the natural increase. Now, Sir, the census of the United States, in 1880, disclosed the fact that there were at that time 719,000 native-born Canadians living in that country. It also gave the number of children of these native-born Canadians, born in the States, at 936,000. Upon the same basis of calculation, the number of children of native-born Canadians in the States in 1890 would have been about 1,350,000. If we then take into account the 1,500,000 population lost to this country in the last decade, the 719,000 that were in the States at the commencement of the decade—of course their numbers had diminished by death during the period since, but that loss had been more than compensated for by the children born in the States of immigrants that had gone from this country to the States, and which are not accounted for—and add to that the number of children in the States in 1890, born of Canadian parents, we have a loss to this country from this source of 3,500,000 souls. If this calculation is true, and I believe it is, had there been no exodus, the population of Canada to-day should have been 8,350,000. But we do not take into account the grandchildren in the States born of children of Canadian parents. We do not take into account the loss to this country of immigrants leaving Canada for the States in all these years since Confederation and before. We do not take into account the children of these immigrants born in the States, and who would have been born, we may assume, in Canada, had the immigrants who came to Canada remained here. It is susceptible of mathematical demonstration that if there had been no exodus from this country of native-born citizens or of foreigners who came here from the old world to make their homes in Canada, the population of this country would be 9,000,000 souls, and we are to-night discussing an item for getting into this country immigrants, while the people of this country are leaving by thousands. We are attempting to fill a barrel by pouring in at the spigot and leaving the bunghole open. The result is that we have got in Canada less than half the population we would have had if the exodus from this country had not been as it has been.

Now, what is the matter? Perhaps I might answer the question somewhat differently from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and the answer I should give to that question, if I gave a truthful answer, would, in my opinion, reflect somewhat upon the Minister of Finance and his colleagues. I do not wish to be offensive to them, but we must deal with facts as they exist. There are several things the matter. The whole policy of the Government for years has been of a character to produce this result. We have disgusted the people of this country with the character of the policy of its Government; our Gerrymander Bills, our Franchise Acts, the corruption and boodling that prevail, the National Policy and many other things, which have had a tendency to drive the population out of

this country. People become disgusted ; they see the debt piling up ; they see the taxation from customs increasing ; they see the inordinate increase in the expenditure ; they see the Government carrying out the policy of bribing constituencies by Act of Parliament at wholesale, and bribing them by means of armies of boodlers at retail ; they see the corruption pervading every department of the Government ; and our people are leaving the country in disgust. It is useless to talk of redeeming this country by appropriations for immigration, as long as these giant evils drive the population from the country. Now, the National Policy, so far as fiscal reasons can be assigned, has produced very grievous results in this country. It has failed to redeem one single promise made in its behalf when it went into operation, not giving us, for instance, a home market——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman. I know that his discussion is pleasant to himself, and at another time it might be quite in order ; but I do not see that it is in order to-night, on an item for immigration, to go into a discussion of the general policy of the Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. This opens a wide field. Here is an appropriation for the purpose of adding to the population and prosperity of this country. Am I to be told that it is out of order to point out that while we are endeavouring to bring people into the country the Government are pursuing a policy which tends to drive them out? Surely the point of order taken by the Minister of Finance is not well taken in this instance.

Now we will go on to discuss the question, how we can increase the population and prosperity of this country. We will soon point out to these hon. gentlemen the mistakes they have made ; we will go on to exhort them to adopt an efficient policy for retaining and increasing our population ; and all this will be strictly in order. The National Policy, I was about to say, has been, not a promoter of immigration, but a great immigration agent for the country across the line ; and if our friends opposite wish to go out of the business of acting as immigration agents for the United States, there are certain things they want to do. Of course, an appropriation for bringing immigrants to pass through our country to the United States is one thing; but they had better adopt some plan to retain those people when they arrive here, and it is quite in order to discuss that. As I was about to say, the National Policy has been——

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPROULE). I think I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the item under consideration, which is a vote of $1,400 for agents at Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are dealing with the whole subject of the immigration appropriation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think that an old parliamentarian like the hon. member can hardly excuse himself by saying that he is dealing directly with the question of immigration, when he is discussing the National Policy.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, if you upon your honour as a gentleman and in your position as chairman of this committee, will risk your reputation by asserting that the National Policy has nothing to do with peopling this country or driving people from this country and has no bearing on the question before us to-night, then I shall have to sit down. But I think I am in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must say that is my ruling, whether I am sustained by the House or not

Mr. CHARLTON. Very well, we will pass to another subject, the subject of taxation, which may possibly have some bearing on the question of retaining our population or offering inducements to people to come and settle in the country. Under the customs law of this country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON —we have taken out of the pockets of the people by customs taxes in the last ten years, $227,000,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is wandering into another subject which is just as irrelevant to the question as the one he left.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very well, Mr. Chairman, we will take up another subject. I must confess that I am surprised that an old member of this House, in attempting to deal with the question under discussion, and in pointing out facts entirely pertinent to the case, should be ruled out of order in the arbitrary manner in which you have ruled me out on this occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Apologize.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will apologize to the extent that I do not suppose the chairman would be intentionally arbitrary, but he has ruled me out in a manner which I hold, from my standpoint, to be arbitrary. Now, Sir, I come to another feature of the Government's policy which undoubtedly has very great influence upon the question of the desirability of this country as a place of residence, that is, the policy which places the settler, the labourer and the producer at a great disadvantage in the cost of everything they have to purchase. For instance, when the purchaser spends $2.25 for coal oil, he gets only a dollar's worth. When the farmer wishes to purchase barbed wire, he pays $1.50 for a dollar's worth. When he purchases binding twine, the policy of the Government compels him to pay $1.40 for a dollar's worth. If he wants to buy a fork, he pays $1.50 for what he would get for a dollar but for the policy of the Government. If he wants to buy spades he pays $1.50 where he would otherwise only pay a dollar. He pays $1.50 for a dollar's worth of nails, $1.35 for a dollar's worth of cotton, $1.35 for a dollar's worth of earthenware, from $1.40 to $1.80 for a dollar's worth of woollen goods, and so on. I will not weary you, as you may think me out of order, by going extensively into this matter. When the farmer settles his store bill at the end of the year he pays $140 for what he would get for $100 but for the policy of the Minister of Finance. The result is, that during the past ten years the people of this country have had to pay in customs taxation $227,000,000, and probably twice as much more in incidental taxation to private interests, or a total of $454,000,000 incidental tax added to the direct tax. This amounts to $150 per head for the last ten years for every man, woman and child in the country from direct and indirect taxation ; and that has something to do with the question of peopling this country, and promoting its prosperity, and it is the policy pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite which has brought this country

to the condition it is now in. It is that policy which has shut it out of its natural market. It is that policy which has piled on the shoulders of the people these inordinate burdens. It is that policy which has ran up our debt from $75,000,000 to $234,000,000, and has increased our expenditure from $13,000,000 to $37,000,000. It is that policy which has increased the customs taxation from $9,000,000 to $24,000,000. It is that policy which has increased our debt, taxation, and expenditure from three to five times as fast as the population has increased. It is that policy which has a bearing upon the question whether this country shall be peopled by millions or become almost depopulated. It is that policy which has a bearing on the question whether we will be able to retain the immigrants brought by means of the appropriations the Government call on us to make, or whether they will only arrive here to drift away by the million as they have done hitherto, and help to swell the greatness and the resources of another nation. It was perfectly proper to allude to these matters in connection with the discussion of the item we have under consideration to-night.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. If the hon. gentleman wishes to appeal against the ruling of the Chair, he has a right to do so, but he has no right to reflect upon it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I deny that I have, either directly or indirectly, reflected upon your ruling, Sir, unless you consider yourself responsible for this policy. I have been talking about the general policy of the country, about the particular question of the prosperity of the country, and the means to secure it, in order to ascertain whether we will be able to people this country or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us about the Buffalo interview.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman will get the item and read it, I will tell him. I challenge him to produce that item and read it so that we may have it in discussion now.

Mr. FOSTER. Pull it out of your vest pocket.

Mr. CHARLTON. I challenge the Minister to read it.

Mr. BOWELL. Can you not repeat it?

Mr. CHARLTON. I read it once and my memory is not as good as that. I disclaim anything more than a serious desire to have that matter placed before the House. As reference has been made to it by the Minister of Finance, let him produce the article and read it.

Mr. FOSTER. You want to get it in the *Hansard*.

Mr. CHARLTON. None but a coward would make allusion to a thing and refuse to give a gentleman upon whom imputation has been cast the chance to refute it by withholding the charge to which he alluded.

If the Government desire to promote the population and prosperity of this country, let them retire the monopolists from power, and let them give attention to the interests of the farmer and the labourer. The results of their policy with regard to the natural markets of this country are very strikingly set forth by a comparison of the Trade and Navigation Returns with the United States for a period of years. In 1866 our exports to that country were $40,000,000 in round numbers. In 1891 they were $41,000,000. Now, Sir, taking into account the short returns of nearly $3,000,000 in round numbers last year, our exports last year were less than in 1866.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the item.

Mr. LAURIER. Are we to understand that upon a question of this kind, when the Government are asking an appropriation for immigration, the House is not at liberty to discuss all questions which have a bearing upon this policy? It seems to me this ruling is not in accord with the rules of the House, as I understand them. At the opening of the committee to-day the hon. member for South Oxford required, what is always given in England and seldom in this country, from the Minister in charge of these estimates, a general statement of the policy of the country. This is always done in England. No Minister there would dream of asking the House to vote an appropriation such as this unless he gave definitely the reasons for urging the expenditure. The hon. member for South Oxford invited such an *exposé* from the Government. The Minister of Agriculture gave it, and now the whole subject is in order, and it seems to me the ruling of the Chair would confine us within unreasonable limits. We are discussing the policy of the Government with regard to immigration, and anything bearing on that subject is in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I understand it would be quite in order to discuss the immigration policy of the Government, but not the commercial policy.

Mr. EDGAR. Surely, in discussing a large item, the money to be spent in bringing immigrants to this country, we ought to be able to show reason why we think it is wasteful to expend money in that direction when the field is open in other directions. If we undertake to show that by a prudent course in other directions this money will be saved, which under this proposal will be wasted, we ought to be allowed to do so. Discussions in committee will be utterly useless if we are to be gagged by the Chair in discussing the general policy of the Government on an item like this.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no desire on this side, and I am sure none on the part of the Chair, to gag any hon. member. The hon. member for North Norfolk has a wide scope in dealing with the question of immigration, which, every one must admit, opens up a discussion to a great extent of the policy of the Government, but the difference between the two sides of the House as to the scope allowed the hon. member is this: His contention is, that because we have asked a vote for immigration, he can open up every question concerning the human race. So far the hon. gentleman has been good enough to confine his observations to the history of Canada, including questions past and present, and every phase of the policy of the Government, but the same logic that sustains him in doing that would sustain him in coming to the history of any other country and discussing the policy of every country in the globe. We do not want to restrict the hon. gentleman unduly, we do not object to his discussing anything bearing on the question of immigration, but let his discussion be governed by some rule which will enable us, some day or other, to arrive at an end.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will be remembered that the hon. member for South Oxford asked for an explanatory statement from the Minister with reference to the policy of the Government in immigration matters, and it was thoroughly understood that the discussion was to be a general one as to the policy of the Government. We are discussing items under the heading of immigration, and the item following this is $150,000 for immigration expenses. It was thought, however, more convenient that the general question should be discussed now, after we have had the statement from the Minister with reference to their policy as regards immigration. From that standpoint, my hon. friend has been pointing out that our immigration policy has been a total failure, and that unless certain reforms are introduced in other departments of our policy this expenditure will be useless. That is the basis on which the discussion is proceeding, and I must say, if you were to adhere as strictly as you did, Mr. Chairman, to the idea which I think was in your mind, that we were discussing this one item, it would be impossible to have any general discussion at all of the immigration policy. Surely Ministers will not take the point that at no period in the passage of these estimates are we to have the opportunity of a general discussion of the Government policy in regard to immigration. That was the desire expressed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I would suggest to the Minister that it would tend to promote and to expedite business if that were done, because he may depend upon it that, if the Chair should rule that this general discussion is inopportune at this time, these questions will have to be worked in at some other time and perhaps in not so convenient a way. Gentlemen will not forego their undoubted right to discuss this matter, if not now, at some other time, when the discussion might be less effective. That, I think, is the view under which my hon. friend was proceeding, and possibly the Minister and the Chairman might agree that we should discuss the general policy now, and that the Chairman should review his decision that what we are discussing is the salary of the agent at Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two things which have been stated on the other side which I cannot allow to go unchallenged, and which I do not want to be understood as assented to on this side of the House. The one is the statement that we objected to the course pursued by hon. gentlemen because it was getting warm for this side of the House, and that the unpalatable truths which the hon. gentleman, in his opinion, was bringing forward grated very harshly on the ears of hon. gentlemen on this side. The hon. gentleman need not lay that flattering unction to his soul. We have heard all this before. We have heard those statements from year to year, we have lived under them, and we think we shall still live under their repeated infliction. It is not that we are afraid of having facts brought out. The other assertion is that we are afraid of a general discussion upon the immigration policy. We are not afraid of a general discussion of that policy, and while these items are proceeding is the time to take the general discussion of that policy, but what we objected to, and what the Chairman properly ruled upon, was that my hon. friend for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in professing to discuss the general immigration policy, was altogether travelling out of the record.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I will appeal to my hon. friend himself. The hon. gentleman who provoked this debate says he was in order in going into certain matters in order to show that our policy of immigration and the expenditure for immigration was futile unless certain changes were made, and two of these things which he was discussing were the National Policy and the keeping of this country from what he calls its natural markets in the United States. He went on to assert that he had a perfect right, in discussing the immigration policy, to discuss the National Policy, which is a question of tariffs, and to discuss our relations commercially with the United States, which is a question outside of this altogether, because they had a remote bearing on this subject.

Mr. LAURIER. A direct bearing.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, a direct bearing—that is stronger still. Where would my hon. friend have him stop? If he can discuss these matters and justify their discussion on this vote, he can discuss anything in the wide world. He can discuss whether it is opportune now to declare that this House and this country had no confidence in the present Government. He can discuss whether or not it is better that we should remain an integral part of the British Empire. He can discuss whether or not we should become a part of the United States. He can justify the discussion of all those on the ground that they have a remote connection with the question under debate, because he might contend that if it is better for us to become a part of the United States it would tend to keep our people here, and, if it is better to cease our connection with Great Britain, he might say we would have greater inducements for bringing people here and retaining them in Canada. All we ask is that the rule of proper discussion should be carried out in committee. While we have no objection to fair discussion of the immigration policy, while we would welcome one single pertinent suggestion from that side of the House as to any better system of carrying out that policy, which we have not had from that side during the hours' discussion which has taken place and would probably not have during two or three hours' discussion to-night, still the subject itself should not be departed from. The hon. gentleman was simply making an attack upon the party regarding certain lines of policy entirely outside of the question before the committee. No person would welcome more than myself a temperate, fair, reasonable discussion of what is the best thing to do in connection with the immigration policy, and the wisdom of gentlemen on the other side of the House, if they would just simply confine it to this one topic and give us their suggestions and endeavour to show us what should be the right methods of immigration, would be welcomed by every member on this side and certainly by me. The item under discussion is item 76, which is a vote for the salaries of agents in this country, and, if one place better than another can be found where the general policy could be discussed it would be item 79 of $150,000 which is the general vote for immigration purposes, where, of course, the general policy of the Government should be properly defined and debated. I am not, however, raising the point that we should not now discuss the general immigration policy, but let

us discuss the immigration policy and not the tariff and other matters outside, because, if we do, each side making assertions and the other rebutting them, we may discuss the subject for six weeks and get no nearer to a conclusion.

Mr. LAURIER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that he is willing to receive any good suggestion as to the best immigration policy to be pursued.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but we cannot get any.

Mr. LAURIER. The best immigration policy this side of the House can suggest is a revision of the tariff policy of the Government. You have before you the fact that the present policy, instead of carrying out the promise which was made, and keeping the people here, is sending our own population to the other side by hundreds of thousands. Now, notwithstanding that, you are asking this House to vote nearly $200,000 to bring immigrants to this country, who, if the present course continues, will simply land at Quebec and pass on to the other side of the line. My hon. friend is showing that the whole system is vicious and rotten: that it is useless to spend this money as long as the present condition of affairs exists. Is that not fair? What better proof can you bring to show that the immigration policy of the Government is unsound than to quote the results of that policy during the last ten years? We are willing to bring immigrants from Europe to this country, and for that purpose you propose to expend $200,000 next year. Now, I maintain that if you expend that amount of money in the way you propose, it will be simply thrown into the sea, you will derive no benefit from it. If you wish to make the expenditure of this money fruitful in good results, you must reverse the conditions now existing. How is this to be done unless the results of your past policy are shown to the country? I would not discuss annexation upon this question, I would not discuss imperial federation, nor any other of the subjects the hon. gentleman has mentioned, because they have a very remote bearing upon the question. But I do say that the tariff policy of the Government has an intimate connection with their immigration policy, and that it is the reason why we desire to discuss it at this time. If the present Chairman had been in the Chair before six o'clock, when this subject was opened, I think he would have perceived that it was the whole subject of immigration that was under discussion, and not this particular item at Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend take the position that this vote of $197,000 ought not to be voted until there is a change in the policy of the country?

Mr. LAURIER. I take the position that it is a fair question to discuss as long as the present tariff policy is persisted in.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend think that if he raises a large question of policy like that so long as the present tariff is maintained, it is useless to expend this $197,000?

Mr. LAURIER. I say this is a question upon which we require more information, and therefore it is fair to debate it at this moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not my hon. friend think that the better way would be to introduce a resolution on the subject?

Mr. LAURIER. It may be proper to introduce a resolution at the proper time. But the hon. gentleman knows that, according to parliamentary practice, the resolution is introduced on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MULOCK. The House is asked to vote a large sum of money for the purpose of promoting immigration; it is acknowledged that we are in need of population. Now, what is the cause of that need? What has become of the population that has already come in? Surely there can be no more direct connection with a proposal to bring in population than the condition which has caused a loss of population. Now suppose that in the course of this discussion my hon. friend should succeed in convincing the Administration that a change of tariff would materially affect the whole question, what would the Government do? The Minister of Finance says: Invite suggestions. Why, if he invited suggestions and gave them due weight, he might discover reasons to convince him that by changing the tariff policy we might save to the country the expenditure of this money altogether. Surely the commercial policy is intimately intertwined with the immigration policy. The chairman and all the members of the House admit that the whole immigration policy is now before the committee. If that is the case we cannot separate it from one of the causes that makes it necessary to bring this vote before the House. If it is admitted, as we contend, that the necessity of bringing this vote before the House is caused by a bad fiscal policy, surely this is the time to point out the cause of the evil and to seek a remedy for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not see any reason for changing the ruling I gave. The hon. gentleman might, with equal propriety, discuss the financial policy, the commercial policy, or the railway policy of the Government, and wander over a great many subjects irrelevant to immigration. I think it would expedite business and would be in the interest of the House, if the hon. gentleman would confine himself a little more closely to the question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall endeavour to comply with your request and to keep a little closer to the question in your estimation, although, in my own estimation, I was confining myself to the question before. Now, I was attempting to demonstrate the fact that the fiscal policy of this Government is in some respects pertinent to this discussion, as it is calculated to discourage immigration to this country and to promote emigration from it. Now, one particular point with regard to the fiscal policy of the Government that I was about to allude to, was this: There has been on the part of this Government, and on the part of the American Government as well, apparently, a settled determination to discourage, and as far as possible to destroy, trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. The manifestation of that purpose, so far as our own Government is concerned, has a direct bearing upon the question under discussion; it has a most potential influence upon the destinies and upon the prosperity of this country, and in that respect, and to the extent that it has a bearing upon the prosperity of the country, it is pertinent to the discussion, t

is pertinent to the question of promoting immigration to this country, of increasing our population and developing our resources. I wish to point out the bearing of that repressive policy upon the interests of the country in diminishing its population and in retarding its growth. I desire to point out that the trade with Canada and the United States has remained stationary for twenty-five years, that the annual exports from this country to the United States in 1891 were probably a million less than they were in 1866.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must call the hon. gentleman to order. I do not think he is regarding the ruling of the Chair. If he persists, I shall have to call Mr. Speaker.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Call the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. CHARLTON. Am I to understand that I must drop this branch of the question?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That is my ruling, and I ask the committee to sustain me in that ruling.

Mr. CHARLTON. And I shall ask the House to sustain me in my right to discuss this branch of the question. I do not propose to be gagged in this House of Commons in a proper and pertinent discussion of the question, unless the House decides that I am wrong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, heard the discussion which went on a few moments ago, in which his own friends indicated the bearing which might be given to the question under discussion. I am sure if he will discuss any question directly bearing upon the question before the committee, the House would be very sorry to see him restrained. When this point was raised, the hon. gentleman was taking a latitude which, as I said before, would justify the introduction of any question at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was about to proceed to demonstrate that the particular line of fiscal policy I was speaking of did diminish the population of this country, did have a direct bearing on the question of the development of our resources and the increase of our population. I was not allowed to reach that point. I would have demonstrated that it had a direct bearing, and was a most pertinent illustration. I was permitted to go so far, and then I was shut off.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Go on.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no desire to occupy the time of the House unnecessarily. I have no desire to introduce matter irrelevant to the subject under discussion. I have a line laid out, and I wish to proceed on it to demonstrate certain assertions I have made with respect to the loss of population. I trust I may be allowed to make the statement I desire to make. I was proceeding to say that the fiscal policy of this Government as it relates to our intercourse with the United States has been of a character to diminish the growth of trade between these two countries, and that the exports to the United States were actually less now than in 1866. I intended to proceed from that point to show that with continued free trade the increase of trade between the two countries would have been enormous, that the prosperity of this country from the increase of trade would have been very great, and that the repressive policy of this Government, acting in conjunction with the repressive policy of the United States Government, has been the means of repressing our energies, of driving our population from us, in short of interfering with our growth. If this is not a matter pertinent to the discussion of this question, why surely no matter can be. Notwithstanding the efforts to destroy the trade between these countries, our total trade with the United States last year was actually $3,000,000 more than our trade with Great Britain; and had our exports to the United States increased since 1866 in the same proportion they increased from 1854 to 1866, under a partial reciprocal tariff, in the place of exporting a value of $41,000,000, we would have exported $101,000,000 and $60,000,000 more would have been brought into this country, in the shape of gold or its equivalent, resulting from our exports to the United States than we have received. I would ask if, assuming as true that we lost $60,000,000 of exports through a given line of policy, that policy has not some bearing on the growth of our prosperity and on the increase of population in this country? It has more bearing on this question than this vote of $198,000—it has more bearing than twenty votes of that amount. It is the policy of the Government, the policy of repression, the policy that denies this country its natural markets, the policy of hostility to our neighbours, that accounts in a large measure for the fact that our population is 4,800,000 instead of 8,000,000 as it should be. This is a question of the utmost importance to this country, and it is pertinent, proper and relevant to consider it to-night.

We have a certain line of productions in this country for which we find our export market in the United States, and I wish in connection with this immigration question to show how important it would be to this country, if we had free and unimpeded access to that market, for, notwithstanding the policy of repression, we are obliged to sell in that market at great disadvantage to ourselves. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to this branch of the subject, and he will be then able to judge more clearly as to what policy it is necessary to pursue in order to promote the interests of the country and to increase its population. And you, Mr. Chairman, will appreciate the force of this as a practical farmer, although you are a professional man, and I will now take the trade returns and show the movement of trade in certain articles between this country and the United States and other countries. I take exports of horses, sheep, poultry, eggs, hides, wool, barley, beans, hay, malt, potatoes, vegetables and flax. Last year we exported these articles to the United States to the value of $9,355,531. We exported to Great Britain, where there is a free market, whereas in the United States the bars are up and we had to climb over them, to the value of $830,867, or twelve times as much to the United States as to Great Britain. During the previous year, when the McKinley Bill had not gone into operation, we exported to the United States the value of $14,124,801, to Great Britain the value of $427,876, or thirty-four times the value of those articles to the United States as to Great Britain. When we talk about two-rowed barley, hon. members must remember that we sent to Great Britain last year barley to the value of $75,225, probably all two-rowed barley, and to the United States the

value of $2,849,269, or thirty-eight times as much to the United States as to Great Britain, with 30 cents per bushel duty on that sent to the United States and the British market free and open. That illustrates the vast importance of securing free access to that market where, notwithstanding all these circumstances, we sold thirty-eight times as much barley last year as in the British market. Of eggs, we sold to Great Britain last year the value of $83,680, and to the United States, in the face of the 5 cent duty, the value of $1,074,247. All these facts, and I only refer to them briefly as illustrating the point which I desire to present in a striking light before the House, illustrate the main fact I wish to present, that we are debarred from our natural market: that, in consequence, our prosperity is impaired, that our people leave us and go to that country from which our products are shut out; and if this Government wish to promote the prosperity of this country, to increase its population, to keep the people who are now dwelling here, and to retain the immigrants who come to this Dominion, they must adopt a broader and more liberal policy, a common-sense trade policy with respect to the other forty-two commonwealths on this continent not under the British flag.

I will not detain the House very much longer. I would have concluded half an hour ago, but hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to prevent me saying what I wanted to say on this matter. We want to change our trade policy, we want to reach the markets to the south of us, we want to pay less attention to the markets of other countries and more attention to that great natural market of 60,000,000 lying alongside of us. Last year we were talking about the trade with the West Indies, Mexico, Central and South America. Our exports of animals and produce to those countries last year reached $41,929, of agricultural products $292,355, or a total value of $334,294. At the same time we sent these products to the United States to the value of $11,608,000, or thirty times as much to the United States as to all these countries together. In the face of these facts it is absurd to talk about developing trade with the West Indies, Mexico, Central and South America, when those markets are so insignificant compared with the United States market. I simply reiterate that the Government should adopt a common-sense policy, that they should adopt a wise immigration policy, that they should seek to run this country in the interests of the farmer, the lumberman, the mechanic and the labourer, to govern the country so that our people will remain in this country, which is as good as any on the continent, possessing, as it does, vast resources, and all that is necessary to develop this country and increase its population as rapidly as it should increase, is to adopt a trade policy calculated to promote its interests. Before I take my seat I must reiterate my request to the Minister of Finance to produce the article he referred to, casting reflections on me, and to read it to this House, so that the House may know what the charge is, so that I may know what it is and may be in a position to answer it here as a member of this House where the charge is made against me. I want to know whether the Finance Minister proposes to do this. The allusion is made, and I want to know what it is.

Mr. BOWELL. It is on record that you said that you read it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is on record that Baron Munchaussen lived once and tied his horse to a steeple.

Mr. FOSTER. He has come back again.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say that the Finance Minister should read this article, so that I may have an opportunity of answering it here when the House is made acquainted with its character.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the Finance Minister is not going to defend the statement he made with regard to the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) we will have to proceed with the discussion. When the Finance Minister drew the attention of the committee to a question of order, in place of dealing with the question he went on to outline the direction in which a discussion on an important matter of this kind might take place. He challenged the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on a question of order, but in place of discussing that question when he rose in his place, he went off in every direction he could think of to outline what he conceived to be the proper discussion of a question of this kind. I contend that the whole policy of the Government on the question of immigration is before the committee in connection with this item. Had we proceeded to pass the item now before the committee, hon. gentlemen opposite might claim that since we had passed the salaries to agents at Quebec and other points, we had committed ourselves to the whole policy of the Government on immigration. We claim that now and here is the proper time to criticise the policy of the Government on this important matter. The question of our population has been referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as one of vital interest. When we come to consider the fact that within the last ten years, under the head of immigration, we have spent about $3,000,000 to bring people into the country, and that we now find from the census that they are not here, I am sure the people of this country will consider that we are discharging a very important duty when we are drawing the attention of the House to this question. I agree in every reference made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to the vicious policy of the Government and its evil results on our population. When the Government make a country desirable to live in, and give to the people the necessaries of daily life at the lowest price, and facilitate people coming to the country by free grants of land, and enable them to obtain comfortable homes, then is the time to seek for immigration; and it is not while you continue a vicious policy in force which imposes taxation upon them and makes them victims of combines and monopolies. The people will not stay here when they come, which clearly shows that the policy of the Government is responsible for the loss of our population. I am not prepared to say that the policy of the Government is entirely responsible for all the exodus; but still we must remember that when the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were in the Opposition, they charged the exodus on the Liberal Administration, and they promised that when they got into power they would not only prevent the exodus, but would

bring the people back who had left the country. We now can see that our population increased more in proportion during the Liberal Administration than it has during the last ten years, which is a clear proof that the policy of the present Government has been a failure. The Liberal Administration were characterized by the gentlemen of the Administration as being flies on the wheel, and charged with not giving encouragement to the manufacturing industries—I believe they ventured to say something about the agricultural interest—but these very gentlemen have been for 12 years in power now, and let me ask them has their policy kept the people in the country? No, it has not. Their policy has been a failure and our contention is that it should be recast. Their policy is like the man that went to the gunsmith to get his gun fixed; it wants a new lock, stock and barrel. The whole thing is wrong. I contend that before we pass the salary for a single agent, and before we lend our endorsation in the slightest degree to a continuation of the policy of the Government, it is the duty of the Opposition to draw the attention of the House to the vicious results that policy has had upon the country. It is desirable that we should have a complete change in that policy. The Minister of Agriculture has outlined the course the Government intend to pursue for the next year, and he says they are going to give a bonus of $10 to the head of a family and $5 to each person above the age of 12 years who come into the country. I see that last year we paid out a large sum for bonuses to agents and others for bringing immigrants into this country. I contend that the question is not so much how we are going to get the people here, as how we are going to keep them here when they do come. We have spent millions upon millions to bring population into the country, but the population has vanished. The policy we desire to impress upon hon. gentlemen opposite is the policy that will keep the people here when they do come, and when we have adopted a policy of that kind, then let us inaugurate means to encourage immigration. As my hon. friend has pointed out, the immigrants have taken advantage of all the offers of bonuses and assisted passages; they have come across the Atlantic and landed at Halifax or Quebec or Montreal; they have been treated kindly; everything has been done that could be done to keep them in the country, but they have passed through and passed out at the other end. Now, we want some system that will prevent the continuous flow of these immigrants into the United States, and the only way in which you can keep them when you bring them here is by giving them evidence that you are going to make them free and independent here by removing from them the exactions of the National Policy. I contend that the North-West land policy of the Government has had much to do with driving people out of that country instead of attracting them to it. In the first place the Government should never have parted with the control of the public lands. Had they kept them, subject to a certain lien in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that every man who went there would have a free choice to settle and build his shanty wherever he liked, without restriction, the country would have been much more rapidly settled. But, as it is, when men go there to settle and enter on a lot, they are told that that is Canadian Pacific land; if they go to another they are told that it is some colonization company's land, another is Hudson Bay Company's, another is school lands. The result is that only a remnant of land is left for people to take up as homesteads when they go there, so that many become disappointed and discouraged, and write back to their friends in the old country, saying: The promises and inducements held out to us to come to Canada have not been fulfilled, and we would not advise you to come here; you had better go to some country where you will be better off than in the Canadian North-West. That has been the unfortunate results in many cases. Another thing that has reduced our population is this: Years ago many of our people went to Michigan, Minnesota, Dakota and other parts of the western States, and in writing back to their friends in Canada these people invariably compare notes as to the prices they have to pay for goods and the prices they get for their produce. If the man in Michigan took 100 bushels of barley to market and got $80 for it, while the man in Canada for his 100 bushels only got $48, the latter would decide that his brother in Michigan was better off, and that he had better go there. I know instances myself where men have been the means of inducing their brothers to go to the United States, simply because the prices they received for their agricultural products were better than the prices they received in Canada. We have been coaxing and appealing earnestly to hon. gentlemen opposite to honestly seek to obtain a treaty that would wipe out the barriers between the two countries and give us free access to the United States market. The moment they do that they will stop the exodus. The Canadian will see that he has as free access to the American market as his brother in Dakota. But as long as hon. gentlemen opposite pursue the policy of restriction, and put a barrier in the way of our people obtaining their natural market, so long will they have the people of this country leaving it and going where they can get the advantages which they would have if these barriers were taken down. We have been trying to educate hon. gentlemen opposite, but they appear to be unwilling to learn. But slow as the people of this country are learning, I believe they are learning the truth. I believe they are coming to see that the policy we are advocating must ultimately prevail.

An hon. MEMBER. The bye-elections do not show it.

Mr. McMULLEN. They would show it but for the money and the boodling and the political corruption of hon. gentlemen opposite. These hon. gentlemen do not go before this country trusting to the popularity of their policy; they trust to the popularity of the dollars which they have in their pockets; that is the reason they smile over the bye-elections. For these reasons we are justified in urging upon hon. gentlemen a revision of this whole policy of immigration. We want it recast. Before there is a single dollar granted or an agent appointed, we insist that it is a waste of the people's money to spend $275,000 or $300,000 to bring people here to pass on to the United States. The people of this country are heavily enough burdened with debt now, without being made financial slaves for the purpose of increasing the population of the United States. We have done that for the last ten years, because hon. gentlemen opposite declared that

their policy was going to reverse the order of things that prevailed before they came into power; but it has made matters worse, for ten people leave the country to-day to every one that went formerly. Now, Sir, I want to say a few words with regard to the province from which I come. The whole movement of immigration for a number of years past has been towards the North-West. Every pamphlet written and sent across the Atlantic has been for the purpose of inducing people to go to our North-West. Hardly a word has been said with regard to desirable locations that can be had for a very reasonable sum in the older provinces. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island there is surely room for thousands, yes, millions, on arable land that would provide them with comfortable homes. More than that, there are people in the Province of Ontario, who under the operation of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite have become paupers, whose lands have become mortgaged, who would like to sell them at a reasonable price, and who would make the best pioneers in the North-West. Now, if we could get instead tenant farmers from the old country who would come out with £2,000 or £3,000 capital and buy our Ontario farms, we could send to the North-West our Canadian farmers who would make more successful pioneers than the English farmers ever will. But the whole drift of the Government has, on the contrary, been to send everybody to the North-West. Of course the Canadian Pacific Railway have exercised a considerable influence in this direction, and you cannot blame them for endeavouring to secure an influx of population where their chief interests lie, but that is all the more reason why we should not lose sight of the older provinces. In Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that class of settlers would find comfortable homes, which they would buy out, and enable the Canadian farmers to go to the North-West and develop that country. If a policy of that kind were adopted, there would be two objects served. In the first place, it would tend to relieve many of the farmers now in financial embarrassments in the older provinces, by obtaining for them reasonable value for their lands, many of which are now mortgaged and will eventually fall at a sacrifice into the hands of the mortgagees; and they would thus have something to start with in the North-West: which they are better fitted to develop than immigrants from the old country. That is a change which should be adopted, if we are to have an immigration policy at all. Under the operation of our immigration policy in the past, our money has gone and the people have gone. We have neither the one nor the other; and now, before a single dollar is voted, is the time to inaugurate a change and bring about a different condition of things. We want to show the people of the old country that we are going to give them comfortable homes, that every item entering into their every-day use can be found in Canada as cheap as in the United States. We want to procure for them the same markets for their supplies and produce as is given by other portions of the continent. We want to give them every opportunity to advance. We want to throw off shackles and restrictions, make this a free, progressive country where every man is given the opportunity of selling in the best markets and buying in the cheapest. The people of this generation are not fools. You cannot get immigrants from the old country, who do not know how many beans make five. They are not ignorant of the history of their own country; they know what it has suffered under protection; and they are convinced that protection is objectionable. We know what it has brought this country to. We have a condition of things serious enough to be deplored. Take the words used by Goldwin Smith when addressing an important individual of the Australian colonies, upon the question of the confederation of those colonies. He said, and I am sure it was with feelings of regret he said it, that he had to admit that the demoralized condition, the slough of political corruption through which the confederacy of Canada was passing, was enough to deter any colony from entering into a confederacy. It is time we should put a stop to the unfortunate condition of things here, one extravagance after another; one expenditure after another. We have throughout this country evidences of the failure of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have railroads which now remain as exhibitions of folly, in many cases not paying for the grease on the wheels. We have the railroad built in Cape Breton that has cost the country over $2,000,000 and does not pay running expenses. We have our Intercolonial Railway with its numerous branches on which the people are losing $100,000 a month. Last year $684,000 was lost in the operation of that road, and we are paying interest on $50,000,000 sunk in building it, or $2,000,000 a year at 4 per cent besides the $684,000 loss in running the road. As the legitimate outcome of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, there are hundreds of men hired on the road who have nothing to do. 160 were dismissed the other day and 300 more received notices that in a short time their services would be dispensed with. Some change will have to take place. Let us begin now and reform this pernicious policy which has been in operation for ten years. Give the people who come here freeholds; give them every inducement to settle; but for the sake of the taxpayers, let our policy be first to inaugurate a system which will keep the people here we have, and then we will have no difficulty in bringing others in.

Mr. CASEY. Before this item is passed, I wish to call attention to what is almost a piece of ancient history, and that is the two promises made so long ago that both sides seem to have forgotten them. When we were passing the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we were told that it would not add anything to the burdens of the country. We were told that it would free us from immigration expenditure, as was proved to be the case in the north-western States. There the Government made grants of land to the railways, and the railways in their turn advertised for settlers and filled up the country. We all knew this to be true about the north-western States. We all knew whenever we saw a pamphlet or a poster advertising lands from Kansas to the Canadian boundary, that poster or pamphlet was issued in the name of some railway being built in that district and published for the purpose of getting settlers and traffic for their lines. Of course, they not only got traffic for their lines, but were enabled to sell the lands given them by the Government. We were told that this would be done in the case of the Canadian

Pacific Railway, but now, eleven years have passed and we find that instead of the Canadian Pacific Railway doing all that was necessary to advertise the lands and thereby relieve the Government, the Government Immigration Department has become to a large extent the advertising department of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have given them lands and money to build the railways, and now we are putting ourselves to the cost of advertising those lands in Europe and elsewhere for the benefit of the railway, and, as the hon. member for North Wellington justly remarked, we are advertising not only at the expense of Ontario, but in Ontario. We are spending money with the effect of inducing Ontario farmers to remove to the North-West, and thereby depreciating the value of property in that province. I suppose it is useless to expect from the Minister of Agriculture any statement as to negotiations between himself and the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the view of that railway assuming the lion's share of the task of advertising the North-West. When a Minister has not sufficient energy or willingness for work to attend to the duties of the Department of Agriculture, we cannot expect him to go outside of the narrowest possible groove for the purpose of making arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway or anybody else. And we cannot expect that this Government should ask the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry out the promises made on its behalf by its godfather, Sir Charles Tupper, when he took charge of the measure, eleven years ago, in this House. We cannot expect this Government to hold the Canadian Pacific Railway to any of their agreements or promises. It is more likely that the Canadian Pacific Railway are holding the Government to its promises. The compulsion in all dealings between the two parties seems to be on that side. There is another point to which I must call attention, the question of assisted immigration. We are not only paying bonuses for the importation of adult persons from Europe, which I see have been very considerable in amount—though I am not now dealing with the amount but with the principle—but, besides that, we have been paying bonuses for the importation of pauper children from England. I think, after a good many years' experience of this importation of young paupers, the country at large is not inclined to look upon that trade—for I can hardly call it anything else—with great favour. In the first place, the material imported is necessarily of the worst class. Children whose parents are so poor or so vicious that they cannot, or will not take care of them, are picked up by the philanthropic societies of Great Britain and put in training for a short time there, and then exported to Canada. Now there may be, of course, and no doubt are, many exceptions to the rule, but the rule is that the children of vicious and unhealthy parents will grow up to be vicious and unhealthy themselves. The children of such parents are utterly degraded in mind, in body and in morals. It is surely not necessary for a country so rich in resources as Canada to descend to the importation of the offspring of this degraded stock as the basis for a future population. Worse than that, after they are brought here, these children are placed in a position of virtual slavery in the families to whom they are entrusted. No doubt, as I said when speaking of the character of these children, there are exceptions, and many of them are received very young into families where there are few or no other children, are received as members of the family, and grow up to be good and useful citizens as far as they can be, considering the breed from which they come; but we have constant reminders in the courts that many of these children are brought into families where there are other children, where there is jealousy on the part of the other children, where the father or the mother singles them out from the rest of the family and treats them as slaves or pariahs. We have constant accounts in the papers of these children being brutally used, and on the other hand we have accounts of these children turning out very badly, robbing their employers, or, as might be readily expected on the part of the female children, falling into very bad courses. Looking at all the circumstances, looking at the very bad material and at the practical results of the scheme as far as we have seen, I think the country is tired of the importation of pauper children. I say that in families of the kind I have mentioned these children become slaves or pariahs. You cannot help that. The people who put them out have no means of knowing the families to whom they send them. No doubt there is some kind of inspection, but it cannot extend to any practical care taken of the children. We do not want the importation of slave labour under cover of philanthropy. We do not need it in this country. We are having sufficient trouble to prevent our own children being taken out of our own country to the United States to desire to import an inferior class in their places. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) have done what was perfectly right, what was perfectly in order, and what was their duty in pointing out that it was useless to expend money to get immigrants when we could not keep our own people at home. Look at the comparative value of the immigrant and of the young Canadian who is lost to us by the policy of this Government which is importing foreigners. The young Canadian is generally a well educated, sturdy, honest man. After the country has paid its share in bringing that child to manhood, how much is he worth to the country? A friend behind me says $1,000 is a very low estimate. I should be inclined to double or treble it. In the States they estimate that every immigrant is worth $2,000. If an immigrant is worth $2,000, what is a mature, grown up young Canadian, educated as a young Canadian is and coming from the stock that young Canadians come from, worth? Double it again and call it $4,000 and you will not be far off the mark. And now you are every year losing these young Canadians and replacing them either by adult immigrants from another country or by paupers from the slums of London. Can we call this a patriotic policy? No. The policy should be, Canada for the Canadians. Keep Canadians in Canada first and then import other people from outside. The Government have appeared to see that. They are compelled to see it. They are now trying—and the Canadian Pacific Railway are assisting them to a certain extent—to repatriate the Canadians who have gone to the United States. In the Province of Quebec there are societies that are trying to do the same thing in regard to Canadians who have gone across the border. But it is a strange commentary on our immigration policy that we are

spending money to bring in foreigners when at the same time we have to send agents across the line to bring back our own people who have gone there. I say that the contented settler is the best agent. The man who writes home to his friends and tells them of his good circumstances is the best agent, and it is far better for us to make the immigrants we get happy and contented than to spend all this money in getting more. That is worth more than the 628,000 copies of the farmers' delegates reports that have been got and distributed. It is worth more than the 4,000 copies of the Brandon *Mail* at a cost of $700. It is worth more than the 25,000 copies of the *Scandinavian-Canadian*. I wonder how many Scandinavians we got by the circulation of that paper. If we make our immigrants happy after they come here, we need expend very little on the salaries of the immigration officers. How much does the United States Government expend for immigration? I do not know the figures, but I believe the amount is very trifling compared with ours. It is the railway companies who do the work for them. I say no matter how much we pay our immigration agents, no matter how many pamphlets we send abroad, the census figures go abroad too, they are quoted by those who wish to deflect immigration into other channels, and those census bulletins give the lie, apparently, to everything that is asserted by our agents, or by our pamphlets. I say they give the lie apparently, because after all, Canada has the advantages in soil, and climate, and natural resources, that are asserted in those pamphlets; but in face of the fact that the exodus from Canada has exceeded the immigration into Canada during the past ten years, what are foreign countries going to believe? They say: It is all very well to tell us about your natural advantages, but we find that more people are leaving your country than are going into it. What does this mean? If we tell them it is the result of the Government's fiscal policy, they cannot go into the minutiæ of our politics. We may say what we like about our products, about our farms and forests, we cannot make a favourable impression on foreign countries as long as the figures show that people are going out of the country faster than they are coming in. As the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Mc Mullen) says, we are getting rid of the people and the money at the same time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As I understand the discussion has, from the outset, taken a somewhat wide range, I want to make a remark or two on this subject of immigration with special reference to the province from which I come. I understand the hon. gentleman at the head of the department has had in his employment whether selected by himself or by the High Commissioner, I do not know, a certain number of skilled farmers known as tenant farmers, that they visited the different Maritime Provinces with a view of seeing whether there was any land open for settlement, and whether the inducements were such that they could fairly recommend to their clients at home to come and settle in those provinces. I understand from conversation with several gentlemen who themselves conversed with these tenant farmers, that they were well satisfied with the natural condition they found there; they thought the climate was good, the soil was good, and that these two combined conditions were favourable to agriculture, and they were prepared to recommend to their friends to make the Maritime Provinces their home. But I understand that these gentlemen reported further—and I think the committee ought to have this matter put straight by the hon. gentleman if it is not correct—I understand they reported further that although the natural conditions in the Maritime Provinces were favourable to the development of agriculture, still the fiscal conditions overpowered the natural conditions, and they would be obliged to recommend to their friends in the old country not to come to the Maritime Provinces. Now, when the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was making his speech in the early part of the evening, and was interrupted by the Chair on the ground that he was not in order, it struck me he was quite in order, because the very reason given by these agents sent out by the department showed that immigration does not flow into those provinces because of the artificial fiscal regulations which are enforced at the instance of the Government. If that is so, it indicates a condition of matters which ought to engage the serious attention of this House. If these tenant farmers found that neither our soil, nor our climate, nor other natural conditions, were unfavourable to immigration, we would have been obliged to submit in silence, because we cannot alter any of those; but when they find that all these natural conditions are favourable, and that the only unfavourable conditions are those which have been introduced by the Government of the day, and that if those unfavourable conditions were changed these men would be prepared to recommend to their friends to come to this country, then I say not only that this point is pertinent to the discussion of the question before the House, but that it is the bounden duty of members to consider it most seriously in connection with the very grave facts which are found in the census returns regarding the Maritime Provinces. Now, I find that the Maritime Provinces, under the fiscal conditions that prevailed between 1871 and 1881, increased in population by over 100,000. Now, what has been the result in the last ten years, when a new fiscal policy was introduced? The total increase including cities has been but 10,000. The loss in the three provinces during the last ten years has been 165,000, allowing for the natural increase of 2 per cent alone. I say this is one of the most lamentable, one of the most appalling, facts which ever a free and independent people had brought before them, and it behooves this committee to consider with great attention this solemn and serious matter affecting the future well-being of our country. Sir, while this question is being discussed it would become hon. gentlemen whose constituents are more or less affected by it, whom I see opposite to me, the members of the Government and their supporters, either to answer these facts, or to give some explanation showing why they intend to persist in the continuance of a policy which is depopulating one of the finest portions of this Dominion. Now, let us come to details. I see before me the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) a gentleman who occupies a high position in the respect and esteem of this House, and who is believed by his friends to be a pretty able man. Why, Sir, we find him supporting this policy. I find by the census returns that the County of Albert had a total population in 1881 of 12,300. The natural increase was 2,400; the total loss in popu-

lation was 1,358, and the natural increase lost besides was 2,400, making a loss in 10 years of 3,758. Sir, looking at that gentleman's education and position, and the influence which he wields in his party, I should have expected him either to insist that a change should take place in the fiscal policy which produced such results, or that he should have given some explanation showing that these results are not attributable to that policy. I find that in that gentleman's county, in the previous 10 years under a different fiscal policy, the population instead of decreasing, increased by 1,657. Sir, there is the Minister of Finance, who comes from the County of King's, N. B., the man who controls the fiscal policy of the country. I find that the loss of population in that county is 2,527, and the natural increase of 5,000 was lost besides, making a total loss of 7,527. The hon. gentleman is not in the Chamber now, but these figures were read to him by my hon. friend who sits at my left (Sir Richard Cartwright) before, and from that day to this he has never assayed any reply, not to the argument, but to the fact recorded in the census returns as brought down by himself. Then we find in the county represented by the leader of the Government, Antigonish, there has been a loss of population of 1,948, in addition to the natural increase of 3,600, or 5,548. Are these facts to be ignored? Has the Minister of Agriculture nothing whatever to say in the face of these facts? Is this the result of pouring out the money and treasure which has gone out from his department during the last 10 years? Lamentable is a mild word to use, it is disgraceful to the country, disgraceful to the department, and disgraceful, I must say, to the men who propounded the system under which it has taken place, and to which it is to be chiefly ascribed. Take my own county, which is the flower of all the counties in regard to agriculture.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I repeat that in regard to agricultural products and agricultural capabilities it is the flower of all. Its population has decreased 2,132, and the natural increase, 9,000, lost, gives a decrease of 11,333 in that county alone. If we take the whole St. Lawrence group, Cape Breton, Victoria, Inverness, Antigonish and Pictou——

Mr. CAMERON. You cannot take Cape Breton anyway.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is leaping before he reaches the stile. I was going to make a quotation from the official records. The hon. member may contradict it: if he does so, he must give some evidence to justify his contradiction. The St. Lawrence group of counties, containing a population of 123,000 in 1891, has increased its population 68 souls during the past 10 years. So that group of counties alone has lost its increase of 24,000 people, and that in face of the fact that during those years there has been an expenditure there of nearly $4,000,000 of public money in the construction of a railway. Although hundreds and thousands of men were brought in to assist in building that road, the natural increase of population of 24,000 even did not occur. These facts have to be answered—they are not mere statements. I remember some years ago when members who came from the Maritime Provinces ventured on their responsibility, and acting on their personal knowledge made statements akin to these in the official records, we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we were decrying the country, that we were exaggerating the facts, that we were no true patriots and that we were not to be relied upon. I did not blame at that time the head of the department and the leader of the Government for not accepting our statements when they were contradicted by our colleagues who supported the Government in the Maritime Provinces. Now every statement has been verified and shewn to be under the mark, and the official record shows that the people are fleeing from those provinces as from a plague, and that the population is 165,000 less than it should be, and it would be if they had retained their natural increase. It behooves the head of the department to take this matter into his serious consideration. The population is not only depleted, but in material wealth has fallen behind until the situation to-day is appalling.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman who laughs does not know what he is laughing about, and he does not come from that part of the country. Does he know that there has been an increase in the three chief cities of the Maritime Provinces of only 60 people during the last ten years; that the value of shipping held by the maritime people has depreciated over $9,000,000; that the young men are not taking that pride in the country they ought to take, considering its great capabilities as regards agriculture, fishing and mining; that the young men who are going from those provinces to the United States are considered to be the flower of the population of the republic? Does the hon. gentleman tell me that a fiscal system which drives the rising young men of the country out of it is one to be continued, and that hon. gentlemen opposite have nothing to say when these facts are brought before them? We have reached a crisis—I cannot speak for the upper provinces, for I do not know how they stand—we have reached a crisis in the history of the Maritime Provinces so great and severe that, unless something is done in the near future, if they continue to believe that statement made by the Minister of Finance that there is no hope of obtaining better trade relations with the United States, I repeat to him what I have previously stated, that he will make one-half of them annexationists within two years. I rejoice to know there is a better gospel preached, there is a brighter hope for our people, but it does not come from the men who are dumb to-night in the face of these facts, and who have nothing to offer the people but a policy of despair. What is the sense of voting this sum year after year? The Minister says we have been adding to the population in the North-West and are now doing so. But immigrants would go there without the Government money, if the Administration would remove the restrictions of which the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) spoke and give them fair-play, and give them the best land, and we would have no need to pour out money like water, as the Government has been doing, to induce people to go there. The best people would go there, as they go to Dakota and other western States, without these artificial inducements. But whatever the hon. gentleman may be doing in the

North-West he is doing nothing in the Maritime Provinces. I do not ask the Minister to spend money to bring immigrants there, because I agree with the tenant farmers who reported to him, and whose report is in his possession, that while the present fiscal system remains, if they came there they would leave in a short time. But he can awaken from his dream and help his colleagues to make this a cheaper and better country to live in, and to secure the removal of the artificial restrictions, when we would obtain people with money in their pockets and energy in their constitution, and hope in their hearts, who would come from the old country, where there is a surplus of population, and make for themselves free and happy homes in that garden down by the sea, a garden once prosperous, contented and happy, but now, I am sorry to say, exactly the reverse. If it is the reverse, I charge it on the hon. gentleman and his policy; and if hon. gentlemen opposite continue another 10 years with the policy of despair, there will not be a slight increase of 165, but even that will have been wiped out, for the people will have left the country altogether:

Mr. CAMERON. It is not my intention to prolong this discussion because I think it has assumed quite a sufficient length already. However, I cannot allow to pass unnoticed some of the observations made by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). I always take very much pleasure in listening to him because what he lacks in argument he makes up in sound, and on nearly every occasion that he speaks he must have a fling at Cape Breton. I would say at this stage that it was an unfortunate circumstance that the Government did not accept some of the suggestions made in 1890 by the hon. members opposite. There are no persons in this House I believe who more fully realize the fallacy of the census taken previous to 1891 than my hon. friends from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and from Queen's (Mr. Davies). If the suggestions made by them in 1890 had been taken by the Government a good deal of the arguments which they used to-night, and which they have been using on former occasions, would have been taken from under their feet. In the same way that their discussions on the National Policy recoil upon themselves every time they raise it in this House, so will their discussion in reference to the census of the Dominion recoil upon them when the question is thoroughly understood by the people of this country. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in 1890, page 2390 of the *Hansard*, said:

"I hope the Minister of Agriculture will not forget the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). It is a most important one: that all absentees' names should be checked. It is of the highest importance that instructions should be given to the enumerators with regard to persons who have left, and who may have left permanently, although they left but the day before. The errors that undoubtedly exist in the last census render it, to a great extent, untrustworthy—as a report of the population—in one province at least."

That is the basis of the whole argument. The census which my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in 1890 characterized as utterly untrustworthy, he now bases his argument upon. If it were untrustworthy as he said, why does he now form an argument upon it? In order to ascertain the real nature of the suggestion made by him I will refer to what the then leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Edward Blake, said. At page 2389 of the *Hansard* of 1890, Mr. Blake said:

"As the hon. member for Queen's County has said, if a father were asked whether he expected his boy, who had been away some 15 or 20 years, never to come back, of course the father in the hope of having his son pay him a visit, would say that certainly he expected him back. The son's name would be put down. That is the report I have received from many parts, and my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Langelier) confirms it with regard to that province."

That was the state in Ontario and the state in Quebec, and in order to convince my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) that it was the state in the little province whence he comes, I shall quote an authority which I believe he cannot doubt, and that is himself. He said on that occasion, page 2387 of the *Hansard*:

"Now speaking on matters which came to my knowledge with regard to the last census, I noticed that many enumerators, taking, as they said, their returns under instructions from those who appointed them, took from the head of the house, not only the number of his family and of the servants who were at home with him, but the names and numbers of those who had left many years before; the only question being asked was: 'Do you think that he will ever return?' Well 'ever' is a big word, and the father of the house did not want to banish all hope that some time or other his son who had left home to make a living abroad, and to be a resident of another country, might at some future time return; and in this way the names of hundreds and thousands were put down who had, for all practical purposes, left Canada, made a new home for themselves in another country and become naturalized in the United States."

In 1881, then, according to the evidence of my hon. friends opposite, there were hundreds of thousands of the people of this Dominion absent in the United States, and upon that census of the Dominion they base their whole argument. As I stated at the beginning, it is almost a pity that the Government did not adopt the suggestion made by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), for if they had done so, a different showing would be made in the last census. His suggestion was that not only the census would be taken as they had been taken without a time-limit, but also that the names of those who had been absent for a number of years should be taken down as well. If that system had been adopted in 1891 it would show an increase in the population of the Dominion during the last decade in the same, if not in a greater proportion, than previous to that time. In order to show that this would be the case, it is fair that I should take the Province of Nova Scotia for an example. In 1861, before Confederation, the population of Nova Scotia was 330,857; in 1871, 387,800; in 1881, 440,579; and in 1891, 450,492. My hon. friends opposite know very well that there was no time-limit in 1861, 1871 and 1881, and as my hon. friend the senior member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said, hundreds of thousands of our people were absent in the United States in 1881, who were enumerated in the census of that year. If they had been enumerated in the same manner in 1891, I believe the increase of population would have been larger than it was in the decade before that. Nova Scotia increased in population between 1861 and 1871 nearly 14 per cent, and between 1871 and 1881 14 per cent also; and if the census had been taken in the same way it would have shown an increase at least 14 per cent between 1881 and 1891 also. But the hundreds of thousands of people who were absent in 1881 continued to be absent in 1891, and they were not enumerated as they were not here. The result was, that instead of an increase

of 61,680, we only had an increase of 9,920, because the absentees for a number of years were not enumerated as in the taking of the former census. If the suggestion made by my hon. friend the hon. member for North Norfolk had been taken, we would have not only the real population as it is shown by the census of 1891, but we would also have the population based on the same system which was adopted in 1861, 1871 and 1881. If you base the population of this whole Dominion on the calculation made in reference to Nova Scotia, instead of having an increase of half a million, we would have an increase of at least another 500,000, if the persons absent were enumerated as they were in the previous census. It is perfectly true that gentlemen opposite would find fault anyway, but that does not do much harm. My hon. friends opposite have been making capital against the National Policy, and endeavouring to make the people believe that it is the cause of the emigration from this country, but when the census of 1901 will be taken, hon. gentlemen opposite will have the grounds of their argument taken from under their feet, as they will find that when the census are taken upon the same basis as this year, the population of this Dominion will show a larger increase than ever before was shown since Confederation. If my hon. friends opposite continue their agitation against the National Policy, if they continue their deception of the people, for it is nothing else, in regard to the exodus, it will recoil upon their own heads in the same manner as their arguments against the National Policy. My hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) knows as well as I do that the commencement of the exodus from Prince Edward Island and the Maritime Provinces generally was between 1854 and 1866. I was one of those who crossed the lines during those ten years, and I remained there for many years and possibly I would not have returned but for the exhortations of friends at home, who felt that it would be a great loss to the country if I did not return. It was during that time the nuclei of the agencies on the other side were established. In 1861 I was in Boston, New York and Philadelphia and other cities, and I saw a number of people from Prince Edward Island in the different cities of the United States. The emigration of these people from the Maritime Provinces commenced shortly after 1854 during the time of the reciprocity treaty. The youth of this Dominion need to have the facts explained to them so as to prevent their being deceived by the fallacies raised by hon. gentlemen opposite and by their attempts to throw dust in the eyes of the people. As the hon. member for North Wellington has said, many of the people who have gone have been encouraging their friends at home to cross the line, and unless hon. gentlemen opposite discontinue their blue-ruin agitation a great many more of their friends will leave them. I may relate an incident that occurred in my own experience not long ago. As I was coming up to the last session of Parliament shortly after the general election, I was very sorry to see car loads of our people leaving for the United States. Some of my opponents who were on their way to the city of Halifax to attend the session of the Local Legislature, twitted me a good deal on the train on account of the emigration from our county to the United States. I passed through the car and I observed that there were a large number, and I was sorry to see them going; but I observed further that there was not a single Liberal-Conservative in the car except one; and when I was twitted by the remark that notwithstanding all I had said in favour of the National Policy our people were going away, my answer was a simple one, and it was a true one: My friend, I said, for the last four weeks you and your political friends have been leading our people to believe that they could not live in this country; they believed you, and unfortunately for the country they are leaving it; the very people who believed you and who supported you are leaving. And further than that, my political opponent is now in Michigan seeking his fortune. But I believe he will come back, a sadder and a wiser man, and will find that he can make a more comfortable living in Inverness than he can on the other side of the line. A great many more people have left the country on account of such discussions as we have heard to-night, which tend to discourage our people from living in this country. I believe that many who go will return sadder and wiser men, but unfortunately many cannot return, though I am glad to say that many who went to that country have made a comfortable living. My own impression, after considerable experience in Parliament, is that we should emulate the people of the United States. I have been on the other side on business and on pleasure as well; I am always pleased to go to the United States; but I have never heard any person on that side of the line depreciating his own country depreciating its products, its climate, its soil, its policy and everything else.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Whom did you ever hear do it here?

Mr. CAMERON. I would ask my hon. friend if he ever heard a member of Congress telling the people of the United States that the policy of the Government of the United States is calculated to ruin the people. Whatever policy it may be, it is the best in the world; whatever part of the United States your are in, it has the finest climate in the world; everything there is better than it is in any other part of creation; and if our hon. friends would only emulate them a little in that respect, and try to lead our people, even to mislead them if you will, to take a pride in their country, I do not believe so many Grits, as they mostly are, would leave the Maritime Provinces to go to the United States.

Mr. PERRY. It was not my intention to address the committee on this important question until I heard my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) making such erroneous statements as he has been making so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. If he looks at the census returns from his own province, he will find that his statements are not borne out. I contend that from 1854 to 1866 the population of Prince Edward Island increased and increased largely, and it kept on increasing up to 1881, when Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia as well, felt the effects of the unpatriotic administration of the Government which my hon. friend is so willing to support. What is the result shown by the census? The population of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick has not increased since 1881. To what can we attribute this decrease, if not to the unpatriotic administration of the present

Government? From 1854 to 1866 we saw good days. I know people from the United States came and settled in my province and carried on fisheries and other industries there during that period, giving employment to our people, but since then only the memory of those good days remain. If the hon. member for Inverness will go to Boston to-day he will find a very large population there from his own province. We can hardly go five steps in the main street of Boston without finding a man from Cape Breton, and he will find him a credit to this country, but these men were driven from their home although my hon. friend will not admit it. It is not when we had free trade from 1854 to 1866 that our population diminished. In those years, when there was no Chinese wall between the Dominion and the United States, when people were allowed to buy goods in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, the people of the Island made their money and were enabled to establish banks and other commercial institutions. These were the days of prosperity, but now this money has disappeared, prosperity has disappeared, and discontent has taken its place, and the people are seeking better times in other countries. It appears that the Government are either afraid or ashamed to have their policy on the question of immigration properly expounded. I do not know exactly how many immigration offices there are in the Dominion besides what they have in Europe. I do not see why there should be so many. There is one in Halifax, which may be wanted there, one in St. John, N.B., which may be wanted there, one in Quebec, another in Montreal, one in Three Rivers, one in Hamilton, two or three in Ontario, many more in the North-West and British Columbia, when two or three in the whole Dominion would be quite sufficient. Look at the report of the Auditor General last year. It shows nearly $200,000 spent in these offices. Can the Government show that they had any return for this money? Can they show that they have successfully established one immigrant in the North-West or any part of Canada? The census returns show they have lost in the last ten years all the immigrants who have come here, notwithstanding the fact that the blue-books show we have got 900,000. Not only have we lost all these immigrants, but we have also lost our natural increase of population. If that is not an unsatisfactory state of things, I do not know what is. Yet the hon. member for Inverness will stand here and tell us that we are prosperous and doing well, that the population of Nova Scotia is increasing, that the population of Prince Edward Island is increasing, that the census is all wrong. He has no faith in the blue-books or Government returns, but is convinced that the mischief was done from 1854 to 1866, when the hon. gentleman was hardly old enough to read or write. It would be better if the Government, instead of throwing away this $250,000 or $300,000, would make a present of it to our people, who are going away, in order to induce them to remain here. We are not able to keep our own population here, and as the hon. member for North Wellington has said, the North-West is in such a condition that no settler can dare go into it. If he will look to the east he will find the land monopolized by somebody, and if he will look west or north he will see the same result; and what is left, a small tract of land here and there, only fit for rabbits and squirrels. Does he expect the population from across the Atlantic is going to settle on such lands? I contend that immigrants who have to be brought out at the expense of the country are not the class of people fit to settle here and develop the resources of the country. If there are inducements to the people across the Atlantic to come here they will come without our paying their passages, but the fact is that when people come they are disappointed. They see that the state of the country is not such as it has been represented to them by our agents at home, and the moment they find that out they go across the line and settle in Montana, Dakota, or Washington Territory or some other parts of the United States. The hon. member for Inverness must know that we have now in the United States over 2,000,000 Canadians, a labouring class of people, who are developing the resources of that country when we should have them here assisting to build up this country. When did these go there? Did they go in 1854?

Mr. CAMERON. A large proportion of them did.

Mr. PERRY. I do not know of one emigrant from Prince Edward Island who went to the United States from 1854 to 1866, but I know that many Americans in that period came and settled in the Island. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that emigration from Nova Scotia is far greater now than it was from 1854 to 1866. We are losing our population and yet this Government are not taking any steps to keep them here. It is time to cry halt and turn over a new leaf, if the Government intend doing anything for the country. But what do the Government care? They have a strong backing and can vote the money they require, but if they expect the Liberal members to sit here as dumb and allow them to squander one-half the revenue of the country without protest they are much mistaken. It would be better for them to cut down this whole expenditure and lower the taxes. It would be better that they should adjust their tariff so that there will be no discrimination against the poorer class. But there is no danger of their doing that, they must have a large revenue to squander on elections, and while such a system is allowed to be carried on the country can never progress.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have listened with considerable interest to the discussion this evening. Perhaps it has not always been confined closely to the question at issue, but I think the most unkind statement in reference to the Minister of Agriculture and his policy made to-night it has been reserved for my friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) to make. When he comes to this House and calmly accounts for the present condition of things by saying that his friends took the census of 1881, and took so many people who had left Canada, when they were under instructions to number the people of Canada, and that the census now taken really shows the same natural increase in the population, there surely could be no greater testimony to the incompetency of the department presided over by my hon. friend.

Mr. CAMERON. Is it true, all the same?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). No, it is not. You have to take the latter statement of the hon. gentleman in reply to his first statement. He tells the

people that to-day there is no exodus from his part of the country.

Mr. CAMERON. I said nothing of the kind. I said there were car loads leaving when I came up.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). That is what the hon. gentleman said at the end of his speech, but I leave it to the hon. gentlemen behind him if he did not say in the earlier part of his speech that the people had not left the country, but that the change in the numbers which appeared was in consequence of the over-statement in the previous census. The fact is that these gentlemen are in a corner and they know it.

Mr. CAMERON. I think there is another party in a corner too, and they are getting smaller every year.

Mr BAIN (Wentworth). The fact is that the policy pronounced by the Minister of Agriculture to-night will not satisfy any thinking citizen of this country, no matter what his political creed may be. These gentlemen tell us, with the calm assurance which characterizes my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron), that the reason why people leave this country is that gentlemen on this side of the House decry this country. I deny the statement emphatically, and I defy them to show any statement to prove their assertion. We have always said that the natural resources of Canada are equal to those of any country in the world. The northern portion of Ontario has untold mineral resources which are only just attracting attention, and the proof of that is that, while people are flying from my hon. friend's province as if they were flying from a plague, the population of Algoma has doubled in the last ten years. Turn to the resources of the great prairie-plains of the North-West, and look at the mineral wealth of British Columbia, to which attention is now being attracted, and we have always maintained that we have unrivalled natural resources in this country; but we have contended at the same time that the policy of this Government was not calculated to increase the prosperity of the country, but that we were cursed by the worst Government that ever a civilized country was cursed with. It is because we object to the Government of this country that these gentlemen turn around and complain because we object to the principles under which they administer our public affairs, and we point to the returns of their own official census and the figures furnished under the Minister of Agriculture during the last ten years as evidence that they can neither rebut nor deny. Then they resort to the old plan, when you have no case abuse the plaintiff's attorney. It is the old, old cry, personal abuse instead of argument. What object is there for gentlemen on this side of the House to decry the prosperity or the advancement of the country if it were not true? Are not our interests as much bound up with the welfare of Canada as those of my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron)? Our all is embarked in this country and is involved in its prosperity, but I tell that hon. gentleman that the last twelve years of his policy have not conduced to the progress and welfare of this country, and no one knows it better than hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, whatever may be the position of affairs in the older provinces of the country, let us take a glance at what has been done in the newer territories. What have we done for the development of the resources of the great plains of the North-West, and what facilities have we offered to induce people to go there? If the official records of the department over which my hon. friend presides are of any value, we have increased the debt of this country by $61,000,000 in hard cash in order to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have given that company a land grant besides of 21,000,000 acres. For what? To develop the great natural resources of this country and induce immigrants to go in there. In addition to that, we offer a free grant of land to those immigrants, and now the Minister tells us that he is going to give to each head of a family that settles there $10 in cash and to every member of the family $5 in cash in addition, in order to induce settlers to go in there. Besides that, we have given 25,000,000 acres of land to aid in building branch railways to enable the settler with facility to get his produce on to this great thoroughfare, the Canadian Pacific Railway; and in the last ten years, with all these facilities offered, with all this staff of immigration agencies scattered over the whole of Europe and throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, what have we done? We have only succeeded in increasing the population in the whole area extending from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean by 179,000 souls all told. Is that a result which is satisfactory? I do not care who the judge is. I say emphatically it is not, and that we have not returns for the large expenditure we have made, and that it is time to call a halt. I regretted exceedingly when I listened to the Minister to-night, when he announced his general policy, to find that it was a repetition of the same old round. He proposes to keep up the same agencies, to go on with the same round of administration, with the addition of paying this bonus to settlers who have located in the North-West. I say that the facts of the census have a great deal to do with the future of the administration of our immigration department. If the census returns are of any value at all, and if they are utterly without value the sooner we know it the better, if my friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) can sustain his contention and demonstrate that his friends are unreliable in taking these figures, let us know it and let us begin anew on a solid basis, but if these figures are of any value at all, the more money we spend in European agencies and the more population we draw into Canada, by so much the more we are increasing the population of the great republic to the south of us. I remember that, when the Canadian Pacific Railway enterprise was presented to this House for consideration, one of the strong arguments submitted to the members by the late Premier was that in the course of a few years we would be able to dispense entirely with our immigration machinery and that the Canadian Pacific Railway would become, like the large American railway corporations who are owners of large tracts of land, one great immigration agency, and we would fill our farms in the North-West with a large agricultural population. I remember that we were promised by the Premier of this Dominion in 1881 that so rapidly would the population flow into that country that by the year 1890, 75,000 souls would settle there in one year, and that in the ten years we would add to the population of the North-West at least half a million. But when the result comes to be brought down alongside with their own official figures, declared by

the Minister to be correct, we have a paltry addition of 179,000 souls all told. There, Mr. Chairman, is about the way in which Tory promises pan out in performance. I remember another promise that was made by Sir John Macdonald to this House in 1880 and I dare say other older members will remember it, and that was that we would have in the vicinity of $69,000,000 in cash, or mortgages as good as cash, in the treasury of this Dominion, at the end of the year 1890 from the sale of these lands and the great Pacific Railway would not cost us anything. I remember that about $3,000,000, or thereabouts, was to be taken out of that sum for the purpose of surveying the lands and administering the sales branch of the department; but I remember also that last year when the figures were toted up, and the clear result of the managment of those lands was made known, and the surplus that we had in the treasury instead of anything in the neighourhood of $69,000,000, we had the paltry sum of less than $1,000,000 all told, as the clear result of ten years' operations under this magnificent administration. I leave it to the most prejudiced Conservative on the other side to say whether their loud promises have been anything like fulfilled in the administration of the affairs of the North-West. In the meantime the rest of the population of this country are carrying the burdens imposed upon them for the development of those resources. Hon. gentlemen opposite may sit here and shut their eyes to the facts, but the facts cannot be ignored. I say their policy has not been a success in settling up the vacant lands of this Dominion. Now, the next question to consider is the remedy for this state of affairs. The hon. the Finance Minister stands up and says that he would be very glad to have us suggest some remedy. I would like to know what we pay him $7,000 a year for, if it is not to attend to the affairs of this country. Are we to find a policy for him? Has he become so threadbare in resources, so poverty-striken, that he has nothing to offer except to go on in the old groove, in the hope that some good luck may turn up in the future, that something will occur to change the current, and we will get along better? No, Sir, the people of this country will not be satisfied with any such administration of their affairs. There is one thing evident, and that is that the expenditure has never ceased to grow, and the Government have carefully kept up the expenditure, whether the people were able to endure it or not. Now, I say it is time we had a new order of things. If the transference of immigration from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior will give us new life and new energy, by all means let us have the transfer made. But when they come down to us and offer no better propositions than to go on in the old groove, I fear that the difficulty is deeper, and that we will find ourselves going on in the old circuit, spending money without any satisfactory results. There is no doubt that the circumstances in which we are placed are peculiar. We are not separated from the nation to the south of us by those differences that separate European nations which have grown up under different institutions, with differences of language, of habit and of custom, that form barriers between the nations of the old world. Here we have to recognize the fact that we are practically one people with the nation south of us. We have the same ideas, the same origin, we speak the same language, and in everything except political purposes we are practically one people. The difficulty is that the larger nation to the south of us does offer inducements to our young men that we are not able to offer them here. I point out to our friends opposite that they declared when the National Policy was inaugurated that they were going to stop this exodus from Canada to the United States, they were going to create employment for our people at home, they were going by that means to secure a market for the surplus products of the agriculturists, and by employing our labour in manufactures we would keep our people at home. But the results show that instead of keeping them at home we have driven them out of Canada at an accelerated rate; and whereas those gentlemen used to howl themselves hoarse in complaining of an exodus from Canada to the United States of 30,000 or 40,000 people yearly, they now calmly sit down and say nothing when their own returns show that we have lost at least an average of 100,000 population per annum for the last ten years, and they coolly ask us to be content with things as they are. I say there is something radically defective in that policy, and they have failed in the highest degree in fulfilling the promises that were made to the electorate of this country when they inaugurated their National Policy. I ask if it is not a legitimate inference that that policy has not accomplished what they promised it would accomplish, and that it is a dismal failure as applied to the administration of Canada's affairs. I say that the sooner we set about endeavouring to find a remedy for this condition of things, the better it will be for the people of Canada, for I can come to no other conclusion than that if we keep on at the present rate we will see our population gradually melting away and leaving our shores for a country where the conditions are more favourable for their personal advancement. I say this is a matter of deep concern to every lover of his country, and it is not to be met in the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite have met it, by sneering at hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, because we point out the facts to them. The sooner those hon. gentlemen realize the condition of affairs and set about finding a remedy, the better it will be for themselves and the better it will be for the population and the prosperity of this country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In asking us to vote this amount of money, it would seem proper that the Minister should give us reasons why we should do so.

Mr. CARLING. This $1,400?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The whole item of $197,000 which is under discussion at the present time. It is a continuation of the same system, so I would judge, as we are asked for the same amount this year as last year. It seems to me that it should not need so many gentlemen to rise and point out the state of the country and the useless expenditure of money during the past years, to have caused the Minister to rise and give some explanation, either to state that our policy has not been a failure, that the money we have expended by the hundreds of thousands, and running into the millions during the past years, has not been lost to the country, but that it has brought people into the country,

and that they are in the country now. In order to do that he would have to show where the people are that he alleges were brought into the country. I notice that the Minister took the ground that there were absolutely 886,177 people, as stated by him in his reports, brought into Canada from foreign countries in the ten years from 1881 to 1891. Then we have the facts also given to us by the hon. gentleman's department that when the population of this country was counted it was found there had been an increase of only 504,000 souls during the ten years. The Minister will see, then, leaving out of the calculation the 800,000 additional population that we should have had by natural increase alone, that there are 380,000 souls that he says were brought into this country by him, that are not in this country now. It seems to me he should state to us where these 380,000 have gone, and the reasons that caused the departure of these people, for it surely must strike the Minister of Agriculture that it cannot be a wise policy to go on expending money to get people into this country, if they are leaving it as fast as they are brought to it. If his explanation with respect to this matter be the explanation given by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), then I want him to avow that statement openly on the floor of the House. The House while receiving any statement from the hon. member from Inverness with great respect, does not look upon it with that authority it would possess if it came from the Minister himself, and the Minister has the duty devolving upon him, not of leaving some supporter on the back benches to give an explanation of this feature, but himself to show how it is that, leaving our natural increase of 800,000 aside altogether, 386,000 of the population, which according to his statement have been brought in, are not in the country now. If the hon. Minister will take the statement of the hon. member for Inverness, that those people have not left the country, that the immigrants have not left the country, but that it is to be accounted for by the character of the census of 1881, if he is prepared to take that statement, I want him to make the avowal. In that event I want him to endorse the statement of the hon. member for Inverness, to rise in his place and tell the House that when I was administering the department, that when the count was supposed to be an honest count I instructed the men charged with the duty to make fraudulent returns, to count men who were not here, and that those officials gave me figures to present, that were a lie on their face—I want the hon. gentleman to assume the responsibility of making that statement laid down by the member for Inverness. If he will do that, it will relieve us from the difficulty, and we will be able to give the Minister credit for some of the 386,000 of immigrants, who according to the figures of the department, are not in the country now. I fancy he will hardly take that position, it is a task which any Minister would hesitate to undertake.

Mr. CARLING. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct a statement? The hon. gentleman has made a statement that I prepared the census for 1881. I was not in the Government at that time.

Mr. BOWELL. It makes no difference.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was speaking of the head of the department, the occupant of the office of Ministerial changes. Last year the hon. gentleman might have been held responsible because of some statements made by the hon. gentleman who represented him here when he was in the other Chamber. I am not speaking about Ministers individually, but in regard to the Minister of Agriculture whose duty it was to do this work. Will the Minister of Agriculture say that he gave instructions to have a fraudulent account made in 1881?

Mr. CAMERON. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BOWELL. What the hon. gentleman stated was what the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) said.

Mr. CAMERON. Hear, hear. If he said what was not true, I cannot help it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Finance was not here at the time the hon. gentleman was speaking, but that would not make any particular difference.

Mr. CAMERON. May I quote what I said. It is here.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I know the hon. gentleman read his speech from *Hansard*. Did he not give the House to understand that what was stated in that speech was the actual fact?

Mr. CAMERON. No.

Mr. BOWELL. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And how the discrepancy was to be accounted for was, that if an honest count had been made in 1881, there would be no difference shown between the two counts at the present time. *Hansard* will show to-morrow whether I am mistaken, or whether the hon. gentleman is mistaken in the statement he has made.

Mr. CAMERON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me. I did not find fault with the manner in which the census was taken in 1881 or in 1891. I simply stated, in reply to the hon. member for Queen's, and another member of the Opposition, that the manner in which it was taken included in 1881 a number of persons who were absent from the country. That was the mode in which it was taken. I found no fault with it. I suggested it was a pity it was not taken in the same manner in 1891; and, if it had been so taken in 1891, the apparent increase would have been as great between 1881 and 1891 as it was in the former count. The mode was changed; I did not find fault with one or the other, nor did I say there was anything wrong in either. But I say if the present system is continued, the increase of population will recoil on hon. gentlemen opposite just as their arguments against the National Policy on former occasions have recoiled. That is my argument, and there is no member in this House who knows that it is true better than the hon. member for South Brant; but the hon. gentleman is simply wasting time in discussing the matter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman, therefore, regrets that the fraud which he gives us to understand was perpetrated in 1881 was not perpetrated for some reason in 1891, and, if it had been done, there would not have been the present discrepancy. We will allow the Minister of Agriculture to accept the statement that far, if he will. I question very much if a Canadian Minister will

undertake to accept that position in the House; but we will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to say whether he takes that position in regard to the census of 1881. If not, there are 386,000 of our immigrants who have been brought into this country during the past 10 years who have not been found here, in addition to the 800,000 which is the natural increase. I say it is his bounden duty now, when we are entering upon the discussion and consideration of an expenditure of money for the purpose of promoting further immigration to this country, to tell us where these immigrants have gone and why they have left us? I have my own idea as to causes that have produced it. I lament the fact that they have gone. The Minister has taken the ground that they were here. He stood by his figures to-night and he said there was no mistke in them. He will stand by the census of 1891 which the Government claim is an honest count, and he will admit that the people are not here now. He should have some explanation of why they left the country after having come here. That explanation cannot be found in the condition of the country. As pointed out by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain) there is no better country, and no better opportunity for settlers than upon our western prairies, and in the western provinces, to say nothing of the older provinces. The explanation is not to be found in that, and it is for the Minister to declare, then, what causes have been operating to expel these men from our midst after they have been brought here with this expenditure of money. Mr. Chairman, having regard to your ruling I will not be at liberty to adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Finance and to give the reasons which in my judgment have led to the removal of these people, nor to suggest changes the legislation which I think will do much in the direction of tending to prevent such a disastrous result in the future. That would involve touching upon matters which you have ruled may not be introduced in this discussion, but the Minister himself will not I am sure be held to strict order by you, when he attempts to give his explanation of how these people are not to be found in the country. I do hold it is his absolute duty before he asks us to pass one single item of this estimate to give us the reasons that in his judgment have led to these people leaving the country, and if that reason which he gives, is a reason which is found in operation still, he will see the force of not asking us to expend one single cent of that money until the causes that led to the expulsion, or the voluntary leaving of this country by those people have been remedied in our legislation. The fault cannot be found as I have said with the country itself. When the member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) volunteered the statement that he had heard gentlemen on this side of the House, of the party to which I belong, decrying this country, running down its resources, condemning its soil and condemning its climate, I have to say that the member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has made a statement that he will have difficulty in proving. He has made a statement that I defy him to prove in this House. If he means to say that he has heard statements from gentlemen on this side of the House, declaring that the Government of this country during the past ten years have not administered the affairs of this country in such a manner as to conduce to its welfare, he certainly can find these statements. The hon. gentleman may view the 13 or 14 gentlemen who form the Administration, as the country, but gentlemen on this side of the House only consider them as a portion of the people of this country entrusted for the time being with certain powers which they are bound to use for the benefit of the people. If the hon. gentleman has reference to the fact that on this side of the House he has heard denunciations of the fiscal and commercial policy of the Government and of the governing party, he is correct in that. But, Sir, denouncing, and pointing out fallacies in the fiscal and commercial policy inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite is not decrying the country, and is not, as that gentleman has alleged, decrying it in its material resources, depreciatingits qualities, and generally endeavouring to cast a slur upon it. Sir, the hon. gentleman from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has ventured upon a statement that he cannot prove, and he must understand that when the policy of the Government is arraigned and condemned from an honest belief that it is not in the best interests of the country, he is not justified in making the statement that the soil and the resources of this country were decried by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. We believe, Sir, that this country is capable of receiving and sustaining, not only the 886,000 immigrants that the Minister said he brought in during the past 10 years, but we believe it is capable of sustaining millions upon millions of people, and we are anxious and desirous of having these millions of people in the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are also desirous for it. They would not have placed this item in the estimates for our approval unless they were desirous with ourselves of having the population of this country increased, so that we may develop in the elements of national life, and with the strength of a nation. We agree upon that, but we are found face to face with the fact that taking the hon. gentleman's own figures—not trying to make a point against him, but honestly to sit down now when this matter is under discussion and consider it—we must ask, is there not a leak somewhere; is there not some fault; is there not something that requires a remedy that ought to be applied, while we are going on in our efforts to bring people to this country? Does not that leak, through which our population have left us, require to be stopped? If there is any policy or any legislation enacted by the Government that has tended in the direction of opening that door of exit through which these people must have been in a measure forced to go—for, having come to this country, they would not voluntarily leave it except there was some impelling cause—I ask is it not the duty of the Government now to deliberate upon and to ascertain, if possible, why that has been brought about, and what is the cause of it so that we may apply the remedy. As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I have my own views in reference to this matter, but your ruling precludes me from stating what I consider would be wise and beneficial legislation in conjunction with this immigration policy of ours, if it is to be continued. I am not at liberty to allude to it, Sir, under your ruling, but the Minister must see that something is wrong and he can give us his views in reference to it. If there is no remedy to be applied, if the same state of things is to prevail, if the immigrants we hope to bring into this country by

this expenditure of $200,000 are to leave us when they are brought here, then it will be for us to consider what shall be done in the face of the determination of the Government that they will do nothing in any direction to stop the leak. If they cannot give us an assurance that it will stop of itself, or that they will take means to stop it, is it not a consideration for us to consider whether we should not retain this $200,000 in our own hands, and if we cannot get the population to remain with us, then we can at least save to the people of this country the money which we are now asked to expend. Now, I think it is not unreasonable that the Minister should give us his views in regard to that—that he should tell us whether he believes that these figures honestly represent the population of the country between these periods, or whether he believes there was a dishonest count made in 1881, and an honest count made in 1891, and that that will account for it. But even if he does that, I beg him to remember the natural increase of 800,000 added to the 386,000 immigrants, and when he puts these together, it will require extremely fraudulent figures in 1881 to account for the difference. If the Minister will take that position, it will help us out in a certain measure, though it will cast discredit on the department with respect to the census of 1881. If he cannot account for the difference, it is for him to show what good ground he has for expecting that if we expend this $200,000 more this year to bring immigrants to the country, they will stay with us. This is the point on which I think it is proper the Minister should give us some information before we consider the individual items.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. We have been here four mortal hours, anxious to do business and to make some progress in the estimates; but for some reason better known to themselves than to us, hon. gentlemen opposite——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is most unfair.

Mr. FOSTER. As I have not objected to the hon. gentlemen speaking for the last two hours, I think I may be permitted to say a few words, even though they may not be pleasant to the hon. member for Queen's. Very humbly I would ask his permission to say a few words. For reasons better known to themselves than to us, hon. gentlemen on the other side do not seem willing to make progress in passing the estimates. It is of no use for us to remain longer under these conditions, and, therefore, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not propose that the hon. gentleman shall make that statement unchallenged. In the first place, the hon. gentleman has not been in his seat at all during the discussion. He may have been attending to his duties elsewhere, but he has not been here, and is not competent to form an opinion as to the character of the discussion which has taken place. I have sat in this House for as many years as the hon. gentleman, and I have never listened to a debate more interesting or more instructive than the one that has taken place to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman took part in it.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I took very little part in it. I spoke a very few minutes, entirely from the standpoint of the Maritime Provinces. I gave the committee some information, and drew some deductions which the hon. the Finance Minister might have been benefited by if he had been in his place. I think the statements made in the House in this debate will be read with a good deal of interest in the country, and I resent the statement that the time of the House has been wasted, and that for some reason we have prevented progress been made in the estimates. We have not prevented progress being made. We have discussed, as we had a right to discuss, as it was our duty to discuss, the policy involved in the expenditure of a large amount of public money; and in the discussion of that question we showed that for the past ten years the exodus, from the Maritime Provinces particularly, has been so great and the loss of population there so grave, and that the present condition of the Maritime Provinces is so serious, as to call for more than a passing remark from the Government benches. It demands their solemn and serious consideration. We have pointed out that the continuance of the existing fiscal system would be ruinous, is ruinous, and calls for a change, and in doing this we are to be told by the hon. gentleman that we are obstructing the public business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman think that we are here merely to register the decrees of the Government—that the Opposition have no duties to discharge? I tell him that we have, and we appreciate them, and we have been discharging them to-night.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, Sir, that the discussion, so far as it has taken place since I have come into the House, does not warrant the observation made by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. TUPPER. You came in late.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, Sir, I have heard a portion of the debate, and that portion has been strictly pertinent to the subject before the committee.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister of Marine was not in the House at all.

Mr. TUPPER. I escaped some.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman, as usual, is expressing an opinion on a subject with which he is not very intimately acquainted. Now, with regard to the subject, the Minister of Agriculture asks us to vote a very large sum for the purpose of promoting immigration. Is it not the business of this committee to consider whether that is a proper expenditure or not? Are we here simply to vote every sum that the Government choose to ask at our hands without considering whether the proposed expenditure is one in the public interest? Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has asked for this appropriation for the last ten years in succession. He has had his attention called to the unsatisfactory result of that expenditure in years past, and what answer has he made? What answer has the Minister of Finance or any other member of the Administration made in reply to the criticisms which have been offered from this side of the House? The hon. gentleman in 1885

took the census of the North-West Territories. His department kept an accurate record, so we were informed, of the immigration into that country; and what was the result of that census? The result showed that but one in nine of the population which he stated had gone into the country, remained there when the census was taken. Now, has more than one in nine of the immigration that has been assisted to this country remained in the other portions of the Dominion? What answer does the hon. gentleman make to that question? What information does he give to this committee to satisfy it that the expenditure is a proper one, or that we are receiving any advantage from it? I have heard nothing at all. The census shows that there has been an enormous depletion going on during the last ten years in the population of this country. We have lost nearly the whole or the greater portion of the immigration along with the natural increase. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has only shown, from the census taken in 1885 and that taken in 1891, that we are expending large sums of money every year for the purpose of settling the waste lands in the neighbouring republic. Well, that is perfectly consistent with the policy which the Administration has pursued for years past. I remember when a certain section of railway was taken from the Grand Trunk, one of the conditions made in paying for it was that there should be a railway in the State of Michigan. I remember also that a large sum of the money of the people of Canada has been spent in the State of Maine, and so it is perfectly consistent with the policy which the Government have pursued in other matters that large sums of money should be taken out of the public treasury of this country, wrung from the impoverished inhabitants of this country, for the purpose of promoting emigration to the neighbouring republic. That is the course which hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued, and when they are unable to justify an appropriation, they accuse us of delaying public business. Delaying what public business? Delaying an attempt to appropriate money from the public treasury for a most improper purpose. We have asked hon. gentlemen to excuse, if they can, their policy, and they are utterly unable to do so; and I say again that their policy of expending money without any results is simply that described by Hood as a black job. They are ready to gild the man they can no longer bleach. That is precisely what the hon. gentlemen are engaged in doing. And when the Minister of Agriculture is asked to point out in what way he is going to secure the retention in this country of these people, should we succeed in bringing them here, he is unable to reply. He has up to this hour given no explanation to show that he will succeed any better than he succeeded last year or the year before. At the outset he said he was going to hand this business over to the Minister of the Interior, who would accomplish something which he had been unable to accomplish the last ten years. How is the Minister of the Interior going to accomplish these results? Will the hon. gentleman give some reasonable explanation to show that this money will not be wasted as it has been during the past ten years? If he does, he will get his item through, but he has given none, and yet he expects that he is going to obtain this vote without any resistance from this side of the House. What right has he to expect this appropriation? Why, the most important function of this House in committee is to see, as guardian of the public treasury, that money is appropriated for none but necessary public purposes. All that the hon. gentleman has shown is that for the past ten years he has expended money in bringing people from across the Atlantic, eight of whom out of every nine have gone across the border.

Mr. TUPPER. The motion is that the committee do rise.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is more than that. There are very offensive observations of the Minister of Finance, perfectly characteristic but none the less offensive. He has thrown across the House, the insulting observation that we have for four hours resisted a proper motion. I say we have properly resisted an improper demand.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not get excited.

Mr. TUPPER. There was no reference to the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There was not to me particularly, but the whole Opposition was referred to.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman boasted the other night that he would not allow us to proceed with business.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am delighted to see that those saints on the Treasury benches are waiting for an opportunity to have their rest, and the most patient, the Job of the Administration, the Minister of War, is getting into a warlike mood just now when he sees that prospect becoming more distant. I would ask the hon. gentleman just to cultivate patience and preserve his equanimity of which he does not possess any very extensive stock. The hon. gentleman knows his weakness in that direction, and I would have refrained from making any remarks, but I rose for the purpose of protesting against the observations addressed by the Minister of Finance to the committee.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that it is necessary to continue the discussion for any length of time. As for my equanimity, perhaps if I had been dining-out and not been listening to the Opposition, I might possibly bear patiently the repetition over and over again of the statements we have heard during the last four hours and preserve my equanimity undisturbed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it because the hon. gentleman is not dining?

Mr. BOWELL. Let me advise the hon. gentleman not to get so excited. He is very cool on most occasions and perhaps under other circumstances he would be less excited to-night. However, be that as it may, if the hon. gentleman had been here himself during four hours and listened to the discussion, he might possibly have some sympathy for those who had to bear the infliction of listening to the same arguments repeated over and over again.

Mr. MULOCK. You ran away.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman could not have been speaking, or I am sure I would not have gone, but I did go away for a few moments and the hon. gentleman was away at the same time; and I am sure he will give me credit for this at least, that I have sat as patiently as any member on this occasion, and as I usually do throughout debates, unless called out on business. We have had on

this question of voting $1,400 to an immigration agent a discussion of the whole policy of the Government. That item is the only one that has been before the House since the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole. I did not take any part in the discussion of the question at all, though I thought hon. gentlemen opposite were going a long way beyond it. I made up my mind however that as there was evident determinations on the part of the Opposition that we should not proceed with business——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BOWELL—we might just as well allow the committee to rise, and I suggested that to my hon. friend. The leader of the Opposition told us that on this item, they had a right to discuss everything bearing on the prosperity of the country. Under that contention, we might have a debate on the dual language in the North-West. Hon. gentlemen opposite might point to the hon. member for Quebec East, and ask whether the country will ever progress until he is on the Treasury benches, and then it would be in order to ask whether the party could succeed under his leadership, on account of his religion and nationality with the machine politician behind him, as described by the hon. member for North Norfolk. That would be just as pertinent as the whole question on which discussion has taken place to-night. My hon. friend who generally sits beside me might also bring up the school system and the use of the French language, and ask whether this country could hope to prosper while they were allowed as they are to-day. As the Minister of Justice has pointed out, they might commence with Genesis and go on to Revelations.

Mr. LAURIER. The Genesis is followed by the Exodus.

Mr. FOSTER. They cannot pass the exodus.

Mr. BOWELL. At all events, they always stick at Lamentations. They always lament over everything from the creation of the world down to the present time. We have heard the question of the census and the question of the exodus discussed most exhaustively by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) over and over again, and I will ask any member of the House who has listened to this four hours' discussion whether a single idea has been advanced which has not been many times laid before the country by the member for South Oxford. If there was no other idea on the part of hon. gentlemen than to obtain some information which they required, I would ask why there should be this reiteration for four or five hours with no other purpose except to kill time. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says he spoke for a few moments. His few moments are of a very elongated character. His few moments consisted of about an hour.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh.

Mr. BOWELL. He spoke for three-quarters of an hour to-night at least. It is true that we had a little badinage amongst ourselves and did not listen to him very attentively because he was advancing nothing new. If the object of the hon. gentleman was only to seek information, the first speech or two would have answered all the purpose, but it would seem to be carrying out the threat made by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) not a fortnight ago that he would obstruct business if certain things were not done. If the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches are determined to obstruct business, they should intimate it in the beginning of each session of the House, and then we would meet and adjourn immediately after 3 o'clock, and go home and sleep and come back refreshed the next day. That would be better for all of us. We could then attend to our departments, and the hon. gentleman could study and prepare speeches for the future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does appear to me, from his language and demeanour, that, if my hon. friend has dined well, the hon. Minister has dined better, or perhaps, as an hon. gentleman suggests to me, he has not dined at all, and that would account for his impatience. However, I want to refer to a matter apart from the dispute between my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the Minister of War. I want to call the attention of the Government, and particularly the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to this: When a Minister comes to Paliament to ask for a large appropriation of money, it is the practice in England and it ought to be the practice here, that an explanation in sufficient and reasonable detail should be offered to the House of the doings of the department during the past year and the policy of the Government in respect to that department, and how the Government intends to administer the sum of money which they ask. The Minister of Agriculture gave us, I must say, a very meagre and stinted account of what he intended to do, and the circumstances disclosed to the House by the census returns show that there was the strongest possible reason for expecting the Government to account for the extraordinary discrepancies between the statements which have been made for many years by the department over which that gentleman now presides and the facts revealed to us. We would have been utterly recreant to our duty if we had not insisted on that information being given. I say to the Minister of War that there could not be anything more necessary to be explained to the people of Canada than the causes which have led to our losing a million and a half of people in ten years. Could there be imagined anything in the discussion of which this House could better afford to spend three or four hours than the causes which led to that extraordinary result? If hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches do not know the fact, they should be informed of the fact that all over the world, wherever Canada is known, great attention has been given to the fact disclosed in this census, and it is of the greatest importance to us that some reasonable explanation should be given from the Treasury benches which has not yet been given, of the causes which have led to this extraordinary state of things, and I entirely dissent from the statement made by the Minister of War or the Minister of Finance that any attempt has been made to obstruct business on the present occasion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Finance Minister at the commencement of this discussion took exception to some remarks which were not considered pertinent, and sought to have them ruled out of order, and the Chair did so rule. Since then the discussion has been entirely confined to the item before the committee. Very few Minis-

ters have been in their places. In fact they were all out except the Minister of Agriculture. Even the Minister of Marine, who knew all that had taken place, did not come in until I had nearly finished my remarks.

Mr. TUPPER. I came as soon as I knew you were speaking.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yet he seemed to know all that had taken place in his absence.

Mr. TUPPER. I could well imagine it. I have heard it all before.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We are not here to deal with imaginings. The Minister was absent, but I was in my place all the time and I know whether the discussion was within the proper lines or not, and I appeal to the chairman to say if I did not speak to the resolution and confine myself to the immigration policy of the Government. Any remarks outside of that were in reference to what had been said by the member for Iverness (Mr. Cameron), and they also bore on the discussion. The Finance Minister desired to limit the debate at the outset, no Minister has attempted, none apparently being able, to answer the questions which have been put to them, and now, wishing to get out of the dilemma, the Minister of Finance wishes to throw upon the Opposition the charge of obstruction, and, therefore, he moves that the committee rise. This proves one of two things. Either the Minister of Finance is inclined to act in a babyish manner, which I could hardly suppose, or he considers himself to be a sort of dictator in this House. Simply because some estimates have been presented to this House and that the Opposition do not quietly sit in their seats and perhaps venture to ask a question now and then, he is to lecture them, he is to move that the committee rise, he is to show resentment, he is to show temper and be petulant, Well, Sir, we do not propose to be put in any such position. The discussion has been one that the country will say is requisite, and when the country knows that while this discussion was going on Ministers were out of their places, not for minutes but for hours, when there was no attention being paid to the subject under discussion, when but the one Minister who is at the head of the department was in the House, when he never rose to answer a question, or make a statement, or to give the slightest information, I believe the people will say that the Opposition were not obstructing business, but they were discharging their simple duty. But when it is known that the Ministers opposite neglected their posts and failed to give the information asked for when money was being voted, in face of the revelations we have of the non-effect of the previous millions that have been spent, I venture to say the people of the country will reprobate that Ministry and their silence, whether it is produced by incapacity or any other cause. The hon. gentleman calls upon the committee to rise. If he wants to go home for the purpose of consulting with his colleagues to see if they can devise some means by which they can give the explanations required by the House, if they require a night's deliberation and the calling of a council in order to ascertain how it is possible to make out where this 386,000 immigrants have gone, besides the 800,000 of native population, that they may explain these things before asking for $200,000 more to go down the same stream—if that be their object, why, the proposition to adjourn will, I have no doubt, be conceded by the Opposition. I think the Finance Minister has no right to complain of the manner in which the discussion has been carried on by the Opposition. I think that every member who has spoken has only spoken once to-night, and none of the speeches have been long. I am now speaking to the motion to adjourn, but I say that on the resolution before the House none of the members of the Opposition have spoken more than once. The Minister of Finance says that when one or two speeches were made on the opposite side that was enough, and that the members of the House should know enough to hold their tongues. Sir, the members of the Opposition do not recognize that their views are to be expressed by any one or two members in this House. Gentlemen opposite may be content to sit mute and dumb, if they see fit, but the members on this side of the House mean to avail themselves of their rights to discuss these questions. The Minister of Finance, in attempting to dictate to the House by any exhibition of petulancy or crying of a baby, will not deter members from exercising their rights. They refuse to be told that when they exercise their proper rights they are following a line of obstruction. Speaking for myself, I can only say that when the Minister of War suggested there was an understanding that this item should be delayed, he is entirely mistaken. I do not see how he arrived at that conclusion. My own opinion was that a large amount of discussion of this question would take place on the general policy of the Government. I told the Minister of Finance, through the chairman at that time, that while he might strictly draw a line with reference to separate items when they came up, it would conduce to the quicker transaction of business to allow the discussion to go on in a general way at the outset. There is nothing to be gained in the way in which the Finance Minister proposes to dispose of the business of the House; and if he wishes to assume the responsibility of moving that the committee rise when members are prepared to go on and do business in a legitimate manner, then I take no exception to his motion.

Mr. CAMERON. I think it is hardly fair to charge us who have been taking part in this discussion, with trying to obstruct the business of this House. I am one of those who have taken part in this discussion, and I was trying to convince my hon. friends opposite that the arguments which they used relative to the exodus from this country, and relative to the National Policy, were discouraging to our people and caused many of them to emigrate from the country, while they had discouraged those who left the country years ago, from returning to Canada. I was challenged by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) to produce any proof that the arguments used on that side had a tendency to produce that unfortunate result. Well, I need not refer to the price of barley in the United States compared with the price of barley here, I will not refer to the several discussions which have occurred year after year in this House and in the country; I will simply refer to some remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain). He said that our friends to the south of us, meaning the Ameri-

cans, offered people greater inducements than we were able to offer them here. He will not deny that he made that statement. He said that in the hearing of every person in the House except the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who has been enjoying himself in another place. He said that the conditions are more favourable on the other side of the line than they are in Canada. Is this not encouraging our people to leave the country? Are these remarks not frequently made in this House and more frequently in the country? When will our great statesmen from the grand Province of Ontario cease to use utterances that are calculated to depopulate the Dominion of Canada? I believe the expressions of hon. gentlemen opposite will have their effect when the proper time comes. I have only to say that many of the words which my honourable friends put into my mouth were never uttered by me. They said that I denied that I said there was an exodus from the country. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. You said they were leaving by car loads.

Mr. CAMERON. I said they were leaving by car loads, and I produced proof that they were all Grits but one. I have no hesitation in saying that the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite will have their effect. We, at all events, endeavour to make the people believe that we Canadians can live under the existing policy of the Government, or under any Government in this country, whether right or wrong. The arguments which we adduce are calculated to make our people remain at home, but all the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite, during the number of years I have had the honour of being a member of this House, have tended to drive the people out of the country. My own old opponent left for Michigan some weeks ago. He discouraged himself to such an extent that he left the country. But he will come back, and I have no doubt that Hargraft and other Grits who have left the country will adopt the same course.

Mr. CARLING. I have no desire to occupy the time of the House at this late hour except to say a few words. At the commencement of the debate I stated the Government's immigration policy for the coming year. That policy has been the same as the policy of the Government preceding it, the policy of the Government of which the hon. member for Bothwell was a member, and it is the intention of the Government to continue the policy that has existed for the last few years, and to improve it as much as possible by holding out greater inducements to the people of Europe and the United States to come to Canada. But I must say that what we have had to contend with as an immigration department have been the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side, unpatriotic speeches, unworthy of true, loyal Canadians. We have had those speeches quoted in papers in the western States, in papers in the eastern States, in papers in Europe, all going to show that this is a country unfit to live in, that we are going to ruin, that we have nothing but ruin and decay in this great country of ours.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So you said in 1878.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member for South Brant and the hon. gentleman for North Wentworth have challenged us to show any speech made by hon. gentlemen opposite which was detrimental to the interests of this country. I happen to have a few lines of a speech made by a leading member of the Opposition in a flourishing town in west Ontario, and I was surprised that any hon. member on either side of the House or any true patriotic Canadian would make use of such language in regard to the country of his adoption. I will read the speech made in that western city of Ontario by a leading member of the Opposition, and I do so in answer to the request made by the hon. member for South Brant and the hon. member for North Wentworth.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Name the man and the town.

Mr. CARLING. This is what was said by the hon. gentleman who made the speech:

"Trade is stagnant. Stocks of many kinds have diminished in price. Agriculture is greatly depressed. Lands have fallen in value. The farmer is overwhelmed with debts. He is no longer the free man that he once was. To many there is nothing left but the air and light. The fences are going to decay, and the buildings are out of repair, for the occupier is giving up the struggle—the land cannot be redeemed. The fires in new factories have gone out; the looms in the cotton mills are silent; the employés have been dismissed, and at every railway station from east to west machinery and industrial appliances lie rusting—the supply exceeds the demand. What does it all proclaim? Capital misdirected and lost, labour unemployed, expectations disappointed, hopes blighted, hearts sore from pecuniary losses, men financially embarrassed urgently calling upon the Government to do something to save them from financial disaster."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) All true.

Mr. CARLING. That was a speech made by a former member of the Reform Government, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) at Hamilton. I ask this House, and I ask the country, in view of a speech like this I have read, circulated in England, Ireland, in Scotland or in the western States, and delivered to our young men in this country, is it any wonder that some of our people, who may have confidence in the hon. gentleman and in the party he represents, leave the country and seek homes elsewhere than in our own great North-West? I have no desire to take up the time of the House, but I do say the Government have had more to contend with respect to people coming here and our retaining them in the country, from the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite and the articles written in their papers, than anything else.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has read a speech made by me in Hamilton a little more than a year ago, I think. I now affirm that there is not a statement in that speech which is not true. The hon. gentleman and I are both residents of the city of London. The hon. gentleman knows how many manufacturing establishments came into existence after 1878. The hon. gentlemen knows that not one of those establishments is alive to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is true. The hon. gentleman knows that every one of those establishments is closed. Where is the establishment of John Elliott? Where is the machinery that he sent to the North-West? It was lying precisely, as I said, rusting on every platform and going to decay at every railway station thoughout the whole North-West Territories, because he was

deceived by you as to the population. What is true of that manufacturing establishment is equally true of others.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It is not true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say it is, and if a committee is given me, I will establish it in this House beyond question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It cannot be done.

Mr. DENISON. Does that apply to manufactories at Toronto?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I should like to know whether all the cotton manufactories are in operation to-day. I should like to know if it is not true that there is invested in cotton mills in Canada a sufficient amount of capital and machinery to manufacture for 12,000,000 of people. Where are the 12,000,000 of people to be provided for? Have we not combinations formed to-day? Have we not a number of these establishments closed; have we not others operating, not on full time, and the profits divided among those that are idle as well as those in operation? Is not every statement in that respect true?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hon. members say, "no"; I say, yes. Is it not true that agricultural property has depreciated in value?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hon. members may say "no," but there is not a loan company in Canada to-day, but knows that it is true. Do the hon. gentlemen wish to discredit their own testimony by shouting "no" in answer to a question of that sort? Let me call the attention of the hon. gentlemen to the resolution proposed by their leader in 1878. The hon. gentleman was not in office then, and what representations did he and his friends make of the country when their opponents were in office? Did they say it was prosperous; did they not say there were tens of thousands leaving Canada, because they could not find employment at home. Did they not publish abroad that there were tens of thousands of Canadians who were fed at soup kitchens at all the various cities of the country?

Mr. TUPPER. That is true.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said "it is true," but I tell him that is a slander upon the country, that is an unpatriotic declaration that was published abroad all over the continent of America and all over the continent of Europe, and it was against just such statements without a particle of foundation, that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had to contend. Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who has forgotten the statements made with regard to the cries that were heard from every part of the country "John A. will you come over and help us." The Minister of War knows what representations he made as to the condition of the country; but he never said it was unpatriotic then to make representations of this sort.

Mr. BOWELL. You never heard me say one word against the country?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Ah! You say "against the country." We are not speaking against the country; what we are denouncing, are the flies on the wheel. It is the incompetent men who occupy the Treasury benches whom we are denouncing. We say we have a good country, but that no country was ever so scandalously treated by men entrusted with the discharge of public duties as Canada has been by the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite. We tell them, Sir, that if they will get out of their places, the country will at once begin to prosper. There is nothing that stands in the way of the prosperity of Canada to-day except the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, and who declare their inability to frame a public policy that will promote the public interest. Why, Sir, they are calling upon hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to give them some suggestions by which they may be able to shape out a policy. They have gone to Washington, they have consulted Mr. Blaine, they have travelled all over the continent in search of a policy and so far they have not succeeded. These hon. gentlemen say: Oh, it is highly unpatriotic to say that the country is not prospering under us, but it was highly patriotic when we were in Opposition for us to say that the country was not prospering under you. It was a proper thing to put in a resolution, it was a proper thing to vote upon, it was a proper thing to canvass this country on from one end to the other. It was proper when we were in Opposition to declare that the country was in a calamitous condition, that the people were on the verge of bankruptcy, and that tens of thousands were fleeing from the country every day. What do the reports of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States now show? They show that during the period of Mackenzie's Administration that on an average 23,000 a year left Canada, and that on an average 100,000 leave every year since the present Government came into power. The hon. gentlemen opposite came into office and the young men of Canada fled from the country as if from a pestilence.

An hon. MEMBER. They are coming back.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Look at the American statistics for the States of Massachusetts and Vermont, and Maine and Michigan and the North-West country, and see if they are coming back. Everything shows that the exodus is continuing. We ask the Minister of Agriculture now, when he is taking this appropriation for immigration, what assurance can he give the House that the money will not be wasted as it has been wasted for the last ten years. The hon. gentleman answers us by saying we are pursuing the same policy as you did. We called you flies on the wheel when in office, we said you were incompetent men, but now our defence is that we are doing just as you did 13 years ago. If we did wrong when in office, why did you follow our example and why did you not adopt a different policy?

Mr. CARLING. So we did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman justified himself a moment ago by saying it was the same policy.

Mr. CARLING. I said the immigration policy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There is this difference between our position and yours: When we were in office we succeeded in retaining four-fifths of the people we brought here, and you have succeeded in running out eight-ninths of those you bring here. I say, Sir, that this difference is due to the fact that the Government have taxed the people of Canada to death. They have taxed the men out of the country, they have depreciated the value of

agricultural products and diminished the income of the farming population, and they have done so in the interests of the Red Parlour, and the Red Parlour sustains them, and they sustain the Red Parlour, and so long as there is a copper in the pockets of the farmers of this country the friends of the Government will not be permitted to want.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 25th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WRIT ISSUED.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received information of a vacancy in the representation of the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of York, Ontario, by the demise of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and I accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ for the said electoral district.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister state when the report of the Commission which sat on the Civil Service will be laid on the Table of Parliament?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The report has not been received yet. I am informed it has not yet been made, and it is, therefore, impossible to state the day when it will be laid before the House. The Bill on the Paper in the name of the Secretary of State is intended to provide some temporary amendments in case the report should be received when it would be too late to take up any larger measure.

BRITISH COLUMBIA QUARANTINE.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with. I would ask the Government if they have received any information in regard to quarantine matters in British Columbia? I have been informed that last Monday the *Empress of Japan*, a steamer sailing from Hong Kong, China, came into the harbour of Victoria with small-pox on board, also that the quarantine officer there landed some 518 Chinese passengers and that the accommodation was totally unfit for any large number of invalids to be treated. I would like to ask if this is correct, and also whether the Government do not think they should put the quarantine station there on a good footing to deal with a large number of invalids? Now that these steamers are running regularly from China and Japan, every precaution ought to be taken to have that quarantine station in a proper shape, so that no delay may be caused to the steamers, and that the passengers may be so treated as to prevent the diseases from spreading over the country.

Mr. CARLING. The ship mentioned did arrive at Victoria with over 500 Chinamen, and there was a case of small-pox on board. The whole number were quarantined, and are quarantined at the present time. The question of putting the quarantine at Albert Head is now being considered by the Government, with a view of putting it on a good footing and preventing the spread of disease.

U. S. ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would call the attention of the Government to a very important question which is referred to in this morning's paper. There is information there from which it appears that about 20 French Canadian labourers were stopped by the American customs authorities at Rouse's Point and were taken back to this side of the frontier. It would appear that there was no justification whatever for that, because these men were not hired but went to that country to look for labour. I should like to know if the Government have taken cognizance of this matter, and what action they propose to take in regard to it, because if what is stated is true, it is a very serious outrage.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have no intimation in regard to that except what we have derived from the statement in the newspaper. If the facts as they are stated are correct, no doubt we shall have before long some representation on the subject, because it is a very extraordinary action to take unless the Alien Labour Law was violated before the entrance of these men into the States, or some violation of the amendment of 1891 took place.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the "Dominion Millers' Association."—(Mr. Stevenson.)

Mr. J. L. PAYNE.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether one J. L. Payne was in the service of the Government from the 3rd of February, 1891, until the 7th March, 1891? If so, what services did he render, where did he perform such services, and what amount was he paid therefor? Has said J. L. Payne been in the service of the Government since 30th June, 1891? If so, for what periods, what services did he render during such periods, and what amount was he paid therefor?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. J. L. Payne was in the service of the Department of Agriculture from 3rd February, 1891, to 7th March, 1891. His services consisted in the performance of the duties pertaining to a special clerk, and during the period stated in the question, he was employed in London, to which place the general correspondence of the Department of Agriculture was sent while the Minister was there. He was specially qualified for his work. His pay was $3 per day. He was also in the service of the department from 9th October, 1891, to 31st March, 1892, performing work as a special extra clerk, and was paid at the same rate as above stated.

LAKE ST. JOHN AND CHICOUTIMI RY.

Mr. FREMONT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any measures to ensure the construction of a railway from Lake St. John to Chicoutimi and St. Alphonse, which will serve the needs of three-fourths of the population of the Saguenay district, who are now from 50 to 75 miles distant from railway communication?

Mr. BOWELL. Measures have been taken by the Government towards ensuring the construction of the railway from Lake St. John to Chicoutimi. By 51 Vic., chap. 3, and 52 Vic., chap. 3, subsidies are granted in aid of this road to the extent of $3,200 per mile, amounting to $160,000. For the construction of the first section of 30 miles a contract is made with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, and they have applied to enter into a contract for a further 20 miles, representing that they are prepared to proceed with the work.

BRIDGES OVER THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. FREMONT asked, Whether any representations have been made by the Imperial to the Dominion Government as to the danger in the event of war, of railway communication between the Atlantic and the Pacific being severed by the destruction of the bridges over the St. Lawrence at Montreal, both of which being in close proximity to the frontier? And, if so, has it being pointed out to the Imperial authorities that a railway bridge at or near Quebec under the guns of the Citadel on one side, and of the new Lévis forts on the other, would be perfectly safe from attack?

Mr. BOWELL. No such representations have been made to the Canadian Government by the Imperial Government, consequently they have not been answered.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the lands chosen by the locating engineers of the Cape Breton Railway for terminal accommodation at North Sydney, have been purchased and paid for? If so, what quantity of lands have been appropriated and what price has been paid therefor and to whom paid? If any change has taken place in the location of terminal accommodation on what property has the terminus been located, and how many acres purchased and at what prices and from whom purchased?

Mr. BOWELL. The lands chosen for terminal accommodation at North Sydney have been expropriated, but they have not been paid for. No change has taken place in the location of terminal accommodations, but the town of North Sydney now asks that the terminus be established at the ballast wharf instead of at the Imrie wharf. There are 3·31 acres expropriated at the town wharf for terminal facilities, the value is placed by the official land appraiser at $5,000 and by an official referee of the Exchequer Court at $6,000.

PROCEDURE—NOTICES OF MOTION.

On the order being called for the motion of Mr. McCarthy, the same was asked to stand at the request of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to call attention to the rule which requires that motions should be dropped if not gone on with when they are called, except when the Government asks them to stand. This privilege on the part of the Government should not be exercised unless they are prepared to give reasons for so doing. It appears to be customary for some member of the Government to call "stand" whenever a notice given by one of their supporters comes up during that gentleman's absence from the House. We of the Opposition have not the same opportunity of using the privilege granted to the Government under the rule, and I think the rule should be enforced unless the Government can give satisfactory reasons for asking the motion to stand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure we have always desired to make use of any privilege of that kind as much in favour of one side as the other, as in both cases it is only done by courtesy. I am quite willing to join in the request to have any motion stand for a member of the Opposition who has any reason to offer to the House why it ought to stand. In this case, as the Minister of Railways, who has been unwell for some days, is absent, and this motion relates to the business of his department, it was evidently necessary that the motion should stand.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between Mr. Gamble, the resident engineer in British Columbia, and the Public Works Department, Ottawa, in regard to the Custom House and Post Office buildings in Victoria, B.C. Also, all reports by the above-named officer on the said buildings. Also, all correspondence and reports from Mr. E. H. Fletcher, post office inspector in British Columbia, in regard to the Post Office building in Victoria, B.C.

He said: By this motion I am asking to have the correspondence between the engineer of the Public Works Department and the Government brought down for the purpose of seeing the opinion of that gentleman in regard to public buildings in Victoria, B.C. For the last three or four years my colleague and myself, every session, have spoken in regard to the necessity that exists for having new buildings erected in that place. I do not think it is needful for me again to give any statistics of the business done at that port, because I have given them every year and they do not seem to have had any great effect on the Ministers. However, the necessity still exists for having new buildings. The present buildings in Victoria were put up many years ago when the town was a very small place indeed, and every hon. member in the House knows that Victoria has grown very rapidly within the last few years. The revenue from Victoria is over $1,200,000 a year from Customs alone. I am informed by the civil servants who are stationed in those buildings that it is almost impossible for them to carry on their work on account of the inadequate size of the structures. I think the post office cost something like $40,000, and the custom house a similar amount; and any hon. member will readily see that the town is entitled to public buildings more in keeping with that amount of revenue than the buildings at present existing. The reason I make this request, Sir, is not solely because I wish to have the money spent in Victoria, although I do say we have a perfect right to look to the Government to spend that amount of money, but my

object in desiring proper buildings erected is that public business should be facilitated and carried on in a manner suitable to the requirements of that city. I feel convinced myself that the Ministers who have been out there and who have seen this place will admit that we should have such buildings erected there as would be a credit to the city and to the Dominion. I only hope that these Ministers who have been there will use their influence in Council to ensure that an appropriation will be inserted in the Supplementary Estimates sufficient at least to make a commencement on these public buildings, which are so much needed in Victoria. I, therefore, move this motion, seconded by Mr. Mara.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS TO STAND.

On the Order being called for the motion of Mr. McCarthy relative to commercial interests between the United States and Canada.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy,) intimated to me that he would be here at 4 o'clock. He is detained in the court until then, and under these circumstances I will ask to let the motion stand.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose it is understood that any hon. gentleman who has a motion and who intimates to the Government beforehand that he will not, cannot, be present, will be accorded the same treatment?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said more than that. I said we would be glad to ask the same for any gentleman on the Opposition side who had a good reason to offer, whether he intimated it beforehand or not. I did not ask that it should be intimated beforehand.

Mr. MULOCK. The reason ascribed here will, I suppose, always be a good reason: that a gentleman is occupied in the Supreme Court.

NORTH-WEST ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. DAVIN moved for:

Copies of all resolutions and memorials passed by the North-West Assembly at its last session and addressed to the Government.

He said: Mr. Speaker, some of these resolutions relate to matters that I think have been already satisfactorily dealt with by the Government, but there is one resolution in regard to immigration that I wish specially to press upon the attention of the Government and upon the attention of this House. Any one who reviews the history of the proceedings of this Government and of the Government that preceded it, will, I think, come to the conclusion that they have not erred in overzeal for the promotion of immigration. Several things have undoubtedly combined to that effect; the principal of which is, that there has been in the cities a strong and influential party influencing elections, who were opposed to assisted immigration. Well, Sir, the time came when a wise policy was adopted by the Government of Canada, and that policy was this: Only to pay for results; but, in my opinion, that policy has fallen short of what was needed by the Dominion of Canada because of unwillingness on the part of both sides of this House to supply the money necessary for the promotion of immigration. The history of immigration in the United States has been that immigration moved on from one basis; a basis along the Pacific coast, a basis stretching down the whole length of the original states that broke away from England. Here in Canada we have had to proceed upon a different basis. First you had a short territory in what were called the Lower Provinces; then you had Quebec, then you had Ontario, and there you had the great lakes stretching between Ontario and the territories, and that has necessitated that in Manitoba and the territories we should proceed upon a perfectly new basis. That has made migration difficult for us as compared with what it was in the States. The point, therefore, I make is this: that if you are going to people Manitoba and the North-West Territories as you ought to do, and as rapidly as you ought to do, you must make you basis there and act from there; and the little Parliament in Regina has asked that a sum of money should be devoted to their use to deal specially with immigration. Now, Sir, what is done by the other provinces? Ontario, New Brunswick, Quebec, Manitoba, has each its agent or agents who are all active in promoting immigration into these provinces, and as a fact we can state the amount of work that has been done in promoting immigration into Manitoba by the very energetic and able man who now controls immigration for that province. You have that man with a number of agents in various parts of Ontario for instance, and they are doing work that he himself can measure. He can tell exactly the amount of work they have done, and show the money value which that province has got from those agents. Now, what we in the North-West say is this: Give us the means of doing precisely the same thing for the North-West as has been done for Manitoba. What we need to do, in order to make Canada's position secure in the future, is something large in the way of promoting immigration. There is no reason why, if you bring in 20,000 immigrants, you should not bring in a million. You have a vast field in Europe to draw from—in Germany, in Scandinavia, in Scotland, in England, in Ireland: and if that field is properly exploited, there is no reason whatever why, in a year or a couple of years, you should not bring a million of immigrants to this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I hear scornful cheers from hon. gentlemen around me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Are they not scornful? Then hon. gentlemen agree with me. If that million of men costs you $10,000,000, then the $10,000,000 are properly and fruitfully expended, because from that moment you secure the future of Canada, and I will tell you why. Suppose the bringing in of the million men within a year or two should cost $10,000,000, does it not strike every man of sense that that money is far more fruitfully expended than if you got a million of men in by the same expenditure spread over ten or fifteen or twenty years? The fact of getting them in within a short time not only gains the result of the expenditure of $10,000,000, but it secures for the country the best immigration agents we can possibly have, namely, successful settlers. Now, Sir, in the past we have been *trop tard*. As the Minister of Agriculture knows, we have in the last two years been getting

most admirable settlers from Dakota, but with reference to Dakota we have been *trop tard*; if we had begun there a year earlier we should have had far better results. Now, what we want with regard to Canada generally is a large immigration movement. Without that, you cannot build up in Canada what we all want, a nation; but with our vast resources, and our magnificent waterways and harbours, there cannot be the least doubt that if we make the same effort to secure immigration from the congested districts of Europe that the people of the United States have made, we can make the future position of Canada secure, and that is the only way it can be made secure. So much for the general question. Now, in regard to the particular question of the North-West, it is the great field into which we want to pour the immigrants, because even Manitoba is getting pretty well filled, as well as the other provinces; but in the North-West you have a country that can sustain a hundred million people, and that country, Sir, is the future backbone of Canada. Make the North-West a success, and the future of Canada is secured. I ask, therefore, that the Government here should give the little Government of the North-West at once the means of dealing with that problem, which is the great problem for Canada as well as for the North-West. All the other problems will settle themselves; but if we go on without increasing in population, then failure will be the doom of Canada. Suppose you gave the North-West Government $20,000 or $30,000 this year to spend on immigration; why, Sir, $100,000 would be fruitfully expended on immigration to the North-West. Think of our vast harvest of last year; how much of the returns from that has flowed into the pockets of the people of eastern Canada? Merchants who do business with the west will tell you that their best customers, those most certain in sending orders and in meeting their bills, are the people of the North-West; and I say that as a mere matter of prudent investment, you cannot do better than place a large sum in the estimates to be at the disposal of the Government of the North-West in promoting immigration. On previous occasions I have dealt with the other questions involved in these resolutions, with regard to some of which I think the Government have already done their part; but this question of immigration, as I have said in this House, is the master question for Canada. It is the question to which the statesmen desiring to build up a great nation here will apply their whole energy; and instead of frittering away our time and spending a few thousand dollars a year upon it, it is something on which we might well concentrate our attention and so build up a great, a prosperous, and a united Canada.

Motion agreed to.

DECISIONS ON ELECTION PETITIONS.

Mr. GILLIES moved for:

Copy of the petition presented and filed in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, against the election and return of Joseph A. Gillies for the County of Richmond, Nova Scotia, at the general election holden on the 5th of March, 1891; together with the dates of filing and service of such petition; and also, all papers and documents in connection with the following proceedings in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia:—

1. Application to the Honourable the Chief Justice extending the time for setting the petition down for trial.
2. Application to set the petition down for trial returnable before the Honourable Mr. Justice Weatherbe and the Honourable Mr. Justice Graham, but heard by the Honourable Judge Weatherbe, sitting alone, on the 19th day of November, 1891.
3. The order made by the said Judge Weatherbe, sitting alone, for trial of the said petition, fixing the 8th of December, 1891, the date for said trial.
4. The notice of appeal, dated 28th November, 1891, from this decision of the Honourable Judge Weatherbe, to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, the grounds of appeal being as follows:—

(*a*) Because there was no jurisdiction to make said order, or the portion thereof extending time.

(*b*) Because six months had elapsed since the presentation of the petition.

(*c*) Because the time and place of trial were not fixed within six months from the presentation of the petition.

(*d*) Because the extension of time granted by said order was not made on application for that purpose, supported by affidavits, and it does not appear from such order, and it was not made to appear when the same was made, that the requirements of justice rendered such enlargement necessary.

(*e*) Because the respondent had no notice of any application to extend the time for the commencement of the trial herein.

(*f*) Because one judge has no jurisdiction to fix the time and place of trial.

(*g*) Because the trial of the petition cannot be commenced during the term of the court at which the judges assigned to try the said petition are bound to sit.

5. The notice of motion on said appeal for the 3rd day of December, 1891.
6. The appointment by the Honourable Judge Weatherbe, then senior judge, for a hearing before the Supreme Court on the said 3rd day of December, 1891.
7. The postponement of this hearing until a later day.
8. The judgment of the Supreme Court upon this case.
9. The rule of the Supreme Court, dated the 19th day of December, 1891, setting aside the order of the Honourable Judge Weatherbe fixing the date of the trial of said petition.
10. The date on which the Honourable Judge Weatherbe and the Honourable Judge Graham received a copy of the order of the Supreme Court setting aside the said order of Judge Weatherbe for trial.
11. The date on which the said judges reported to the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons that the said petition had been heard by them, and that they had declared the election of the said Joseph A. Gillies void, and his seat in Parliament vacant.
12. The date upon which application was made to the Honourable Judge Weatherbe to defer the decision in the petition pending the decision of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia on the question of jurisdiction, and the refusal of this application.

Mr. FORBES. I presume the hon. member desires to have the papers in all these various petitions before the House. It has come to my notice that different decisions have been given upon the same point by the same bench in Nova Scotia, or upon points very similar to one another, and in order that the whole question may be fairly before the House, and that there may be not an opinion arrived at from one set of facts only, I beg to move that the resolution be amended by adding thereto, after the last clause, the following words:—

Also, copies of the several petitions presented and filed in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia under the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, against the election and return of Hon. Sir John Thompson, Hon. C. H. Tupper, W. C. E. Kaulbach, Mr. J. B. Mills, Mr. N. W. White, and Mr. Hugh Cameron, for six of the several counties of the Province of Nova Scotia at the general election held on the 5th March, 1891: also, all papers and documents in connection with the various proceedings in the said cases in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think there is any objection at all to the adoption of the amendment. I would like to suggest that this amendment and resolution seem to me to contain a good many matters which are probably of no importance in the question the hon. gentleman would like to discuss.

A copy, for instance, of every petition is asked for, and those are documents which are nearly all alike. I presume it will be satisfactory if the return brought down will contain only one petition and the paragraphs in the others which are different. A good many of the documents on the file, I suppose, would not be required for any practical purpose whatever, and I presume there will be no objection to our discriminating in making the return.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of the amount of crude cotton-seed oil imported into Canada during the year 1891; also the amount of refined cotton-seed oil imported into Canada during the year 1891.—(Mr. McKay.)

Copies of all papers, letters, documents, correspondence, petitions and resolutions, with reference to the opening of a post office at Cap St. Ignace Station, in the County of Montmagny.—(Mr. Choquette.)

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. McNEILL moved:

That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a substantial reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.

He said: The Prime Minister of England, speaking at the Mansion House in November last, made use of these remarkable words:

"The great subjects of consideration are those treaties of commerce that are to expire next year. The great question is what tariff will the various nations adopt with respect to each other. Although with respect to material warfare I think we can hold out to you the most promising anticipations as far as our present prospects go, with respect to this industrial warfare which has for its weapon protective legislation, and has for its prize the markets of various countries, I am afraid we must be content to occupy for a time a peculiar and isolated position. The cause of protection does not sink; it rises."

I think, Sir, that you and the members of this House, having regard to the high position which the speaker whom I have quoted holds in the councils of the world, will be of the opinion that this is a very grave and serious utterance. The Prime Minister of England tells us that the great question which is at present occupying the attention of the statesmen of the world is the question as to the tariffs which different countries impose, one against another. The warfare which we have to consider at present is, he says, a warfare which has for its weapons protective legislation, and has for its prizes the markets of the world. Unfortunately, Sir, we in Canada have been too familiar with this warfare for many years past.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad to find that my hon. friend so entirely coincides with my views in that regard. We have had, year in and year out, since 1866, a warfare of tariffs waged against us with unremitting and relentless hostility by our great neighbour to the south. For twelve years we took no step, we adopted no measure, to defend our infant industries which lay open and exposed to this unnatural warfare; and it was not until at length we found that, under the circumstances, this unnatural condition of things must result in the stifling and trampling out of the infant industries of this country altogether, that we adopted means for their protection. When we did so we accompanied our protective legislation with a statutory offer of peace and good-will to our friends to the south, but this war has still continued. It is now about a quarter of a century since our friends to the south commenced to wage this war against us, and in place of having received our overtures in the friendly spirit in which they were offered they have, confident in their great strength, confident in their enormous resources, spurned our overtures, and have, in point of fact, apparently regarded them rather as an evidence of weakness than of a desire for peace and good-will. The result is that we are now face to face with new batteries recently erected against us on that side of the border. This warfare which has been waged against us is not only such a warfare as has been described by the Prime Minister of England, one which has for its object the mastery of our markets, but it is only too well known that it is designed also to dominate and control our country. I hear some apparent ironical cheer from the other side of the House, but I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, upon what I think is sufficient authority. I think the history of the unhappy condition of things which exists sufficiently shows us that one of the objects, at all events, which the Government and people of the United States had in view in waging against us this war of tariffs, was to force us to a political union with them. Their public men have said so. We all of us remember a famous expression of one of their public men when he said that the result of abrogating the Treaty of 1886 had not been such as they had expected, namely, that they would obtain the fruit "by violently shaking the tree," but the result had been to bring about a consolidation of the British provinces of North America; and just as that result was brought about at that time, so the action which our friends are taking at the present day is tending to bring about a consolidation of the outlying provinces of the Empire, rather than, as they had hoped, to induce a disruption of that Empire, and the falling of a portion of it into their arms. I may say in further proof of the statement I make, that Mr. Wiman has explicitly admitted the fact that the Treaty of 1886 was abrogated with a view to coerce this country into annexation. With the permission of the House I will just read an extract from a speech of Mr. Wiman's delivered before the commercial bodies of Detroit and Buffalo. He referred to the United Empire Loyalists, and he alluded to them:

"Because there is a tendency in the American mind to feel that isolation and a refusal to admit Canada to the privileges of the markets of the United States will have the effect of forcing them into a humble position as applicants for a political alliance. Doubtless the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1866 was largely influenced by this consideration."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough to prove the point I was making as to the animus which actuates our friends on the south of the line in their fiscal policy towards us. But there are many other considerations which point to the same conclusion. I think it would not be inappropriate if I were to read to this House an extract from a speech delivered by a gentleman in the city of Boston, a city of which we have heard something of late, the city which has been selected by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and by

his friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in which to give their views on the commercial relations which ought to exist between the two countries. I think it might be well if I were to call attention to some utterances of another gentleman delivered in that city. That is the city they select in which to deliver their addresses, presumably because they feel that the people of Boston sympathize with them and their views. A short time before the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) delivered his famous address in Boston, an address was delivered by another gentleman in that city "by invitation of prominent citizens there." I believe the gentleman who delivered this address was one of those who welcomed the hon. member for South Oxford to Boston on that occasion, and this address was thought so highly of that it was printed by prominent citizens of Boston and was circulated in pamphlet form, in handsome type, and actually a copy of it reached my hands, with the compliments of the committee, away in the north riding of Bruce. It was thought to be so valuable and of so much importance that it was circulated so wide and so far as the north riding of Bruce. When an address of this kind is circulated throughout the length and breadth of Canada it is evident that it is thought of some value by the leading citizens of Boston, and therefore, with the permission of the House, I will read a few extracts from this address in order that hon. members may see the frame of mind of the leading citizens of Boston as to this "continental unity," of which we have heard so much. "Continental Unity" is the title of this pamphlet.

"So long as"——

said the gentleman who delivered the address, whose name is W. H. H. Murray:

"So long as Canada remains as she has been and is to-day, comparatively weak in population, in developed resources and in military power, she is not a subject of serious concern to us, scarcely even of thought. But once let her begin to assume proportions of magnitude in those directions; once let us discern that her 5,000,000 are soon to become 20,000,000, and those twenty likely to become in the progress of time 40,000,000, and the great protective principle of our nationality, now lying latent as regards her existence on our borders, would suddenly come to the surface. I do not think I overestimate the American instinct touching the solidarity of this continent when I declare that we of the Republic shall never stand idly by and see a great power built up either on the southern or northern side of us.

"By right of deeds done and blood shed, of money spent and progress made, by the right of trials numberless bravely borne, of sacrifices beyond count freely offered upon the altar of our national faith, and, as we believe, on the altar of God, we do solemnly hold, that we have a right to live and grow, unchecked, unhindered, unimperilled by any other flag or power, and that the whole continent, from gulf to gulf, and ocean to ocean, will, must, shall, in the fullness of time, and we hope by the law of benevolent attraction, come under the banner of the Republic, of which to be a citizen, we hold, is better boon than to be a king.

"But one thing Canadians must understand, and it would be unwise and unfair for us to conceal it from them, and that one thing is this: that this Republic will never see a great power built up on this continent, either to the north or south of us, under either French or English flags, and take no action to prevent it. Least of all shall we ever assist them to become numerous, rich and powerful, with that end on their part in view. We invite them cordially to share with us the destiny of the continent; to share with us its greatness and its glory, as historically they have a right to do and should be proud of doing; but if they foolishly decline our invitation and undertake to rival us and imperil us by an alien development, then must they look for no help from us, for we shall certainly not help them at all, and we shall as certainly oppose their progress to the fullest extent of our power."

Now, these are some of the tid-bits of this address which was delivered at the request and on the invitation of some of the prominent citizens of Boston, and was so highly valued that they thought it well to circulate it through the length and breadth of Canada for the edification and instruction of the people of this country. When we add to the facts I have laid before you the fact that the people on our southern border through their representatives in the Senate refused to ratify a treaty which their own President, their own Government and their own commissioners declared to be a just and righteous treaty; when you add still further the fact that on the Pacific seaboard they have laid violent hands upon our peaceful vessels pursuing their lawful avocations on the high seas and carried them off captive to their own ports; when, to use the words of Mr. Mowat:

"The proofs (of unfriendly feeling) are to be found in the school books which are in use; in the 4th of July orations; in the tone of newspapers and their European despatches; in the diplomatic documents; in the election cries; in the speeches of public men in the Federal and State Legislatures and elsewhere; and in many other ways;"—

when we add all these facts and circumstances together, I do not think we have a right to blame Mr. Mowat very much when he describes the people of the United States as a hostile people. I presume Mr. Mowat did not mean they were hostile in the sense in which France and Germany are hostile, but I presume he meant that they were hostile, not in a military but in a political sense, in the same sense that hon. gentlemen opposite are hostile to those who now occupy the Treasury benches. We do not expect that the action of hon. gentlemen on this side will be very much assisted by the action of hon. gentlemen opposite, but that, on the contrary, their action will be hostile, and I presume it is in that sense that Mr. Mowat speaks, believing that the United States will use every political means to injure and thwart the interests of Canada. But I am glad to say that we are not dependent upon them. I am glad to say that we can live without them. They have a great country, they have a vast country, but we have a far greater country. They have a population of 63,000,000 of people, but we have a country with a population of 366,000,000 of people and, if we add our protectorate territories to that, we have a population of 410,000,000 of people. They have a great trade, it is true, but if you add to it the trade of the great French Republic and trade of all the Russias and the trade of the vast German Empire, you will have a trade only one-sixtieth part greater than the trade of the British Empire. I admit that we ought to treat our friends on the south in a friendly and conciliatory way. I believe that every member of this House, on whichever side he sits, desires to do that, we desire to treat them in that way, but at the same time in the way in which one honest and manly man would deal with another. Mr. Speaker, we possess more than one-half of the sea-borne commerce of the world. Our Empress Queen is by common admission the mistress of the waterways of the world. We hold almost all the most important coaling stations in the world. Ours are by far the greatest wheat areas in the world; ours are overwhelmingly the greatest wool markets in the world. It is said that in one valley in our Empire we can grow more cotton

than all the cotton produce of the United States. Ours are the greatest diamond fields in the world, and I almost think that we are to-day the first country in the world in the production of tea ; if we are not the first, we are almost the first. In coal, iron, copper and nickel, we hold our own with all mankind. We have the greatest timber forests in the world. In sugar growing we hold a good place : in tobacco growing we come third, and I have Sir Charles Dilke's authority for saying that we produce the finest coffee in the world. Every variety of climate, every variety of soil, everything that we can possibly require we possess in lavish abundance in our own Empire. We are not, Mr. Speaker, absolutely and utterly mendicant, we British subjects. It is not absolutely necessary that we should go cringing and whining to the back door of any foreign power to beg a little of their trade for charity. We are quite ready to trade with them, and anxious to trade with them, but we will trade with them on fair terms, if you please. To use old Admiral Blake's words : "We are not going to be fooled by foreigners." As I have said, we are prepared to treat upon fair terms, but only upon fair terms. But now, Mr. Speaker, the trouble of the matter is just this : That while we have these enormous resources, resources which are almost unimaginable in extent and in value, we have not common action with regard to them. We find, on the contrary, that the produce of our own people in our own markets is taxed just as the produce of the foreigner is. We find that the foreigner who excludes our goods from his market has all the benefits in the markets of the Empire that any member of the Empire has. We say that that is wrong, we say that ought to be changed, and we say that it will be changed. We say that the day is approaching rapidly when a change will be made, and I hope before I sit down I will be able to convince you, Sir, and the members of this House, that that day is rapidly approaching. I do not think it is very necessary for me to elaborate to any great extent the argument that it would be of enormous benefit to this country if we had preferential treatment for our goods in the markets of the mother country. I do not think it is necessary for me to point out to the farmer the advantage that it would be to him if he had preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain for his wheat and oats, and for his barley, and for his horses, his butter, his cheese and what he has to sell. I do not think it is necessary for me to argue that it would be a benefit to our lumber interest if we had preferential treatment in the markets of the mother country for our lumber, nor is it necessary to point out the advantage it would be to our fishing interests if we had the same advantage for our fish. The market of England being our natural market, and being overwhelmingly the greatest market in the world, I think the truth of the statement that it would be a benefit to us to have preferential treatment in that market goes without the necessity of argument.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman's argument to be that it would be beneficial under all circumstances, or, only if we got a higher price for our commodities there ?

Mr. McNEILL. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the mere fact of our having preferential treatment in the markets of the mother country would be a benefit to us, even supposing that there was not a higher price for the commodity we export ; but I do not say we would not get a higher price. I say that even supposing there was not a higher price obtained it would be a benefit to us, because we would have the first place in that market and we would ensure the sale of our goods. Take the case of lumber, for example. Would it not be an enormous advantage to us to have the certainty of a market for the sale of our lumber ? Even supposing that an increased price was not necessarily obtained, the surety of the market would be of enormous advantage.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentlemen say that England is our natural market for lumber ?

Mr. McNEILL. I say that England is our natural market for the best lumber we produce.

Mr. MULOCK. The lumbermen have not found it out.

Mr. McNEILL. I think they have, and I think my hon. friend has not looked into the figures or he would discover that they have found it out. If the hon. gentleman will look into the figures he will find that while we sold the year before last to the Americans, some $10,000,000 worth of lumber, they exported exactly the same amount of lumber of the same kind, and they were acting as middlemen for us except for the worst kinds of lumber.

Mr. MULOCK. Where do all those barges go ?

Mr. McNEILL. I trust my hon. friend will hear me and not interrupt. If my hon. friend keeps me talking all the afternoon answering interruptions, as he is in the habit of doing when I get up to speak, it will prolong the discussion a good deal. I was just saying that England was our natural market. I know we are told that the market lying alongside of us is our natural market, just because it does lie along side us. I see my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Laurier) agrees with me and he nods approvingly. We are told that just because the market of the United States lies alongside of us it must be our natural market, so that, when I, as a farmer, take out my wheat or barley to sell it, I should go to the farmer next me on the same principle. I can sell him a few bushels of seed wheat or barley, or a cow or a horse, and therefore I am to go to him, because he is my natural market as he resides alongside of me. That is the argument of hon. gentlemen on the other side. If my neighbour has ten thousand bushels of wheat and I have only five hundred, still I am to go to him to sell my five hundred bushels because he lives alongside of me. I should like to know from hon. gentlemen opposite why the farming country lying alongside of Canada should be the natural market of Canada any more than the farm beside me is my natural market. I have just jotted down a few facts for the instruction of my hon. friend which I will give to him. I find that China does not find her near neighbour, Japan, her natural market. She sells more to the United States than to Japan ; and she does not find India with all its teeming populations her natural market although it lies on her border. China sends six or seven times as much of her produce away over the ocean to the United States as she sells to India ; and she sells all the way to Great Britain two and a half times as much produce as she sells to Japan, and nearly fifteen times as much as she sells to her neighbour India. Yet

it is her natural market lying alongside, and in India you cannot say it is hostile tariff which prevents the trade, because India is as nearly a free trade country as you can find anywhere. Now let me give some facts with regard to the trade of Japan. Japan sells to North America twenty times as much as to India and Siam, and to France ten times as much; and France sells to the United States almost double as much as she does to her neighbour Italy. Belgium sells to the Argentine Republic nearly twice as much as to Spain, and four times as much as to Norway and Sweden. Germany sells to the Argentine Republic between two and three times as much as to Russia, four times as much as to Italy and ten times as much as to Spain. So that I do not think that this argument about the natural market being necessarily alongside the trader will hold water when you come to apply to it the test of actual experience. Turkey sells to France eleven times as much as to Italy. I might go on and multiply these instances, but I will conclude them with this fact, that our very innocent neighbour Brother Jonathan, who through his emissaries is endeavouring to teach us that his country is our natural market because it lies alongside of us, sells to the Argentine Republic, Central America, Mexico and Brazil—all his natural markets according to this theory—$38,000,000 worth, and to that unnatural market across the Atlantic $444,000,000. So much for the question of the natural market. When our rival finds his markets in England, I do not see why we should not find ours there also; and it is very satisfactory to find that we are opening up a market there for our products very rapidly. I do not intend to trouble the House with a mass of figures, but I will call its attention to one class of figures for a moment. I recollect that only last session we were told how absurd it was to think we could develop a market in England for our horses. We were told the same with regard to our eggs. I have not the figures to show the growth of the market there for eggs, but I think it is pretty well known to the public of Canada. But I will mention the number of horses sold in England within the last three years, from which you will see the extent to which we are developing our trade with England. In 1889 we sold $27,000 worth, in 1890 $66,000 worth, and in 1891 $245,000 worth. So I think we have reason to be satisfied with the progress we are making in that regard. Now, it is gratifying to find that the demand in England for our goods is steadily increasing, while unfortunately the demand in the United States is steadily decreasing.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). How many horses does England import from the whole world?

Mr. McNEILL. I told that to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) last session, and my impression at the present moment is that England imports between 45,000 and 46,000. I suppose my hon. friend is prepared to say 15,000 or 17,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Less than 12,000.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken, as the hon. member for Bothwell was last year, as he would find if he looks into the trade returns more carefully.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Trade and Navigation Returns, then, are not correct?

Mr. McNEILL. It is the returns of the British Government that I am quoting from, and it will be found that my statement is correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the hon. gentleman know that last year we took more horses from England than England took from us?

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend can look at the returns for himself, and correct me if I am incorrect; but I think it would be better if he would let me finish my rambling remarks in the meantime. I was just saying that the English market was developing, while, unfortunately, the market in the United States is very much the reverse. The demand in the United States for our products is falling away very rapidly. The principal farm product that was taken from us by the people of the United States was barley, and our exports of that product has fallen off within the last two or three years by considerably more than half, irrespective of the McKinley Bill altogether. As my hon. friend ought to know, and as I suppose he does know, the farmers in the Western States are devoting much more attention to the cultivation of barley than they did a few years ago, with the result that they are raising a better class of barley than they did formerly; and the fact that the brewers of the United States are now using an inferior quality of barley enables the farmers of the United States largely to supply the demand for barley there, and it is only a matter of a short time when our barley, with the exception of small quantities of the finest grades, will vanish from the United States market altogether. We have in the mother country, however, a market for our barley which, I am glad to say, is likely to prove much more valuable to us than the market in the United States ever did. I suppose I shall be told that however important or valuable it would be for Canada to have preferential treatment for our goods in the markets of the mother country, the mother country will never agree to it. I shall be told that the mother country will never tax the food of her toiling millions—that is the favourite expression: and that she will never permit the trade of Canada, a mere contemptible fraction of her whole trade, to imperil her trade with the whole world. These are formidable objections, and, with the permission of the House, I would like to say a word with regard to them. In the first place, as to taxing the food of the toiling millions, there are two fallacies which are rapidly being exposed in the mother country. The first is, that an actual increase in the price of wheat must necessarily increase the price of the loaf. The imposition of a small tariff of say five shillings per quarter, it has been asserted, would necessarily increase the price of the four-pound loaf. Well, it has been found by the test of actual experience, that an increase in the price of wheat to the amount of five shillings, and even more than five shillings, does not necessarily raise the price of the four-pound loaf to the extent of one farthing; but furthermore, as the Chairman of the Council of the London Chamber of Commerce recently pointed out—and he is a sufficiently good authority, one would think, being at any rate a pronounced free trader. He said that in France and in Germany, the effect of the imposition of a small duty upon wheat had not been to raise the price of wheat at all. So much for the increase price of the loaf. The second

fallacy which is being exposed in England is the fallacy that the cheap loaf for the workingman is necessarily the large loaf. That used to be accepted as an axiom. That fallacy has been exposed as concisely, recently in England, by a leading public man there, as it very well can be, when he said: Employment, not cheapness, is the large loaf for the labouring man; want of employment is the small loaf, or, I may add, no loaf at all. It is quite evident that the mechanic having constant employment at good wages, and with money in his pocket, can afford to buy a large loaf even though it be a little dearer, but the unfortunate labouring man out of employment, with little or no money in his pocket, must be content with a very small one, however cheap it may be. The labouring men and mechanics of England have come to understand this, that the first requisite is steady employment and that cheapness comes second. They look abroad, and they see that the outlook for employment, and steady employment, for them is by no means bright. They see that one by one great markets into which their goods were admitted a few years ago are being closed against them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Oh!

Mr. McNEILL. I do not understand the interruption of my hon. friend.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would like to hear the truth of that statement.

Mr. McNEILL. I wonder that the hon. gentleman should require any proof of the statement that the markets of France, Germany, Russia and the United States, and all the great civilized countries of the world are being closed against England at the present time. I suppose he knows better than Lord Salisbury, but Lord Salisbury says so. However, as I was stating, these markets are being closed, one by one, against the products of England, and the workingmen feel that they are unfairly handicapped in the industrial race; for while these markets are being closed against the products of their industry, the products of these very foreign countries are being poured on the open markets of England. Now, perhaps, hon. gentlemen may be surprised if I tell them that they are being poured in upon the open markets, the products of foreign labour, almost to the extent of one-half the amount of manufactured goods that England sells to foreign countries. What do we see as the condition of things in England to-day? Take the condition of the greatest of all industries in England, that of agriculture, which employs two million hands as against one million hands employed by the textile industry, we see that the products of agriculture in England, according to McCulloch's Mercantile Dictionary of 1845, and the official return of to-day have fallen off to-day to the extent of fifty millions sterling, and that there is an increase in the importation of foreign agricultural products to the extent of eighty-four millions sterling. And what do we find in reference to manufactures? Do we find that there is such an increased activity in manufacturing centres as to compensate for this desolating agricultural loss? No, we find nothing of the kind. We find, on the contrary, that the condition of things is most serious with regard to the manufacturing industries of England to-day. We find that this inroad of foreign goods is attacking the very staples of her industry. We find that her jute and linen industry, one of her staples, has been attacked to this extent, that while last year England exported $8,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, she imported actually $10,100,000 worth, or $2,000,000 more than they exported. We find that the export of cotton manufactured goods has fallen off. We find that in silks the industry has been ruined altogether.

Mr. LAURIER. Then England is going to adopt protection?

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what England is going to do.

Mr. LAURIER. It ought to.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad to hear my hon. friend coming round so rapidly to protectionist views. I am giving him facts and figures, and he says they lead him to the conclusion that England ought to adopt protection. Those facts and figures are incontrovertible, and I hope the hon. gentleman will come over here and support us in our protective policy. But I was going to say, that, so far as woollen manufactures are concerned, we have the same story to tell. The woollen manufactures imported into England last year amounted to over £11,000,000 sterling, and she only exported £18,500,000 sterling, so that in that great staple of English industry, which has been world famed, we find the foreigner has sent into England more than half what she has exported. Then, as I have said, the silk industry has been annihilated. The silk looms of Coventry are standing idle, and the foreigner poured into England last year £11,000,000 sterling worth of silk manufactured goods. These facts and figures are producing their effects upon the minds of the people of England and they are coming to the conclusion, many of them at least, that some remedy will require to be found for this state of things; and many are turning their eyes to the colonies and the outlying possessions of the Empire. And what do they find? They find that while there has been this extraordinary falling away in the markets of foreign countries for English manufactured goods, in the colonies the very reverse has been the case. Even at the time when there was an increase of exports to the United States, to France to Germany, to Belgium, and to Holland, who are our best customers among foreign nations, while there was an increase in fourteen years from £71,000,000 to £81,000,000 sterling or one-seventh of the increase, during that time, of manufactured goods exported to these countries, during the same time there was an increase of from £22,000,000 to £42,000,000 sterling or an increase of ten-elevenths of manufactured exports to the colonies. Let us look at this from another point of view. Let us compare the United States and the five great powers of Europe with Canada and five of the great colonies of the Empire. We find that, while the United States takes over $2 per head of her population of English manufactured goods, Canada takes over $8 per head. While Austria takes 16 cents per head, the West Indies takes $11.65 per head. While Russia takes 31 cents per head, the Cape takes $23 per head. While Italy takes $1.35 per head, New Zealand takes $26 per head. While Germany takes $2.06 per head, Victoria takes $31 per head. While France takes $2.16 per head, New South Wales takes $31.50 per head. I do not think, in face of these facts and figures, it is very surprising that we should find Lord Salisbury stating that the vital forces of the com-

merce of the Empire were to be found within the Empire itself, and it is too late in the day altogether to talk about the insignificant trade of Canada or the colonies in face of these figures. I will give an idea of the class of goods that the colonies take from England by the following statement :—

—	Foreign Countries	Colonies.
	£	£
Apparel and slops	949,000	4,000,000
Arms and ammunition	1,000,000	750,000
Books, printed	500,000	750,000
Brass manufactures	294,000	206,000
Candles	110,000	150,000
Clocks and watches	52,000	70,000
Copper manufactured	825,000	1,000,000
Cordage, &c	285,000	209,000
Cotton piece goods	28,500,000	25,500,000
Cotton hosiery	313,000	350,000
Furniture	252,000	396,000
Glass, all kinds	467,000	598,000
Haberdashery and millinery	500,000	1,500,000
Hardware and cutlery	1,500,000	1,100,000
Hats of all sorts	611,000	660,000
Iron and steel, railroad rails	2,000,000	2,000,000
Railroad chairs and repairs	453,000	637,000
Iron wire	483,000	599,000
Sheets, galvanized	855,000	1,300,000
Nails, screws and rivets	166,000	213,000
Wrought and manufactures of, unenumerated	1,300,000	1,084,000
Lead, all kinds, manufactured	171,000	170,000
Leather, wrought, boots and shoes	330,000	1,500,000
Medicines	405,000	655,000
Musical instruments	66,000	124,000
Paper of all descriptions	509,000	1,100,000
Plated and gilt wares	131,000	184,000
Saddlery and harness	219,000	422,000
Silk handkerchiefs	106,000	404,000
Soaps	209,000	324,000
Telegraphic wires and apparatus	719,000	882,000
Woollens—		
Flannels	166,000	328,000
Blankets	209,000	392,000
Rugs, coverlets or wrappers	258,000	268,000
Hosiery	455,000	458,000
Small woollen wares, not enumerated	98,000	100,000
Umbrellas and parasols	150,000	426,000

I think it is impossible for any one to attempt to say, in the face of those figures, that the trade of the colonies is so insignificant that England would not dream of sacrificing or imperilling any trade she now has for the sake of that colonial trade. I do not think that can be reasonably maintained. The truth of the matter is that this colonial trade is, as Lord Salisbury has said, the trade which gives the vital force to the whole trade of the Empire. Under these circumstances it is not unnatural that one should suppose, on first principles, that something would be done towards strengthening and developing this trade with the colonies by people in England. I think I have said enough to give a *primâ facie* reason for expecting such action to be taken, I but want to give more definite grounds for expecting such action. In the first place I want to give emphasis to the statement of Lord Salisbury that he regards the trade with the colonies as the vital force on which depends the whole trade of the Empire. I would also call attention to a newspaper called the London *Times*, and I would especially call the attention of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to this, because he said last session, when a similar matter was under discussion, that he had taken the *Times* for 20 years and could not believe that such an article could appear in that newspaper. I will read a few lines from a leading article in the *Times*, and I hope they will impress the mind of my hon. friend :

"If the federal idea makes progress among our colonies, the desire to remain in the Empire of Great Britain will only give place to an equally strong sentiment in favour of retaining Great Britain in their Empire. Still, there can be no doubt as to their wisdom and even the necessity of strengthening either sentiment by attaching substantial benefits to the union.

"Sir Gordon Sprigs tell us that free trade is not a fetish in the colonies, and that the theories of the text books are not allowed to stand in the way of any fiscal measure that seems advantageous. As to the text books they are getting somewhat out worn even here. Our modern economists have so many qualifications to make in the fine square cut doctrines of the older school that the science is rapidly becoming unrecognizable."

So says the London *Times*—

"There is still a considerable amount of fetish worship, but the ideas upon which any commercial union must rest will not in future incur the furious and unreasoning hostility that would have greeted them 20 years ago.

This is all from the London *Times*, I wish to tell the hon. member for Bothwell—

"It is getting to be understood that free trade is made for man, not man for free trade, and any change that may be proposed will have a better chance of being discussed upon their own merits, rather than in the light of high and dry theories backed by outcries against the thin edge of the wedge. The British Empire is so large and so completely self-supporting that it could very well afford for the sake of a serious political gain, to surround itself with a moderate fence."

Just think of that—

"There would of course be some economic disadvantage in a customs union, but if a larger political advantage can be gained, there is no sound reason that we know of why the transaction should not be regarded like any other in the light of expediency."

Now, Sir, when we find an organ of public opinion holding the unique position that the London *Times* holds among the journals of the world, a position of dignity and influence which no other journal holds, publishing an article of that kind, we have pretty good evidence that a wonderful change is passing over the spirit of the British people with reference to this question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If my hon. friend will allow me, I would point out that there is a difference between the line of argument of the London *Times* and the one he is now addressing to us. The London *Times* takes an economic position with a political advantage ; my hon. friend is contending for this union on account of its economic advantages.

Mr. McNEILL. I am simply pointing out this fact, that a proposition which a few years ago would not have been entertained for a moment, in favour of which a letter had not been inserted in the columns of the *Times*, is now, I might almost say, advocated by the London *Times* itself—at all events it is not opposed, for some reason or other—I care not what. I say that is a proof that an enormous change has passed over the minds of the people of England. But further than that, we find that since the commencement of last year there has been an organization established in the mother country for the express purpose of advocating this policy which I am attempting to place before the House ; and we find that while there were but a few members of that organization when we met last in this Chamber, there are now over five thousand members of the United Empire Trade League, and among

them there are over three hundred members of British Parliaments. Is that not another evidence that there is a great change passing over the minds of the people of England in reference to this question? But further, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that some years ago when the representatives of the great Conservative party in England, the ruling party in England, met together in convention, a resolution in favour of such a policy as this was proposed. There were a thousand delegates present, and out of the whole number only twelve were found to hold up their hands against this proposition. I want to say furthermore that only on the 25th of November last another great convention of the Conservative party of the United Kingdom was held in Birmingham, and at that convention this resolution was moved:

"That the principles advocated by the United Empire Trade League, favouring the extension of commerce upon a preferential basis throughout all parts of the British Empire, will be of the highest collective and individual advantage: and further, that the provisions of any treaties imposing limitations upon the full development of trade between the United Kingdom and other parts of the British Empire should be abrogated.

"And that this conference express the earnest expectation that Her Majesty's Government will see their way clear before the next electoral campaign, to make some decisive declaration of their intention to endeavour to promote mutually-favoring customs arrangements between the colonies and the home country."

That resolution was moved at this great meeting of one of the great parties of England, held in Birmingham so late as the month of November last, and there were only five men in the whole meeting who were prepared to oppose it; and the London *Times*, in its report of the meeting, says that the resolution was carried amid a scene of great enthusiasm and much cheering. Is that an evidence, or is it not, that there is a strong body of opinion in England in favour of a policy of this kind? Sir, I wish to adduce still further evidence in support of what I am saying, and I wish to call the attention of this House to what occurred last year in Dublin at a meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce for the United Kingdom, at which were present men representing trade and industry from all parts of the mother country. The same matter was brought up there and the same subject was discussed. A resolution had been prepared by the London Chamber of Commerce in favour of such a policy, a resolution had been prepared by the South of Scotland Chamber of Commerce in favour of such a policy, and these two resolutions were blended into one, which was moved by the chairman of the council of the London Chamber of Commerce itself. This gentleman, in getting up to move the resolution, described himself as an avowed free trader. Now, here is what this avowed free trader says:

"One of the chief things that our interests demand is that, so far as possible, we shall have open markets. If we cannot get them among foreign nations may we not take steps to secure them among the colonial dependencies as the price of concessions to them? I concede that the policy which is suggested will inevitably involve great sacrifices. It will involve the sacrifice, in some measure, of the free trade policy which has been characteristic of this country in the past."

That from an avowed free trader, and the chairman of the council of the London Chamber of Commerce. He goes on to say:

"It will involve on the part of the colonies some concession in respect of their protective tariffs that have so far, with one exception, marked their career. That sacrifice must be great in the case of growing colonies, in the early stage of whose existence Stuart Mill was understood—I do not say he said it—to admit that protective duties might be usefully adopted to establish new industries. It may be that sacrifice will have to be made by the consumer. Do not let us think that this work can be achieved out of nothing. * * * * With the duties imposed on corn in Germany and France the price of wheat has not advanced, but quite contrary."

However, he says:

"Very many commercial representatives here would have to contemplate the raw material—wool—being advanced in price."

It just occurs to me to mention now, what I had intended to mention previously, that so far as the danger of England imposing a tax on the raw material of wool, is concerned, it would seem when one looks into the figures, as if that would not be a very terrible undertaking after all; seeing that out of the £27,000,000 worth which she imports, she only imports £3,000,000 worth from foreign countries. All the rest she imports from her own Empire, and therefore it would be a small matter, the imposing of a duty on foreign wool. He continues:

"But the prosperity of colonies might be augmented to such an extent that the result might be a reduction instead of an advance * * * The days are a little over in which the chief object in existence was competition and cheapness. That was the doctrine of a school of very high authority, the school that gave us free trade. But men are giving their thoughts to wider aspects, and they no longer believe that produce by competition—enabling some men scarcely to live, with no leisure, and under such conditions that life is scarcely worth living—is the highest objective of social existence. The feeling is growing in the minds of the people that the object of national existence is not the accumulation of wealth, but the wider one of the welfare of mankind. If it be true that in place of mere competition we can put before the country a noble and practical ideal which can be truly realized, then I think even sacrifices may be justified for such permanent and good ends as the welfare and continuity of the supremacy, commercial and otherwise, of our great Empire. * * * What is the commercial aspect of the Empire? I say without hesitation, that the colonies and dependencies of England are those who give us not only the most secure portion of our trade, but contribute the largest proportion of it taken as a class. * * * I do think by a differential customs tariff, based upon allowances by the colonies, our own rates giving our kith and kin advantages in their commerce with us, you will be able to found a customs league which will be able te fulfil all the requirements of their existence, and enable them to deal with the mother country on terms of the most reciprocal advantage." * * *

This is, as I have said, from the statement of the chairman of the council of the London Chamber of Commerce, an avowed free trader. That resolution was put to the meeting and that resolution was carried unanimously, and the remarks which I have read were received with rounds of applause when the speaker resumed his seat. I think I have given evidence sufficient to show, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very strong and a very influential body of opinion in England in favour of the policy which I am humbly endeavouring to advocate here to-day. I think it is impossible for any fair-minded man to doubt for a moment that there is a reasonable probability of our obtaining that preferential treatment in the markets of England which would be so beneficial to us. Not only to us would it be beneficial, but it would be enormously beneficial to England also. If we are right in supposing it would be beneficial to us, then every man in Canada would be able to buy more from England than he does to-day. At the present time the trade of the colonies—I am speaking of the purchase by the colonies of the manufactured goods of England—is equal to considerably more than half the amount

that is paid to her for her manufactured goods by foreign countries. The amount which foreign countries pay to England for manufactured goods is from £138,000,000 to £140,000,000, and the amount which the colonies purchased from England of manufactured goods is £85,000,000 or £86,000,000, so that you see it is very much more than half. As I have said, every man in the colonies will be able to buy more from England, and not only so, but England would have a preference in our market, and therefore much more will be purchased from England than is at present purchased, even supposing the condition of our citizens was not benefited by this preferential treatment. However, that would be a very superficial view to take of this matter, it would be a very superficial view to take of the advantage that would accrue to England from this policy, because it cannot be doubted that there would be a greatly increased flow of immigration towards these favoured regions of the world that enjoyed the enormous advantage of preferential treatment, in what is incomparably the greatest market of the world. We might naturally expect that the population of the Empire would increase at a rate for which we have heretofore no example at all. The advantage would act and react, and we must recollect, Mr. Speaker, that we are all of one Empire and that each part of this Empire is able to supply the other part, and all the other parts, with some of those things they require. I am not one of those who think that the interests of this country must conflict with the interests of the Empire. I am one of those who believe that our interests are inextricably woven together. I maintain, Sir, that the man who says that the interests of Canada must conflict with the interests of the mother country who guards the interests of her offspring all the world over, I say that the man who says so and who thinks so, in my opinion takes a very narrow view of a great question. I say, Sir, that the man who goes up and down this country, or who goes up and down England, making the statement that the interests of Canada must conflict with the interests of England, is no true friend, and can be no true friend of British connection. I say, Sir, that the man who preaches such a pernicious doctrine as that is seeking with subtle hand to undo the golden links of loyalty and love that bind the Empire together. I care not who he be, whether he be a Reformer or a Conservative, whether he be Grit or Tory, Canadian or Englishman, he is, as I have said, an enemy of the British Empire whether he knows it or not. No, Sir, I say that the interests of Canada and England do not conflict in the true sense, in the statesmanlike sense. The interests of the provinces of Canada conflict in a restricted sense. The interests of the counties in the provinces conflict in a restricted sense, the interests of the cities and towns and villages of the counties, conflict in a restricted sense, the interest of the individual tradesmen in the villages conflict in a restricted sense. Even the interests of the individual members of a family may conflict in a restricted sense, and gentlemen of the medical profession tell us that the interests of the members of our own bodies conflict in a restricted sense. But, Sir, just in the same sense as the interests of the provinces do not conflict with the interests of the Dominion as a whole, so is it true that the interests of the different provinces of the Empire do not conflict with the interests of the mother country. I wonder what my hon. friend would have thought if the great and good man who so very recently passed away from amongst us; when he occupied the position which my hon. friend fills now so worthily and with such satisfaction I am sure to both sides of this House; I wonder what my hon. friend would have thought if that good man had risen in his place and had said as my hon. friend said: The interests of England must conflict with the interests of Canada, and when that day comes my guiding star, and my sole guiding star, shall be the interests of Canada, first and last and all the time, and not the interests of England at all? I wonder what he would have thought if the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie had risen in his place in this House and said: The day must come when the interests of the Province of Ontario will conflict with the interests of the Province of Quebec, and when that day comes, my guiding star, and my sole guiding star, shall be the interests of my own Province of Ontario, and not the interests of Quebec at all? I wonder if the hon. gentleman would have thought that that was a very wise, salutary or statesmanlike utterance on the part of Mr. Mackenzie? I think, Sir, that nothing could be conceived better calculated to destroy the harmonious conditions which happily exist between the provinces—to show distrust and discord among them, and to shake Confederation to its centre, than such utterances as that, delivered by politicians of weight and influence. Mr. Speaker, the spirit and the frame of mind which induces such an utterance is foreign to the spirit of British institutions and alien to the genius of the British race. Not thus, Sir, was the British constitution built up. Not thus have British institutions been made so successful and so salutary. Not thus would the best British statesmanship deal with the problem, should a sad day dawn when the interests of England and of her peerless daughter seem to conflict. No, Sir; not thus, but by wise concession, by moderation in counsel, and by reasonable compromise in the interests of both these countries, whose interests are so inextricably interwoven, would a solution of the difficulty be sought and obtained. But my hon. friend says that would not be his policy at all. He says that in that day he would not consider the interests of England at all, but only the interests of Canada; he would leave the people of England to look after their own interests. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that this is a new departure in Canadian politics—a departure altogether at variance with the principles which we have always understood to underly the political life of this country. This is a platform which I venture to say will not be approved by the loyal people of Canada. It is very natural that my hon. friend should have been drawn into this position, since he happened to be drawn into a support of the policy which of late he has been advocating. Hardly anything else could have been expected; but I venture to say that if it were possible that such a policy could be adopted and it were persevered in, one result only could flow from it. The children to be born of it are discord, disruption and disaster, imminent and terrible peril for Canada, and the disruption of the Empire for England. That, Sir, is plain. It is surely so plain that a child can see it; because if we announced it to be our policy

that we will not consider the interests of England at all. England will thereby be absolved from any obligation to consider our interests at all; and thus, at one fell swoop, in a paroxysm of political insanity, if I may say so, we fling away all the moral support, all the glory, the prestige, the might, the armies and the ironclads of the matchless Empire of which we form a part—prestige, might, armies and ironclads, Mr. Speaker, which cost us not so much as one poor cent but which are to all intents and purposes as truly and absolutely at the service of every man, woman and child who shall to-morrow morning walk on the streets of Ottawa, as they are at the service of any one of those who thronged at the throbbing heart of the Empire a few short months ago to mingle their griefs with ours for the death of one who, however highly we may appreciate his services here in Canada, found them if possible even more highly valued by the foremost statesmen of the metropolis of the world. No, Sir, we are one Empire, we have common interests, and nothing but political insanity can drive us asunder; and I for my part am convinced that if this House passes the resolution which I have placed before it, and if our action is followed, as I have no doubt it will be followed, by similar action on the part of the other colonies of the Empire, the day will very shortly come when we shall find such prosperity reigning within our Empire as no man has yet dreamed of.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Mr. Speaker, I have accepted with pleasure the honour of seconding the motion of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I am induced to do so by the importance of the question to which this resolution asks the serious consideration of this House, and also on account of the good which, I have no doubt, a calm, temperate, intelligent and earnest discussion of this subject will do to the country. There is no doubt, Sir, that whatever may be our views as to the practicability of the proposition, or the difficulties of working it out, that it is a very fit subject for debate, and that it calls for the patriotic consideration of all the well-wishers of the prosperity of Canada. But, Sir, I think it is proper to preface the few remarks to which I intend to solicit the kind hearing of this House, with some observations on the relative importance of internal and external trade relations. Whilst I fully appreciate the importance of extended foreign trade relations, and recognize that it is the duty of this Parliament to do all it can to extend them, I cannot refrain from noticing that in the discussion of the subject, either in this House, in the press or on the public platform, many speakers and writers are apt to lose sight of the paramount importance of internal trade compared with foreign commerce. If we were to judge the opinions of some of them by their utterances, we should be almost driven to the conclusion that they admit of no other criterion of the country's prosperity than the more or less rapid increase of its external trade. With due respect to their way of thinking, with due regard to the weight of their opinion, I cannot help saying that I consider such a one-sided view of so complicated a question as entirely erroneous. True it is, that especially since the beginning of this century, the foreign commerce of the nations of the world has very much increased. The cause is not far to seek nor difficult to find. This happy result, which contributed so much to the progress, the comfort and the intellectual and moral advancement of humanity, is the natural outcome of the marvellous development of the means of production, and the consequent increase of the consuming power, and also of the wonderful development of transportation facilities. But if external trade has so much increased, on the other hand internal trade has wondrously developed under the powerful influence of the same beneficial causes. In my humble opinion, we would be taking a wrong view of the question if we were to neglect our duty to internal trade, and devote all our care and attention to external trade. The public good demands from us an equally intelligent effort to foster the two great classes of commercial intercourse, and not the short-sighted policy of sacrificing the former to the latter. Statistical science has progressed a great deal of late. Man's mind is apt to get enthusiastic at the sight of big figures, telling the story of the development of the foreign trade of the nation, and one so carried away is liable to forget the still more interesting and important increase of commercial intercourse among the various parts of his own country. A few cases in point will not be out of place. When we read, for instance, of the external trade of the United States and ascertain that the great republic to the south of us exports nearly $1000,000,000 worth of its products annually, we are somewhat appalled at the hugeness of these figures, but our ideas of the foreign commerce of our neighbours become sobered somewhat when we reflect that it is small indeed compared with the volume of internal trade. While the export and import trade combined of the United States amounts to about $1,700,000,000 in round figures, the internal trade of the republic represents at least $40,000,000,000, or more than twenty times as much. The same thing can be told of the other leading nations of the world—of France, of Russia, of Germany, of Austria, and of Italy. The country where the disproportion of external trade to internal trade is less marked is England, and this for obvious reasons. England is a great hive of industry, and will continue to be in spite of the foreign competition getting keener every day. It manufactures for all the world, and has developed an external trade much larger than any country of the globe. In 1890, its foreign trade amounted to $3,725,000,000 or $100 for every head of the population, while the United States have only a foreign trade equal to $27 per head. Thus the foreign trade of England, compared with that of the United States, is nearly four times as large. If we return to Canada, our foreign trade represents an average of $220,000,000 per year. This, for a population of 5,000,000, gives $42 per head, which is fifty per cent more than the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite are continually discussing the question of our trade relations, with the view of increasing our trade with the United States. They point to the marvellous growth of the United States, but when they speak of the external trade of the United States as compared with that of Canada, we have the means of answering them by showing that our foreign trade is nearly fifty per cent larger per head than that of the United States. Such a large foreign trade for Canada with a population of 5,000,000 is a pretty satisfactory figure, but when we come to our internal commercial intercourse, we find that it is at least fifteen times greater than

our foreign trade, showing the great importance of our internal trade. I need not enlarge further on the relative importance of the two great classes of commercial intercourse, because the history of Canada for the last fifty years conclusively proves that the people of our country and their representatives in Parliament have duly appreciated the great national importance of developing our internal trade. Hence our railway policy, the improvement of our inland navigation, the protection given to our manufacturing, mining and agricultural interests. But, Mr. Speaker, admitting that it is the first duty of Parliament to do all it can for the development of internal trade relations, of course I fully appreciate also the importance of external trade, and the necessity of doing our best to increase our trade relations with as many as possible of the nations of the world. I need not go into a historical sketch of our efforts to develop our foreign trade. Those efforts have been mainly directed towards the United States as well as towards England. The result of our overtures to the United States is well known. I am only repeating what is known to every member of this House and every citizen of this country, when I say that it is no fault of ours if our trade relations with the United States are in the position they now occupy. We have been fairly doing all that a nation, with due respect to itself, can do, to induce a foreign power to improve commercial intercourse. We have done our share. Unfortunately, we have not met with a hearty response from our neighbours to the south of us. They have their own reasons for it. I am not one of those who believe that the United States, or the authorities of the United States for the time being, have taken this course of action merely for the purpose of injuring Canada. They have their own internal policy. They have their own way of looking at their interest, and still I believe and hope that, with deliberate consideration, with time, when the question has been more fully discussed over there and public opinion has matured, the day will yet come when we will be in a position to obtain a fair measure of reciprocity with the United States. Fortunately, now we know under what conditions the United States would be likely to entertain the proposal of the scheme submitted to this House and to the country by hon. gentlemen opposite, and, unfortunately, the knowledge of these conditions is such that, in honour bound to our own country, we cannot accept them. The three great objections to extended trade relations with the United States according to the system of hon. gentlemen opposite, unrestricted reciprocity, I will repeat though they are now well known. They are discrimination against England, a common sea-board tariff, and the consequence for us of taxing directly our population to raise the revenue necessary to carry on the Government of the country. As to the first point, discrimination against England we cannot grant. Moreover, it depends also on the supreme and paramount authority of the British Empire, of the Crown, of the Imperial Parliament, and, even if some amongst us were tempted to grant this condition to the United States, they would meet this great obstacle from the Imperial Parliament, which would naturally lead them to ask either for separation from England, or to abandon this wild scheme forever. But I will go as far as this, that, even if England would agree to discrimination against herself, Canada could not agree to a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity which would impose upon us a common sea-board tariff and direct taxation. These two conditions depend only on ourselves, and these two conditions we cannot for any consideration in the world accept. Whilst we are in such a position in regard to our trade relations with the United States, and waiting for the time which I hope will come, perhaps sooner than hon. gentlemen opposite would like it to come, we are not to stand still, and it is our duty to do our best for the extension of our foreign trade with the other nations of the earth. We must not look only to this pretended natural market of the United States, as if Canada was not able to trade with any other nations of the world. We have already a trade with other nations, with France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, the West Indies, and we are developing a foreign trade which is increasing every year. Our best efforts must be directed in this way, but of course the greatest market for Canada is, has been, and will be in the future, the market of England. It is in this market, it is with Great Britain that we can expect to greatly develop our foreign trade. Last year we had an external trade with England to the extent of $91,328,384. The rapidly-increasing consuming power of Great Britain is a guarantee to us that we can find in this market an increasing opening for the products of this country. We know very well that the population of Great Britain as a whole is increasing rapidly. It has more than doubled since the beginning of this century, when it started, if my memory serves me well, with about 16,000,000 people in the three kingdoms, and that population amounted in 1891 to about 38,000,000 people. The increase is rapid, but of course Great Britain cannot expect to increase its agricultural products to a similar extent. It is rather decreasing in that respect, as was proved a little while ago by my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill). The quantity of agricultural products required by Great Britain will be rapidly increasing, and we may expect by the development of our great North-West to be able to supply the larger quantity of the needs of this great market. I admit the difficulties which are in the way. The hon. mover of the resolution and myself cannot expect this question to be settled at once. I know very well the objection of the British people generally to the taxation of food products. I have read a great deal about the agitation in reference to the corn laws, but a great change has taken place since. The means of transport have been very much improved. Great wheat areas have been brought under cultivation and more are, in a few years, to be brought under cultivation. For my part, I have no doubt that very soon the British market could be supplied with all the food products it requires from within the British Empire itself without increasing the cost to the British consumer. I base this opinion on the knowledge, I may say, of every one of the capabilities of our North-West. But, whatever may be our different opinions on this point, I think all must agree that it is very important to let Great Britain know what are the views of this Parliament on the subject, and that is one of the reasons that induced me to second the motion, and to join with my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) in asking this House to vote for this proposition.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was remarking that whatever may be our different views on the question of trade with England, and of the preferential advantages which the mother country could grant to her colonies, at all events, there is certainly no inconvenience, and there may be a great deal of good, in letting Great Britain know the feeling of this House and the country on this question. I know the several objections which our friends opposite are likely to make to the proposition, and which we have often heard from them. Their principal objection is this: That it is no use to seek markets so far away when we have the greatest market at our doors, the United States. On this point, they often speak to us of what they call continental free trade, and they say that our first object, indeed our only object, ought to be to cultivate trade with the countries of this continent. Well, Sir, I look at this as a very erroneous idea, and, for my part, I sincerely and earnestly believe it would be a very bad policy indeed to place one continent in perpetual commercial antagonism to another. This is contrary to the history of the whole world from beginning to end. Just as nations have always tried to increase their commercial intercourse with one another, the history of the world has continuously shown that the different continents have tried to develop commercial relations between them. This was the case between Europe, Asia and Africa, before the discovery of this continent. Sir, when bold navigators for the first time went on the open sea, and for the first time braved the fury of the ocean waves, were they not looking out for increased commerce between Europe, Asia and Africa? And when Columbus started on his momentous expedition, was he not in search of a short passage to Japan and China for the purpose of fostering trade between the eastern and western continents of the old world? When he came across the seas to the new land of America, which was then the insuperable barrier to his enthusiastic hope of navigating the ocean over to the Chinese Empire—which is now accomplished by the Canadian Pacific Railway across this continent—Columbus little expected that the time would come when American public men would maintain the astounding proposition that it would be conducive to the world's prosperity and peace to place one continent in a position of commercial hostility to the other. It is not after this progressive nineteenth century has seen the building of the Suez Canal, the oceans traversed by gigantic steamers exchanging the natural and manufactured products of the different nations of the world, after railways are leading civilization into unknown wildernesses, that continents can be led to adopt such a wild proposition. Sir, it is not after we have, at great cost, established a magnificent highway through our country, not only for the purpose of our internal development, but also for the purpose of providing Europe and Asia with easier, cheaper and more rapid means of commercial intercourse—the real north-west passage which was long but vainly sought for by daring explorers, and at last given to the world by the political foresight of our statesmen and the manly courage of our free people—it is not, I say, after this wonderful achievement that we can accept the erroneous idea of placing the whole continent in a position of perpetual commercial antagonism and rivalry with the rest of the world. Such a policy would be retracing our steps, and trying, almost, to go back to the times when the new world was unknown. It is a dangerous utopia to believe that you can isolate one continent from another: even if you try to do it you can never succeed. The forces of nature are constantly at work against such a preposterous scheme. Steam and electricity have overcome distance, have conquered the fury of the ocean waves, and have given us facilities of marine and inland transportation which are daily drawing the different parts of the world together. Oceans no longer divide continents but rather unite them. By the developements which have taken place on the continent of America during the last century, we can form an idea of what the future ought to be. But when I hear this talk about continental trade as opposed to commercial relations with the continent of Europe, and when I remember that the two continents of America, just as they are now, have already a total trade with the continents of the old world of over two milliards of dollars, I wonder how hon. gentlemen opposite can maintain to this House such a proposition as that. However, the question of the extension of our foreign trade will, of course, continue to call for the very serious consideration of this House and country. The hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends have once more favoured us lately with their matured thoughts on the subject. They have two principal aspirations: the first, in their opinion, is of great practical importance; the second is a more or less remote possibility. They claim that the time has arrived when we should be allowed by England to negotiate our commercial treaties entirely free from any kind of control by the Imperial Parliament. By taking this important step in the direction of complete political liberty, they aspire to national independence. These aspirations the leader of the Opposition has openly avowed on the floor of this House, and on the public platform, in eloquent and enthusiastic words. Sir, with regard to the power of negotiating treaties, I need not on this occasion dwell on the very good reasons which must induce us not to press for that claim. Although I will have just now, from a certain point of view, to congratulate the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) upon his advanced ideas in reference to the very enlarged measure of self-government which he would so much like Canada to obtain, he will no doubt kindly allow me to call his cordial attention to the fact that very often the philosopher is ahead of his times. In the daily activity of his mind, in the large sphere of his thoughts, he is very properly allowed this latitude of action, men of the times being all the while thankful to him for the light he may throw on the future. If such, however, is the part of the philosopher, such is not the rôle of the statesman. Of course the statesman is also bound to look to the future, but he must prepare it by practical statesmanship during the present. Though the hon. leader of the Opposition aspires to national independence, he will not pretend that this question is within the range of practical politics. If I pause to notice these views of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is for the very plesant reason that they are at last obliged to couple the ex-

pression of their aspirations with that of their matured opinion, that we have attained to such a wonderful degree of progress that we are fit for national independence. We know the feeling of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He deplores that in this country after 25 years of trial of the system of federation, that, on going around the country, while he hears a great deal of pride of race and creed, yet he sees or hears very little of pride of nationality, I will join issue with the hon. gentleman on this point as on many others. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what has been said by the hon. gentleman, that, for the last 25 years, and particularly for the last 14 years, since the return of the Conservative party to power, there has been rapidly developing in this country that pride of nationality which the hon. leader of the Opposition, for the first time in his life, perhaps, was kind enough to tell us, the other day, he was longing for. I also join issue with the hon. gentleman on another point. I do not deplore the pride of race and creed in the Dominion of Canada, but what I do deplore is the fanaticism and prejudices of race and creed, and they are two very different feelings. Providence has so decided that on this free soil of Canada different creeds and nationalities are to live together in happiness, and in contentment to work out their great destiny. For my part, I believe that the English Canadian, the Irish Canadian, the Scotch Canadian and the French Canadian can properly cherish and revere the noble and patriotic deeds of the nations from which they sprung, and, at the same time, be not the less devoted nor the less loyal to the land of their birth or of their adoption, for whose prosperity, grandeur and honour it is their sacred duty to work and to battle. But, Mr. Speaker, if we have to deplore that perhaps there lingers around the country too much of national fanaticism and sectional prejudices, are we not fairly entitled to say that hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for this deplorable state of things? Have not their efforts for the last 25 years tended to create and to stimulate this fanaticism and these sectional prejudices against Confederation? The hon. the leader of the Opposition went a little further. He has been given of late to lofty aspirations, and he no longer finds that colonial citizenship is sufficient for him, or that it ought to be sufficient for the people of this country. He aspires to national independence. We, on this side of the House, have been battling for the last 20 years, and especially for the last few years against the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is certainly very pleasant to hear, after these years of denials, and of lamentation on the ruinous state of the country, that these gentlemen are now obliged to proclaim that Canada has so much progressed and developed that the world is to prepare to welcome into the society of nations a new born independent people with all the promises of strength, of activity, and of intelligence. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know by what miracle the hon. members for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) and for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) have suddenly arisen from the slough of despond to this unflinching enthusiasm which they exhibit. I would ask why is it that looking with hope and fondness at the bright political horizon of Canada, the hon. leader of the Opposition is able to behold with enthusiasm the dawn of our national independence. Sir, it is because for the last 30 years the world has witnessed the untiring efforts of our free people to work out the designs of Providence in this grand land allotted to them for their inheritance. It is because we have realized this great union of the provinces stretching from ocean to ocean, and embracing half a continent full of resources and populated by a people full of confidence in the future. It is because we have bound the different provinces more closely together by a vast network of railways, by improved inland navigation, by increased intellectual intercourse, by developed friendship, by reciprocal fair-play and respect for race and creed. And it is also because we have given the grand example to the world of a generous, high-minded and liberal practice of religious, civil and political liberty. It seems to me that through the dawn of this rising sun of independence, as perceived by hon. gentlemen opposite, we all can admire with a very legitimate pride that the wave of fanaticism and sectional prejudices is rapidly receding before the advance of progress, leaving in full view all over the length and breath of this wide Dominion the landmarks of our past noble work, and the unmistakable evidence of our future national greatness. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I voice the sentiment of the large majority of the people of this country when I express my earnest belief that it is not advisable to modify in any such way our present political status. But whatever changes may be reserved for us in the future, I hope that, whether as one of the brightest gems of the British Empire, or as a powerful ally, Canada will forever be the devoted, the loyal, the grateful offspring of the great, the glorious, the dear old mother country.

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of making any extended or protracted remarks on the question now under the consideration of the House; but before a question of such great importance—exceeding in importance, I think, any that has come before this Parliament during its present session—is disposed of, I would like briefly to place on record my views concerning it. In the first place, I think it only proper and right that I should extend my congratulations to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) who introduced this resolution to the House, for I believe he is entitled to the congratulations and the thanks of the House for having brought before us a subject which has, or at least ought to have, lifted the House for a time out of the rut of party discussion into which it is too apt to fall; and I think he is deserving of our congratulations, also, for having introduced it in so able and well considered a speech as he has made. I would also like to express the surprise that I have felt at not hearing the hon. leader of the Opposition or any of the hon. gentlemen prominent on the other side of the House, express their views on this question. In a matter of such great importance, a matter of policy, one would naturally have expected to hear the views of the eloquent and honourable leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of the Government.

Mr. HAZEN. No doubt we will hear from the leader of the Government later on. I would also have expected that the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches would not have let the discussion of this question be taken up wholly by speaker after speaker on this side of the House, but that they

themselves would have taken part in it and have given us their views either as individuals or as an Opposition. However, on this occasion hon. gentlemen opposite have seen fit to pursue the policy of silence. There is an old proverb to the effect that speech is silver and silence is golden. Probably it is to follow out the truth of this proverb that hon. gentlemen opposite sit still and mute. That is not the course usually pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is not the course pursued by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), or by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), or by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) or by many other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, who generally give us their views on all public questions whether they are great or small. I would naturally have expected, above all things, that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who a few evenings ago entertained this House with a most classical and academic essay of the question of our treaty rights, would not have been backward in giving us the benefit of his experience and advice on this question, which is of far greater importance. We are bound to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen occupying benches to your left have come to the conclusion that it is not advisable at the present time to make their views known to the country on a matter of this importance, but that it is more prudent to wait and see how the proposition is received by the public, before they define their position upon it. Now, the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for North Bruce, is one to which I think, from a Canadian standpoint, very little if any exception can be taken. That resolution is to the effect:

"That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods."

Looking at it from the purely Canadian standpoint it appears to me that this is a proposition to which no man in Canada, I care not what his party leaning may be, can offer any serious objection; and I think it will be generally admitted in this country that it would be an advantage to the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen and the miners of Canada if we were able to send our products to Great Britain, obtaining for them there an advantage of say 10 per cent against the products of foreign countries, while we gave Great Britain a corresponding advantage of 10 per cent over the United States and other foreign countries in the manufactured goods she sent to us. Any hon. gentleman who has paid any attention to the matter knows that Great Britain affords a market for everything that Canada can produce. From a British standpoint the objection offered to this proposition may be urged that the doctrine of free trade has become such an integral part of political institutions of Great Britain, amounting to a tenet of the political religion, if I may use the term, of its people, that they would not listen to any proposition which would involve a tax on the breadstuffs or any of the food products which they consume, even if it were for the purpose of drawing the colonies and the mother country more closely together, and even if the effect of such action would be to give the manufactured goods of Great Britain an advantage in the markets of Canada and the other portions of the Empire over those of foreign countries. That might be said from the English standpoint, and it might be said with a great deal of force, because we all know that the policy of free trade is strongly entrenched in the hearts of the British public irrespective of party. Yet, any hon. gentleman who has followed the course of politics in Great Britain for a few years past must have observed that the fair trade movement has recently made great progress, and that where it was received a few years ago with ridicule, it has to-day got beyond that stage, and is receiving the serious attention of public men on that side of the water; and judging from the progress in the past and from the fact that to-day in Sheffield and other manufacturing centres in England, protectionists, or rather fair traders, are elected to Parliament, there is no telling how soon this question may become, if it has not already become, a practical question in the politics of Great Britain and the colonies. When Great Britain adopted her free trade policy it was generally believed by the leaders of that movement that all the civilized countries of the world which follow her lead, and that very soon free trade would exist all the world over; but the expectations of the statesmen of that day as to the course of events have been disappointed, because we find that with that one exception every country in Europe is to-day a protective country, and the United States, which is the greatest competitor of Great Britain in manufactured goods, has to-day the highest protective tariff which the world has ever seen. So in that respect it has been disappointing. It is well known to-day that in the manufacturing centres of Great Britain the shoe is beginning to pinch, that they find British capital is being sent to the United States and used there, under a protective tariff, to build up the industries of that country, and that the products of those highly protected industries are being sent across the water to compete with the fruits of the labour of the British workman and artizan. So that while the question to-day is perhaps not a burning one in Great Britain, the signs point to the fact that the time is coming when it will be seriously considered, more seriously than it is to-day, and certainly the period has passed when it was greeted with ridicule. The signs are that it will shortly become an important question in actual and practical politics both in Great Britain and her colonies. Coming back to Canada, it seems to me there is no Canadian, no matter what his party feeling may be, who will not say that such an arrangement, giving Canada, Australia and the other colonies the advantage of say 10 per cent against other countries in the markets of Great Britain would be of inestimable value to the miners, the lumbermen, and the farmers in the Dominion. Now, the answer which may be made, I do not say by hon. gentlemen opposite, because I do not know that they disagree with this resolution——

Mr. LAURIER. By members of the Government.

Mr. HAZEN—I would say, by any hon. gentleman who does not agree with the resolution, the argument which might be made would be that it is injudicious and unnecessary for us to try and build up a trade with Great Britain by means of preferential duties, but that it would be more to our

advantage to turn our attention to the markets of the United States and try and get free admission of our goods there. That is the position which might be taken with a certain degree of fairness, and I may say, as I have always said, that I am one of those who believe it would be, to a considerable extent, to the advantage of Canada, could we make a treaty upon fair and equitable terms with the people of the United States, provided we could do so without sacrificing national honour or imperilling in any way British connection. Now, I think at present it is useless to talk of getting a market with the United States. We have the statement which has been made this session by the Finance Minister of the results of the negotiations at Washington. That statement which has never been contradicted from Washington—and no doubt telegrams have passed between here and Washington on the subject, yet there is not a word to show that the statement is not literally and absolutely correct—that statement is, that in the negotiations with the Cabinet at Washington conducted by Mr. Blaine, the Secretaay of State, he declared, as the mouth-piece of the American Cabinet, that the United States would never consent to reciprocity with Canada on any other terms than that the United States should have preference in the markets of Canada over the producers and manufacturers of Great Britain. That is, that reciprocity with the United States can only be obtained upon terms involving discrimination against Great Britain in the markets of Canada, involving practically the assimilation of the Canadian tariff to the American tariff and the assimilation of our inland revenue duties to theirs. That is the position in which the question of reciprocity with the United States stands to-day; and being in that position, I do not think there is a loyal Canadian who would say he wants reciprocity upon terms which would destroy our present political status and our connection with the British Crown. If there is any sentiment strong in this country, it is that in favour of the maintenance of British connection. I believe that is the strongest sentiment which animates the people of Canada to-day, and the people of Canada are not willing to put themselves on record as saying, or offering to say, that the times are so bad, that their circumstances are so straitened, that they are willing to accept reciprocity with the United States on the condition of discrimination against Great Britain, sacrificing what revenue they have from the customs, and imposing on themselves direct taxation. It is true, hon. gentlemen who argue in favour of reciprocity take the ground that we can have it without discriminating against Great Britain and without imperilling in any way our British connection. The leader of the Opposition in this House has always taken that view. When he went down to Boston after last session and was feted and dined there by an organization in that city, he expressed that view. I have no doubt that generous hospitality was afforded the hon. gentleman such as is always afforded by the good people of Boston to their guests, and I have no doubt that the people of that city were pleased with the visit of the hon. gentleman and the remarks he made. But the remarks he made, if we can judge by the press of Boston, did not impress the people of that city as he would have liked to have them impressed, because I find the Boston *Journal*, a leading organ of public opinion there, the day after the hon. gentleman made his speech in which he said that the United States are our natural market, and, with a very considerable disregard of the geography of the country, said that our rivers ran into the United States and theirs into our country—the day after I find the Boston *Journal*, discussing that speech, said:

"IT MEANS ANNEXATION.

"(*Boston Journal.*)

"Sir Wilfred Laurier in his speech in this city Tuesday evening protested with much vehemence that there is no necessary connection between reciprocity and annexation. Sir Wilfred, no doubt, sincerely believes that the commercial union of the United States and Canada would have no political consequences. His opinion in this respect is flatly opposed to the sentiments that are entertained on this side of the border. It seems to us that the American view of the question is the right one, and that our distinguished visitor is the wrong.

"In the beginning, it must be admitted that there can be no reciprocity with Canada until an agreement is reached to maintain a joint tariff against Europe. This is a proposition that is substantially undisputed, and it means that Canada's tariff must be assimilated to that of the United States. For under reciprocity the two countries would be, for all commercial purposes, one country, and the maintenance of two rates of duty on any given article would be the cause of endless loss and confusion. It might not be that Canada's tariff would be dictated from Washington, but Washington would certainly have the prepondering vote.

"How would England regard the spectacle of her most important colony heavily taxing British manufactured products, while admitting the competing products of her bitterest rival free? Such a situation would inevitably lead to a still further estrangement between London and Ottawa. Meanwhile, if the fruits of reciprocity were realized, the American and Canadian people would find themselves drawn into closer and closer social and political sympathy through the instrumentalities of increasing commerce. Under all these circumstances, it would be a marvel if the unnatural political connection between Canada and England could endure a single year.

"The questions of commercial union and political union with Canada are not two distinct, separate questions. They cannot be disassociated in the minds of statesmen and in the minds of the people. Reciprocity with Canada is a very different thing from reciprocity with the Latin American nations. The latter policy contemplates only the free interchange of a comparatively small number of products—of articles as a rule which only one of the two contracting parties produces in sufficient quantities for home consumption. But the products of Canada and the United States are largely identical, and the argument for a free interchange rests on a totally different basis from the argument for reciprocity with Latin America. Reciprocity as applied to Canada is a misnomer. Commercial union is a better term. And we must face the fact that, with Canada, political union must inevitably follow, if it does not precede, commercial union. No boding of any such result from reciprocity with Brazil or Venezuela or Mexico."

Now, I say it is evident the leader of the Opposition, though no doubt he charmed and interested his Boston audience, failed to convince them that it was amongst the possibilities that we could have reciprocity with the United States without discriminating in the markets of Canada against the British producer and the British manufacturer. And I would say, with all deliberation, that I believe there are very few people in Canada, though they would regard a fair measure of reciprocity with favour, who would look with favour upon a treaty, the result of which inevitably must be, from the logic of facts, and the statement of Mr. Blaine, to discriminate against the mother country and cause us a great loss of revenue, which can only be made up by direct taxation and which would eventually lead to the change of our political status, because, as the Boston *Journal of Commerce* says, it would be incredible that, under such

an unnatural political system, our present relations with Great Britain could continue for a single year. Now, touching the question of reciprocity, I have always been of the opinion that a fair reciprocity treaty along the lines of the old treaty would be of advantage to some extent to the Dominion of Canada, but it is not the right thing for us in this country to have it go forth to the world or among our own people that it is impossible for us to make our way and be prosperous within ourselves without having the advantage of the market of the United States. We all know that, when the McKinley Bill was passed by the statesmen of the adjacent Republic, there was a general fear that there would be something very much akin to a commercial crisis in Canada. We know how public speakers on both sides of politics as well as the public press said it would strike a deadly blow to the interests of the farmers and producers of Canada; but, notwithstanding the passage of that Bill, which has been in operation for about two years, we find that during the present year, far from trade languishing and our exports falling off, for the first ten months of this year, our exports exceeded those of the previous year by nearly $11,000,000, and the estimate of the Finance Minister is that for the full year ending the 30th June next, they will exceed them by about $14,000,000, and that despite the fact that the McKinley Bill has been in operation during that time, and the fear was so generally felt that, in consequence of that measure, there would be no market for our agricultural produce. In the position in which reciprocity is to-day, it seems to me to be the duty of members on both sides of the House, irrespective of party, to turn their attention to seeing what can be done by our statesmen; what markets can be opened up so that we may get a better market for our produce in Great Britain, and I believe this resolution, if carried, would give a boom to the agricultural interests as well as to the other interests in this country, and that we could find a market for almost everything we produce in Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always put forward the statement that the United States is the natural market of the Dominion of Canada, and that it would be an untold blessing for the people of Canada to have a market of 65,000,000 people. I believe the term "natural" in this connection is a misnomer. Markets are not the result of nature, but the result of the business carried on by men, and, when we talk of the benefits to accrue to us from the markets of 65,000,000 people, we must remember that we would only have the benefit of a very small portion of the 65,000,000 as consumers, because a great majority live in the south and west, and the only people we would have to sell our produce to are those of the New England States and the states along the Atlantic seaboard. While that would be no doubt an advantage some years in regard to the sale of our potatoes and our horses, I do not believe it would be the great blessing to the agricultural interest that some gentlemen anticipate, because I do not see that the increased market would improve the value of the farm lands in Canada when we find that in the State of New York the value of farm property has decreased 33 per cent in the last ten years, and the exodus from the farm lands in New York has been so alarming that the governor of the state called attention to it in 1890, and the state assessors refer to the decrease in the value of those lands in their report. Therefore, while I believe there would be an advantage in our having a free market in the United States, I do not believe it would have the result of increasing the value of our farm lands to the extent which has been supposed. We send to England the largest portion of our lumber. That is the market for our cattle. In the United States there is practically no market for our cattle, and if the duty were taken off beef, we would have Chicago beef brought into Canada and competing with our farmers. Our beef goes to England. England is the market for the apples of Nova Scotia and for the cheese of Ontario. There is no market in the United States for our cheese, and while the United States produce every year enough agricultural produce for their own people, and are able besides to export millions of dollars' worth, on the other hand Great Britain imports hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of agricultural produce every year, I ask any reasonable man if the latter is not the natural market rather than the former? The United States produces more agricultural produce *per capita* than any other country. Sending our goods to the United States is like sending goods to a middleman, because we send the produce to them, and they send their produce out of the country to the extent of millions of dollars a year. Looking at the question from this standpoint, it seems to me to be our duty, reciprocity being at present out of the question except upon terms that I do not believe any loyal Canadian would accept, to devise some other means by which our exports will be increased, and we will get a market for our produce. By this resolution I believe we are taking a practical step in that direction, and, therefore, it has my hearty support; and, as no one has risen to speak against the resolution, I suppose we may take it for granted that it has the unanimous support of the whole chamber. Something has been said in this House at different times to the effect that our alliance with Great Britain is little more than a sentiment. To some extent that may be true, but, while this might be an advantage to us in a material point, I think, further, it would appeal to the sentimental side of the people of Canada as well as to their practical and material side, because I do not believe there is any sentiment in the minds of the people stronger than the sentiment that exists in favour of British connection. As I said a little while ago in this debate, I do not believe there is any principle which is so strong in this country to-day as the sentiment in favour of British connection. I do not believe that any party or any politician in this country can hope for success who ignores that sentiment and is willing to hand over our destinies to a foreign, and, I believe, in many respects, a hostile country; because, while the McKinley Bill was framed as a general measure of protection for the United States industries, it was, in some respects, framed as a hostile tariff against the Dominion of Canada, else the duties would not have been placed as they were upon hay, upon eggs, upon berries and upon lime, which articles go into the United States from Canada alone. I believe that in imposing that tariff their idea was that it would strike a deadly blow at the interests of the Canadian people, and

would force us into such commercial relations with them as would imperil our political status. But, Sir, that is not the sentiment, I take it, of the people of this country, that is not the kind of stuff the people of this country are made of. They are not going to be forced into any alliance that they do not like. As our late chieftain said in his manifesto on the eve of the last election, this country has existed for hundreds of years under the protecting ægis of the British Crown. The people of Ontario and the people of the Maritime Provinces are descended from men who, a hundred years ago, left their happy homes in the New England States, and all that the world holds dear, and came to New Brunswick and Ontario, then little more than a wilderness, for the sake of the principles which they held dear, for the sake of their loyalty to British connection and institutions; I say the descendants of those men in Canada to-day are not prepared to admit that their ancestors made a mistake at that time, and that they will be less true in their allegiance to British institutions and to the mother country, than were their forefathers who made such great sacrifices over a century ago.

Mr. SKINNER. Before this question is put to the House I wish to express my views upon it. I am very glad it has been introduced, because I believe that in a very few years this question, and those that are related to it, will be among the most vital questions that will be considered in the Parliament of this Dominion. All persons, no matter whether they agree with this resolution or differ from it, must be of opinion that our colonial existence is not a permanent one. The time of colonial life is a time of growth, a time of preparation for national existence in some form or another. There have been throughout history no people who have always been contented with colonial life, and there never will be in the future. Our people aspire to national existence, as all great peoples do. I recognize that aspiration as among the most lofty of the Canadian people from one part of the country to the other; but I do not, therefore, think it is at all necessary that we should look forward to a national life distinct from that of the great Empire to which we belong. I believe our national aspirations can be better realized by maintaining a connection with the Empire rather than by a severance from it. While that may be correct, still Canada must some time or other consider what her future status is going to be. Shall we continue as we are, a part of the Empire, although we are no longer a mere colony? Shall we join the United States, or shall we become independent? The hon. gentlemen who are opposing the Government at the present time, seem, so far as we can gather from their speeches and from their press, of the opinion that we should at once strive for independence without settling any of the other questions at all. My view is that, first of all, we should see whether we are not in a position to form a closer connection with the Empire before we consider the other question. A little over a hundred years ago, when the colonies, now the United States of America, were considering their status in the British Empire, Franklin, on behalf of the colonies, proposed to the British Government that they should be admitted into closer relations with the mother country, with representation in the Imperial Parliament. The British Government of that day would not listen to the proposition, and the result was separation. If the idea of Franklin had been embraced by the Government of the Empire, the British flag would to-day float from the borders of Mexico to the Hudson Bay and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean; because the people of the colonies turned away from their mother country at that time with a great deal of reluctance. I say now that in view of the changes that have come to pass in Canadian life, we should first propose to the Empire, before we take another step, that they consider what they will do with us, and what we will do with them. Now, this resolution does not deal with the question of reciprocity, it does not touch the question of free trade, so to speak, between us and the mother country, but it takes a broader sweep than any of these questions indicate. By this resolution we ask the mother country, in effect: What do you think of the proposition that we should draw closer together in our trade relations? A few moments ago some hon. gentleman opposite sang out: We have that now. Yes, we have free trade with Great Britain now in almost every article we choose to send there. While that is true, it does not meet the proposition of this resolution. We want to say to Great Britain: What are you going to do with reference to the commercial relations between these two countries? By this resolution we declare in effect to Great Britain, that Canada cannot always exist as a colony, but higher questions are arising, and we want to know what you are going to do about it. Hon. gentlemen who oppose this movement say it is no use to do that, Great Britain will not even consider the proposition, Great Britain will never become a protective country. Well, we will find out what Great Britain will say. Great Britain has never yet been asked, her public men have never yet been called upon seriously to consider the question. Since every other empire that has adorned or affected civilization has passed away, hon. gentlemen who oppose us on this movement say this Empire also must pass away, that it must disintegrate as other countries have done, that Canada must go away, that Australia must leave her mother land, that the West Indian colonies must fall into the United States, and this great Empire must become a thing of the past. Well, so far as Canada is concerned we are going to attempt at all events to do something else. For ten years this country has been growing up to the idea of British connection, and of establishing a nation here in connection with the Empire. Our people have made great sacrifices to this end, and it was thought by the Americans when they did away with the last reciprocity treaty, that Canada could not succeed, but since the repeal of that treaty Canada has succeeded as she never did before; she has grown in a manner that no one could expect, and she has, so to speak, become a young nation and is now developing a commerce that is astonishing to all who are called upon to consider the question and who look upon it from a national or historic point of view. Suppose that the United States should erect a barrier so high and so strong that we could not buy from them nor sell to them, and that there should be no trade at all between the two countries, Canada would even then succeed. Canada will not be beaten down, but will progress, as she has progressed in the past, and in

the measure which the energies of her people wish her to progress. We are going by this resolution to say to Great Britain that we are considering this question, that we want them to consider it also, and I believe that the people of Great Britain will be glad of the occasion to do so. The people of England have always been willing to listen to the claims of the people of her colonies in the past, and why not with reference to this present question. I could go on to show if it were necessary, that suppose they did put 10 per cent on all foreign imports such as might be produced in Canada, the people of Great Britain would not have to pay any more duties upon it. It is probably not necessary that I should argue in this direction. Let us take a few articles as illustration. The colonies can produce all the wool Great Britain require, the colonies can produce, or soon will be able to produce, all the wheat and nearly all the lumber that she may require, and, therefore, it is, that if we are able within ourselves to produce all these things, the mere duty of 10 per cent, or whatever it may be on these articles going to Great Britain from foreign countries, would have no other result in fact, except to give our own people our own markets. It would be doing for Canada as a part of the Empire what our friends on the other side of the House say would be done for us in connection with the United States, if we were commercially united with that country. We all know that so far as protective duties operate they do not necessarily raise the price of the article upon which the duty is laid. With the tariff that now protects Canadian industries, we know that cotton was never so cheap in this country as it is now, and in fact there is no country in the world in which manufactured cotton is cheaper that in Canada at the present time. The tariff has not increased the price of cotton to the Canadian people, while it has given to our country an important manufacture in which rich and poor benefit alike. The same law worked out will give the same result in regard to the whole Empire, if it could extend to the whole Empire in the manner in which I am endeavouring to show. On the other side of the House they say that Great Britain will have nothing to do with this, and that she will not in fact make any reply to our suggestions. I do not think that a newspaper always represents public opinion, but it was a very important article that was read from the London *Times* this afternoon by the hon. the mover of this resolution. We do know that in Great Britain there is a tendency of thought in reference to questions of this character that was not to be found there even ten years ago. I believe that when the public men of Great Britain come to take up the question, when the Parliament of Great Britain come to have it actually before it as to what it is going to do with this Empire, it will not stand silently by and see the Empire dismembered, but it will be prepared, if necessary, to make certain sacrifices for the purpose of sustaining the Empire. The people of the Empire have never in the past been afraid of making sacrifices. British blood and British money has been expended all over the world where the line of civilization has run, and is it to be said that even if the people had to make an economic sacrifice they would be less brave in questions of this character than they have been in the past? I believe they would not, and I am the more convinced of that for I know that this is for the purpose of perpetuating the Empire. If blood and money had to be sacrificed to found the Empire, and to maintain it thus far, are the people of Great Britain going to say in a question of this character that they would not lose a little money, if necessary, for the purpose of perpetuating the Empire? Again I notice that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to-day said across the floor that it was a very different idea when Great Britain was called upon to make an economic sacrifice, and that she would never do that. The idea of the hon. gentleman was that Great Britain was too selfish to do a thing of that kind, and that they would never tax themselves a single farthing to preserve the Empire. If it were necessary that the people of Great Britain should do so, I believe they would tax themselves, but I do not believe, on the other hand, that would be at all necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend is mistaken. When the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) was speaking my point was this: The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) was reading an article which showed that what the comment contemplated was economically disadvantageous while politically advantageous; while he was arguing very strongly that it was economically advantageous.

Mr. SKINNER. I understand that, but I understood further that although the hon. gentleman makes it clear enough that that was the meaning of the article in the London *Times*, that he is of opinion that if there was to be any economic disadvantage to the mother country, that would settle the whole question and the mother country would have nothing to do with it.

Mr, MILLS (Bothwell). I said nothing about that.

Mr. SKINNER. I know the hon. gentleman did not say so, but I am declaring from the course the hon. gentleman has pursued and from the position the hon. gentleman takes in this country--I am declaring from the expressions that the leader of the Opposition has made in this House and in the different parts of the Dominion, and from what he said in Boston as reported in the press: that he is of opinion that the time has come when the British people will never again make any sacrifice for the sustentation of the integrity and perpetuity of this Empire. I say I believe differently, but I do not think it would be necessary for anything of that kind to arise. I do not believe that the people of Great Britain would lose a cent by adopting a policy of this kind The Empire is too large, the population too extensive and the trade too vast for that. If the United States can put walls around themselves and say they can live independently, why they are only pigmies in comparison to the Great British Empire with which we are connected. If Great Britain should, so to speak, erect a tariff around the British Empire as high and as strong as that which the United States have erected around their country, we could live more independently and more prosperously than the people of the United States live under their tariff. But that is not necessary. Why, Mr. Speaker, this Empire would include every kind of country under the sun. We have the frozen country; we have the tropical country; we have grown in the Empire a portion of all the products the world is capable of produc-

ing. There is India for tea, cotton, wheat and a hundred other things; there is Ceylon for coffee and tea; there are the great colonies of Australia, New Zealand and the Dominion of Canada; there are the West Indies lying at our doors; there is Newfoundland, which has the greatest and most valuable fisheries in the world. Therefore, this Empire has within itself everything for its support, everything that its merchants need to trade in, everything for the purpose of sustaining its people. Shall it then be said that if it became necessary, we could not live within ourselves? I believe the time will come when this Empire will say, even from a place near the throne, that if the United States or the nations of Europe are going, by hostile tariffs or in any other way, to aim at the life of this Empire, or at the life of the most extreme or insignificant of its colonies, the whole force of the Empire shall be brought together, whether by economic laws or otherwise, to sustain the whole. It has been said that this question of independence is forcing itself upon the people of this country. I do not believe it. If we have independence looming up at all as a question to be considered by the people of Canada, it is because of the agitation which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have seen fit to bring about in this country. I can understand the idea of having free trade with the United States, but I cannot understand how honourable men can propose to have free trade with the United States and at the same time to discriminate against the mother country; and, as was said a little while ago, I do not believe, no matter what they may suffer, that the people of this country will ever consent to any kind of a trade treaty, or to free trade with the United States, if to secure it they have to aim a blow at the mother country and the other colonies of the Empire. The hon. gentlemen who differ from the view of this question which I am attempting to bring before you, think that because the people suffer, because we may not be able to make so much money or to become as prosperous while cut off from the trade centres of the United States, we will knock under to any proposition they may choose to make, or, in other words, that we will have free trade at any price. Never, Sir, will the people of this Dominion submit to that. We belong to a race of people who never bowed the knee to any nation or to any people and who will never submit to being put down in any other way than by the force of war; and I believe that the people of Canada will just as surely maintain their independence and integrity, and their connection with the Empire in that respect, no matter what the loss may be, no matter what we may suffer by doing so. We will work out our future, maintaining our connection with the Empire, and continuing to be Canadians whether we may be better off or not. Therefore, I say this is a practical question which we are discussing to-night. This is almost the first time, in my experience in this Parliament, that we have ventured to take the step which this resolution proposes. During the few years that I have been here, I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite always sneer whenever the question of imperial federation has been mentioned. Why they have done that I do not know. I can understand that they might say it was impracticable, that the British people would not have it, or that we had not the statesmen who could work the thing out; but why they should sneer at it I could never comprehend. It is certainly a destiny that we ought to look forward to with pride. To be a nation within the British Empire ought to be the proudest destiny that Canadian or any other portion of the British Empire could look forward to. This is a step in that direction, and it is a step that will be followed by others; and these steps will be taken not only in Canada, but in Great Britain as well; as I have said, the safety and integrity of the Empire will rise above party considerations and above every other question of any importance. I am, therefore, glad that this question has been brought up. In reading a day or two ago a despatch from Lord Knutsford in reference to some trade question, I observed that he spoke of a self-governing colony. The public men of Great Britain will have to understand, and they will soon understand, that Canada is more than a colony. Canada is a Dominion: and that denotes a step of growth in Canadian history. But we are not satisfied with that, and we are going to take another step towards nationality—towards a national life within the Empire, if the statesmen of England will have it; and if they do not, we cannot help it. If they scorn this offer and cast us off, we shall be found as independent as the United States were a hundred years ago, and we will work out our destiny after that decision has been declared. But I am not prepared to believe that the people of Great Britain and of the whole Empire will do that until they do it. The world has advanced vastly in a hundred years. The British Government will, I believe, look at matters differently from what they did a hundred years ago. It would be easier for Canada to be a part of the British Empire to-day than it was for Ireland or Wales a hundred years ago. Now treaties are made by telegraph. One ambassador is at Washington, and another with whom he is negotiating is in London; and in a moment, so to speak, the communications are flashed between them, so that the world is practically one. Electricity and steam have made possible what was impracticable a hundred years ago. Therefore, we have no right to argue from the past as to what will be done in the future. The British people will consider this question, and when this vote is passed to-night, it will have an effect I believe on the British Government. I may say this further, that while hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House keep silent, we shall be able to say to the people of Great Britain, as the result of this vote, that the Parliament of Canada are unanimous. This will be *par excellence* a case where silence will be consent. Therefore, we shall be able to quote, so to speak, in the court of the nation, that the Opposition are with us in this matter, that they have not said a word against the proposition and will not vote against it, and it will go forward as the unanimous opinion of this Parliament. I therefore anticipate, Mr. Speaker, a good deal from this resolution passing. I look forward to it as the beginning of the movement. I expect that the question will continue to be agitated, and I look forward to the time when this whole Empire will be united, and when no alien hand will attempt to haul down the flag which floats so proudly over us in the relation in which we stand.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have been much pleased with the speeches of my two hon. friends from St. John, as regards their expressions of loyalty, though they seem to me rather excessive. I believe in the unity of the Empire and in the integrity of the Empire, but I fail to see that the Empire cannot be united as well under free trade as under protection. Nothing would please me better than to see free trade among all the English-speaking races. I could understand that. If my hon. friends had made a proposition to meet the mother country on the same conditions as those on which she meets us, I could understand it. I could understand their love for Great Britain if, after Great Britain has opened her ports not only to Canada but to all countries, certainly to Canada, because there is nothing we produce that cannot go into Britain free of duty, they would move a resolution in favour of free trade. If my hon. friends would move a motion in favour of free trade with Britain, I would vote for it. But we are undertaking to legislate for too large a community The 400,000,000 people under the British Empire are more than we can manage. We have pretty hard work, as it is, to legislate for less than five millions in Canada. But our friends are so generous they want to begin to legislate for the mother country for the Empire, and they want the mother country to go back to protection, restriction of trade. They want the mother country to go back on trade matters, after they have had a thousand years experience of protection, when protection did for them what protection is doing for Canada. After long years of experience of restriction of trade, and of monopoly, England was in a condition when her people were poor, when bread riots and starvation and distress prevailed everywhere, when ships were lying at anchor with their sails flapping against the masts and rotting in the harbour, when their spindles were idle; and then they adopted free trade. I am attached to the mother country. I am loyal to the British Crown. I am a Briton, but my loyalty does not ooze out in the way the loyalty of some of our friends does. The fact is their loyalty is loyalty to the Prime Minister, to Mr. Abbott, loyalty to protected industries, and loyalty to a political party. I am loyal to the mother country for the battles she has fought out for the race. I am loyal to the mother country because she has set an example to Canada and to the wide world in everything; and I would as soon expect England to go back to African slavery as to see her go back to protection. Protection is a selfish, a weak, a sinful thing. It is legislation for the few at the expense of the many. It is legislation for a party, and it is kept up by protected industries, and Great Britain has had a sad experience of that system for hundreds and hundreds of years. They had protection and protected monopolies. There was a guild for everything. This one had the right to make vinegar, another to make hats, another to make boots and shoes, and for these privileges each paid into the treasury and the people suffered. Great Britain will never go back to that condition of things because of the experience of which she has had under it. Great Britain adopted free trade from conviction; she adopted it from her experience of the evils of protection; and I do not think that she will ever go back on it. There are some that talk fair-trade; there are some cringing spirits that want to be protected and enriched at the expense of the great mass of the people; but the time never will come when the great heart which has fought so many noble battles for the world will go back on the principle of free trade. What liberality is there in this resolution? What evidence of loyalty to Great Britain is there in this resolution? None at all. If you will discriminate in our favour, they say, we will discriminate in yours. If you will discriminate in favour of 5,000,000 of people against all the rest of the world, we will go in with you. That is the gist of this resolution. Do you suppose she is going to be blind to the interests of her people? Is Great Britain going to be blind to the interests of her nation? Is she going to tax a trade of £550,000,000 or £560,000,000 sterling with the world for £150,000,000 or £160,000,000 of trade with her colonies? I do not believe she is. And in matters of trade there is none of this sentiment. Why do we trade with Great Britain? Is it because she is the mother country? Much as we are attached to her we do not trade with her any differently from what we do with New Zealand or France or Russia or any other country. Men trade with their own people the same as they do with foreigners. They trade where they can do the best, and if I want to buy I buy where I can buy the cheapest. Do not you, Mr. Speaker? Do not you, gentlemen on the Treasury benches, do not you, gentlemen from St. John? Why, you will hunt around all over the city to find a store where you will get a pound of tea 2 cents cheaper than anywhere else. Yes, and if there were duties on it you would smuggle it after that. I want to live to see the time when the example of Great Britain will be adopted by the world, and when the world will be one universal brotherhood. That is the time when poverty will cease to be, and men will be better off than they are now with their tariff and restrictions on trade. I know that there are a good many Liberals who linger shivering on the brink on this trade question, but I do not. I am going to follow the mother country's example, the best example ever set on the trade question, and the only one, and it is that which makes her the greatest nation of the world, and I hope she will always continue to occupy that proud position. She was not the greatest nation in the world when a protected country. Look at the strides England has made within thirty or forty years since she has adopted free trade; and you need not be afraid that she will ever forsake it. The only trouble in this question is that those who have been in the habit of skinning the people do not want to lose that privilege. The people in Canada can raise their revenue without taxing trade. If you want Canada to be a rich country, let her trade freely. Let our people make money, and then there will be no difficulty in raising taxes. Of course, this may be unpopular, because the rich men feel they would have to pay more than they do now. Well, who should pay the taxes but those who have a surplus? Should the men raise part of $40,000,000 who can hardly keep soul and body together, and who work from daylight to dark, as I see them around here, at $1 a day, and have to keep their families on that? The country cannot prosper when it takes the taxes out of the poor. A few millionaires will be made, and you see a few rolling in wealth and their eyes sticking out with fatness. Why, you

talk about cotton. Cotton ought to be as cheap again as it is. There is such a surplus of cotton that they have to send it off and give it away in China and Japan. If the people in Canada had cotton cheaper, there are 200 men in this House who would have more cotton than they possess now. There are many poor people who cannot keep up their window curtains. They have to take them down in order to get them washed. There would be no surplus of anything if it were cheap enough for the people, and if you want to make it cheap to the people give them free trade and let everybody in this short life, and this wilderness of woe, get some benefit. This loyalty of our friends on the other side is of a kind that I am astonished at. I think I am pretty loyal, but I am loyal to Great Britain, not because of her aristocracy, not because of her wealth, I am loyal to her because her statesmen have been unselfish, her statesmen have been intelligent, her statesmen have been true to their convictions, her statesmen have been true to principle. When the time came that a great principle was presented to them, they presented it to the people, and carried their reforms, all the great reforms that bless mankind, or nearly all. Freedom of thought, freedom of opinion, freedom of trade, freedom of press—all these things have been fought out by the mother country. Therefore I have no idea of hurrying up to be a nation. I do not understand that sentiment. We can afford to go a little while longer before we need independence. But my friends here are very loyal. If you will discriminate in our favour, they say, we will be glad to continue a part of this great nation, and have a share in her ironclad ships, in the greatest navy in the world, and in all her prestige, if you will discriminate in favour of us and give us some advantage in trade. That is the extent of their loyalty. We will be truly loyal if you will do something for us, if you will pay for it. You want to tax the workingmen of England, and they do not pay very much because everything they eat, everything they drink and everything they wear, from the hat on their head to the shoes on their feet, they get as cheap as the world can give it to them. And is not that right? Why should any man be compelled to buy from any other man? There is none of this sentiment in trade. If any one wants to be generous, let him put his hand in his pocket and give, but there should not be and is not any friendship in trade. Trade is a natural right. It is as natural and right to buy and sell as to breathe and to eat, and this discrimination in favour of one country or another, and this system of protection is an appeal to men's selfishness and greed, and, as I have heard it called, a legalized robbery, and that is what protection is. Great Britain will never go back. If she goes back on her trade policy, there is no hope for the world, but she never will. It is that policy that makes her the greatest power in Europe and in the world. It is her principles that have done that. She would not have her navy now if she were a protected country. She would have been poor and miserable as Canada will be if it holds on to protection. We have tried protection a good while in Canada, and what has it done for us? Throw open your ports. You have tried this side of the Atlantic, and now you are going across the Atlantic. It seems the only free trade you can get on this side of the Atlantic is to the north of us. You cannot get it to the south. Canada does not want it unless it can get a partial free trade, which it cannot get. I sympathize with idea of federation if you could get it on proper principles. It would be a glorious thing if the English-speaking nations could be federated. But the world was not made for the English-speaking people. God Almighty did not make the world for them alone, but they are spreading all over the world. I would like to read to you some figures showing the advances Great Britain has made since free trade was adopted. In 1840, the foreign trade of the United Kingdom (combined exports and imports) amounted to £172,133,000, equivalent to £6 9s. 11½d per head of the population. In 1878, it amounted to £614,255,000 or £18 3s. 6d per head, a marvellous rate of increase. In the United States the proportion of foreign trade to the population is £4 13s. per head. In France, it was in 1876 £8 3s. per head. In Russia, it was in 1876, £1 9s. per head, The public revenue for the year 1840 was £51,850,000: for the year 1878, £81,598,000, and the latter sum pressed far less heavily on the people than did the former. The income tax in 1843, the first year of its incidence, yielded for every penny in the pound, £801,000. In 1878, the taxable incomes had so increased that every penny in the pound of income tax yielded £1,947,000. In order to show how the poor were benefited after free trade was inaugurated, I may make the following statement:—The consumption of tea in 1840 was 1¼ pounds, in 1878 it was nearly 5 pounds per head. Sugar, under the protective system, was 15 pounds per head, under the free trade system it was 48 pounds per head. That shows you what free trade does for the poor. And so in all these articles that were taxed, their consumption of clothing and food was just double, and instead of the people starving and suffering for the want of food and clothing, free trade enabled them to live more comfortably. Some of you, I have no doubt, were in England when free trade was introduced. I was there then, and I talked with the labouring classes in England and Ireland, and I know something about how they lived at that time. I was there when the agitation was going on for free trade, when there were little bazaars held all over England, and I went in and made my small contribution to help along free trade. I did not expect at that time, that nearly 50 years afterwards Canada would go back and adopt the odious principle of protection.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I have listened with great pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) as I always do when he rises to speak on the question of free trade. There is a charming frankness and earnestness about his utterances which are very pleasant in an age like this when we are so much accustomed to sham. I also agree with him in being proud of being a British subject, and having a right, as such, to share in the past history of England, But I do not agree with him in reference to the resolution now under consideration, as I most heartily support it, and I hope it will be well received by the Government and by this House. There is no doubt, that at the present time we are receiving, and for many years past, in fact almost from the time that Canada emerged from the nursery, if I may use the expression, we have received great benefits from our connection with the mother

country. For instance our trade interests as well as those of Great Britain and Ireland are looked after at foreign courts by a number of skilful and trained British ministers. A small army of British consuls protect our citizens and look after our commercial interests in all the principal towns and cities of the civilized and semi-civilized world; and if the moral influence of these ministers and consuls is not sufficient for the purpose, and if any power, civilized or uncivilized, wishes to impose upon us, physical force in the shape of the British army and navy is at our back, and the party trespassing on our rights knows that he has to face, not a small country of five millions or less of inhabitants, but he has to face the might of England. This, Mr. Speaker, is not a small advantage; but we must remember that in time of need, when we have found it necessary to raise large sums of money in the markets of the world, and when the scheme for which the money has been required was of such size as to alarm financiers, the mother country has come to our assistance by guaranteeing loans to enable us to raise the money for the purpose, whereas we would not have been able to get it at all, or at any rate, we would have had to pay a much higher rate for it, without this guarantee. However, we have become so accustomed to these advantages, looking on them so much as a matter of course that when we are summing up the credit and debit side of the ledger and considering the advantages and the disadvantages of our connection with England, these are considerations that we are apt to overlook, and I think we must acknowledge that at the present moment the main tie that binds us to the motherland is that of sympathy and sentiment. Now, I am aware that it is the habit of many gentlemen in this House, and outside, to laugh at sentiment as something effeminate, old fashioned, old fogyish, and out of date. But I am not at all in accord with those who hold that opinion, for I doubt if there is anything which has a stronger influence over a man's action than sentiment. Of course, I am perfectly aware that there is a kind of sentiment, so-called, that is not worthy of the name, which can only be treated with contempt: I mean that which you find in the sentimental young school girl who has been reading mawkish poetry and that sort of thing, and who goes into fits of tears, because, perhaps, the family cat has knocked over the flower pot and broken a lily from its stem. That is not the kind of sentiment I am speaking of. I mean the emotion that stirs the souls of brave men, that which makes men willing to sacrifice their money and their lives, if necessary, in defence of their homes, their country, or some great principle. That is not a feeling to be laughed at, it is not a feeling to be despised. It is a feeling which has produced most of the deeds of which we read in history with pride and exultation, and which more than anything else, more, even than ability and eloquence, shows that there is something divine in human nature, and that men are far superior to the brutes of the field. Now, sentiment is very strong in this little Canada of ours, and I think that no one can run counter to it without finding to his cost that he has made a great mistake. In my opinion, Sir, the success, the unprecedented success, which the Government candidates have met with in the recent bye-elections is principally owing to the fact that this sentiment of loyalty in Canada has become alarmed. Now, Sir, I do not wish to be misunderstood in what I am saying, I do not wish to be thought to hurl a charge of disloyalty across the House, or even to insinuate that the Reform party as a party are disloyal, for I know very well that such is not the case. I know the vast mass of the Reform party are as loyal as the Conservatives; I know they have been too well taught by the late Hon. George Brown and the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who so lately left us, and whose loss is so much deplored, not to understand fully the value of British connection, and the necessity of doing everything in their power to preserve it. But I do mean to say that there are some gentlemen in the Reform party, some gentlemen occupying prominent positions in the Reform ranks, who are supposed to be willing, at least, to coquette with the United States, in the hope of obtaining seats on the Treasury benches, and who are supposed, in fact, to look too much to our friends to the south of the line for the sign by which they shall conquer. That feeling has come thoroughly aroused in the interval which came between the end of last session and the beginning of this. For some years before the general election of 1891, several leaders of the Opposition, gentlemen of ability and eloquence, stumped the country preaching the doctrine of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. They, of course, showed only the silver side of the shield, and those who listened to them, hearing the arguments in favour of that policy only, and not having any one to answer those arguments, were, to some extent, impressed by them. When dissolution took place, and the candidates who were chosen by the different constituencies to carry the banners of the respective parties in the coming election, went to the country, the people at large, then for the first time, heard the other side of the story: they learned that all is not gold that glitters, that while this system of unrestricted reciprocity offers some advantages; it also presents very serious disadvantages; they learned that there was a question of discrimination against the goods of the mother country in favour of those of a foreign, and as some have described it, a hostile country. They learned, moreover, that an arrangement with them could only be made by sacrificing the control of our own tariff, and by handing the regulation of our fiscal policy over to the Washington Government instead of regulating it, as we do now, in Ottawa; they learned, in fact, that they would be reduced very much to the position in which the American colonies were themselves when they rebelled against the British Crown, that is to say, they would be taxed without representation. Of course the Reform party when this was mentioned by the Conservative speakers throughout the country, did not pay much attention to it. They thought this was just a little claptrap got up for the purpose of catching votes, but when after the election was over they read the letter of the former leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. Edward Blake, in which he took the view that although he was as strongly opposed as ever to the policy, and in fact, to everything else connected with the Conservative party; yet he was so utterly at variance with his own party on this question of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, that fond as he was of political life, he found it necessary to cut himself adrift from them and to retire to private life rather than support such a policy. Mr. Blake

announced in clear and unmistakable terms that the adoption of that policy could only end in one thing, and that was annexation: and he more than intimated that if we were going into annexation we had better make terms with the States at once when our hands were free, instead of waiting until we were tied hand and foot by the bonds which this commercial union would bring with it. When this letter was read there were numbers of Reformers throughout the country, particularly among the young men, who thought it was time to go slowly, who thought it was time to consider whither this policy of the Opposition would lead them. They did stop, they did think, and the consequence was that when the elections came on they were found either staying at home or recording their votes for the Conservative candidates. Now, Sir, it was not only this trade policy that caused so many of these Reformers to leave the ranks of their party, it was also the utter want of faith in their country shown by the leaders of the Opposition. It is a fact that they were tired of this blue-ruin cry, tired of hearing that we were rapidly becoming beggars, while they still felt they had some money in their pockets, and that they and their neighbours were getting better instead of worse off. They thought they would adhere to the party which was trying at all events to build up a nation, and that they would forsake the party which wished to hand it over to a foreign state. They thought they would give their allegiance to a party that tried to make Canada a great nation allied to the British Crown, instead of to the party that tried to have Canada wiped off the face of the earth, and to have her represented by five or six stars on the American flag. From what I have said Mr. Speaker, you will see that I am not inclined to underrate the strength of the sentiment which binds us to the mother country; but confirmed as I think that tie is, and strong as I think that sentiment is, I should not be sorry to see it strengthened, by another tie almost though not quite so strong, that is to say, the tie of self interest. I think that the adoption of the resolution brought before the House by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) will go very far to strengthen that tie, and to bring about a state of affairs that will show to the people of Canada that it is to their interest to maintain the connection which has so long existed between us and England. I do not think that there is any doubt that taking the Dominion as a whole it would obtain very, very great advantages, if a policy such as outlined by this motion were adopted. Speaking for my own Province of Manitoba, I can say without fear of contradiction that it would be a boon of the greatest importance to us, because we produce nothing that would not find a ready market in England. They would take every bushel of wheat we grow, and every pound of beef that we produce, whereas even if unrestricted reciprocity with the States were carried out, instead of finding a market to the south of us, we would simply be flooded by their surplus wheat and beef. It is true that a small portion of our produce at present is sold to the United States, but what is sold there is for one of two purposes. It is either sold in some places where from local reasons, where because of the failure of a crop or something similar there is a temporary demand for what we have to sell, or as in the majority of cases, the people of the United States buy simply as middlemen to retail it again to England and other European countries. If this is the case they, of course, get the profits that middlemen always obtain, and our farmers are just so much out of pocket, which, had we this trade arrangement with the mother country, would be found in their pockets instead of enriching our neighbours. Now, Sir, this question is so thoroughly understood in the province from which I come, and so deeply interested are the people residing there in it, that a very short time ago the Board of Trade of Winnipeg—a thoroughly representative institution, a board which is composed of level-headed business men with a keen eye to their own interests and who belong not to the Conservative party alone, but to both parties, and I should think to both parties in nearly equal proportions;—passed a resolution instructing the delegates that they are sending to the Trade Congress which is soon to meet in England, to do everything in their power to have some such arrangement brought about as is outlined in the motion now under the consideration of the House. They instructed their delegates not to commit themselves in any way to imperial federation, which they consider as visionary and not likely to be brought into practical use for some time to come at least, but to devote their energies to having some alteration made by which the mother country will discriminate in favour of Canada. That shows how this question is viewed in Manitoba, and under the circumstances I am not astonished that that view is taken. Of course hon. gentlemen opposite—or rather I should say for I am not justified in saying hon. gentlemen opposite, as only one of them has spoken, and I take it for granted that most of them are in accord with the motion, such gentlemen in this House as are opposed to the motion of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) will likely urge: It is all very well for you to say that this arrangement would be a good thing for us, but we cannot make it all by yourselves. We cannot go into a corner and draw out a Bill which would be accepted and passed by the English House of Commons by which this discrimination will be brought about. The Parliament of England has something to say about this, and neither the English Parliament nor the English people will have anything to do with it. They may also point to the result of the motion made on this subject at the opening of the Imperial House of Commons when it was defeated by an overwhelmning majority. But, Mr. Speaker, I would point these gentlemen to the fact that everything must have a beginning, that when the adoption of free trade was first preached by Adam Smith it found very few supporters, that Richard Cobden had but few men around him when he undertook the task of altering the fiscal policy of England. It is true that when the Anti-corn Law League once got a fair footing it went on by leaps and bounds until it overturned the protective policy which had hitherto prevailed in England. Why should not a similar thing occur again? It is known that history repeats itself, and it is rather a strange coincidence that the very class by which free trade was carried is the class most in favour of the policy now under discussion. The horny-handed artizans of England are the persons who feel the chief pressure of foreign competition. They are the ones who find their market curtailed, their wages reduced, and their hours of work cut down by the free, untaxed

importation of cheap-made foreign goods, and they are the ones who are chiefly advocating a policy such as that on which I am now speaking. As time goes on, this feeling will, I believe, spread among the artizans of England, and as they are voters they will make their voices heard; and I should not be astonished if before long we found the hundred members of the House of Commons who are at present in favour of giving Canada and the other colonies preferential duties, vastly increased in number, and able to make more than a fair fight. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is my place to instruct the English Parliament what they ought to do. I think we can fairly leave that to them. All I would advocate is that we should show that we are willing to meet them at least half-way, to hold out to them the right hand of fellowship, and to say to them, if you will discriminate in our favour, we are willing to do the same in favour of you. In that way we shall undoubtedly encourage our friends in the mother country. We shall show that the colonies at any rate are in favour of the change, and that will give them heart, and we all know that heart and perseverance will accomplish very much. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) in his very vigorous denunciation of protection, said that he would be very glad to show his loyalty by supporting a proposition for wiping out duties altogether and returning to a free trade policy—I suppose he meant with the whole world, at all events with the mother country. I am afraid that the state of affairs at present existing in Europe as well as on our own continent, is hardly such as to induce us to adopt that course. We see the continent of Europe, instead of fulfilling the prediction made by the leading orators of the Anti-Corn Law League, that within ten years of the adoption of free trade in England it would be universally adopted in Europe, going back to the protective policy, and not only so, but becoming more and more protective. We see the United States following in the same footsteps, and England almost alone in the world favouring a free trade policy. We see also that the effect of that policy has been to cramp her manufacturers, and to force her labourers to work short hours and some of them no hours at all under the strain of foreign competition. I do not think these things are such as to induce us to adopt at present a free trade policy in Canada, particularly while occupying, as we do, a different position from that occupied by the mother country when she adopted free trade. We must remember that at that time England had by a long course of protection brought her manufactures to such a pitch of perfection as to be able to manufacture goods at a less cost and to place them on the market at a lower price than any other country in the civilized world. It was, therefore, to her advantage to throw her markets open to other countries, and above all, it was her interest to abolish the Corn Laws, so as to obtain free and untaxed breadstuffs for the artizans who produced her manufactured goods. Her peculiar position has enabled her to maintain the struggle longer than other countries could; but I believe that she is now feeling the pressure put upon her by the protective tariffs adopted by foreign countries, and by her practical exclusion from their markets. Under any circumstances, no matter what policy may be adopted in England or in our sister colonies, I do not think that we can do better than adopt the motion of my hon. friend and show that we are willing to take the first step in the matter. Then, if we succeed, we shall have the satisfaction of saying that we were the first to move in the direction proposed, and if we fail we shall know that we at least have not failed in our duty, but have done the best we could to consolidate the Empire, and especially to advance the interests of Canada, which ought always to be our first thought.

Mr. WATSON. It was not my intention to take part in this debate, because I consider that it is occupying the time of the House upon a question that is simply absurd. I do not suppose that any sensible man on either side of this House supposes, for a moment, that England would return to the policy of protection or discriminate in favour of Canada; but when the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) says that the Province of Manitoba was opposed to reciprocity of trade with the United States because the produce of the United States would come in and flood that country ---

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Excuse me, I did not say that.

Mr. WATSON. He said that if our markets were free to the United States we would be flooded with the produce of that country.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). Precisely, and I say so again.

Mr. WATSON. As a representative of the Province of Manitoba I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman make such a statement, because in the produce which is natural to that province we defy competition with the world. The idea of saying that we would be flooded with the natural produce of the United States--with its wheat, its barley and other grain--in Manitoba, where we can produce the greatest number of bushels to the acre of the best samples in the world, is absurd. Then, as to manufactures, we have none, and we ask for no protection for them; we have no interest in manufactures there at all; and if the farmers of Manitoba are to be taxed for the purpose of encouraging hot house manufactures we do not want them. The hon. gentleman knows that in the general elections last year the trade policy was not discussed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). I won my election on the trade policy.

Mr. WATSON. The trade policy did not elect a Conservative in Manitoba. Every one was elected on the loyalty cry.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). No.

Mr. WATSON. I challenged any gentleman who appeared on the stump against me to name any one article produced in Manitoba that could be benefited by protection, and no one did so. I challenged any one to name any article in the protected list the duty on which did not injure the people of Manitoba, and no one named one. We have no use for protection at all. If we had reciprocity of trade with the United States a year ago, on wheat alone we would have gained about 7 cents a bushel. Not that I believe that wheat can be protected either in Canada or in the United States, because free trade England regulates the price of both beef and breadstuffs. But we would have made 7 cents a bushel by being able to send our

wheat to be milled at Minneapolis, where we would have the competition of seven railroads in freight rates. That the hon. gentleman would know if he consulted the Board of Trade of Winnipeg. To-day we send our beef and breadstuffs to England, but outside of these, where is the market for our natural products? Where is the home market to-day which hon. gentlemen spoke so loudly about when they were inaugurating the National Policy? It is in the United States; it certainly is not in the cities and towns of Canada. For almost all our natural products, our horses, sheep, barley, potatoes eggs and poultry, our natural home market is in the United States. Both Canada and the United States export beef and breadstuffs to free trade England, whose markets regulate the prices. What benefit will you derive, even if such resolutions should pass? I do not expect that any one imagines England will discriminate in favour of Canada against any of the other colonies or any other country in the world. She has had her experience of protection and free trade, and it is free trade which has built her up to the position which she holds to-day. In Canada, take railway transportation, in which we have reciprocal relations with the American roads, and we find that our railways can compete with theirs and secure a large share of their traffic; whereas if you take our shipping, in which there is no reciprocity, we find that 5 per cent of the trade of Canada only is done to-day in Canadian bottoms under the Canadian flag.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WATSON. I am speaking of our shipping on the lakes. Hon. gentlemen opposite taunt us with crying blue-ruin. But if we take the census returns, we will find blue-ruin there clearly depicted. We will find that we have lost either the immigration or our natural increase. We have in ten years only increased a paltry 500,000 when our increase should have been 1,800,000. Take the United States right along our border, and what do we find? We find plenty commercial activity, whereas along the Canadian side, you would imagine there was a plague of small-pox which had driven the people out. If we had reciprocity with the other side, I believe that we would soon see as thriving industries here as we find over there. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of sentiment and dilate on the pride we feel in having England at our back. We are proud of that; but in what manner have we treated England in return? We pride ourselves on having the British army at our back; and how have we treated England? The very artizan who is taxed to maintain that standing army, his products we tax in order to keep them out of this country. And we tax them higher than we do those of the Americans. Our average rate of duty on goods coming from Great Britain is 22½ per cent and on goods from the United States 14⅛ per cent, but yet, still the great party opposite boast of their loyalty, taking good care all the while to discriminate against Great Britain. Take the average of duties, on dutiable and free goods from the United States, and it is 14⅛ per cent compared with 22½ per cent against England. Why, Sir, the proposition of the hon. gentleman is an absurd one. We have no objections to it, and the whole House, if it came to a division, would be in favour of it, but does any reasonable man expect that we are going to secure what it calls for. Let us discuss some practical question. To imagine that England is going to discriminate in favour of Canada against any one of her colonies is, to my mind, absurd. When we on this side speak of the advantages which the opening of the great market on the other side of the line should be to us, hon. gentlemen opposite say we are disloyal. But, I believe, that if they continue to pursue the course they have in the past, if they are going to maintain this protective system for another 10 years, you will see a great many annexationists in Canada, for if the people cannot change their position commercially, they will do it politically. I do not accuse the Conservative party of being disloyal, and I do not think they have any right to accuse us of disloyalty. We know in whose ranks to find the annexationists. Not one man in the Liberal ranks has ever risen to declare himself in favour of annexation; but if we look to hon. gentlemen opposite we can find annexationists in the person of their Premier, among their senators, and all along their line. In the Liberal ranks, however, not one man has ever risen to any position of prominence who proclaimed himself in favour of annexation. If hon. gentlemen opposite would come down to business with hon. gentlemen on this side and go to the United States and make a fair attempt to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, I think such a move would be practicable. We have the English market for our beef and breadstuffs free. They are trying to force the growth of barley in our country suitable to the English brewers, but so far without success.

An hon. MEMBER. It is a success.

Mr. WATSON. An hon. gentleman behind me says it is. But I know of what I speak. I know that you require to have a soil as heavy and in as good condition to produce two-rowed barley fit for the English market as to grow wheat; and that being the case, the farmer prefers to grow wheat. We have any amount of light soil, not under that state of cultivation which would make it favourable to the growth of wheat, but on which we can raise six-rowed barley; and where does that barley go? We exported 4,500,000 bushels to the United States and only a few thousand to Great Britain. Where do our horses go if not to the United States? Since Confederation, out of some 315,000 horses we only sent 5,000 to Great Britain, and the balance found their way to the United States despite their tariff. That is our natural market for nearly all the produce we have outside of beef and breadstuffs. This resolution is nothing else but a fad, impossible of attainment. The last gentleman who sat down believes that imperial federation is a fad, and I think he is following up in the same line with this resolution and trying to draw a herring across the track. We are going to stand by what we think is in the interests of Canada, and that is to secure a market which will give the greatest good to the greatest number. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of England having had protection until she built up her manufactures. We have had it until we have built up our manufactures to such an extent that they can form combines and trusts for the purpose of increasing prices to the consumer. An American company actually controls our cordage production to-day, and have a little preserve in Canada by which they are enabled to charge 3 cents per pound

for binding twine more than what it would otherwise cost. We have sugar rings and trusts, who are even more protected than they were before the reduction of the duty, and as they bring in the raw material free we derive no revenue at all from the taxation they impose on the people. While the Americans only charge a duty of half a cent a pound, we have $\frac{3}{10}$ of a cent a pound and shut out all the light brown sugars which would be consumed by the farmers and labouring classes. Our refiners have more protection to-day than they had previous to the reduction of duty because they can bring the raw material in free and have entire control over all the sugars consumed to the extent of $\frac{3}{10}$ cents per pound through our restrictions on all sugars over 14 Dutch standard. If you want to benefit the people by reducing taxes, allow this sugar below 16 Dutch standard to come in free, and we will relieve them of a heavy tax without losing a cent of revenue, a tax amounting to some $6,000,000. But you retain that protection for the benefit of a few refiners in Canada. Then take the article of coal oil. These men form a combine in Canada and oil is taxed at 110 per cent. It is used almost entirely by the farming community and the labouring classes, because gas and electric light takes its place in towns and cities, but you find that two-thirds of the tax goes into the pockets of the refiners, because there are 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 gallons used in the country, and there are 5,000,000 gallons imported. You could find instances of this all through, and, as my friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) stated the other day, when it can be shown that any manufacturer can form a trust or combine to unduly enhance the price to the consumer, the duty should be reduced. I hope this side will be heard from. Evidently hon. gentlemen opposite have brought up this discussion in order to prevent the discussion of another matter which is on the paper. I gave way on a motion which I had on the paper in order to allow the motion which should have been discussed long before this to come up. This question is not worthy of being discussed, but it serves to kill time on a private members' day. We have only a few days, but I will utilize a portion of a Government day in the discussion of the motion in reference to binding twine, which I dropped this afternoon. Evidently hon. gentlemen opposite fear the discussion of some of the notices of motion on the paper, and put men up to talk on the idea of England discriminating in favour of Canada. It is absurd, and a waste of time, and I will not say anything more about it just now.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to say a word in explanation. It may be soothing to the feelings of my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) and my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Watson) if I utterly repudiate, as I do, the statement that the resolution before the House suggests a return on the part of England to the system of protection. The Prime Minister of England has stated that he does not consider that discrimination in favour of the colonies means protection. I also desire to repudiate most emphatically the suggestion that has been made that this resolution has been brought up by me in order to take the time of the House. My hon. friend, I think, should hardly have flung such a statement across the floor of the House. He knows that I gave notice of this resolution long ago, and that it has come up in its proper order on the paper.

Mr. DAVIN. The question before the House, as it is on the paper, does not entirely commend itself to me, although I agree with the idea. The question reads:

"That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods."

That question as framed appears to suggest that there are limitations to be removed by Great Britain. As a fact we know there are no limitations to be removed, and that the suggestion of the question is that limitations should be imposed. Now, that is a perfectly new idea, and I say it ought to be discussed here, if discussed at all in this practical Parliament, apart from the National Policy, apart from the extraneous questions that have been introduced into it. The question has to do entirely with Great Britain herself. It has to do entirely with the interests of Great Britain, and what it seems to me to suggest is, can we show to Great Britain a reasonable equivalent to induce her to impose what she would call a duty on bread or an embargo on bread? My hon. friend who proposed this resolution showed, I think very cogently and very properly what has been shown in some leading periodicals in Great Britain, that as a fact a duty on wheat has not raised the price of the loaf. If you could raise the cry in England that the price of the loaf would be raised, it would be simply impossible to have the people of England entertain this proposition, and, therefore, it is of the most vital importance to the proposition of my hon. friend to be able to show that the price of the loaf would not be raised. Now, I grant at the very outset that it seems almost absurd to lay down the proposition that a duty on wheat will not raise the price of that which wheat produces. Some of my friends here echo that and say it is absurd, but it has been shown in some English periodicals that a small rise in the price of wheat has not raised the price of bread. I am not sure that even that concludes the question. I am not at all sure that, if you show that in a given instance the rise of a few shillings in the price of wheat has not raised the price of the loaf, you, therefore, show that, if you lay a discriminating duty on all the wheat going into Britain except what comes from Canada and the other colonies, it may not raise the price of the loaf. Then, on the other side, we have to remember that we do not now raise anything like the wheat we shall raise within a few years. I have stated before that we shall be able to raise all the wheat necessary for the consumption of Great Britain, and, if we can do that, then a discriminating duty might be safely placed on all foreign grain and yet not raise the price of the loaf. The proposition of my hon. friend, which seems, at first sight, absurd may, after all, be literally true Last year we raised, in Manitoba and the North-West, $20,000,000 worth of wheat. Next year we may raise $30,000,000 worth, and the year after we may raise $100,000,000 worth. In fact it is incontrovertible that in those vast plains of Manitoba and the North-West we can raise enough grain to supply the world. If we

can raise enough grain to supply the world much more can we raise enough grain to supply England, and not raise the price of the loaf. Now, this question is a vastly important one. The moment you go to the English Parliament and propose such a policy as this, the statesmen of England draw themselves up and say: This is a vast proposal, this is entirely new to us. We have progressed under free trade, we have built up a vast commerce under this policy. This is a new thing, can you show to us that it will be of advantage? Now, look at the extent of the British colonies, look at the peculiar position of Europe; because as my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) pointed out, when England adopted the free trade policy this proposition was in her mind, as you will see by the speeches of Richard Cobden and John Bright: If we can only get free trade we will command the trade of the world. But the world outside were determined not to reciprocate; and Germany, France, Belgium and Italy have themselves built up a vast trade and industry under protection. Why, when I was in Belgium in 1887 I saw a thing that surprised me. I saw there tradesmen's houses exporting cloth goods to Manchester. It utterly surprised me, I thought that Manchester was the chosen home of the manufacture of those goods. Now, Sir, that shows that in Belgium labour is cheaper than it is in England, therefore they can produce at a less cost. Now, all these commercial questions are founded on the cheapness of labour. If once the idea can be grasped by the Chinese that they could overturn this world, I am not sure that they could not make a great stride towards it in consequence of their capacity of living cheaply, because cheap labour is the prime condition of cheap manufacture. Now, have not the United States taken the true idea? They say: Here we have in this country boundless resources in lands and mines; we shall take care that every man in this country manufacturer, labourer and merchant, shall be a happy and prosperous man; and so they put on a protective duty. That brings us to the very question before us at this very moment. As my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) asked, why may not the time arrive when in this vast British Empire, where you have colonies touching every sea, it would be in the economic interest of that Empire to make such an arrangement as would benefit not merely the outlying colonies, not merely the ramifications of that Empire, but the heart and soul of the Empire itself? I say that is a reasonable question to ask. Now, I lay down this proposition, that evermore human affairs follows economic necessities. You cannot look at the history of the past without seeing that human affairs are controlled by human interests. Although I know that sentiment is a great influence, the primary motive in human affairs is material interest, and unless this proposition can stand the test of material interest, it cannot stand anything. Unless you can show that this proposition of my hon. friend can stand the test of material, and economic, and personal welfare, that proposition cannot stand. But it is at the present moment, to some extent, an abstract question with a practical face, and you throw it across the broad Atlantic over which the sons of England have come to found colonies and empires here; you throw that proposition across to England, and you say to her: We believe that under this policy you can more closely, more successfully and more progressively unite the great British Empire. I say under these circumstances it is proper for us to discuss the question. Away with the tone taken by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), away with that tone of disparagement, and this manner of appealing to our august mother; and away with much of the discussion we have had; because much of the discussion we have had has not been *ad rem*. But what I say is this, Parliament may fittingly deliberate here as a practical assembly and say to the august mother of nations: We do not want to sever our connection with you, we look forward to a great career side by side with you, and the only way we can look forward to that career is by such an arrangement between your colonies and yourselves as will bind more closely the British Empire, and will show the world what it has never yet seen, a world-wide empire, bound together by economic and practical bands.

Mr. KENNY. As no hon. gentleman opposite seems disposed to take part in this discussion, I rise for the purpose of expressing very briefly my entire accord with the resolution which is now under consideration of the House and which aims at increasing our trade with the mother country. Whilst offering my congratulations to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) for the manner in which he has placed this important question before us—and I may say that since I have had an honour of a seat in this House, I think we have considered few, if any, more important questions—whilst congratulating my hon. friend upon the manner in which he has placed this important question before the Parliament and people of Canada, I, as a member of this House, and as a citizen of Canada, thank him for bringing it so prominently to our notice. The gentlemen who have preceded me in this important debate have dealt so fully and indeed so eloquently with the question, that I realize there is very little for me to say. I hail the introduction of this question upon our political platform and in this political arena, as a happy relief from the blue-ruin cry to which we have had to listen for so many years; I hail it as a happy relief from the unpatriotic speeches which we have been condemned to read which have been uttered by hon. gentlemen opposite in the foreign city of Boston. During the last few years hon. gentlemen opposite, the leaders of the Opposition in this country, have gone to the foreign city of Boston and there propounded a policy for the people of Canada. On the last memorable occasion when the present leader of the Opposition visited Boston, he is reported in the Canadian newspapers to have uttered the following sentiment:—

"Canada and England have interests apart, and the day will come and must come when Canada and England will have to separate from each other."

I do not know whether that statement has been read before in the course of this debate, but I consider it a very important one. It surprised the people of Canada, and the Hon. Mr. Mowat, the leader of the Liberal party in the Legislature of the important Province of Ontario, considered it incumbent upon him to take notice of it and to some extent to repudiate the sentiments which were uttered in Boston by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I can say, Sir, that in the province from which I come the idea that England and Canada have interests

apart is entirely repudiated, and that we do hope the day will never come when England and Canada will be obliged to separate. Therefore, it is that if it were only to give us the opportunity to publicly repudiate the sentiment in the extract I have read to the House to-night, it is well that we should have had this discussion upon the resolution now under consideration. For myself, Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from the busy ways of commerce, engaged as I am in commercial pursuits all the year round, it seems to me that the question which is now introduced, and which in one form or another has been under the consideration of the people of Canada for some time past, appears to be beset with certain difficulties, and I am glad to find that hon. gentlemen who have more time to devote to the consideration of this question than I possess are turning their attention to a subject which is of the most vital importance to Canada. It is all the more important, Sir, because the predictions that the gentlemen on this side of the House made as to the result of the unrestricted reciprocity agitation have been verified. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), who posed as a free trader, stated that his great objection to the present conditions of things in Canada was the amount of taxation which was imposed upon the people, and yet my hon. friend voted for the unrestricted reciprocity resolutions which were submitted to this House, a policy which would have very much increased our taxation. During the debate in this House upon the unrestricted reciprocity resolutions, and upon the public platforms of Canada and in the press of our party, we told the people that the unrestricted policy which the hon. gentlemen opposite proposed could never be obtained unless we agreed to discriminate against the mother country, and to abdicate the power which we had inherited and which we hold, of making our own fiscal arrangements. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that such was not contemplated by the Americans, who were the other party to the bargain. They made certain pilgrimages to Washington and they came back with the report that there would be no difficulty in carrying out their unrestricted reciprocity policy, but the organs of the dominant party in the States told them plainly that such a policy as they advocated was impossible, and we since have the statements made in this Parliament by Ministers of the Crown, that the Secretary of State of the United States had told our representatives at Washington that, as we predicted, the only terms on which we could have reciprocity, were that we should agree to discriminate against the mother country, and to adopt the tariffs which the Americans choose to impose. In other words, that we shall submit ourselves to the whim and the caprice and the urgencies of a foreign nation, a position which is a humiliating one, and yet it is one which these hon. gentlemen opposite, in Boston, and I believe in Buffalo, and on the floor of this House and elsewhere, have advocated not to their advancement politically but rather to their utter dismay. I agree with my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) that the appeal which was made to the people of Canada in 1891, and which was repeated so generally at the bye-elections in 1892, was fairly and squarely on the trade question, and on those occasions that we advocated the protection of Canadian labour and the retention of our Canadian nationality. That was certainly the issue put before the people in the province from which I come, and I believe it was the issue placed before the people of the entire Dominion. I have heard it also on such good authority that I must believe it to be true that the result of the bye-elections in the Province of Ontario which so agreeably surprised us coming from the eastern provinces, the shreds and patches, is due to the fact that the people of Ontario now realize fully what would ensue from this unrestricted reciprocity if it could be obtained. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) in the course of his remarks, appealed to the House that we should abandon the discussion of such a trivial matter as we are now considering and proceed to the consideration of other questions. He went further. He threw across the floor the insinuation that this discussion had been purposely prolonged to prevent the consideration of some other notices of motion which were on the paper. I wonder if the hon. gentleman remembered what occurred in this House last week. When I arrived here on Thursday last after the Easter vacation, ready to assist in the deliberations of this House to the extent of my humble ability, I found the whole night spent and some 200 gentlemen wasting their time here listening to hon. gentlemen opposite discussing largely the cost of a waggonette. The next night was devoted entirely to a talk upon the National Policy when the matter under consideration was the estimates for the Agriculture Department and the approp riation for immigration. If we were to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that that looked very like obstruction, I suppose they would be very much offended; in fact I am told, and I read it in the newspapers, that a prominent gentleman opposite who came late to the House that night was very much offended and so expressed himself, at the bare insinuation that such conduct was meant to obstruct, and yet the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) states here to-night, when we are advocating a measure of the greatest importance to the people of Canada, that we are wasting the time of Parliament and that we are debating an impractical question. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have simply to say that I am very glad, indeed, that this matter has been brought up, and that it has been so fully discussed, because I hope and I believe that if some such arrangement as this resolution contemplates can be established, it will inure to the material advantage of the people of Canada, and will strengthen those ties which bind us in a love-knot to the mother country and to the great Empire of which we form so important a part.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the vote is taken on the motion of my hon. friend, I desire to say a few words, and very few they shall be. I desire to join with others who have spoken in congratulating my hon. friend on the able manner in which he has placed this resolution before the House and the country, and I thank him also for having done it, for this reason, if not for any other, that it has given us a debate out of the ordinary, in which for a time party politics and attacks and counter attacks have been pretty well lost sight of, and the thought of the House has been directed to a higher and larger question. I think it is a matter for congratulation when questions of this higher kind can now and then be discussed in an assembly like this. I also thank him for it on account of its value, to which point several hon. gentlemen have already

spoken, and which I shall not elaborate further. It has been a little peculiar to notice the broad silence with which the question has been treated——

Some hon. MEMBERS. By the Government.

Mr. FOSTER—by gentlemen who are generally forward to speak on most questions that come before this House. I venture to say that if anything having the least suspicion of unrestricted reciprocity had been involved in a proposition brought before the House, hon. gentlemen would have found their tongues, and we would have had the usual flood of eloquence and bubbling springs of enthusiasm which one naturally looks for in discussions from that side of the House. I desire to state, in connection with this question, first, that although it would be a good thing for Canada to have reasonable trade arrangements with the country to the south of us, although it would be a better thing in my belief for Canada, if it could be brought about, to have the advantage of a proposition of this kind practically carried out, I do not believe that the future of Canada, its progress, its development, its prosperity, depend absolutely upon either the one or the other. That is the proposition which I wish to make now, and to make as firmly and as strongly as I can, that it is not because Canada is *in extremis* that she wants either the one or the other; and if it happens that she can get neither, her future is not therefore beclouded, and her great prosperity is not therefore placed in doubt. I wish also to state that I dissent from the doctrine which is frequently put forth in the country and in this House, that Canada at the present time is being hemmed in and restricted in her trade relations—is having a cordon of restriction and exclusion drawn continually more tightly about her, and that therefore she is in a condition which requires vigorous and active effort in one direction or another in order to insure for her any chance for progress and prosperity. A glance at the circumstances surrounding us is sufficient to place this in a stronger light. Where are the restrictions? Where is the hemming in process? Where is this cordon which is continually being drawn more tightly about her, which closes her avenues of trade and strangles the business life of the country? Even in the case of the United States it is not a new thing for Canada to have a tariff against her. Since 1860 a protective tariff has met all Canadian goods going to the border; since 1883 a very high tariff has met them; and since 1890 they have been met by a tariff which is in some respects higher and in some lower than the previous one. Such have been the relations between the two countries, however, that Canadian goods have to a large extent found a market in the United States, notwithstanding these tariffs, and until an absolutely prohibitive tariff is placed against them, they will continue to find an entrance to a very large extent in the market to the south of us. If we go a little further south to the West Indies, hon. gentlemen opposite have sometimes asserted that we were being restricted there; but the facts do not bear out that assertion. Not only have we just as free entrance into the markets of the West Indian Islands, as we ever had before, but our position has been actually made better. If it be true in regard to necessary articles of consumption, that the freer their entrance into the country of the consumers, the more will be consumed, we stand to-day in a better position in regard to the West Indies than we did before the United States made a treaty with them, for the effect of that treaty has been to lessen the duties on the goods, the produce of this country, which are consumed in those islands, and therefore to enable them to consume more of them, and to require us to send them more. If we go to the Antilles, although the United States has made a favourable treaty with Spain in regard to those islands, the Dominion of Canada is a sharer in the advantage, and gets better terms in that market than it had before. Hon. gentlemen may say that on the 30th of June this advantage may cease, and we may reply that it may cease or it may continue, and negotiations are at present on foot between Great Britain and Spain looking to a continuance of the present treaty or the negotiation of a new one. Going further south the only country with regard to which Canada has been placed at a greater disadvantage than before is Brazil, a large market, it is true, but between which and Canada the traffic has never been very large. Whatever comes of that disadvantage we bear, but it is a small thing on account of the smallness of the trade we have had with Brazil. With all the other South American countries, we are on the same footing as before, and at all events our trade with the countries of South America is not a large trade. If we go to the eastern countries, our traffic with the great east, the old east, is continually developing. It is not yet magnificent or immense, but it is developing by large and quick percentages, and gives a prospect of opening widely into lucrative and progressive trade. So much for this continent, and that brief review of it shows that the trade of Canada is not being hampered or hindered on account of the circumstances that exist in this respect. With regard to the old country, the great market of Britain is open to us as free as ever it was, and is opening to us in larger measure and in greater degree than ever before, inasmuch as our products are becoming better fitted for the particular uses of customers there, and their excellence is becoming recognized. And when once they have overcome the prejudice, long and hard to overcome, against Canadian goods, they will, by dint of long tenure and durability, be able to hold their own against other goods which had equally to withstand a similar prejudice in the first instance. Instead of finding the avenues closed and our trade hampered, the prospects are of an almost unlimited development of trade in that direction in the great staple articles which we can produce in this country to a very large extent. How is it in the continental countries? The maximum of the French tariff is applied against us at present. We hope it may not be so for a very long while, but our export trade to France has not as yet been large, not so large as we would wish it to be, but even the maximum tariff which is applied against us there on account of our small export trade to that country, does not fatally injure us, and is more than compensated by the benefit we have in other markets in Europe on account of the lowering of rates for staples which Canada produces. Going outside of France, we find that, owing to the treaty arrangements made between Germany, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, Belgium and Italy, there has taken place a considerable reduction in certain

staple goods of which Canada has a surplus, and that by virtue of the most-favoured nation clause in the treaty with England with these countries, this benefit inures to us, and our markets are being opened up in that direction. This is proof, and I refer to it just to show, if it were necessary to show, that the position is altogether unfounded and untenable that the markets of Canada are being circumscribed. They are not being circumscribed. They are being developed and they will be developed more and more in proportion, as, having gained a foothold in our own markets, having practically captured our own markets, our people now, with their enterprise and push and energy, are opening up markets in other parts of the world and are devoting the enterprise and energy, which at first were entirely confined to the exploiting of our own markets, to exploiting the markets in foreign fields. Anyway let us come to the practical proof, that is as to whether or not our exports are increasing or decreasing. Are they increasing or decreasing? They are increasing and increasing largely, and increasing more largely than the trade returns show, because the trade returns show simply the value and not the volume of trade; and if the diminution in price which has taken place from year to year were added to the increase in the value of our trade, there would be shown a very notable increase in the export trade of our country over previous years; and this present year, when the stress and strain of this restrictive process should have weight and force, if it ever should have, in the nine months compared with the corresponding nine months of the previous year, there is an increase in our exports of nearly $12,000,000. I dismiss this trade question with these few observations. Now let me, if you please, give a little attention to two or three points of the question in hand. I have tried to make this clear, that Canada is not *in extremis* and therefore bound to look in either one or the other direction for benefits in trade in order to conserve her trade vitality or keep on progressing and developing, but that is no reason why we should not use every power and energy to get an outlet in both, if possible, or in the most beneficial if we cannot in both. The next point to which I wish to draw attention is this: There are certain difficulties in the way of carrying out the proposition of my hon. friend. I do not wish to say that the proposition is one which will go by the mere reading of it. Neither does my hon. friend. No one knows better than he, for he has studied the question—and no one will know better than the one who studies it most thoroughly—that before such can be achieved, there will need to be very great changes in public opinion. There will have to be great changes in existing fiscal arrangements; there will have to be great changes in the circumstances and apportionments of trade, before that proposition can be thoroughly worked out and adopted, involving, as it does, the gigantic undertaking of revolutionizing sentiment on the other side and possibly, to some extent, sentiment on this side; but the arguments which my hon. friend has brought forward should teach us is that we are not to be discouraged, if it is not this year or next year or the year after, or even longer before the Empire draws itself together in bonds of trade and commerce as wide over the world as the flag of the Empire floats. But there are difficulties. What are they? The first difficulty that occurs to one's mind is the force of what is called free trade sentiment in Great Britain, as expressed by the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson), who, out of his wealth of wisdom and long experience, flew in the face of all those who were of a different opinion, and declared that the proposition was an absurd one. No doubt, the force of the free trade sentiment which has to be overcome in the old country is a formidable difficulty, but it is not a difficulty which is insurmountable in my humble opinion. If I read public opinion in the old country aright, I believe that the free trade sentiment pure and simple founded upon what was thought to be irrefutable principles, almost divine in their origin, is largely changing in Great Britain. I believe that there, as the wide world over, partly through processes internal and partly by necessities which urge from without, it is coming to be felt that there is no such thing as a fixed and divine principle underlying trade and that tariff conditions are simply expedients, which must vary from age to age and from day to day and from circumstance to circumstance, and what is a right and good policy in trade matters to-day for a country may, in ten years from that time, not be the policy at all which should be carried out. And so the forces inside and the forces outside are, in my humble opinion, doing very much in Great Britain to-day to make the people reflect as to whether or not it is best to continually work on the line of abstract free trade, or whether there are not larger and greater interests at stake, which will make them revise their opinions, and to a certain extent move them in the interests of their own country and the broader interests of the Empire, of which they are at the same time the heart and the head. So I do not look upon it as being an obstacle insuperable and incapable of being overcome that the free trade sentiment in Great Britain has been strong and that therefore it will not vary to the degree of making a discrimination in favour of colonial produce in return for a discrimination by colonial peoples in favour of British manufactured goods. The second obstacle which shows itself to one's mind is the protective idea in our own country. They say to you: What does that mean? Are you going back on your system of protection in Canada? Are you going in for free trade? That does not follow. Protection as a system in Canada was adopted for a purpose, and it exists to-day for a purpose, but I hold that, while we are not going to destroy the industries which we have brought into being and into successful development in this country by the policy which was forced upon us and which was a wise and enlightened policy for Canada to adopt, competition is a necessary balance-wheel for protection, and the results of protection, and, if we are to have competition, it is not a bad thing that this competition should be British if we can get any compensating advantages on the other side to make it British to the exclusion of competition from other sources. So it is not impossible neither is it a contradiction of the protective policy and the protective system in a reasonable way that we should enter into this agreement and be mutually benefited thereby. Another obstacle is the "most-favoured nation" clauses. If we give advantages to British goods, we must, by these clauses in the treaties of Great Britain with other nations, give the same advantages to the goods of those countries.

These obstacles exist to-day, but they are not insuperable. Who that has studied the changes in regard to tariffs in Europe and the changes in opinion in reference to these matters within the last five years is not prepared for greater changes than those which have taken place? In the last ten years the whole policy of Europe in this regard has changed, and what was considered good policy in making long treaties with "favoured nation" clauses is not to-day considered the best policy, and the nations of Europe are denouncing by wholesale the treaties containing the "most-favoured nation" clauses, and are obtaining greater freedom than these long treaties gave them in their commercial action. These changes have been brought upon them by great changes in economic development, and by the opening up in the different parts of the world of new producing centres as well as new markets, and the same reasons may create a change in Great Britain which may lead that country to do, what that country's government is in sympathy with doing, get rid of the clogging effects of those treaties as far as the relations of Great Britain to her colonies are concerned. So these are not insuperable difficulties. Then there is another difficulty. What are you going to do for revenue? If you are going to discriminate in favour of British manufactured goods, you will lop off so much revenue. Of course that will be considered, but, if the compensating advantages to the trade of the country should be so great as is represented, we can do without so much revenue from that source and get it in another way. That is a difficulty easily met if the compensating effects are in any way commensurate with it. There is also a difficulty to be thought of, and that is, suppose that Great Britain and Canada and the colonies of the Empire at large make this discriminating or this differential arrangement between themselves, it is like raising a barrier against the rest of the world, and will not the other nations of the world retaliate and raise their tariffs against British and colonial products? That may possibly take place, but there never has been and is not to-day any empire in the wide world which is so self-contained and sufficient for itself as the British Empire and its dependencies. If this were done, and retaliatory tariffs were attempted by other peoples against such a combination, there is nothing that human beings eat or wear or require for enjoyment or pleasure which is not raised, and raised to the full, in some one or other of the countries which to-day are dependencies of the great British Empire. So, taking these difficulties into consideration and not taking a rosy view of this matter at all, seeing all the lions in the path, I yet believe that, when this people and the British people and the greater British people the wide world over get their heart and their mind down to this matter, these lions will be found to be but chained, and when this subject is heartily and earnestly taken up, with due consideration of the great imperial and world-wide questions, these obstacles will be surmounted and these difficulties overcome without danger either to the central part of the Empire or to the dependencies themselves. So I am in favour of what my hon. friend has moved. I want it to go as the voice of Canada to Great Britain, as our hand held out to them. The hon. gentleman from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) represented it as a mean and dickering proceeding for us to say to Great Britain: You do so much for me and I will do so much for you, as if that were undignified and unworthy. It struck me that my hon. friend did not make equally strong objection when certain resolutions were introduced by my hon. friends opposite to discriminate against the goods of Great Britain *in toto* in favour of goods from the United States. He did not say then that it was a mean thing to do, but he thinks it is a mean thing for us to dicker with Great Britain and to say: You do something for us and we will do something for you. I think it is a plain business matter, and I hope this resolution will be passed by a strong, round majority. Let it go to Great Britain as the voice of one of its premier colonies, as the voice of this great Dominion, declaring that we are willing to join you hand in hand in business and economic matters as we join you heart in heart in loyalty and sentiments of devotion to the Empire. It will have its effect. It may not be now, it may be much later when the full effect comes, but Canada will have done its duty, and I as well as others cannot but be captivated with the grand possibilities of the prospect. The great British Empire, disjointed to a certain extent with various tariffs and policies in its different parts, is yet the greatest empire in the world. But if you can bring this idea to work and add the harmony and unity of commercial and trade interests to all the rest, you will have such an empire in its strength and in its prosperity as the world has never seen before, and as the world will never see hereafter. This proposition was not put before the House in order to obstruct business; this proposition has not been debated in the House in any childish or obstructive spirit. It is a calm and sober proposition which has been debated in a calm and sober way, and it has within it the elements of great possible benefit, not only to Canada and to Great Britain but to the British Empire the wide world through.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fear that the ponderous platitudes of the Minister of Finance will hardly be accepted by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution to-night as compensation for the cold water which the Minister has thrown upon his truly loyal resolution. The hon. gentleman was cruel, maliciously cruel I would say, in allowing my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and the gallant band of loyal members who followed him, to exude with loyalty for some five or six hours this evening in support of a resolution upon which he continued to pour buckets of cold water from the time he stood up until just before he closed. Sir, the hon. gentleman was surprised at the ominous silence of the Opposition. It did not strike him as singular that a proposition amounting to a fiscal revolution was proposed by one of his followers and supported by six or seven other followers, and that not a member of the Government rose to lead the House, and tell us what their policy was. It did not strike him as at all singular that they had abdicated their functions in a matter of large fiscal policy, and called upon the Opposition to-night, as they have called upon them time and again, to give them a policy and to lead them out of the wilderness in which their friends seem to think they are wandering. The hon. gentleman's friends have lost their faith in the National Policy; they are anxiously seeking round for some exit, some way of escape, from the miserable dilemma, from the commercial atrophy which surrounds this country everywhere. And,

sir, the hon. gentleman who should lead them, this political Moses who should strike the rock and make the water to flow, looks across the House and asks the Opposition: Can you tell us what we ought to do with this resolution? Why his position to-night was almost as pitiable as that of the Minister of Agriculture last Friday night. He did not know what the policy of the Government was, and he was afraid that if he did know it he could not explain it. Now, what does the hon. gentleman tell us? He says things are very satisfactory; there is no need of preaching blue-ruin or singing doleful songs about the condition of this country. Canada is not now hemmed in nor is Canada being hemmed in, by the tariffs of any of the surrounding countries. Commercial prosperity, if one can believe his statements, is abounding. I suppose the hon. gentleman believes it abounds in the province which he specially represents. I suppose the city of St. John is, in his opinion, a good example to-day of commercial prosperity, and the Province of New Brunswick, which never was so poor, from which there never was such an exodus before, the commercial metropolis of which is enveloped in a commercial atrophy never felt before, are, I suppose, places which he would especially single out as examples of the prosperity of this country. We are not being hemmed in. No, Sir, not when Newfoundland, in response to the silly and childish retaliatory policy which the hon. gentleman introduced a few years ago of taxing the trade between that country and this, has put an almost prohibitory tariff upon our exports to that country, and turned the whole trade which should flow into Canada, into the United States channels. We are not being hemmed in from a country to which we sent a hundred thousand barrels of flour last year, and to which, under existing circumstances, we cannot send one, a country to which Prince Edward Island and the eastern coast of Nova Scotia, including Cape Breton, exported annually enormous quantities of food products, which are now to be excluded by this prohibitory tariff which the hon. gentleman's silly legislation has invited and challenged. Yet the hon. gentleman tells his friends we are not being hemmed in from Newfoundland. Sir, he calls our attention to the Spanish Antilles once more, knowing well that on the 30th June next, our equal rights to the entrance of our products into those ports will cease, and that the United States, with the advantages which they possess under the new treaty, will take possession of those markets of which we formerly had a large share, and that we will practically be prohibited. He tells us the old story about the Spanish treaty. Why, Sir, I have been 10 years in this House, and I can never remember a session in which negotiations were not going on at Madrid about this wonderful Spanish treaty. I expect the results next June to be just as they were before. And the West Indies—the hon. gentleman says there has been a new free trade policy introduced there, the consequence of which will be that the people will get their goods much cheaper, that there will be a larger consumption, and that we will share in the large exports to that country to supply the consumption. What a specious argument to come from that hon. gentleman. If that is the effect, why does he not carry it out in the country where he has the power? Why does he not give us free goods here, by taking off the tariff and the duty? Why does he not make trade increase here as he says it is going to increase there? The hon. gentleman knows, and he should have had the courage and the manliness to say it, that under the treaty made between the United States and the West Indies, although there is no discrimination against Canada, the United States, buying as they do all the West Indies have to export, will sell in return by natural process nearly all the West Indies want to buy. There is no doubt about it, and the hon. gentleman, with his silly and fatuous policy, has to-day hemmed us round in Newfoundland, and the Spanish Antilles, and the West Indies, with a people and a series of governments hostile to Canada, and carrying out policies antagonistic to Canadian trade. The hon. gentleman talks about our trade not being hemmed in, about the avenues of trade not being closed. The hon. gentleman told us before that the McKinley Bill was going to close up these avenues. He is ready for any emergency. If the tariff barriers are taken away in the West Indies, he says it is all right, you are going to have an increased trade there. If the tariff barriers are raised in the United States, he says it it is all right, they will not stop our trade with that country. The hon. gentleman contradicts himself. Where are our horses going now, our barley, our eggs, our beans, our sheep, and all the products that we have been exporting to the United States, if the avenues are not closed up? Go down to the Maritime Provinces and ask them where the market for their potatoes is, for their horses, and all the articles they have got to sell. The hon. gentleman will be told by every one that he does not know what he is talking about, or else he is trying to throw dust in the eyes of the people who do not understand the conditions of trade there. Now, I do not want to paint the picture blacker than it is; God knows it is black enough, and we have got to thank the hon. gentleman and his policy for it. But, Sir, if there is a bright spot at all in the commercial horizon, that bright spot is in the motherland, which has thrown down those antiquated barriers and invites all quarters of the world, Canada included, to come forward and sell them what they have got to sell, without any artificial barrier being erected to keep them out. Sir, he boasts that we have exported $12,000,000 more in value during the past nine months than during the corresponding period of last year, and we are all proud of it. Does he think any one is fool enough to believe that his fiscal had policy anything to do with that? The hon. gentleman knows that it is to a beneficent and bountiful Providence and to that alone that the good harvest we reaped last year is due and that we owe whatever advantage may be derived from these increased exports. Therefore, if Canada is in a position to hold her own, it is in defiance and in spite of the hon. gentleman's policy, and in consequence of blessings which have been showered upon us from on high. What does the hon. gentleman propose? He told my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) who introduced his resolutions to-day in a very pleasant and agreeable speech, filled with interesting and pleasant matter, delivered in somewhat of a florid style, but relieved from any dulness by the moral earnestness with which the hon. gentleman urged his case. He always is in earnest in this cause. I believe he honestly thinks

in his heart and soul that he has discovered a policy which is capable of being practically carried out. I admire the hon. gentleman, I like to see him when he rises enthusiastically and presses and forces his points, because he has convinced himself, if he has convinced no one else, that he can reconcile his loyalty to the United Empire with the policy of taxing English goods which he has been advocating for years. What does the Minister of Finance offer to my hon. friend? In the first place, a bucket of cold water, by telling him there are certain difficulties. There is the policy of free trade in England which permeates all classes of society, even down to the artizan who wants to get cheap bread; and there will be a great difficulty in overcoming that. Then the Minister of Finance said there was the protective feeling in Canada, which he has supported for the last twelve years to build up the Canadian manufacturers and to the exclusion of the British manufacturers, and you have got to overcome that. Bucket of water No. 2. Then there is a possible loss of revenue, bucket No. 3, and the Minister of Finance said: Possibly that may be modified by a possible compensating advantage, I could not make out very well what it was. And last of all he says: But if you adopt this policy Great Britain may invite a retaliatory policy from all the world. Bucket of water No. 4. So, Sir, the Minister of Finance went on throwing bucket after bucket of cold water, until I looked for my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to see if he was alive and kicking, as I expected him to jump up and withdraw his policy altogether. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the Minister of Finance advise as the policy of the Government. He says: Carry the resolution by a unanimous vote as a message to the old country and it will cement and unite the great imperial and British Empire all over the world in some love knot. Is this the twaddle that sensible and practical men are to have addressed them by the Finance Minister? What nonsense, Sir. He has proven to the mover of the resolution that the resolution is absolutely ridiculous and not capable of being carried out, and yet he calls upon Parliament unanimously to vote it. Why, Sir, it is positively pitiful, the condition into which the Parliament of Canada is being dragged to-day by the hon. gentleman advocating a policy which in one breath he says is incapable of being carried out, and which in the next breath he asks us to pass for some fanciful reason. The hon. gentleman says he is going to cement the Empire. I will show him directly what imperial statesmen think of the kind of cement he offers. I want to address one word of pity, or sympathy rather, to the unctuous and eloquent member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), to my friend from St. John (Mr. Skinner), and to our pleasant, agreeable and genial friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald) who supported this resolution under the belief that they were doing something which is loyal to the mother country, and which was going to win the approval of the gentlemen on the front benches. What was the surprise of the member from Halifax (Mr. Kenny) when he found the Minister of Finance sitting upon him and telling him that this policy was positively impracticable. The hon. gentleman from Halifax told us, taking up the statement of the member from Winnipeg (Mr. Macdonald), that there was a revolution in public sentiment in this country, that the effect of the policy of the Opposition had only lately been discovered, and that the electorate by an increased vote had set their face against it. Sir, is that true? Perhaps it is. I remember that an election took place in Halifax a year ago. I remember at that time when the hon. gentleman preached nothing but loyalty that he came out with a majority of 1,000 votes. He went back to his constituents after the people had had twelve months to think it over, and he came out with his majority reduced 66 per cent. That is the condition of my hon. friend from Halifax.

Mr. KENNY. That is not the condition in Ontario.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E. I.) Then all I have got to say is that I recommend the hon. gentleman to educate the people of Ontario as he educated his own people, and I have no doubt that if he talked to them as he talks to his own friends, the results will be the same in Ontario as they were in Halifax. I like to see my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Skinner) speak as he did to-night, because he is known to be a loyal man. Why, Sir, I remember a year or two ago when the hon. gentleman pronounced from one of the platforms of Canada, that the Tory party with which he is now allied had done more by their policy to promote annexation than anything that has ever happened in Canada. I was not surprised at the hon. gentleman's speech to-night. He is no political Bourbon, for when it is necessary to change his opinions he can do it, and more than that, the hon. gentleman can give you as many contradictory opinions in the same speech as he pleases. He started out to-night with a burst of loyalty. He warned us—I did not know whom he particularly addressed, but he looked chiefly towards the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace); I do not know that he thought the member for West York was particularly disloyal but he looked in that direction—he warned him and he warned this House that come weal come woe, the Canadian people had nailed their colours to the mast and were going to sink or swim with the mother country. But no sooner had he finished a carefully prepared and well delivered essay on that part of the subject, than he turned round and said: I tell you that if Great Britain won't keep us on our own terms, which are reasonable, we will repeat the revolution which brought about the independence of the United States. Such are the arguments by which my honourable and earnest friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has been supported this evening. I have a great deal of sympathy with him in many things, and I have sympathy with him in the sorrowful condition in which he finds himself placed. Now, Sir, let me address a few serious words to my hon. friend upon his resolution itself. The Minister of Finance, although he does not believe in the resolution, and showed by so many cogent reasons that it was incapable of being practically carried out, said, if not to flatter the vanity of my hon. friend, I do not know what for, let us pass the resolution as a message of peace and to "cement the Empire." That was bosh. I want to ask my hon. friend from Bruce a question or two about his resolution, because I think it was not drawn up by himself, but by some old parliamentary hand, and I will tell him why. The resolution says:

"That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the produce of foreign countries, the parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages."

Now if he had stopped there I would have understood the resolution. What corresponding advantages? He confines them and limits them by saying:

"By a reduction in the duty it imposes upon British manufactured goods."

But not by discriminating. The hon. gentleman does not offer the prize of discrimination to them. He will only reduce the duties on their goods on condition of their discriminating against the rest of the world. Does the hon. gentleman mean to discriminate against the rest of the world if he gets discrimination in England in his favour? If he does, why does he not say so? Why, Sir, I am more magnanimous than he, for I will propose to reduce the duties on goods from England now, out of the abundance of my loyalty and good-will, whether England discriminates in our favour or not; and I want to know, Sir, whether that loyal gentleman and I believe he is loyal and the dozen or two other gentlemen, who followed him and asserted their loyalty, will back me up in that proposition? Sir, we have talked a great deal about loyalty to Great Britain, and what does it amount to practically? A few years ago you came in, and when you got into power you commenced to tax British goods as highly as you could tax them. Some hon. gentlemen to-night told us that we owe a great deal to Great Britain; we have the protection of her army and her navy, we live under the ægis of her name, and we are proud to be a part of the Empire; but the return of thanks which we have given to Great Britain for all this has been to tax her goods to the uttermost. Sir, to-day it is a lamentable fact that hon. gentlemen opposite not only tax British goods, but practically discriminate against Great Britain. They do not take an article, such as iron or coal or soap, and say it shall pay so much duty when it comes from Great Britain and so much when it comes from the United States. If they did that, I would admire their courage and manliness, if I did not adopt their policy. But they were mean enough to discriminate against Great Britain in an underhand way. Their tariff was so framed that on a total of $42,000,000 worth of goods imported from Great Britain they collected $9,114,000, or 22 per cent, while on a total of $53,600,000 worth of goods imported from the United States they collected taxes amounting to $7,734,524, or 14 per cent.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Leave out the free goods.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So that upon the total imports from Great Britain, which are $11,000,000 less than the total imports from the States, the taxes are $1,500,000 more. An hon. gentleman says, oh, that includes free goods. Certainly, it includes free goods. You have watched what class of goods come from the States, and what class come from Great Britain, and you have placed on the free list such an enormous proportion of the goods that you know come from the States, that you turn the tables entirely against Great Britain. You allow free goods to come from Great Britain to the amount of $10,599,000, while from the United States you allow free goods to come in to the amount of $23,895,255. Why do you not apply to the mother country the same measure that you do to the United States in respect of free goods? Why, Sir, leave out the free goods, and take the dutiable goods alone, and you tax those from Great Britain 4 per cent more than you do those from the United States. The dutiable goods from Great Britain are taxed 29¼ per cent against 25¼ per cent on those from the United States. The hon. gentleman sees that he has been acting towards the mother country as an undutiful and disloyal son. Why, Sir, I have sat in this House for eleven sessions, and I have seen Finance Minister after Finance Minister come down with increased tariffs, with the object, they said, not of protecting British goods, or promoting British trade, but of protecting Canadian manufactures; and I have never yet seen one of those superloyal gentlemen who have spoken to-night, and who are bursting with loyalty to the old flag, raise his voice in protest. Obediently one after another they have recorded their votes, and the higher the tariff has risen the higher they climbed; they got on the top and shouted: I am loyal to the old flag. Let me call the attention of my hon. friend—who I think is capable of being converted—I hope so—to one or two things in connection with the imports of Great Britain. I took the Trade and Navigation Returns when the hon. gentleman was speaking, and went through them carefully, selecting the figures showing the imports of woollen manufactures; and although it may be tedious, I will read over the taxes which the hon. gentleman voted to place on British woollen goods and the taxes on the same character of goods imported from the United States; and the hon. gentleman knew when he voted for the tariff that all these woollen goods came from England, and would have to come from England; yet he placed an enormous duty upon them. Let me give him the result, which he may send to England as a message of peace and good-will, to show how much we love the old flag:

WOOL MANUFACTURES.

——	Duty on Imports from Great Britain.	Duty on Imports from United States.
Blankets	$ 26,215	$ 389 00
Cassimeres	21,696	26 00
Cloths	482,448	4,064 00
Coatings	236,272	41 00
Tweeds	306,216	784 00
Flannels	57,696	1,586 00
Hosiery	89,435	699 00
Shawls	27,794	129 00
Socks and stockings	140,445	340 00
Yarn	36,368	222 00
Wool goods, 10 cents a yard and under	136,926	141 00
do 10 cents to 14 cents.	101,895	257 00
do 14 cents and over	543,419	3,674 00
Ready made clothing for women	159,398	4,996 00
Ready made clothing for men	31,188	1,287 00
Shirts, drawers and hosiery	7,399	69 00
Clothing, N. E. S	21,979	941 00
Carpets, Brussels	120,305	839 00
do Dutch	2,768	1 25
do Tapestry	126,894	184 00
do 2 and 3 ply	11,630	2,054 00
do Felt	4,705	1,783 00
	$2,692,950	$24,506 00

Mr. DAVIN. Question. What has this to do with the question?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What has this to do with the question, says one hon. gentleman, who is a little more obtuse to-night than he generally is, for he is generally very clear-headed. It has this to do with it: I am pointing out that hon. gentlemen opposite tax commodities which they know have to be imported from Great Britain, and put on the free list those that come from the United States; and I read a statement of the articles, and I intend to invite the hon. gentleman to-night to support a resolution declaring, not that we will concede to Great Britain a reduction of duties in return for some advantage which we ask her to grant, but out of the abundance of our loyalty and devotion, and in consideration of all she has done for us, what she is doing now, and what she will do in the future for us—in consideration of the fact that her markets are thrown open for all the products we can grow and export—that for all these reasons and also because they are unnecessary, we offer to reduce or remove the duties upon English manufactures. Sir, we have treated the mother country harshly, cruelly and selfishly. There has been no loyalty, no love, no devotion on our part. Pure and unadulterated selfishness has marked the conduct of this country during the past twelve years, in its dealings with the mother land to whom we owe so much and of whom we speak so proudly. Do we feel as truly as we speak? If we do, let us show our loyalty in something more than loud phraseology. The hon. gentleman told us he really believed there were evidences in England to show that this policy of his had some prospect of success. He quoted from a copy of the London *Times*. I failed to catch myself the special pertinency of the quotation he read, but nevertheless I credit him with good intentions, and I have no doubt he thought he was quoting something which supported his views. Further than that, he quoted from the resolution moved at the Birmingham conference of the Conservative party held only last fall in England, and he told us that a resolution embodying views similar to those he had expressed here, in behalf of a discriminating tariff in favour of the colonies against the rest of the world, was received with great applause by that conference as representing the whole Tory party. He would lead us to believe that that was some evidence that the Tory party were prepared more or less to take up this policy. Well, the hon. gentleman, having been in political leading strings so long in this House, and knowing the extent to which even the best minded man in the party will follow their leaders, might have known that while the leaders were throwing this fly at the convention, they had no idea of ever embodying it in their policy. It was supposed to catch some floating votes. There was not a man of third rate or man of fourth rate or even tenth rate standing who spoke in favour of it. But when parliament met, when the motion for an address in reply to Her Majesty's speech was moved, then came forward Mr. James Lowther, the leader of my hon. friend, seconded by Colonel Howard Vincent with a resolution in the direction in which the hon. gentleman moved to-night. How did it fall? It fell still-born. It got a mover and a seconder. It had a father and step-father, and nothing else. One hon. gentleman told us to-night that there was a majority against it. Nonsense, Sir, there was not a third man to be found in the House. It was ridiculed and laughed out of the House. I hold in my hand both the resolution and the comments made by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach on behalf of the Government. I will quote the resolution for the special benefit of the hon. gentleman. I was surprised that his political repertoire being so well filled with literature on this subject, he did not give this speech to the House to-night, for I know he was anxious we should have both sides, and surely he was anxious that the Canadian people, who have not the privilege, many of them, of taking the *Times*, should know what the Conservative leader of the Conservative party in the House of Commons said when this question was broached there. Here is the resolution:

"Resolution moved by W. J. Lowther in amendment to the Address on speech 'regretting retention in certain treaties of provisions operating in restraint of the establishment of preferential trading relations amongst the several portions of the Empire.'"

Nothing could be plainer. It is the hon. gentleman's proposition in a nutshell, freed from the ambiguity he has introduced into his resolution. Let the first step, he said, be taken to denounce those treaties which prevent our establishing a system of preferential trade relations among the several portions of the Empire. And what did Sir Michael Hicks-Beach say:

"We are offered what the right hon. gentleman calls a comprehensive commercial policy; in other words a preferential arrangement of a very remarkable character between our colonies and the United Kingdom. I confess, speaking for myself, that I would go a long way if I could secure a Zollverein between the colonies and the United Kingdom, a common tariff applicable to the whole Empire. But this miserable substitute would injure us without doing the colonies any good. Why would it injure us? Because the colonies according to my right hon. friend desire a preference in our market for those goods which they principally send us. What are those goods? Corn, meat wool (cheers), raw materials of food the cheapness of which is essential to the best interests of this country—(cheers). Supposing a duty is imposed upon those articles coming from foreign countries here, what would be the natural effect? The price would be raised by something more than the duty. If the price was not raised what good would it be to the colonies? We should be in fact adopting a policy of protection upon imported food for the benefit not of our own agricultural interests—which many of us might be anxious to do something for—but for benefit of the agricultural interest of our colonies (cheers). We should lose in that way and how should we gain? Would the colonies reduce their duties on our manufactured goods."

I want to put that question to the Minister of Finance to-night. I think it is his duty to tell this House and the country if he favours this policy.

Mr. McNEILL. That is the resolution.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—

"(Mr. Lowther). They would give us a preference. (Sir M. Hicks-Beach.) You would leave them perfect freedom to impose as high duties as they chose upon manufactured goods going from this country in competition with their own manufactures—giving a small 10 per cent preference to our manufactures as compared with the manufactures of foreign countries. What would be the good of that? They would take good care to protect their manufactures as against ours, and as against the competition in the colonial market. Why we have these markets already on equal terms, and therefore my right hon. friend's scheme is hardly any good at all."

And when the hon. gentleman finished his speech and sat down, the baby fell to the floor still-born, and it has never been heard of since in England;

and now the little animal has been brought across the Atlantic and trotted out here to-night, and the poor little puling infant, after being supplied with milk from the super-loyalists on both sides of the House, has had its poor little brains dashed out with four buckets of cold water by the Minister of Finance. I do not think my hon. friend really appreciated the importance of the demand he was making on this country. When the hon. member for Assiniboia was speaking about the quantity of grain we export to Great Britain, I turned up the Statesmen's Year Book of last year to see the proportions of grain supplied. I find that Great Britain imports 13,262,592 quarters of wheat, which makes, one quarter being 8 bushels, 105,000,000 bushels. I find that in 1891 the United Kingdom imported 3,653,000 quarters of wheat from her own possessions and the remainder from foreign countries. What are her own possessions from which she imports wheat? What position has Canada relatively to the other possessions that supply this enormous quantity of wheat. The United States sent 4,838,991 quarters; Russia sent 2,910,581 quarters; India, 2,601,157 quarters; and Canada, 634,768 quarters. That is a large quantity, true; and I hope that my hon. friend will be right in his prediction that in the near future we will largely increase that quantity, but is it not pitiable at present to talk of our ability to supply the English market, when, out of the total of 13,653,000 quarters, we only sent 634,000 quarters. Why, instead of the few thousand people we have in the North-West, we would require to have six or eight or ten millions of people there, and God knows we never will have them there as long as we have a National Policy. I think my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), great as his faith was at one time, has had it very much lessened of late years in the "cabinet of antiques." It is so late that I will not delay the House with any more figures, but I will invite my hon. friend to join with me in exhibiting, not a false or hypocritical offer to Great Britain, but an offer to improve and extend our relations with the mother country on a proper basis, and to support an amendment in the form of a fair and generous offer to Great Britain, something which she has a right to expect from us. I move that all the words after "that" in the main motion be erased and the following substituted instead thereof:

"Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain should be reduced."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A number of gentlemen who have spoken in this debate, even the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) have congratulated the mover of the resolution which we have been discussing all the afternoon on the manner in which he presented it for the consideration of the House, and I am sure we might well include the hon. gentleman who seconded it in such excellent terms, but I did not rise for the purpose of repeating congratulations which are by this time unnecessary, but for the purpose of mentioning a new cause of congratulation to our hon. friends. They have succeeded, after some hours of debate, in converting a gentleman in the most remarkable manner I have ever witnessed. More than that, it would seem from the resolution with which the speech we have just listened to has been concluded, that my hon. friends have succeeded in converting a whole party in this House in a manner which was never witnessed on the floor of a deliberative assembly on a previous occasion. We have seen a party which, if it has been distinguished for anything in this country for the last six years, has been distinguished for open, blatant declamation against any policy that favoured the mother country, we have seen that party wheel about in the course of one evening and not only propose a resolution to the House on the pretended basis of favouring the mother country, but hurl all kinds of objurgations against my hon. friends on this side, when they stood by the interests of the mother country and by the interests of the Empire, as having been too weak and undutiful subjects. The men who became converts since 8 o'clock, the men whose policy has changed since dinner, have reproached us with treating the mother country harshly, cruelly and undutifully, and they have discovered that my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is an undutiful and disloyal son. Another gentleman who spoke this afternoon made a patriotic speech full of ambition, that we should remain in the Empire, to share in the glories of the Empire and in its dangers, and they accuse him of something like disloyalty because he concluded by stating that we desired to accomplish this within the Empire and for the Empire, and that we would only do it outside the Empire under compulsion of such a nature as would drive us to stand upon our manhood. That was considered to be so disloyal that the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) represented it to mean that, if Great Britain did not give us our own way, we would repeat the revolution of 100 years ago. Mark the zeal which distinguishes converts so newly made. They have suddenly awakened to the fact that, while we have been for fourteen years standing by the interests of the Empire and resisting a policy of theirs which, they have to admit, when driven to the wall, would dismember the Empire in five years, we have been harsh and cruel to the mother country, and that to insinuate that we will only remain in the Empire, while we are allowed to remain in it, is to insinuate that we will repeat the revolution of a century ago unless we get our own way. I might have believed in the sincerity of this new-born zeal, I might have believed that it meant a genuine though a late abandonment of a policy which has been scouted from one end of the country to the other and which has only been deserted when scarcely a candidate could be elected upon it in any constituency, I might have believed in that repentance, though late, if there had not been a ring of insincerity in everything that came from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), in his allusion to the mother country, in his allusion to our policy in regard to the mother country, and in almost every expression he used before the House. He spoke in the most exultant manner and taunted the Finance Minister with the condition of things which he supposed to exist in the Province of New Brunswick and in the city of St. John, and he went over half the hemisphere and spoke of the desperate condition of things as to our trade with Newfoundland, the desperate condition of things in the Spanish West Indies and even in the British West Indies, and, when he called it a black picture, he could hardly keep his feet on the floor because of the delight which beamed from every feature

of his benevolent countenance. I could not help thinking that if it were a black picture, it was one that the hon. member for Prince Edward Island enjoyed to his heart's content. But the enjoyment of pictures like that is only for the artist who paints them, and we are happy to know that when the hon. gentleman paints a picture it is always so widely different from nature as to be a wretched caricature. The hon. gentleman took us half way around the globe to tell us how our trade had been ruined with Newfoundland, how it had been ruined with the West Indies, how this treaty with Spain was coming to nothing, as it always had come to nothing when we attempted to negotiate it for the past twelve years. He declared if there was a bright spot in this dark picture we found it in Great Britain where the antiquated policy of protection was utterly abandoned and abhorred. But he forgot that within two minutes he had been showing that that policy, instead of being antiquated, was gradually closing around Great Britain, and was being adopted by nearly every other country in the world. He forgot that it was this antiquated and abandoned policy which was actuating Newfoundland, which was actuating the West Indies, and which governs almost every country in the world. Now, when the hon. gentleman proceeded to address a deliberate argument to this House about the duty of the House with regard to discrimination against British goods, he involved himself and his party in two or three positions which are absurdly contradictory. The hon. gentleman and his friends, with their press, have never tired of making the bold assertion that it is the policy of this Government to discriminate against the mother country. They make use of that argument, not for the purpose of addressing to the House what his resolution points to, but for the purpose of contending that a policy of direct discrimination, which they propose under the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, is that which is now adopted by this Government. The Minister of Finance time and again has torn the mask from their faces, and has shown that nowhere in this tariff is there discrimination against Great Britain, and that when they use the word discrimination they are simply playing upon words to deceive the ignorant among the populace, and for no other purpose. But they will try in vain to mislead this House by any such falsification of terms. Sir, the Minister of Finance last session put that as tersely and in as few words as it could be put. He defied them to name a single product coming from Great Britain which was taxed a cent higher than such a product coming from any other country, and if they cannot do that it is vain for them to talk about discrimination. The tariff, as to articles which are to be put on the free list, or as to any other, must always depend upon the policy which it is necessary for this country to pursue as regards its revenue and the conditions of its people from time to time. We have never made, with regard to the mother country, nor with regard to our own people, any secret of our policy in that respect. We have said boldly to the mother country, not that we desired to discriminate against her; but we have said: You, with our consent and by our wish, have laid certain burdens upon us as part of this Empire; we have, to a certain extent, to maintain our own defence, we have to keep up the British institutions which we got from you, and in bearing our own financial burdens, it is absolutely necessary that we should be the masters of our own tariff, saving one thing only, and that is that we shall not forget the duties we owe to the Empire by agreeing that any foreign country shall have a preference over you in the tariffs which we make. It is for this country, as it is for every self-governing colony, to say what duties are necessary to be raised in order to discharge the obligations which the mother country has laid upon us, and if the hour comes when Great Britain should say to us: You shall not make this tariff or that tariff, the obvious answer we should have to make would be that this is the best tariff we can frame in the interest of our own people, under the constitution she had given to us, and if it did not suit the mother country, we would decline to make any other. I repeat that while we are a portion of the Empire we shall never forget the duties we owe to that Empire and to our sister colonies. When I say that we would decline to make any other tariff than that which suits our own people, I do not mean that we shall surrender our right to self-government, or submit to a tariff made elsewhere; but I mean to say, as Sir Alexander Galt once said, that when a colony was given the right of self-government and charged with the sustenance of British institutions, the colony must be the judge of the tariff which must be made, and that it could be responsible to no other country in that respect. As I have said, we must recognize the sovereignty of the Monarchy of which we are subjects, and our relations to the Empire are utterly inconsistent with the idea of giving a preference to foreign countries, in the markets of this country, over our fellow subjects in other parts of the Empire, and in Great Britain itself. That was what we stood for in our contest with Newfoundland, which the hon. member for Queen's calls childish and puerile to-night. That was what we succeeded in pressing upon the attention of the British Government then, and if we had not fought that battle with Newfoundland, we might have had to fight it afterwards with the British West Indies. In the arrangement with the West Indies made with the United States, they started with this principle: that under no circumstances would discrimination be entertained as regards the mother country or as regards the other colonies. That battle fought, and for the time being won as regards Newfoundland, it had not to be fought over with regard to the West Indies; but if we had given way as regards Newfoundland we should not have had any ground to stand upon when the question came to be considered with regard to the British West Indies. Now, I do not need to point out that this hon. gentleman who has spoken for the last hour, and the party for whom he speaks, have not, by any covert means, or in any secondary meaning of the term discrimination, declared here during this session, and they have avowed everywhere else, while they had the vestige of a hope that the policy of unrestricted reciprocity would help them into office, they have avowed everywhere that that was an essential part of their unrestricted reciprocity scheme, and that any man would be a fool who thought we could get reciprocity with the United States—without which this country must perish—unless we pledged ourselves to direct discrimination against British goods and in favour of goods coming from the mother country. What then is the meaning of the amendment which is brought

before the House to-night ? Is it a sincere change of policy ? Can my hon. friend from Bruce claim that we are, as one time we almost hoped, securing the conversion in platoons on the other side of the House, or is it a merely clap-trap to deceive the House and the country ? Have they become convinced that the British sentiment is still strong in the breast of the people of Canada, and have they come to the conclusion that they had better appeal to that, even though they were a few months ago running strongly in the other direction, in the direction, as the leader of the Opposition pointed out, in which our interests pointed ? Well, Sir, it is either that, or it is this, which has actuated these gentlemen in every step they have taken with regard to the fiscal policy of this country. In every resolution they have proposed, finding there is a disposition on the part of this country to extend its trade and to get something by giving an equivalent, they propose as they have done on so many other occasions, to give what we have to give for nothing. This is the trade policy which these hon. gentlemen recommend,—and it is a policy upon which I suppose they would go to Spain to negotiate a treaty as they say we have been trying to do for the last 12 years. They would try the same policy there I suppose and every place else they would wish to get a treaty made. They would say : Don't let us sit down and discuss what we would exchange, but let us start upon the principle that we will give away everything before we begin. That is precisely why these hon. gentlemen played so ridiculous a part in regard to the question of reciprocity with the United States. They declared everywhere, by resolutions of legislatures, and by speeches and by resolutions put before this House on which they staked the political existence of their party, that what they were willing to give the United States was all that we had to give, with nothing in return. In the words of one of their advocates who went to that country and made one of these famous Boston speeches which have been of so much use in the discussion of this question in this country, and have thrown such marvellous light upon the question of unrestricted reciprocity—

"You shall have the right to come among us and take, in a single word, everything."

The policy which is indicated in the resolution proposed this afternoon is, on the one hand, that there is held up a proposal to Great Britain to give discrimination in our favour as part of the colonial empire, to give the colonial empire discrimination in her markets in return for discrimination in ours. The proposal which these gentlemen would have us make is : We will give you a reduction of duty on your goods without asking for any equivalent in return. Considerable fault was found, in utter insincerity I am sure, with the resolution of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) because it did not declare that we proposed to give a preference to British goods in our markets. If it does not declare that, I am incapable of understanding language. The words of the resolution are :

"That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods."

Those would not be corresponding advantages if they were advantages given to every other country, because the advantage with which they are to correspond is preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain and Ireland ; so that if the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Davies) is so desirous now of treating the goods and products of Great Britain with discriminating favour, he will not find any difficulty in voting for the resolution of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) which he seems to regard as so serious. As regards the amendment to the resolution before the House, I have nothing to add to what I have said. It is evidently intended to mislead the House, and evidently intended to mislead the country by pretending that it goes on the basis of discriminating in favour of the mother country while it does nothing of the kind. It throws away the only chance that we have of making to the mother country an offer which many of us believe, that sooner or later she will be disposed to accept ; but an offer which she will be the sooner disposed to accept the sooner we make it to her. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) put himself to a great deal of trouble to read statements which were made by prominent statesmen derogatory to the arrangement advocated by my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and derogatory to its adoption in the mother country. It is something new to me to find a gentleman upon that side of the House or upon this side, who is willing to take the bare dictum of any British Minister as absolutely concluding a great public question in which masses of the population of the whole Empire are interested. I think, Sir, that is not the way in which changes have been effected or improvements made in time past, whether constitutional or economic ; but it is rather by a bold statement of the principles or the rights which are under discussion, a statement likely to elicit respect in the minds of the people of Great Britain. In times past the people of this country, and of the other colonies too, have never been disposed to be daunted by the frown of a single British Minister. Well, Sir, we have the utterances of other Ministers upon this question, and I remember that it is not so very long ago when Lord Salisbury, whose rank in the councils of the mother country, I need not emphasize, discussed this question. The declaration that he made was not that the policy was a ridiculous one and would not be entertained by Great Britain ; but he said that the time was inopportune, and he declared that a movement like this must come from the colonies themselves ; and if the colonies desire it, the motion which my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has made this afternoon is in accordance with the suggestion of the First Minister of Great Britain himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) took some trouble to treat the House to a little humour of a rather fanciful and exaggerated kind, with regard to the fate of the resolution which was proposed in the British House of Commons when this matter was under consideration as an amendment to the Address in answer to Her Majesty's speech at the opening of Parliament. Anybody who has examined the question with the smallest degree of intelligence would fail to follow the hon. gentleman's argument with any appreciation. Nobody acquainted with parliamentary institutions and parliamentary usages imagines for a single moment that that resolution was put before the Imperial

House of Commons for the purpose of being pressed to a division, or for the purpose of seeing how many members would even support it in debate, yet the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) was facetious in declaring that a third man could not be found to advocate it. As was the case with other important questions, it was moved at that early part of the session, and at that initiatory stage of the session's business, for the purpose of calling the attention of the Empire to the question, and not alone the attention of the British House of Commons. That purpose was served, and the wildest visionary having charge of the question and anxious for its adoption, could not have done it a greater injury that to force it to a division at a time which was not opportune, and when it must have been defeated by an overwhelming majority with even its very best friends voting against it. There is, therefore, no cause for discouragement in the treatment which that resolution received in the British House of Commons. The Minister of Finance has advised the House to pass this resolution as an indication of the opinion of this Parliament to be sent to the mother country. We will, at least, be able to say that it is an expression of opinion, which this Parliament has a right to make, not only upon its own affairs, but upon affairs of the Empire with which it is completely bound up; and, Sir, we will be able to say likewise, that we are taking the step which Lord Salisbury himself declared should be the initial step in the movement, and a step, which, if taken by the Parliament of this great country, will not fail to attract the attention of our fellow colonists, and to awaken I hope a large sympathetic feeling throughout Great Britain and Ireland as well. It will be a resolution entirely consistent with our own manhood and the independence of our own Parliament, and it will not be a filibustering resolution such as the amendment which proposes to give away something and to get nothing in return, and to set up the mere pretense and sham that the policy of to-day is a discriminatory policy against British goods, as British goods, instead of being as it is a tariff enactment which is perfectly fair, and perfectly free, and perfectly equal in its application as between the mother country and the foreign countries whose goods may come into competition from time to time in the Canadian market.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not intend to detain the House at any length to-night; but I wish to make a few remarks in reference to some of the charges made by the Minister of Justice in the course of his speech. At the outset that hon. gentleman informed the House that the party noted for opposition to the mother country was now in a hypocritical sense professing love for that country, and was offering a resolution to this House, which while professing to serve the interests of the mother country and do justice to her, was a hypocritical one, and in that sense was characteristic of the party offering it. Now, Sir, the party sitting opposite is responsible for a policy which was conceived in a spirit of hostility to Great Britain, which provoked the deepest resentment in Great Britain, and which was presented to this country in a spirit the very reverse of conciliatory. When it was represented that the National Policy would have an effect on our relations with England, the leaders of that party said, in the press and on the platform, that if that policy affected British connection, so much the worse for British connection. Sir, that policy has been a hostile policy to England and has been recognized as such by the English people, and the party on this size of the House has never failed on every occasion on which that policy has been under discussion to point out its unfairness to England, and to demand that it shall be changed, and that the burdens imposed on British trade and the injuries offered to British interests shall be removed. If England has had a friend in this Parliament, that friend has been Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. Not a session has passed but the Opposition has pointed out to the people of this country the grievous injustice done to England by this National Policy for which the party opposite is responsible, which it has brought into existence, and which it is sustaining to this day. We are told that the utterances of the hon. member for Queen's in criticising the remarks of the Finance Minister in regard to opening up new avenues of trade for the country, had a ring of insincerity, and that he referred to the calamities which had befallen some sections of this Dominion in a spirit of jubilation. I deny that such was the case. In a very proper manner my hon. friend pointed out that the policy of the Government had been disastrous to many portions of this Dominion, and in fulfilment of his duty as a critic he did so in a way to refute the arguments of the hon. Minister of Finance. The Minister of Justice denies the assertions made on this side of the House that our tariff discriminates against England. Sir, it is impossible to deny that. The facts and figures are before us, and he might as well deny that we have a tariff at all. The fact that the revenue collected on dutiable English goods is 4 per cent greater than that collected on dutiable American goods disproves the assertion made by the Minister of Justice. At the same time the tariff admits a much larger quantity of free goods from the United States than it does from Great Britain. Every one knows that the tariff is hostile to England, and discriminates against England. Sir, we are told that the party on this side of the House proposes to make commercial arrangements by which we shall give something and get nothing in return. I deny it. The Minister of Finance in making this criticism referred, I suppose, to the position of the party on the reciprocity question. Well, Sir, we have never trifled or attempted to trifle with the feelings, the interests or the credulity of the people with regard to reciprocity negotiations. We have never declared to the people that we could obtain a reciprocity treaty on impossible conditions. We have never attempted to deceive the people. We have always professed, if we were to obtain a reciprocity treaty, that we must obtain it on true reciprocal grounds, and that if we wanted to get something we must give an equivalent. These hon. gentlemen, who attempted to get something without giving an equivalent, who recently went to Washington to enter upon a negotiation which they knew was foredoomed to failure, who attempted to deceive this country by making statements which they knew to be false, who professed to be able to get a reciprocity treaty, who professed to have a treaty under negotiation, who dissolved Parliament in order that they might refer it to a House that was not a moribund House, who were all this time making professions that were without

foundation, professions which the Secretary of State of the United States denied when these election dodges were brought to his ears, who in carrying out their game sent their commissioners to Washington where they remained only a few hours, who sent them there again a short time ago to propose impossible conditions, knowing that they would simply meet with a refusal; these hon. gentlemen, having played this game, having made it serve their purpose, seeing it now exposed, and being unable any longer to make it play on the credulity of the people, are taking up another dodge, and are professing to offer to the British people preferences for their goods in this country if England will impose preferential duties against the food products of all countries for our benefit. They are parading this new dodge, assuring the people that they are now going to get another boon, and they will perhaps dissolve Parliament again in order that this question may be referred to a House that is not a moribund House. Sir, we have no reason to suppose that England will concede this privilege, that she will re-enact the corn laws, that she will go back on her policy of half a country, a policy which has made her the great manufacturing and commercial power of the globe. The hon. gentleman does not suppose it; the Finance Minister does not suppose it; but it will be a good thing to amuse the people with. Now, that the reciprocity dodge is played out, they are obliged to raise the cry of despair on that subject, and it is necessary to have something else to amuse the groundlings with, and this resolution they think will in all probability serve their purpose. Now, Sir, what reason have we for supposing that England will ever assent to this proposition? What importance does her trade with her colonial possessions bear in comparison with her trade with the rest of the world? What does her trade with Canada amount to in comparison with her trade with the rest of the world? In 1890-91 the trade of England with the United States amounted to $640,000,000, while her trade with Canada amounted to only $91,000,000. Will England pay more attention to this $90,000,000 trade with Canada than she will to the $640,000,000? In the same year the trade of England with all her possessions, including India, amounted to £183,000,000, and her trade with the rest of the world to £500,000,000, the former being only 36 per cent of the latter. The trade of England with the United States is two-thirds as great as her trade with India, Australia, Canada and all the other possessions over which her flag waves. England is not likely to sacrifice 64 per cent of her trade in order to promote the interests of 36 per cent of her trade. She is a great commercial nation, she has built up her business on commercial principles. Her commercial supremacy rests upon her ability to obtain cheap supplies of food and raw material and everything that forms a component part of her manufactured productions. This proposition is that England shall voluntarily sacrifice the advantages she possesses from her position as the great commercial and manufacturing nation of the globe. There is no human probability that this proposition will ever be entertained in England, and I repeat that the proposition on the part of the Government is one intended to deceive the people of this country. I repeat that they have deceived the people once. They deceived them on the reciprocity question, and they plainly betrayed to-night that they are hostile to it. Every speaker on that side has denounced to-night reciprocity, and now, forsooth, we are to have the proposition that England shall impose discriminating duties on all the food that she imports for the use of her people for the benefit of Canada, and that absurd proposition is to be made by the Parliament of Canada to England for the purpose of securing—what? A mortifying and humiliating rebuff. I think that the object of this motion, the object of this movement, on the part of the Government is so transparent that we can do no better than vote it down. I think the resolution offered by the hon. member for Queen's is on the contrary a resolution which proposes to grant substantial justice to England and to confer a substantial benefit on the people of Canada. If we wish to show our good-will to the people of England, if we wish to redeem some of the faults of the past, if we wish to make some restitution for the cruel discrimination we have practised against England since 1878, we can do no less than pass this resolution which proposes to reduce the duty on English goods that we may increase English trade and reduce the cost of goods to our consumers. Let us give some evidence of our faith by our works and show truly that we wish to make reparation to England for past faults. Let us show that we are loyal to English interests and ready to do England justice.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Before the motion is put to the House, I desire to address a word or two concerning more particularly this question of discrimination under the present tariff and the question how far the tariff in operation during the period of the Mackenzie Government tended to promote trade between Canada and Great Britain. It is a refreshing novelty to hear from the lips of the hon. member for North Norfolk words championing the cause of trade between Canada and Great Britain. We are not accustomed to find him in an attitude of that kind, and I do think that the credit for this eleventh hour repentance is to be attributed, not so much to the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Bruce as to the result of the conference in Washington in the month of February last. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have been in the habit of charging that the Ministers who went to Washington then utterly failed to accomplish any object, but they will have to abandon that position hereafter and admit that at least the mission to Washington has had the effect of changing their attitude towards our commercial relations with England. I may be allowed to use an apt quotation, which I remember from my school-boy days, with reference to the amendment of hon. gentlemen: *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, and I do think we should distrust the gifts these gentlemen are offering to us to-day. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, as near as I could take down his words, said that the Liberal party had never failed to point out the injustice of the burdens we imposed under the National Policy on our commercial relations with Great Britain. He based that statement on the assertion that our present tariff discriminates against Great Britain by the imposition of duties averaging 22 per cent, whereas the duties on goods imported from the United States into Canada are only 14 per

cent. That is perfectly true; but what was the state of things under the tariff in operation during the Mackenzie Government? It was this: The average rate of duty in 1878 upon the total imports into Canada from the United States was 9 per cent and upon the total imports from Great Britain it was 17 per cent, a discrimination of 8 per cent, the same identically as that which exists to-day. Did I say identically? Far from it. A discrimination infinitely greater, for this reason: that our imports from the United States consist now to a larger degree than ever before of free goods, whereas from Great Britain they consist to a larger degree than ever before of manufactured products. Why, these gentlemen who are posing to-day as the friends of trade with Great Britain, enjoyed five years of power, and I think we may fairly judge them by their works. What was the trade of our country when they took hold of the tariff? We imported in 1873, the last year of Conservative rule, $68,500,000 worth of goods from the mother country. In 1878, after these gentlemen had been five years in office, we imported only $37,000,000, or a decrease of $31,000,000; whereas our trade with the United States increased from $47,750,000 in 1873 to $48,600,000 in 1878, or three quarters of a million of an increase, as compared with $31,000,000 of a decrease in our trade with Great Britain during the period these gentlemen held office. If our tariff to-day discriminates against Great Britain, the trade returns do not bear that statement out, because we imported in 1891 $5,000,000 worth more of goods into Canada from Great Britain than we did in 1878, the last year these gentlemen were conducting the affairs of the country. The one point I wish to press upon the House is that there was exactly as high a discrimination against imports from Great Britain under their tariff as exists to-day, that our trade with the mother country, in spite of the increase in duties, is larger to-day than when these gentlemen left office, and that the discrimination in our tariff, not as against British goods but as against that class of goods which we import from Great Britain, is not greater than it was when these gentlemen held office. They know perfectly well, as the Minister of Justice has said, that they are attempting to deceive the people of this country when they talk of discrimination against British goods in our own tariff. Why is it our imports of free goods from the United States are so large? Last year we imported $4,000,000 worth of raw cotton from the United States. Now, if we impose a duty of 50 per cent on that article, would it promote trade with Great Britain? It would simply have the effect of adding a tax on the people without in any way assisting our trade with Great Britain. It is true, I am glad that it is true, that within the last two years we have had duties upon articles of agriculture and beef products for the purpose of protecting the Canadian agriculturist, but if these goods were made free, we should simply admit more of them from the United States without benefiting our trade with Great Britain in any degree. If the policy proposed were carried out, instead of our importing as we did last year three times as much of manufactured goods from the mother country as we did from the United States, the effect would be to revert to the condition of things which existed between 1873 and 1878. in other words to increase our imports from the United States and throw the trade which we now do with Great Britain into the lap of the Americans.

House divided on amendment of (Mr. Davies):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Godbout,
Armstrong,	Guay,
Bain (Wentworth)	Langelier,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Legris,
Bowman,	Lister,
Brodeur,	Livingston,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Carroll,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Monet,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perry,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Delisle,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Rowan,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Featherston,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Sutherland,
Frémont,	Vaillancourt,
Gauthier,	Watson,
Geoffrion,	Welsh, and
Gillmor,	Yeo.—64.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bain (Soulanges),	Mackintosh,
Baker,	McAlister,
Barnard,	McCarthy,
Bennett,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bergeron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bergin,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Bowell,	McKay,
Boyle,	McLean,
Cameron,	McLennan,
Carignan,	McLeod,
Carling,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McNeill,
Corbould,	Madill,
Curran,	Mara,
Davin,	Miller,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Denison,	Moncrieff,
Desaulniers,	O'Brien,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Ouimet,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Colchester),
Dewdney,	Patterson (Huron),
Dickey,	Pelletier,
Dugas,	Pridham,
Dupont,	Prior,
Dyer,	Putnam,
Earle,	Reid,
Fairbairn,	Robillard,
Foster,	Roome,
Fréchette,	Rosamond,
Gillies,	Ross (Dundas),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Savard,
Gordon,	Simard,
Grandbois,	Skinner,
Guillet,	Smith (Ontario),
Hazen,	Stairs,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hodgins,	Temple,
Hughes,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hutchins,	Tisdale,
Ives,	Tupper,
Kaulbach,	Turcotte,
Kenny,	Tyrwhitt,
Kirkpatrick,	Wallace,
LaRivière,	White (Cardwell),
Lépine,	White (Shelburne),
Lippé,	Wilmot,
Macdonald (King's),	Wilson, and
Macdonald (Winnipeg),	Wood (Brockville).—98.

Amendment negatived.

House divided on motion of Mr. McNeill:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Mackintosh,
Bain (Soulanges),	McAllister,
Baker,	McCarthy,
Barnard,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bennett,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bergeron,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Bergin,	McKay,
Bowell,	McLean,
Boyle,	McLennan,
Cameron,	McLeod,
Carignan,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Carling,	McNeill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Madill,
Corbould,	Mara,
Curran,	Miller,
Davin,	Mills (Annapolis),
Davis,	Moncrieff,
Denison,	O'Brien,
Desaulniers,	Ouimet,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Patterson (Colchester),
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Huron),
Dewdney,	Pelletier,
Dickey,	Pridham,
Dugas,	Prior,
Dupont,	Putnam,
Dyer,	Reid,
Earle,	Robillard,
Fairbairn,	Roome,
Foster,	Rosamond,
Fréchette,	Ross (Dundas),
Gillies,	Savard,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Simard,
Gordon,	Skinner,
Grandbois,	Smith (Ontario),
Guillet,	Stairs,
Hazen,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Temple,
Hodgins,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hughes,	Tisdale,
Hutchins,	Tupper,
Kaulbach,	Turcotte,
Kenny,	Tyrwhitt,
Kirkpatrick,	Wallace,
LaRivière,	White (Cardwell),
Lépine,	White, (Shelburne),
Lippé,	Wilmot,
Macdonald (King's),	Wilson, and
Macdonald (Winnipeg),	Wood (Brockville)—97.
Macdonell (Algoma),	

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Guay,
Armstrong,	Langelier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Laurier,
Béchard,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bourassa,	Legris,
Bowman,	Lister,
Brodeur,	Livingston,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Carroll,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Monet,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perry,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Delisle,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Rowand,
Edwards,	Sanborn,
Featherston,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Sutherland,
Frémont,	Vaillancourt,
Gauthier,	Watson,
Geoffrion,	Welsh, and
Gillmor,	Yeo.—63.
Godbout,	

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. Before you adjourn I wish to call attention to something that struck me during the recent debate. It is the most forcible thing that struck me from that side. It is a blue-book, and, speaking seriously, I doubt if language too strong could be used in reference to the conduct of any one who would throw a missile of that kind. It is simply a blackguard trick.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have only to say that I am entirely powerless to prevent these occurrences unless the House sustains me.

Motion agreed to: and House adjourned at 1.50 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) to amend the Civil Service Act. He said: This Bill is to legalize the employment of temporary clerks. They have been employed heretofore under the Civil Service Act, and the Auditor General has raised the point that temporary clerks should not be continuously employed, and this Bill is to permit their employment temporarily.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it increasing the number of clerks?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). No.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. When the Civil Service Act of 1882 was passed, there were some officers temporarily employed. That Act allowed them to be continued, although they did not pass the examination under that Act; but in an amending Act passed a year or two ago—I think by inadvertence, although I may be wrong about that—the section was dropped and the clause re-enacted without it. This clause is simply to continue the temporary clerks who were employed before that Act was passed, in accordance with the general principle embodied in the Act, not to interfere with persons employed before the Act was passed.

Mr. LAURIER. In other words, to allow clerks to be kept in office permanently, under the name of temporary clerks, without passing examination?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, those who were there when the Act was passed.

Mr. CURRAN. This question was raised when the Bill was first introduced and we went into it fully, the understanding arrived at being that the temporary clerks employed in any particular de-

partment before 1882 should be capable of appointment without examination. In the amended Act the clause was omitted. Some very grave acts of injustice have been committed against competent men who have been in the service a large number of years.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But who were unable to pass the examination.

Mr. CURRAN. A certificate of competency from the clerk's superior officer is required.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The principal difficulty was as to age.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I find that the Bill respecting representation in the House of Commons will not be ready till Thursday.

Order allowed to stand.

SUPERANNUATION OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. FOSTER. I promised yesterday to answer the question of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), which is as follows :—

"Whether any of the vacancies caused by the superannuation of civil servants, a return of which had been laid on the Table of the House since Parliament met, have been filled? If so, the name of the appointee and the salary to be paid."

The answer is as follows :—Post Office Department : Name of superannuated officer—F. Denechaud, vacancy filled by transfer ; name of appointee, J. O. Pagneau, salary, $800 ; P. E. Bucke, promotion ; new appointee, W. J. Johnston, salary, $1,400. Customs Department—P. Collins, superannuated ; appointee, Samuel Platt, salary, $150. Inland Revenue Department—F. L. DesRivieres, superannuated ; J. A. P. Hébert, appointee, salary, $500. The other vacancies given in the return as not filled have not yet been filled.

VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I should like to ask the Secretary of State when the remainder of the voters' lists will be presented ? We have not yet received the statement respecting South Grey. The return was made last year ; four months have elapsed, and the list is not yet printed. What is the cause of the delay, and when may we expect to receive it ?

Mr. PATTERSON (Huron). I have not the information with me, but I will give the hon. gentleman full information to-morrow.

RETURNS.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. On 14th March I moved for two returns, one in connection with the engraving contract, and one respecting the admission of live cattle. I have mentioned the matter twice, and the Minister has stated they would be brought down immediately.

Mr. CARLING. The information with respect to cattle has been prepared, and it will be brought down.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. When may we expect the papers in connection with the engraving contract ?

Mr. FOSTER. The papers are all ready, and I have signed them. They will probably be brought down to-day.

TENANT FARMERS' REPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have the Tenants Farmers' Reports yet been placed in hand, and are they ready for distribution ? They were promised for the day after the discussion on immigration.

Mr. CARLING. I spoke to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and told him I had not yet the report of the delegates who had visited the Maritime Provinces, but I had the report of the other farmers' delegates who visited those provinces the previous year. I am not aware of any report from the gentlemen who visited the Maritime Provinces a year ago last spring.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely there was a report ?

Mr. CARLING. The report has been made, I suppose, to the High Commissioner. Their visit was arranged by him, and the reports would be made to him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But surely they would be transmitted here.

Mr. CARLING. I suppose they will be transmitted, but I have not yet received them.

CANADA AND NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to invite the attention of the Government to a statement made in an Ottawa morning paper respecting the complicated arrangements between the Dominion and the colony of Newfoundland. I see it is stated in the paper that the reply of the Newfoundland Government has been received, that is, the reply to the proposal of this Government to a conference looking to the establishment of the *status quo* between the two countries, and that answer indicates certain reasons why Newfoundland would not agree to a renewal of the *status quo*. The proposal made by the Government, and the reply of the Newfoundland Government affect the obligations between the two Governments, and are therefore important, and it is very desirable those papers should be laid on the Table at an early date. This newspaper appears to have full information on the subject, and Parliament should also be advised as quickly as a newspaper should be. We should be placed in possession of this information at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. TUPPER. That will be done.

MAPS.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When may we expect the maps that were promised ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am under the impression that they are prepared. They are being done under the direction of the Minister of Railways, and it is on account of his illness that I am not able to state definitely when they will be brought down. I hope they will be to-morrow ; at all events, I will have information respecting them.

UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 11) respecting fishing vessels of the United States.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he would reach the same object, and perhaps improve the Bill, by striking out section 2.

Mr. TUPPER. That suggestion is acceptable, and perhaps it is better to do it in that way.

Bill reported.

WRIT FOR NORTH PERTH.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood from the Minister of Justice yesterday that the writ for North Perth had been issued.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said it was being issued then; I find it was not issued until to-day.

Mr. LAURIER. It is issued now?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

ORDNANCE LANDS IN TORONTO.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 58) to authorize the conveyance to the Corporation of the City of Toronto, of certain Ordnance lands in that city.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. Who has valued this property?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Whitney was one of the valuators, and the other gentleman was the assessment commissioner, Mr. Maughan.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the amount that was named in the Bill the market value of the fee simple of the land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I believe that the valuation was made about nine months ago. I understand it is the fair valuation of the property and if valued to-day that it would have been valued at less than the price agreed upon.

Mr. MULOCK. Is the city to get the fee simple of the land?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Then what is the meaning of the section of the Bill which says that the grant is to be made subject to such provisions and conditions as the Governor in Council may deem proper?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that part refers to the terms of payment.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that we should know what these conditions are before legislating.

Mr. DEWDNEY. $52,000, and my impression is it is to be paid in five years, with interest in the meantime at 5 per cent or 6 per cent.

Mr. MULOCK. We ought to see the valuations before assenting to the sale.

Mr. DENISON. I may say that the demand on the part of the city for land has increased on account of the enormous increase in the cattle trade. The ground they have is altogether too small, and the price I am satisfied is a good one, a larger price than could be obtained to-day, because when this arrangement was made valuation of property was high. If valued to-day, I doubt whether it would bring quite so much because land is more stagnant now in Toronto.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I must object to the hon. gentleman decrying the credit of the city.

Mr. DENISON. I am not decrying it, but I say I doubt whether the land would bring so much now as it would have brought nine months or a year ago; and I know, as I have said before, that the character of the man who made the valuations stands very high. Mr. Maughan is well known as a man whose character is of the highest, and any valuation he gave would be received with confidence by every citizen in Toronto. I may say the same of Mr. Whitney, the other valuator, and I am quite sure that the hon. member for North York, if he wanted a valuation himself, would not wish for better valuators than those two gentlemen.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the area of this property?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Six acres and a fraction.

Mr. COATSWORTH. It is a little over $1,000 an acre, and the value was certainly high, as land stands at this time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. COATSWORTH. But that is merely owing to local causes, as the hon. member for Bothwell knows well. Land is not so saleable in Toronto to-day, purely from local causes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Blue-ruin.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I would like to say with regard to the second clause, that there are no special restrictions. It is a sale in fee simple, and the terms have been arranged by contract between the Government and the city, and the money is to be paid in five years with interest at 5 per cent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the meaning of this clause:

"Subject, however, to such conditions as the Governor in Council deems proper."

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is only superabundant caution and nothing else.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The reason special attention is called to this is that the preamble recites:

"And whereas the said market is largely used in connection with the cattle trade between the Dominion of Canada and England, and the said corporation have expended large sums of money, and have used other means to foster and increase the said trade, which is a matter of interest and benefit to the whole of Canada; and, whereas, it is expedient that the said grant be made upon payment of the said sum of $52,000, subject, however, to such conditions as the Governer in Council deems proper."

That would imply there are special conditions not attached to the usual grant.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That would naturally be implied, but the fact is that in other Bills, from time to time, enabling us to sell Ordnance lands, or part with them by free grant, those words are used, and they have been copied in drawing this Bill, but inasmuch as this is a sale at full value, there are really no special terms and conditions.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister has been good enough to send me the valuation of Mr. Whitney, but not that of Mr. Maughan.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There was a mistake made in mentioning this gentleman's name as one of the valuators. I did not remember it at the moment, but I find it is Mr. Crosbie.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the property assessed for?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I really cannot say.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we should have that information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In the preamble it is said that large sums of money have been expended by the city in promotion of the cattle trade. Are we to understand that any portion of the money so expended is to be considered as part payment of the value of the property?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; there is nothing paid at all.

Mr. MULOCK. If we are engaged in an ordinary business transaction and selling the public domain for the full value, I can see no object in introducing this argument about the cattle trade which is in the preamble. We are all deeply interested in the cattle trade, and if I were to consider the local interests of the neighbourhood from which I come, I should be doubly anxious that Toronto should make the best bargain it can, but we are here representing the whole people, and we ought to understand whether the sale is made solely for commercial reasons or whether it involves certain concessions made to the city of Toronto. If $52,000 be the present value of the property, why insert this argument in the recital?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Strictly speaking, there should be no sale of ordnance property otherwise than by public auction, and we want to have it appear on the face of the Bill why we sell, even for the full value, otherwise than in the usual way.

Mr. MULOCK. That being the case, I will not quarrel with the recital, but it would have been better if this explanation had been stated on the face of the Bill, that inasmuch as this property is acquired by the city for this special purpose, it was thought advisable to have it valued and sold at what was, in the opinion of the Government, the full market value and as much as would be obtained at an auction sale. I quite agree with my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison) that Mr. Whitney is a very capable man and a thorough expert in this class of business. I do not know whether this valuatien is made by Mr. Whitney himself or by some member of his firm, because this is not signed by Mr. Whitney but by the firm of Whitney & Son. If the valuation was made by Mr. Whitney, I should have perfect confidence in his judgment. I ask the Minister if this is the opinion of Mr. Whitney himself, or of some employé of his firm?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I understood the valuation was made by Mr. Whitney himself. At any rate, he would be responsible for it.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister must not come down to us in that way. We are now proposing to sell property, and there is no question of having a remedy against Mr. Whitney. We ought to know whether it was he who made the valuation.

Mr. COATSWORTH. Does not the hon. gentleman know that there are only two members in that firm, and that Mr. Whitney's son does not make valuations?

Mr. MULOCK. If I knew that I would have said so.

Mr. COATSWORTH. The hon. gentleman lived in Toronto long enough to know.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member has no right to say that I knew that.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I only said that the hon. gentleman had lived in Toronto long enough to know that Mr. Whitney is the valuator of the firm, and all valuations are made by Mr. Whitney personally.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking to the responsible Minister of the Crown. I desire to know if this was made by Mr. Whitney, personally, or by some other member of his firm or some employé? Was it made by Mr. Whitney himself?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is my impression.

Mr. MULOCK. It is the Minister's duty to know and not give us his impression.

Mr. DEWDNEY. This is on the official paper of Whitney & Son, and I suppose it is not made without Mr. Whitney's knowledge.

Mr. COATSWORTH. And it is Mr. Whitney's signature.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I do not think this land is worth as much as the city is allowing for it now. The value of property has decreased lately, and I am sorry to see the city buying that at present, because a few years ago we could have had a larger area of land a mile and a half out on the railway for $40,000. The reason why the city is anxious to redeem that land is that it may not go outside the corporation. They have a net revenue of $20,000 a year from that property, and, therefore, it is to their interest to give a large amount for it, but I think it will not be very long before the city will have to remove that market as a nuisance to that part of the city.

Section 2 struck out.

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

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 13) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to move a clause which has been suggested by the Board of Inspection for the better administration of the Act; it is similar to a provision that obtains in the United States on the same subject. I move that this clause be added:

Section 41 of the said Act is hereby further amended by adding the following sub-section thereto:—

"Every engineer holding a certificate of competency, whether granted under this Act or under the Act of the United Kingdom relating to Merchant Shipping, who is employed on any steamboat, shall keep his certificate of competency posted up, framed, and protected by glass in some conspicuous place in the engine room of such steamboat, and any engineer neglecting so to do shall incur a penalty of $20."

The penalty in the States is $100, but I think $20 is sufficient in this country. The hon. member for North York brought up the propriety of making

an amendment so that there should be consistency in connection with a promulgation of the rules, and several hon. gentlemen in the committee who differed with me on the main question, thought that position a correct one from my own standpoint. My attention was not called to the other portion of the Act at the time, or I certainly would have proposed that to the committee, for it is the principle I advocated in the first instance. In order, then, to take the regulations concerning life-preservers and life-appliances under the control of the board and the Governor in Council, just as has been done in connection with the boats, I propose this clause :

Section 30 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor :—

" The Governor in Council may make such regulations as are deemed advisable with respect to life-preservers or other life-saving appliances to be carried by steamboats or by other vessels mentioned in this Act."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us why it is necessary, instead of amending the Bill and leaving it part of the Act, to confer this power on the Governor in Council? When the Bill was in committee before I called the attention of the House to the fact that the principle upon which they proceed in England is that the Crown in Council deal with matters upon which they have not sufficient data to deal with by legislative enactment. Now, here is a provision that has been on the Statute-book for several years. The hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that he does not know what ought to be done, what Parliament ought to be advised to do. The measure is not one of a nature that requires to be altered every few months ; and a permanent provision ought to be made by Act of Parliament and not by Governor in Council.

Mr. TUPPER. I see nothing to change the defence I made of the Bill when before the committee. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that what I advocate in this connection does not involve anything unusual respecting the supervision over steamers. I think the United States and the mother country afford us very good examples to follow. These rules and regulations concerning the engines, boilers, life-preservers and life-boats, requiring frequent alteration by reason of the improvements that are constantly being made in those appliances as well as in the construction of ships, it is thought well not to make a drastic provision by Act of Parliament that cannot be changed to suit changing circumstances except by the formal method of an Act of Parliament, and great inconvenience may occur in the meanwhile. The custom is for the board of trade in the one country that I mentioned, and the board of steamboat inspectors in the other country, to frame rules which have the force of law. We began this in 1868, when I find we took these powers under a former Act. Even in the Inland Revenue Act enormous powers are taken of necessity, and for the convenience of the public, under similar provisions and regulations by Order in Council. I can assure the hon. gentleman, having looked into the laws of the countries referred to, that there is no new departure. The departure was when this Act was framed and these statutory rules were adopted at that time. I may say that having discussed the subject with the officers concerned, I find they came under an Act of Parliament practically in this way : The chairman having been asked to frame these rules, these rules were submitted and placed in the statute, instead of the Minister at the time asking Parliament to put him in a position to make these regulations effective. We discussed pretty thoroughly this question in committee the other day, and I very reluctantly have repeated the substance of my argument then.

On section 13,

Mr. TUPPER. As we repeal all the rules by this Bill, and as it is proposed that the Bill should go into effect as soon as it is assented to, we shall find ourselves in a position where we will be unable to enforce the necessary safeguards in connection with the shipping interests. It is, therefore, proposed that the Act shall come into force on a future day to be named by proclamation issued by Governor in Council.

Mr. STAIRS. A little matter had been brought to my attention which I desire to submit to the Minister. The difficulty has arisen in the case of certificates granted to vessels inspected under this Act. Inspectors have been in the habit of giving certificates, allowing passengers to be carried on those steamships to certain ports. For example, take the case of a steamer inspected and licensed to carry passengers from Halifax to Charlottetown. Such a vessel cannot call in, on an emergency, at any other port and land passengers. At the same time, it might be considered desirable to change the vessel's route from Halifax to Charlottetown to Halifax to Boston. It has been reported to me by owners of some of the steamers that difficulty has arisen in this connection. I should like to ask the Minister to look into the matter and see how the difficulty may be removed.

Mr. TUPPER. This subject has been brought to my attention by the same parties who have, no doubt, discussed it with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs). I think the difficulty arises from a misunderstanding on the part of the steamboat owners. It is necessary when a vessel obtains a certificate that it should have the right to ply in certain waters. In the case mentioned there would be no difficulty in the owner obtaining a different certificate for a different route so long as, in the opinion of the inspector, the vessel was qualified to ply on that route. It is a matter of administration, and a question submitted by one of the owners in question was answered, I think, to his satisfaction.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister promised to deal with the point raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) with respect to buckets.

Mr. TUPPER. The rules will deal with that matter. In that connection I may state to the House that, in the opinion of the officers of the Marine Department, it would be very unwise to do away with the provision requiring metal or leather buckets. In England there is no provision as to the material of which the buckets shall be constructed, but on every steamer there must be a supply of hose sufficient to reach every part of the vessel. That is a very heavy expense to the owner, and the owners of steamers in Canada are not obliged to follow a rule of that kind. There are certain dangers in connection with wooden buckets. Part of the difficulty arises from neglect to maintain the condition of the buckets. They get out of

order in a shorter period than buckets of other material. It is absolutely necessary, in order to keep them in good condition, that water should be kept in them in order to prevent the hoops from coming off. Experience has shown that when an accident occurs not one-half of those buckets are found in a condition to be used. It was in order to save the expense of putting in a supply of hose that these buckets are required to be of metal or leather. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) mentioned that Mr. Coker had spoken to him on the subject. I have made enquiries, and I find that no representations have been made against that provision to the department by the steamboat owners or any of the inspectors. So I think the provision should not be changed, or, at all events, that a change should only be made after very careful enquiry.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the Minister to say that the rules which would be passed would enable him to decide what the material should be.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister also told us that, according to the best advice he has at present, buckets of wood are very objectionable. That is a very objectionable power to confer on the Governor in Council. Parliament should have some say in the matter. Now we are told that we have nothing to do with this important life-saving part of the Bill, but it is to be left to the all-wise Governor in Council to decide what steps should be taken. When the Bill was before the committee the member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) passed eulogies on it because it proposed to deal with this very question of buckets. We could not get him to look at any other feature of the Bill or see anything wrong about it, because we were going to amend the law on the bucket question. Now the Minister has kicked the bucket, and we do not hear anything about it. Does the hon. gentleman think now it is a good Bill?

Mr. TUPPER. The case of the hon. gentleman in regard to the buckets, if he puts it seriously, is a fair statement as to what Parliament is doing in regard to the whole subject, not only as regards the buckets but also as regards boats. It does not make the case weaker or stronger to mention the extraordinary powers vested in the Governor in Council respecting buckets, and all the arguments that I used on the one question applied equally to the other, The hon. gentleman admits there is some advantage in connection with the changes in these rules and regulations in treating them as I propose to treat them. They would be adopted on the advice of the officers who are paid by this Parliament to look very carefully into these questions. I take it that the hon. gentleman himself if he were dealing with a grave question of this kind, and had some idea of his own as to what a proper appliance would be, he would be the first man to seek expert advice. I do not say that these experts are always right, but their views will be shown in the regulations of the department, and if they do not meet with public approval it is open for the House at any time to rectify or change the whole policy.

Mr. HAZEN. When the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock) attempts to be witty at my expense in the House, he reminds me very much of the elephant I once saw in a circus which attempted to dance. The attempt of the hon. gentleman at being witty is equally ponderous. However, when he does attempt to be witty he should state the facts and he should not try to be witty on evidence that is not correct. The hon. gentleman must remember that when this question was before the House the other day I distinctly pointed out the principal grievance our steamboat owners on the St. John River had was that this law was to be enforced which had not been enforced for eight years previously, and that it was impossible for them to supply themselves with metallic life-boats. It is true I also spoke on the question of buckets, and if the hon. gentleman will refer to *Hansard* he will find that I made that a secondary question, but that the question I laid most stress on was the question of metallic life-boats, which I took pains to point out to the House were not necessary for the safety of passengers, at all events so far as the St. John River is concerned. This House has confirmed the principle that the Governor in Council shall deal with this question of life-boats, and if it is safe to intrust to the Government the regulations regarding life-boats, it is even more safe to intrust to them the question of buckets, which is a much less important matter. The Minister of Marine has, however, made a statement that I question. He said that the amendment to the Act passed to-day gives the Government sufficient power to deal with the question of buckets just as they have sufficient power to deal with life-boats; I doubt that very much. The amendment now adopted is as follows:—

"Section 30 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor: The Governor in Council may make such regulations as are deemed advisable with respect to life-preservers or other life-saving appliances to be carried on steamboats or other vessels mentioned in this Act."

That only gives the Governor in Council power to make regulations concerning life-saving appliances, but I do not think the wording of the section is broad enough to deal with this question of buckets. Section 34 of the old Act says:

"Every steamboat employed in the carriage of passengers whether by sea, bay, lake or river navigation, shall be provided with and have on board, in some convenient place, not less than 25 sufficient fire-buckets of metal or leather, five axes, and six good and sufficient lanterns, approved of by the inspector: Provided always, that passenger steamboats of more than seventy-five and less than one hundred and fifty tons gross shall not be required to be provided with and have on board a greater number of fire-buckets than twelve, and that passenger steamboats of seventy-five tons gross and under, and steam tugs under one hundred and fifty tons gross, shall not be required to be provided with and have on board a greater number of fire-buckets than six."

That section refers entirely to the precautions against fire, while the amendment refers only to life-preservers or other life-saving appliances. It would be a very strained construction to put on the amendment if it were taken to mean precautions against fire, and I, therefore, would ask the Minister of Marine to alter this section in such a way, or to add another section, giving the Governor in Council power to deal with this matter.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman's construction is a little strained, but still I see no objection to making it clear beyond dispute by adding the word "fire-buckets."

Mr. McGREGOR. There is now manufactured a pulp bucket which is the best life-preserver and life-protector we have. I have seen it tried and it

acts well and answers both purposes. It is light, it is substantial, and it can be used as a life-preserver, and is a good fire-bucket. As to the metallic boats, I think that the Minister will see that on the inland waters it would be almost impossible for us to allow vessels carrying passengers out without them. The wooden boats have been found very troublesome. I think if we had metallic boats on the fresh waters and pulp buckets to act as life-preservers and fire-buckets, it would meet the requirements of the case.

Mr. TUPPER. I think that is a very excellent suggestion, and it will be considered. At the time these rules were made, of course these pulp buckets to which the hon. gentleman refers, were not known.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) that if we delegate to the Governor in Council power to say of what material life-boats should be constructed, we might very consistently delegate to them the regulations regarding buckets. I pressed that opinion at the last meeting of the committee in consequence of the member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) insisting upon having a clause inserted in the Bill making special provision for the use of wooden buckets. He was not content at the last meeting to delegate that power to the Governor in Council.

Mr. HAZEN. That is not so.

Mr. MULOCK. At the last meeting, if I heard the hon. gentleman correctly, and I think I did; before we arrived at the proper stage of the Bill he moved an amendment to allow that wooden buckets should be used.

Mr. HAZEN. That is true.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I may congratulate the member for St. John on his conversion, because at the last meeting he was not willing to delegate the question of buckets to the Governor in Council.

Mr. HAZEN. Mr. Chairman, that is not the case; the hon. gentleman might state facts.

Mr. MULOCK. What are the facts?

Mr. HAZEN. The fact is simply this: that I wanted that question of the wooden buckets dealt with, and in order that it might be dealt with I moved an amendment to the Act as it was then. The question as to whether we should deal with it in that way, or refer it to the Governor in Council to deal with, never arose on the last occasion.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman must remember that the Bill introduced by the Minister repeals section 27 of the Revised Statutes, the general Steamboat Inspection Act, and substitutes for the details set forth in the Act such details as may be fixed by Governor in Council.

Mr. HAZEN. As regards life-boats?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, and delegated all that to the Governor in Council. That was demanded by the Government of the House, and the hon. gentleman conceded the wisdom of delegating that branch of legislation to the Governor in Council, and when, notwithstanding that delegation, he insisted upon the House specifying that wooden buckets might be used, I asked the Minister whether he could not very well deal with the whole subject. It was not consistent to delegate one branch of the life-saving apparatus to the Governor in Council and have the House retain the other, and the Minister said it was a very proper suggestion, and that he would consider it.

Mr. HAZEN. I would not object to that.

Bill reported.

INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I want to call the attention of the House to item 25, before having it formally called. The Bill is not printed in French, and I can only go on with it by the unanimous consent of the House; but my reason for asking the House to take it up in advance is this: By a North-West Ordinance passed after the Act of last session, the system of permits in the North-West Territories goes out of operation and in its stead a license system comes into operation. It is necessary to have the Inland Revenue Act extended to the North-West Territories, if possible before the 1st of May. There are some other provisions in the Bill, but that is the only one calling for urgency.

Mr. LAURIER. As this is a very wide departure from the legislation which has hitherto obtained in the North-West, I cannot consent to the second reading of the Bill at present, as I wish to give the matter further consideration.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 43) to amend an Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey (from the Senate). He said: The object of the Bill is only to give power to attach the Geological Survey branch, which is now under the jurisdiction of the Minister of the Interior, to another department, just as several other branches have been transferred to other departments. It gives the power to the Governor in Council to transfer the survey from one department to another.

Mr. LAURIER. Objection has been made during this session, time and again, to the system, now more and more prevailing, of divesting the House of its proper functions in order to convey them to the Governor in Council. At present the Department of Geological Survey is attached by law to the Department of the Interior. Now it is asked to vest in the Governor in Council the power to transfer this department to any other branch of the Executive. If there is any reason to make this alteration, let it be made by law. The Minister himself should give some reason why we should divest ourselves of this power and transfer it to the Governor in Council.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think that in all the Acts for the different departments to which branches are attached, that clause obtains. Under the Act relating to the Department of Agriculture, the immigration branch may be transferred to any other department by Order in Council, and it has been, under that power, transferred within the last week or two to the Department of the Interior. The Geological Survey branch has always been attached to the Department of the Interior. As the work may be heavy, and I fancy it will be from the experience I have had in the last week or two, it is thought that the Interior Department might be relieved of that work. It has not been definitely decided to which department it should

be transferred, and it is only for the sake of convenience this provision is asked for.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). One of the novel consequences that will flow from the adoption of the principle which the hon. gentleman proposes to extend to this branch of the public service, is that, while we have names given to various departments, the duties devolving upon the Minister in charge may have no relevancy to the office he holds. We may by Order in Council transfer the Department of Justice, so called, to the Minister of the Interior, and we might transfer the Department of Public Works to the Minister of Justice, and so the functions of the Minister would not be at all indicated by the name of the office he holds. In the neighbouring republic, which is a very large country, and the executive officers of which have duties to discharge not unlike those devolving upon the various departments of the Crown here, there is no changing about from one department of the public service to another. The name which the Minister holds should be appropriate to the functions which the department is called upon to discharge. If this Bill were adopted—and in this respect it does not differ, I admit, from the Bill relating to the Indian Department, and many others—the so-called Minister of Interior might be anything else than the Minister of Interior. You could not tell by the name of the office which he held what the duties were which he would be called upon to discharge. You may transfer to him the Department of Immigration, you may take away from him the management of Dominion lands and Indian lands, you may make him perform the duties of President of the Council, and yet he is the Minister of Interior still. That is absurd. What we should do is to organize the public service with certain permanent departments and give to the Minister having control of a department a name appropriate to the service he is called upon to perform. I am sure the Minister of Justice would think it absurd if he were given the Immigration Department and the functions of the Department of Justice were taken away from him, and it is the same thing with regard to every other department in the public service. I am convinced that the present practice is not a satisfactory one. I know that many parties communicating with various public departments do not know with what department to communicate, because they do not know where the functions of the department as organized by statute are placed, they do not know under what Minister that department may be, because what may be under the Minister of Agriculture and Statistics to-day, may be under another Minister to-morrow. That is not a satisfactory condition of things. The Geological Department has, no doubt, from the beginning usurped duties which were not placed under its control by the British North America Act. There is nothing in the British North America Act to warrant the geological surveys which are being carried on in the various provinces, except in the case of British Columbia under the terms under which it was admitted; and I very much doubt whether by Order in Council you could attach to that department duties which are inconsistent with the British North America Act itself. No doubt we have the control of the geological surveys in the territories, and there has been hn acquiescence in this usurpation of authority, and I am not going to say in that particular the practice ought to be changed, but I do say that the departments ought to be permanent, that they should be properly organized, that they ought to be under a head with an appropriate designation, and that there ought not to exist a policy of transferring these departments from one Minister of the Crown to another. In fact, this was called originally, not a department, but the Geological branch.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It was made a department two years ago.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it ought not to have been made a department. It ought to be a branch of the Department of the Interior, and so with regard to the Indian branch and the Public Lands branch. They ought to be nothing more than branches of different departments. This means a deputy head for each of these departments, and there may be some manipulation going on, there may be jealousies and disputes in the Cabinet, there may be a disposition on the part of some Minister to grasp more authority than he is now given, and so branches are taken from the department to which they properly belong, and are given to another Minister. I do not think that is satisfactory. They ought to be properly organized, appropriately designated, and they should be under the Minister of the Crown whose name will indicate the duties he is called upon to perform. We ought not to have to look up Orders in Council to see whether a branch is under the control of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Secretary of State, or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There would be a good deal in the objection of the hon. member if it referred to the Bill. There is very good reason why the main department should be under the control of the Minister while he remains in office, and that the public should know who has control over it. But that is not the question now before us. The Minister of Interior has control of the Department of the Interior. That department cannot be transferred to another while he holds the title, and the extent and scope of its powers are defined by statute. It is the same thing with the Department of Justice, the Department of Inland Revenue, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the other departments; but there are certain subordinate branches—and I agree with the hon. gentleman that they would be more properly designated as branches—which have been created by this Parliament, and which are not necessarily attached to any department but may be attached to one or another. The Department of the Geological Survey is one of these. It was erected into a department a year or two ago with a deputy head, but no Minister, and the duties can be as well attached to the Department of Agriculture, for example, as to the Department of the Interior. There is no misconception on the part of the public with regard to that, because there is nothing in the title of the Minister of Interior to indicate that he has control over the Geological Survey. A person who does not look at the enactments or at the Orders in Council has no reason to believe that this belongs to the Department of the Interior more than the Department of Agriculture. The reason for the present Bill is principally, however,

that these subordinate branches have been created from time to time and that Parliament has already adopted the principle of making them transferable. The Indian Department, the Mounted Police Department, and the Immigration Department are transferable. These being transferable, they have been transferred from time to time. The late First Minister chose to hold for a time the direction of the Department of Indian Affairs, and also of the Mounted Police Department. When he took the Department of Railways, he ceased to hold these departments, and they were handed over to the present Minister of the Interior. I think it is desirable to make this Geological Survey Department transferable. Otherwise, all these departments might be grouped under one Minister and might so overload his department. The same authority was taken to transfer the patent branch, though it has never been taken advantage of, but it is on the Statute-book still. The policy remains, and, if these branches can be transferred to different departments, that policy should be made uniform in order to allow the work to be equalized and to prevent all these departments being placed under one Minister and overloading him with work.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the Minister of Interior to say that whilst it was thought advisable to transfer this service from the Department of Interior, it had not yet been determined where to place it; in other words, the Government have not yet decided how they will use this power. Now, the branch in question has been attached to the Department of Interior for a great many years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Always.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems singular, then, that it should be necessary, towards the close of a session, suddenly to legislate to enable the Government to pass it round from Minister to Minister. If they are not ready this session to say where it should be placed, I think the proper course for them to adopt is to let it remain where it always has been until they can confer with the House and take the advice of the House. Now, these branches, according to the fitness of things, must belong to one department more than to another. For example, I would think that this branch, the Geological Survey, most naturally belongs to the Department of Interior. It has to do with land, with property, with mineral interests, with our mineral development, topographical surveys, and so on. That being the case, it is more in the line of the head of that department. It may be that at times an economical use of his staff will save money to the country, because this survey might be able to make use, to some extent, of the staff of the department, whereas if you attach it to a department that has not any staff that can be of service to this branch, it means the duplication of the service, so that as a matter of economy alone, the House ought to have a voice in saying where the branches are to be attached. I am sure, this is one of those questions that the House ought to be allowed to pass an opinion upon, so far as to say to what department it should belong. At present the law allows Ministers to be shifted about from department to department, and now we are going to add to that by allowing the various branches to be shifted around; a shuffle may, perhaps, take place at every Cabinet meeting, and we will not know who is responsible for the proper discharge of the public service. The general principle of the law is against this course. The general principle of the law enumerates certain departments, it creates responsibilities and powers, and all those responsibilities and powers, going with the department, go to a responsible head. It had been wholly contrary to the genius of our system to allow the duties to be changed from individual to individual, and it is now proposed in this important case to do so, and I think that it will result not only in confusion in the public mind which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) referred to, but also to an unnecessary expenditure of public money. That being the case, I think that the proper course for the Government to pursue would be to wait until their arrangements on this question are matured. There can be no urgency. This condition of affairs has lasted from the establishment of the Geological Survey until now. Surely the public interest will not suffer by the matter being postponed until another session, and then the House may be asked to give an opinion upon the subject in the only way it ought to give it as a legislative body. I can only emphasize what has fallen from the lips of others, that there is an aggressive spirit, perhaps not intended but still none the less real; the aggressiveness of the Administration to-day is rapidly doing away, almost, with the necessity of Parliament, it is robbing Parliament of its powers. We find the highest power of Parliament being invaded, we find liberty being taken with the public exchequer, the abuse of power to use the Governor General's warrant. Now, we have that same spirit breaking out in this aggrandizement of the Council, in a claim that the Executive shall be the legislative power. Parliament cannot too soon awaken to the danger of the situation. I know that the Government have enormous power, and I think they are making an unwise use of it when they are practically setting the people's representatives at naught by the very legislation they are now proposing to Parliament. This is but a development of what began a year or two ago, but it has now proceeded at a rate of speed that would certainly have alarmed the old man who for so many years presided over the destinies of Canada. I am sure that the right hon. gentleman who was formerly Premier of Canada, would have hesitated a long time before endeavouring to centralize in the Governor in Council the powers which this present Admininistration seek. I cannot better prove that than by saying that so far as I am aware his Government never abused the power to use the Governor General's warrants, or made such an unlimited use of it as was made by the present Administration. It would be wise, therefore, I think, for them to halt in this case before they have created a feeling, as they will, of want of confidence in Parliament itself. This centralizing of power is wholly contrary to the representative system that we are supposed to enjoy, and for my part I deem it my duty, as long as I am supposed to represent the people of my constituency, to protest against this system, and I, therefore, do protest against this proposition. In this particular instance I think there can be no question that the legislation is not warranted, because the Government do not know to-day whether it will be required or not, and there is certainly no urgency, so far as experience goes.

Mr. CASEY. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in most of what they have said about this Bill, both on the general principle and in regard to the exigencies of this particular department. On the general principle, I think it is wrong that departments of this importance should be capable of being shifted from one political head to another at the will of the Cabinet themselves. As has been pointed out already, it gives an aggressive Minister the chance of obtaining more patronage for his own department. I understand that one of the arguments is that the Department of the Interior is overloaded with work on account of including this Geological Survey. Now, there have been times within all our memories when the Department of the Interior was much more busy than it is now. The hon. Minister of that department shakes his head, but I think he will admit that during the period of the boom in the North-West there was more doing in lands in the Department of the Interior, at all events, than there has been since, and we had no complaint then that the department was overworked. Now, when there is comparatively little doing in that line, the Minister complains that he is overworked, and he takes the liberty of shifting this department on to some other shoulders. I say, on the general principle, this mutability of special departments is most objectionable, but in this particular case, as the hon. member for North York has pointed out, there is a special affinity between the Geological Survey and the Department of the Interior. That department deals with all the real estate and landed estate of the Crown, as represented by the Dominion Government. That department makes the ordinary surveys of those lands, and it should also be in possession of information respecting the mineral wealth in and under those lands. The two branches of the Survey should go hand in hand; the Dominion Lands Survey and the Geological Survey should be under the same political head, and the work should proceed in harmony, so that between the two the Dominion might know as scientifically as possible the value of the land to be disposed of. The conduct of the Geological Survey hitherto has not been too much in the general interests of the Dominion. The moneys voted to that depart ment have been spent largely in developing private property. At the present time surveys in Nova Scotia and other provinces are going on over lands not only the property of the provinces but of private individuals and corporations engaged in mining. These lands are being inspected and mapped out by the Geological Survey, no benefit resulting to the Dominion in its position as land owner. We are exploring and advertising lands from which the Dominion gets no revenue and which do not belong to the Dominion itself; we are developing private property at the Government expense. How it is arranged as to what properties shall be mapped out, I do not know; I suppose it must be done with the consent of the Minister, or by arrangement of the Minister with certain parties. I do not know how far investigations in Nova Scotia are systematically carried out year by year, but I am satisfied that they are conducted in respect to lands which do not belong to the Dominion, and which we should not be taxed to explore and advertise. These surveys are very much analagous to that performed in England by the ordnance service. They are making careful and accurate maps of the district, noting not only the minerals but also the natural features in detail. In that respect they are fulfilling the duties that pertain rather to the surveyors' branch of the department as distinct from the Geological branch, unless it were understood that the two branches of the service were run in common. This might be done to a great extent. Officers should be appointed under the Dominion Lands Survey who were capable of reporting on the mineral character of the various districts, so that it would not be necessary to go over the ground twice, once to map out the township boundaries and the quarter sections, and again to explore the geological features. If the two services were combined in that sense a large amount might be saved. While this diversion of public money is taking place even under the present management of the department which is responsible for the care of the Dominion lands, I fear that if it were placed under another department, one not directly concerned with the lands of the country, there would be even less care taken to limit the operations of this survey to lands the property of the Government, which alone should benefit by these explorations. All the sub-departments of the Government should be attached to the political department for which they have the nearest political affinity, and should not be subject to continuous changes. I do not attach much importance to the difficulty encountered by the public of finding out the department to which a sub-department belongs, because sub-departments can be reached under their own names. My hon. friend from North York has referred to the aggregate number of Governor General's warrants, but I think his memory had failed him in regard to the abuse of the Governor General's warrants in the Cabinet which was led by the late Premier. During his management of public affairs some of the most glaring abuses of that power occurred, two years ago and even last year. I believe the majority of the House would agree with me, if the matter were called to their attention, that the executive branch of the Government has at present too much power over Parliament. The House, without regard to political party, is itself to blame if too much power is placed in the hands of Ministers. Hon. members supporting the Government should pay attention to this matter, and impress their views on Ministers, and insist on their keeping within the old constitutional safeguards.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask to what department it is proposed to change the Geological branch? I understood from the Minister of Justice that if the Department of Immigration is transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Interior, it would involve too great a proportion of the executive work of Government on that one department; and that it is proposed to take this branch from the Department of the Interior and transfer it to some other. I suppose the Ministers know to what department it is to be attached, whether there shall be any legislation in regard to mines, and whether mining is to go along with geological survey or whether it is to be retained as part of the administration of public lands.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The mines administered under the Dominion Lands Act will continue to be administered as at present. With the exception of publishing statistics with regard to mines, the Geological Department has nothing to do with that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There has been no decision arrived at as regards the department, but it is in contemplation to transfer it to Agriculture, from which Immigration is taken.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should imagine that before the Government asks the House to consent to an important change of this kind they would at least have arrived at a decision as to what department they will transfer the duties referred to in the Bill. It strikes me that the legislation is immature if the Government have not arrived at a decision.

Bill reported.

THE FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) to further amend the Fisheries Act. He said: There are several gentlemen who take an interest in the chief sections of this Bill who are not at present in the House, and as I anticipate a lengthy discussion on the measure, I propose to take a stage on the Bill now, so as to refer the resolutions which relate to one of its clauses to the committee together with the Bill, and so avoid a repetition of discussion. If that proposition is accepted, I would move the second reading of this Bill, and I will afterwards also move the resolutions and refer them to the committee. We can then take up the whole question and discuss it at length.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) So far as I am concerned, I see no objection to that.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to impose a fee of five dollars for each license granted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to can, preserve, or cure lobsters, or keep them alive out of close season in ponds or other places.

2. That it is expedient to impose a fee, at the rate of two cents for each case containing four dozen one-pound cans of lobsters, and one cent for each case containing two dozen one-pound cans of lobster, to be paid by the packer to the person directed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to mark, label or stamp such case.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask whether the hon. gentleman is in a position to furnish the House with the information he may have obtained on this subject before he introduced his Bill? It has been stated to me that the hon. gentleman has had reports from experts in his department, as well as from outside the department, affecting this matter. In a matter which involves such important interests as this measure does, it is very necessary that we should be furnished with all the information possible to enable us to have an intelligent debate and to arrive at some conclusion which will be in the interests of the Government on one side, so far as their interests are distinct from the lobster fisheries, and on the other hand in the interest of those who have their money invested in this industry.

Mr. TUPPER. It is my desire, as shown already, that this matter shall be fully and carefully considered, and in no sense in a party spirit. It was for that reason that I departed from the principle for which I have been contending lately, and sought from the House direct, the authority that I perhaps could have obtained from the Governor in Council. I would be very happy to do as the hon. gentleman has suggested, and to lay before the House some interesting information I have received from Mr. Neilson, who is employed by the Government of Newfoundland, and who has been exceedingly courteous in giving my department a great deal of valuable information on the subject. I have also another report, and I will lay them before the House previous to the matter being considered.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee on the resolutions.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TUPPER. My object is to save unnecessary repetition of the long arguments that will be advanced in considering this subject. I asked the House to take the second reading of the Bill and then adopt these resolutions, which will, after being adopted by this committee, be referred with the Bill to the committee of the Whole House again. No hon. gentleman will be prejudiced in the slightest degree, because those clauses will have to be adopted and considered again in committee with the Bill.

Mr. FLINT. I presume there will be no assumption that there is any assent on our part to the resolution.

Mr. TUPPER. Not in the slightest. It is simply to save time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They will be adopted on that distinct understanding.

Resolutions read the first and second times and reported.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the resolutions be referred to the Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 9).

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON BINDING TWINE.

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

Mr. WATSON moved:

That it is computed that fourteen millions of pounds (14,000,000 lbs.) of binding twine are annually consumed by the farmers of Canada in harvesting their crops.

Whereas they are subjected under the present tariff to a duty of 25 per cent *ad valorem*, having thereby inflicted upon them a tax of $400,000 and upwards per annum, while at the same time fishermen are allowed to import twine for use in their business free of duty, under which exemption twine to the value of $424,023 is imported free of duty, and it further appears that the revenue derived from the duty on binding twine for the year 1891 amounts to $6,192, and, consequently, a tax of over $400,000 is imposed upon the farmers of Canada without any appreciable advantage to the revenue; such taxation being doubly unjustifiable in view of the exemption allowed the fishermen of Canada in respect of twine used by them:

That it is therefore expedient that binding twine should be placed on the Free List.

He said: For the last six weeks, I have had a resolution on the Paper providing that binder twine should be placed on the free list. I allowed that motion to drop last night for the sake of arriving at other notices of motion on the Paper, and I now take the opportunity to move in the direction I have indicated. It is hardly

necessary for me to take up the time of the House in discussing this question, as it has already been considerably debated this session, and also during previous sessions, but I find new evidence of the necessity of placing this article on the free list almost every day, and we have had an enormous amount of petitions presented to this House during this session from the Patrons of Industry and other associations, asking that the duty be taken off. I hold in my hand a copy of a petition presented to this House from the Grand Association of the Patrons of Industry in the Province of Manitoba, signed by Charles Braithwhite, Grand President, and other officers of the Grand Lodge :

"We, your petitioners, members of the Provincial Association of the Patrons of Industry in the Province of Manitoba, represented by the undersigned members of the Executive Board of the Grand Association for the said province, humbly showeth :

"1. That the duty now existing on binding twine operates materially to the disadvantage of the consumer ;

"2. Your petitioners desire to show that the existing duty has the effect of preventing the increase of the cultivated area ;

"3. That the cost of binding twine, owing to the duty, bears heavily on the farmers in this province.

"Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable body will pass the necessary legislation, at this session of your Parliament, that will have the effect of removing the said duty on binding twine, and that the said legislation asked for by your petitioners may take effect without delay.

"And your petitioners will ever pray.

"Signed for ex-Board,

"CHAS. BRAITHWAITE, *Grand Pres.*
JAMES BURLAND, *Grand Vice Pres.*
W. C. GRAHAM, *Grand Sec.-Treas.*
J. H. MARTIN,
W. M. CREIGHTON, } *Trustees.*"
ANDREW THOMPSON,

I also find from the Province of Ontario, from the Dominion Grange, a petition presented to this Parliament, which was circulated largely throughout the country. This petition goes on to state :

"That the self-binder is one of the most expensive as well as the most useful of agricultural machines, but in its use binder twine is indispensable ;

"That from two to four pounds of twine is required to bind the crop grown upon an acre, according to the weight of the crop ;

"That the retail price of binder twine during the harvest of 1891 was from 10 to 14 cents per pound, according to the brand ;

"That in the great grain-producing provinces of the North-West and Ontario, the cost of binder twine is an important and ever recurring item each year in the expense of the farm which must be provided for. Unlike the twine in a fisherman's net, which can be used over and over again, and when broken can be repaired, binder twine when once used is done, and each sheaf requires new twine ;

"That the operations of trusts and combines are conducted with great secrecy, and much difficulty is experienced in procuring any information respecting them, but there seems to be scarcely room for a doubt, that the supply of binder twine is controlled by an American combine, called the 'National Cordage Company,' having its head office in the United States, with a branch office in Montreal to supply the Canadian trade, or this same combine operating under some other name ;

"We therefore pray, that the duty upon binder twine, imported into Canada, be abolished, and that it be placed upon the free list, as little, if any, revenue is derived from its importation, and such an Act would destroy the power of a body of foreign monopolists to levy and collect a tax from the Canadian farmer for their own aggrandizement."

Now, I think the evidence in such petitions we should carefully consider. No one can doubt that the farmers are entitled to some slight consideration in this matter. There is little or no revenue collected on binding twine, and, that being the case, there can be no objection on the score of revenue to striking off the duty, Objection was raised in years gone by that the binding twine industry was one which had grown up in Canada, and that it should be protected ; but we find, and I think beyond doubt it can be stated here, that, so far as Canadians are concerned, all their interest in the cordage company has ceased. There can be no doubt that the facts show that the National Cordage Company of the United States control the cordage interest in Canada. This matter is not only agitating the consumers, but the men who deal in binding twiue. I received a letter yesterday from Mr. Charles Braithwaite, the Grand President of the Grand Association of Patrons of Industry of Manitoba, in which he says :

"We cannot get quotations on binding twine at present, as the dealers are waiting to see what the Government is going to do with regard to removing the duty."

Showing that the duty does affect the price of binding twine, that the dealers have not placed their orders yet for binding twine because of the duty. Last year I know a firm in Portage la Prairie that handles both American and Canadian binding twine told me that it was a toss up whether they should purchase American binding twine and pay the duty or should buy Canadian twine. There was little or no difference between the price of Canadian binding twine, showing that they had to pay every cent of this 25 per cent duty on binding twine. This Mr. Braithwaite has been in communication with the manufacturers of binding twine, and he says :

"I have a guarantee from Belfast, Ireland, with a first-class sample of twine measuring 550 feet per pound ; breaking strain 70 lb."

It must be remembered, in considering this binding twine question, that it is not only the price that is to be considered but the number of feet per pound in the twine, because that affects the value. This Mr. Braithwaite is a practical farmer, and occupies the distinguished position of president of the Patrons of Industry in the Province of Manitoba, who number up in the thousands. I find by comparison that the Red Cap brand, which is a brand which has been sold very largely throughout the Dominion, measures only 525 feet per pound while this sample from Belfast gave 550 feet per pound. The Crown brand, which is also sold very largely, measures 490 feet per pound. So this Belfast sample of 550 feet per pound, with a breaking strain of 70 lbs., can be delivered at Halifax for 9¼ cents per pound and delivered at central parts of Manitoba for 10½ cents per pound, if the duty were removed, but with the duty it would cost over 13 cents per pound. Now, after the motion which was made in this House last night, we believe we should do all we can to foster and encourage the trade with Great Britain as far as we can, without making any sacrifice of ourselves, and now we are practically deriving no revenue from binding twine, and if the duty is taken off that article and it can be sold to the farmers in Manitoba for 10½ cents instead of the 13 or 14 cents a pound they have to pay to-day, the Government is in duty bound to remove that duty. Last session, while this matter was under discussion, even the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), who voted against the resolution proposed by the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), admitted that the people of Manitoba suffered from this duty on binding twine, but he said he believed in supporting the National Policy all through, but if the National

Cordage Company of the United States was proved to control the sale of binding twine in Canada, then he would hope the Government would remove the duty, and every one else hoped the same. This tax on binding twine bears heavily on the farmers in Canada, but more especially on the farmers in the North-West, because we cultivate *per capita* a much larger portion of land than is cultivated in any other part of Canada. This is not like a tax on agricultural implements, which may last for years, but it is an annual tax, and if you take 3 pounds an acre, which was the average last year, it runs up to very large figures, because last year in Manitoba alone we had 1,300,000 acres in crop, which, at 3 pounds per acre, gave a total of 3,900,000 pounds, which, at an extra cost of 3 cents a pound to the farmer, amounts to $117,000 more than it should have cost the farmers of Manitoba for the privilege of using Canadian binding twine. In the North-West Territories 300,000 acres were under cultivation, requiring about 900,000 pounds of twine, or paying an extra cost of $27,000. The total extra cost in Manitoba and the North-West last year was $144,000. Take the small population of Manitoba and the North-West, and you will see that they are, without reason, taxed that enormous sum, not for the benefit of any industry in Canada, but to assist in making millionaires of the members of the National Cordage Company of the United States, who control the sale of binding twine in Canada. There may be some here who may have some interest in that cordage company. I believe the hon. member for Halifax had some interest in it, but it is well known that the National Cordage Company of the United States control the binding twine in this country. I find that reference is made to this in the Boston *Daily Advertiser*, which, in the course of a favourable notice of the National Cordage Company's affairs, says :

"The company actually has purchased all the cordage mills in Canada, and the cordage business of the Dominion of Canada is protected by a tariff wall which enables the business to work at a profit."

They fully realize the benefit which the National Cordage Company have in owning the cordage mills in Canada, in having this protection, because, by having this little preserve of 5,000,000 people divided off, they can charge 3 cents a pound extra on binding twine. I have carefully prepared, last year and this year, a statement showing the difference of the cost of binding twine in Canada and the United States. I have the figures from the consumers and from the sellers of binding twine, and, in almost every case, the difference in cost is about the difference in the duty, from 2¾ cents to 3 cents a pound. Last year we imported 196,358 pounds, of the value of $24,595, on which a duty was collected of $6,190.00 Divide the value, and that amounts to $3\frac{1}{10}$ cents per pound. The one-tenth of a cent per pound is sufficient to keep out the American article, and that gives the branch of the cordage company's institution in Canada the advantage of charging 3 cents extra per pound on binding twine to the farmers of Canada. Taking the statistics of all the provinces last year and allowing 25 per cent of the crop in Canada to be bound otherwise than by binding twine, it would take 14,000,000 pounds of binding twine to bind the sheaves on our farms, so that it means an extra tax paid on account of the duty of 3 cents a pound, or about $420,000, and all we received in the way of duty on binding twine last year was $6,192. There appears to be no possible justification for the Government retaining that duty on binding twine. We might hope from expressions made in this House by the late Minister of Customs, now Minister of Militia, that, whenever the Government were shown that there was any increased price placed on an article on account of a combine or trust or any foreign corporation attempting to control any industry in Canada, then the Government should step in and relieve the people. I find that on the 6th July, 1891, the Minister of Militia, who was then Minister of Customs, spoke as follows :—

"The Government are always alive to that which they believe to be in the interest of the consumer as well as the manufacturer. Whenever they found that the salt industry was controlled to such an extent as to become at all burdensome to the people, they took the first opportunity to reduce the duty. And if it be true that the American combination for the manufacture of twine has or is about to secure all the cordage factories in this country and keep up the price, then it will be the duty of the Government to see how far they will go in regulating it in order to prevent the colossal fortunes to which hon. gentlemen have referred being made by the manufacturers."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that it would not be necessary for any member of this House to rise in his place and offer a resolution asking these duties to be removed, because the Minister of Militia admitted in that speech that so soon as what has taken place, had taken place, the Government would then find it their duty to step in and interfere with the protection on twine, but so far the Government have not come down with a measure to relieve the farmers of this burden. I hoped, in allowing my motion to stand from day to day and week to week, that the Government would see their way to come down and make a statement to this House of their intention to remove the duty on binding twine and place that article on the free list. Now, after we have heard that in the Province of Manitoba dealers in binding twine will not give quotations to the farmers until they find whether the Government are going to remove the duty, I think it is time to move in the matter. In the session of 1888 there was a committee known as the Combines Committee, which sat in a room adjoining this Chamber for weeks, attempting to draft a Bill to be placed on the Statute-book that would prevent these combinations. That committee never amounted to much, in fact I do not know that it has ever been of any benefit to the people at all. I find on the Journals of the House, page 403, session of 1888, the evidence of Alexander W. Morris, a manufacturer of Montreal. Being examined by Mr. Gillmor, a member of that committee, he gave this testimony :

"Mr. Connors is in your combination?—He was in, but there is no combination now.

"How many were there in the combination?—Five.

"You proportioned out what each should make?—Yes, we had each a stated percentage.

"What proportion of all the quantity that was to be made for Canada, did he make?—On binder twine last year he had a percentage, I think, of 10 per cent of the whole; and I think he manufactured about two tons of twine.

"How much did he get last year out of the pool, as you call it, as near as you can tell?—I think about $6,000 or $7,000. Perhaps as much as that. It might be $5,000.

"For making rope?—No, not making binder twine."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that clearly shows that a com-

bination was formed even before the National Cordage Company bought up the cordage companies of Canada, and now that they have all been absorbed by this great National Cordage Company of the United States, I think it is certainly time the Government should move to relieve our farmers of this burden. To my mind there is no justification for retaining the duty any longer. Now, Sir, as this matter has been discussed at some length on a previous notice of motion asking for a return, and as this House are probably possessed of all the facts that can be produced, and must be convinced by this time that this duty should be removed, I do not propose to take up any further the time of the House, and will simply leave the motion in your hands.

Mr. MULOCK. As this matter was pretty thoroughly discussed last session and has been ventilated to some extent this session, I shall only speak for a moment. I may say that I recently received a communication from the Secretary of the Dominion Grange of Canada, and it contains an item which I will read to the House, inasmuch as some hon. gentlemen are in the habit of contending that this tax in no way adds to the cost of the material. I remember last session that a number of hon. gentlemen took that ground. They said that the duty added nothing to the cost, that the farmers were supplied with a better article, and in proof that it did not add anything to the cost, they turned to the blue-book and showed that none of the manufactured articles ever came in through the custom house, and so they argued that because no money was dropped into the Government slot at the custom house, none came out of the pockets of the people. Well, unfortunately for this theory, the farmers have come to a very different conclusion, and this House has been flooded with petitions, I understand, from the farming community upon this subject. I think we might allow them to know something about their own business. My hon. friend has cited the evidence of the Grand Lodge of the Patrons of Industry of Manitoba; my communication, as I said before, is from the Dominion Grange. My correspondent is the Secretary of the Dominion Grange of Canada, Mr. Robert Wilkie, and the paragraph to which I wish to call attention is as follows:—

"I may just say that while the duty on binder twine here is 25 per cent, the American duty is only 7·10 of a cent per pound; that standard twine cost American farmers last harvest 8½ cents per pound and the Canadian farmers all up to 12 cents, or say about 3 cents per pound more, which just about makes the amount of the duty."

My correspondent is writing from Ontario, and is giving the cost of standard twine in that province as compared with the cost of the similar article in the United States. It will be observed from the above that the evidence of the Dominion Grange harmonized with that of the Patrons of Industry of Manitoba in the statement they both make that the cost is 3 cents per pound higher than in the United States. There is no controversy about this point, that the duty in the United States is only $\frac{7}{8}$ of a cent per pound.

Mr. FOSTER. $\frac{7}{10}$ of a cent.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes $\frac{7}{10}$ in the States, while in Canada it is 25 per cent. In other words, the opportunity given to the manufacturer to increase his price by the force of combines by virtue of this tariff is over 400 per cent greater than in the United States. Whereas $\frac{7}{10}$ of a cent is all the tax the American manufacturer can impose on this necessary article, the Canadian manufacturer under our tariff can impose 3 cents a pound, or over 400 per cent more than the American. We talk about protecting native industries. Here is how we are protecting Canadian farmers, who have to meet the American wheat exporters in England and in the markets of Europe. The Canadian farmer is handicapped as against his rival to the south, to say nothing of the English farmer who gets his manufactured articles free of this duty. I wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite who are so solicitous for the welfare of the Canadian people, especially when that welfare is at all in competition with that of the people to the south of the line, do not on this occasion relieve them of this unfair burden, one not only onerous, but doubly so as against the position of our rivals to the south. Last session the Government had all these facts before them, as they have them to-day. It is true there were differences of opinion expressed in the House, but I am not aware that there has been any change in the situation. The cordage combine in the United States had last session, prior to our dealing with this matter, acquired the whole manufacturing trade of Canada. That is the condition of things to-day; and I fail to understand, with this information, why the Government have not before this solved this problem, and placed binding twine on the free list. Of course, if their contention is sound, that the duty does not enhance the cost to the farmer, we can understand their not taking off the tax. The arguments advanced by their supporters last year must on that basis be correct, and then I can understand their doing what they did last session, voting down this resolution. But with the evidence supplied to the country last year, how that the removal of the duty on sugar was immediately followed by a reduction in price in Canada, remembering that the Minister of Finance had taken pains to point out that he had taken off $3,000,000 of taxes from the shoulders of the people by removing those duties, I should like to know by what process of reasoning he can prove that the removal of the duty on binding twine would not be followed by similar results. If there was any possible argument in favour of sugar, it is infinitely greater in the other case. For whereas of sugar there were several manufacturers who were to some extent independent corporations, and competed for customers, no one will contend that there is any competition with respect to binding twine in Canada. If, therefore, the prices of sugar fell by the amount of duty removed, which the Minister of Finance asserted last session, much more will a similar reduction of price follow the removal of the protection given to manufacturers in Canada—I will not say to the Canadian manufacturer, but to the American—by an American binding twine combine, which has acquired control of the Canadian market. I cannot conceive of anything more unpatriotic on the part of the representatives of the people than their allowing a foreign institution, citizens of a foreign country, to come here and take advantage of our system to tax our people. We welcome them and their capital, of course, and I suppose we cannot blame them if our institutions permit them to become tax collectors; but the time has arrived when

legislation should not allow either Canadians or foreigners through the means of a protective system, to tax the people and put the taxes in the pockets of the American manufacturers.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend taking up the time of the House discussing this question at length, because it has often been discussed before, and the details connected with it are well known to hon. gentlemen. I hold in my hand the report of the Cordage Company of the United States, and it occurred to me that the report of that company was such that if it were brought to the notice of the Government and of the House, it might have some influence on any action which they may take with regard to the removal of the duty on binding twine. I will avail myself of this opportunity to read a few short clauses from the report of the president of that cordage combination, referring to the properties controlled by the company:

"The properties now owned and controlled by the company are situated in many states of the Union, and the provinces in Canada, and are 49 in number. Among those owned and controlled by the company including all the mills in Canada and several of the largest mills in Boston and in the west and south-west."

Now, Sir, in the financial report of the company, submitted at the same meeting, I find that the profits on the operations for the last year are $1,406,313.45; that the dividends paid to the stockholders of that combine were $1,300,000, and I find that another paragraph of that financial report says:

"It is very difficult at this time to give a correct estimate of the profits of the business for the quarter ending 31st January. I feel safe in stating, however, that, after deducting expenses, rentals and all fixed charges, these profits will be found sufficient to pay the entire annual dividend of $400,000 on the preferred stock, and the quarterly dividend of $250,000 on the common stock, besides leaving a large surplus."

Thus the estimated profits of this cordage combine for one quarter of a year, ending the 31st December, 1891, are said to be sufficient to pay the dividends on the preferential stock as well as to divide $250,000 among the other stockholders. Now, Sir, while it is the policy of those who favour protection in this country to protect our own home industries and to build up manufacturing institutions in Canada, I am satisfied from the statement which I have now submitted to the House that no argument can be based in favour of continuing this duty for the purpose of protecting our own home industries, because it will be plainly seen that all the cordage companies in Canada are under the control of this Yankee combine, and that by maintaining the duty and taxing the farmers and the people in this matter, it is only putting money into the pockets of the American stockholders and controllers of this combination. I do not think that is the idea of the National Policy. I do not think that the Government, or the members supporting this system are desirous of taking the money from the people of this country to enrich these Yankee manipulators. If this is actually the state of affairs, and there can be no doubt but it is, it is very desirable that this resolution should prevail and that the Government should consider the desirability of removing the duty from binding twine and thereby reducing its cost to the farmers of the country. It may be argued, and I heard the argument used, that as the American combination controls all the mills in Canada, that therefore the price would not be reduced to the farmers if the duty were taken off. In answer to this I would point out that there are only a certain number of mills controlled by the combine in the United States, that the price at the present time there is lower than in Canada, and that if the duty were removed the Canadian farmers would have the benefit of the competition of the American mills not in the combine. Twine is also manufactured in Great Britain and we could import it from there. It is, therefore, useless to argue that because the combination controls all the Canadian mills that the price would not be reduced to our farmers. I think I have clearly shown to this House and to the Government that this combination having got control of all the factories in this country, and in view of the immense profits they are making out of this institution, that it is desirable from every standpoint in the interests of the agriculturists of this country that some action should be taken. A leading supporter of the Government and a protectionist has remarked that a Government pledged to protection is bound to act against combines. I am satisfied that never in the past, nor, I suppose, never in the future will we be able to so plainly show that this is a combination which has full control of the manufacture of the article which we are discussing, and in such a manner as to increase the price without conferring any benefit on the country. I hope that it will be considered by the Government that while we may maintain the protective policy here the object was to build up the industries of our own country, but that through some manipulation and combine on the part of those who have control of a certain industry, all the extra taxation on the people of this country goes to the benefit of capitalists in a foreign country. When this state of affairs exists I think it is time that action should be taken to relieve our people from the burden. I hope, Sir, that this resolution will carry. I hope that the Government will take this into consideration, and that they will remove from the shoulders of the agriculturists of this country the taxation which they complain of so bitterly. We have had petitions sent to us from representative institutions of agriculturists, and we have had members supporting the Government in this House state that their constituents are desirous of having this duty removed. I believe that the arguments which have been offered in favour of the removal of this duty have been such that it is impossible to resist them, and I hope that the resolution of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) will carry.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the mover of this resolution has apparently designedly framed it in such a form as to make it as objectionable as possible to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; even to those who may be inclined to take part with him in his desire to see a change made in regard to this particular article. He prefaces his resolution with a preamble which is based upon an assumption, which, if not capable of disproof, is certainly not capable of proof and has not been proved. He bases his preamble upon the assumption that the price of binding twine in this country has been in-

creased exactly by the amount of the duty levied upon that article. That, Sir, is an argument which has been brought forward upon that side of the House whenever we have discussed anything in reference to the National Policy. I entirely dissent from that proposition. If it were a well-founded proposition, why then there would be very little to be said in favour of a protective tariff, because we have always contended—those of us, at any rate, who are not interested in manufactures, and who believe that a certain degree of protection was, under certain circumstances, and will be under certain circumstances necessary to the protection of our own industries—that the competition which prevails in the country has always been sufficient to keep the prices down to a reasonable figure, and I believe that such has been the case, as has been shown in a variety of instances.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As in sugar.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman talks about sugar. I am a little antonished that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), in endeavouring to support the argument of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), spoke about the duty on sugar, and said that because the duty was taken off sugar and that the price of that article was reduced, that therefore the same thing must occur in the case of binding twine. The hon. gentleman surely does not require to be taught at this time of day the first principles of the doctrine as to who pays the duty. Surely there is a distinction to be drawn between an article of raw material brought into this country, which this country does not produce, and an article which is manufactured in this country; and until hon. gentlemen opposite learn that distinction, their discussions on the subject of a protective tariff will certainly be attended with very little benefit to themselves or to anybody else. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), who moved this resolution, assumes in the preamble that the price of the article is necessarily increased by the amount of. the duty, and he goes on to base on that assumption the conclusion that farmers pay a tax of $400,000 a year on binding twine. Now, his premises, if not disproved, have not been proved, and I do not think they are capable of proof, because I believe it has not been and cannot be established that the farmers in the United States get their binding twine at any less rate, the qualities of the various articles being taken into account, than the farmers of this country. There are certain qualities of binding twine that have been sold in this country at lower rates than any of the rates quoted as prevailing in the United States; but I will not take them as an example. This long document, which has been laid before us in the interests of the cordage company, and which I have no doubt states its case as fully and strongly as it can be stated, points out that the price in the United States of binding twine in 1890 fell to an unprecedently low figure, a figure below the actual cost of production because there was such competition among the producers of the article, that the duty levied on it made no difference in the price—which effectually disposes of the argument which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) based upon the sugar duty. Now, Sir, the premises of the resolution being, I say, unproved and unprovable, we can place very little reliance on its conclusion, and, therefore, the whole preamble may fairly be struck out, if we desire to arrive at anything like a satisfactory conclusion on this question. With regard to the duty itself, I think we may safely lay down this proposition, and I lay it down as a supporter of the National Policy: in the first place, as I have said before in this House, the National Policy or a protective tariff is not a thing to be desired for its own sake. It is not like a question in morality with regard to a thing which is to be esteemed or disregarded on account of some intrinsic merit of its own. It is simply a means to an end, and as long as it attains that end it should be maintained, and when it ceases to do so, it may be dealt with as something desirable of reformation. With regard to this particular duty I think it is in accordance with the principles of the National Policy to lay down this rule: That the moment an article ceases to be the product of an independent Canadian industry, we are justified in dealing with it as being no longer entitled to the benefit of any protection whatever. We so dealt with the article of salt, and I think the evidence is conclusive that this article has passed out of the category of those articles the production of which are independent Canadian industries; and therefore if we find, or even without waiting to find, that an undue advantage has been taken by the combination which now controls the production of the article, we have a right to deal with it as though it were a foreign production. We should take that course in accordance with the principles of the National Policy, and not in opposition to them. It is not necessary to consider the question whether or not a productive duty should any longer be maintained. It is not necessary at this time to go into the merits of the general question of a protective or a free trade tariff. We have to deal with things as we find them. It would be useless to take up the time of the House in the discussion of the effect of the duty on every article mentioned in the tariff; but in regard to this particular article, I think the Government may well consider whether the time has not now come to deal with the duty on binding twine, which is an exceedingly high one, amounting to 2½ cents per pound. Such a duty may have been justified at the beginning as necessary to give our manufacturers the control of our own market. I have always understood and contended that one of the objects of the National Policy is to secure for our own industries the control of our own markets, and to prevent them being occupied by foreigners. That has been sufficiently maintained, I think, in regard to this industry, and the article having now passed into the category of those which are not entitled to protection, I think the Government is not only justified but in duty bound, I would not say to take the duty off altogether, but to make such a reduction as to prevent this combination obtaining the advantages they now seek to obtain. As further proof of this, I am told that one factory in the Province of New Brunswick was closed altogether by this company, the owners of the factory having been paid a very considerable sum of money to shut it up. That is enough to stamp the whole combination as one deserving of no consideration at the hands of this House.

Mr. CHARLTON. Quite consistent with protection all around, though.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, I am not going to enter into a general discussion of protection. I am dealing with this particular article of binding twine, and I say that upon the principles of the National Policy the Government are justified in taking into account the circumstances and dealing with it as they dealt with salt. The resolution, as it stands, could not, I think, be accepted by this side of the House even if we were inclined to accept the principle of the resolution, because in the preamble propositions are laid down to which we could not give our assent. Therefore, I for one could never support such a resolution. But while I say that, I am perfectly justified and consistent in saying to the Government that I think the time has come when they may deal with this article in the manner suggested, either by a total remission of the duty or by such a reduction as will at any rate place it on the same basis as the American article.

Mr. CHRISTIE. It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House except for a moment or two. I simply desire to say a few words in support of the amendment now before the House, and to raise my voice against that iniquitous system of taxation which has built up and fostered so many of the combines and monopolies which are now preying on our people. If this combine were the only one, it might be tolerated; but the combines are so many that our people, the farmers especially, are being bled at every pore; and the result has been disastrous. Just in proportion as these combines and monopolies have flourished and prospered, the country has become impoverished, the value of property has decreased, and the exodus of our people to the United States has increased. Now, as an illustration of the working of this protective system, I may mention that in the town where I live there was a rope factory. That factory was in existence for several years, the proprietor was prospering, and it was a great public benefit to the town. About eighteen or twenty months ago, that factory was leased, I suppose, by this combine, not for the purpose of being run, but for the purpose of being closed. I am informed that the proprietor received $7,500 per annum for 21 years, and, besides that, a guardian is paid for the purpose of taking care of this closed factory. In accordance with the agreement, the factory was closed, the hands were all dismissed and compelled to seek employment elsewhere. Not one of the operatives are to be found to-day except the solitary one who is left to guard the closed building, and the closed building remains a standing monument of the disastrous results of protection. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask who it is that pays the $150,000 or $200,000 paid for the closing of that factory, if it is not paid by the farmers and every man who requires to purchase a piece of rope or cordage? That is not all. The farmers are left completely at the tender mercy of a combine. There is no competition, and the combines can charge just such prices as they think proper to demand. Now, as I said before, it is not my intention to say anything further on this question, but, as this case came under my own observation, I felt it was a duty I owed my constituents to bring the matter before the House, and I think the time has come when this duty should be removed. I believe free trade is the only remedy. If we had free trade that would wipe out the whole legions of combines and monopolies that are now preying upon our people.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was rather amused listening to the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) endeavouring, in a very flimsy way, to get out of the position he fancies he occupies before the House and the country on this important question. He certainly is quite aware that a notice of the resolution has been before the House since early this session, intimating in clear and distinct terms to the Government that it was the intention of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) to bring this subject before the House. The Government have had ample time and opportunity to remove the duty from binding twine, and they have declined positively to do it both last year and this session. Last night the question came before the House, and the Government declined to allow it to stand over, thereby forcing the hon. member for Marquette to take this means of bringing it before the House. The hon. member for Muskoka fancies that because this is an amendment to the motion to go into Supply, it will give him the opportunity of explaining to his people that owing to his being a Government supporter, he will be compelled to vote against the amendment, however much he might be otherwise in favour of it. I doubt very much whether the flimsy excuse that, being a supporter of the Government, in sympathy with their general policy, he was bound to vote against this resolution, brought up in the way my hon. friend from Marquette has been forced to bring it up, will go down with his constituents. I doubt very much whether they will consider this as any justification for his voting against the very best interests of the farmers, and sacrificing these interests to his party feeling. My hon. friend has referred to this matter of binding twine in such a way that you would fancy there is no other portion of the world in which that article is made outside of the United States and Canada. If he is under that impression, he is quite mistaken. You would fancy from his remarks that we must come to the conclusion that if the duty were taken off binding twine, our farmers would not get it any cheaper because the American farmers pay just as high prices. I have no doubt they do, and the reason is that a combine exists in the United States as well as in Canada. As my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has said, they control no less than forty-nine factories in the United States and Canada. Their report has been read to the House to-night, and it clearly shows that they control every factory in the United States and Canada. Well, if you remove the duty as far as Canada is concerned, we must either get the twine from the United States at reduced prices or we will import it from France, Germany, England, or any place where it is to be got; and the result will be that the Americans will either have to sell at very much reduced rates or be cut out of our market by the European article. It was rather a striking commentary on the super-loyalist professions of my hon. friend from Muskoka, and a glaring evidence of the inconsistency of his professions when compared with his practice, when we find him averse to taking an opportunity, in this small way, of granting an advantage to England in this matter. He is prepared to say that the Americans shall continue to enjoy all the privileges

they do in Canada of selling twine at the highest figures they choose to fix, and to sink both the interests of the farmer and his loyalty to the mother country in his blind devotion to party. I want him to carry his loyalty only so far as to say that he is willing in this small matter to give the English people a fair show in our own markets, and the hon. gentleman refuses. The hon. gentleman referred to the duty on sugar, and tried to show the House that it could not possibly be argued that because the reduction of duty on sugar had the effect of lowering the price of that article, the same result would not follow the taking off the duty on twine. I do not see why the same effect would not follow the same cause. I would like my hon. friend to go down to the fishermen of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I would like my hon. friend from Halifax, who has an interest in the cordage factory there, to go down to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, and ask them, in view of the strong agitation to take the duty off binding twine, to consent to forego their privilege, which they enjoy at present, of receiving cordage free of duty, on the plea that the reimposition of the duty would not affect the price. I am afraid they would hardly succeed in inducing these hardy, intelligent fishermen to memorialize this House to again put the duty on fishing twine. These men know better. Well, I would ask, if the reimposition of duty on fishing twine would increase the price to the fishermen, why would not the taking off of the duty on binding twine lower the price to the farmers? The one thing is just as reasonable as the other. While our friends opposite are very glad to aid the fisherman by giving him his twine free of duty, at the same time they try to persuade the farmer that the price of his twine is not at all increased by the duty, and that he would pay just as much for it if that duty were taken off. I do not think you will find many farmers, Sir, prepared to accept that statement. On the contrary, about 20,000 of them petitioned this House last year in favour of a reduction of the duty, and you may depend upon it they were sincere in that memorial. You may depend upon it there is not a man who signed it who did not distinctly understand that he was asking something which would be a benefit to him. However much you may try to pursuade him that the duty does not increase the price, he has so long experienced the taxation to which he was subjected in the article of sugar, and is so well aware of the relief he has gained by the removal of the duty on that article, that, as a sensible man, he has come to the conclusion that if the duty should be taken off binding twine he will get it considerably cheaper than he does now. With regard to this cordage company, I think it is well that the House and the country should realize fully the huge proportions financially that this company has assumed. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) went over some of the items connected with the operation of this institution. Their report is to hand up to the 31st of October, 1891, which was submitted to the annual meeting of the company on the 3rd of February, 1892. According to that report, their machinery is valued at $3,143,793. They had accounts outstanding due them and bills receivable at that date amounting to $2,657,576. They had cash on hand to the amount of $540,251. This made a total asset of $6,341,620. They paid a dividend upon the preferred stock of $5,000,000 and the common stock of $10,000,000. I do not know what the common stock of $10,000,000 is, but probably it is what is called in the United States watered stock. The $5,000,000 probably covered the whole cost of the institution, and the $10,000,000 is, no doubt, watered stock, by means of which they hold that the whole value is $15,000,000, $5,000,000 of actual stock and $10,000,000 of watered stock. On the common stock they paid a dividend of 9 per cent. They have real estate, buildings, machinery and leaseholds, amounting to $17,077,500, making a total asset of $23,410,190. The liabilities were: accounts and bills payable, $4,712,806; preferred stock, $5,000,000; common stock, $10,000,000, making a total of $19,712,806, and leaving a surplus of $3,706,313, and, after paying the interest on the $5,000,000 of capital stock, they have this surplus. I think that the Government should at least place the farmers of Canada on the same basis as the farmers of the United States. The duty on binding twine has been reduced there, and there has been a great agitation in the United States on this question. They have reduced that duty to $\frac{7}{10}$ of a cent, while the duty in Canada of 25 per cent amounts to from 2½ to 3 cents a pound. If the action of the United States forced the Government there to come down to $\frac{7}{10}$ of a cent per pound on binding twine, I say that the Government of this country should to that extent meet the demands of the farmers of Canada. If they did that, our farmers might get their twine for 2 cents or 2½ cents per pound less than they are paying now. That would be a great advantage to them, because the amount of twine which is used is so large that it must be a very considerable saving. In Ontario we have about four million acres of cultivated land, as it is estimated. Taking 2½ pounds to the acre, at 2½ cents per pound, that would amount to $225,000, or about a quarter of a million of money that the farmers are losing in this tax. There is another thing. If the farmer had to pay the duty only once in a few years, it would be a different thing. A fisherman can use his twine for some years, but the farmer, when once he uses his twine in binding a sheaf, loses the twine and he has to repeat the operation every year, and pay the duty again. I contend that binding twine is just as much a raw material for the farmers as the twine used in fishing is a raw material for the fisherman. If you admit one for the purpose of the fisherman, you ought to admit the other free for the purpose of binding the sheaves, and the farmers are the most important class in the Dominion and have the greatest difficulties to contend with now. This would be a little sop to those who suffer from all the combinations, the implement combines, the plough combines, the harness combines, the sugar combines, the coal oil combines, the cotton combines and many others, and, if the Government would commence to release the farmers by taking off the duty on binding twine, it would give them a little encouragement and lead them to believe that the day would come when things would be better than they have been in the past. I have shown that this would result in a saving of a quarter of million of dollars to the farmers if the Government would accept the proposition now before the House. There is another question to which I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite and that is the duty on salt. The fishermen are allowed to bring in their salt free of duty.

Why? Because it is looked upon as a raw material for the purpose of curing fish. Then, is not twine a raw material for the purpose of bringing in the grain, getting it bound and putting it on the market? If you say it is right and good and expedient to grant the fishermen the free use of salt for the curing of fish, why should you not give the farmers the use of twine free of duty? Why, when you allow the raw material to be free in the Province of Nova Scotia, should you not also allow it to be free in the Province of Ontario? I would like to hear from my hon. friend from Halifax on this subject. He is evidently taking notes, and I should like to know if it is any more important to the people of this country to catch fish than it is to grow wheat. I say we could live longer in this Dominion without fish than without flour, and it is more important to encourage the growth of wheat than to encourage catching of fish. Fish are very nice, and we have some fish that we like very much to eat. The Atlantic salmon are very nice and sweet, but the bread produced from Ontario wheat is also sweet and nice, and we want to produce all we can of that wheat, and to give the farmers all the twine they require to bind up their sheaves free of duty. It is a poor encouragement to the prairie farmers of the North-West to compel them to pay this duty on their binding twine. I think this is one of the most important questions which have been brought before the House this session. We are all well aware of the organizations we have in this country know as Farmers' Institutes and Patrons of Industry, and there is not one of these organizations, composed of both Reformers and Conservatives, that has not unanimously demanded that the duty should be taken off binding twine. It is my impression that hon. gentlemen opposite will not be able to persuade those farmers that it would not be to their advantage to take off this duty. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) will, of course, tell the farmers, as he has told the House to-night, that on account of this motion being made as an amendment to going into Committee of Supply, he had to vote against it in order to show his loyalty to his party, but if the hon. member for Marquette had made his motion under other circumstances, he would have voted for it. I will read another paragraph that the hon. member for Oxford omitted to read; I find it in a Chicago paper called the *Farm Implement News*, under date of 25th February, 1892. This paper is to be found in the Library, and I would respectfully recommend the Finance Minister to peruse the contents of the 12th page with regard to this combine on twine. Here is the clause I refer to:

"Many of the properties now owned or controlled by the company, including all the mills in Canada and several of the largest mills in Boston and in the west and south-west, came under its control about the 1st November, 1891. Consequently, the profits shown by the Financial Director's Report, merely represent the profits of the mills formerly owned by the company, whereas now its manufacturing capacity has been very largely increased and its earnings should be increased correspondingly."

Then the article goes on and outlines the operations of the combine, and expresses the great satisfaction with which the president of this institution has made his annual statement to this combination. Now, I earnestly hope the Government will, notwithstanding the fact that the resolution was moved as an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply accept the resolution of my hon. friend. It is not too late in the day for them to accept it. It is better to repent at the eleventh hour than not to repent at all. And they have not yet made any move in the direction of aiding those who are suffering under the operation of this combine. We shall hail with delight any evidence of repentance on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the combinations and the restrictions to which the farmers have been subjected. I earnestly hope that this favour, if granted, will be the forerunner of others that will be granted in aid of the farmers of this country who are struggling against combines of twine, combines of cotton, combines of sugar, combines of implements, combines in hats, combines in everything. You can hardly put your finger upon anything produced in this country that is not the subject of a combine. Even the very coffins in which we have to commit our relations to their last resting place, are now manufactured in Canada under the operations of a combine; the very cord with which you lower the remains to their last resting place, is manufactured under a combine. Now, Sir, I say that it is time we should put a stop to this abomination, kill the combines, shake them off, release the people from their operations, and restrictions and extortions. There is not a undertaker in the Dominion of Canada to-day who can start business unless he becomes a member of the association that has been formed; he cannot get the necessary supplies to enable him to pursue that calling unless he first associates himself with that particular combination, paying a sum of $30 or $40 to get a certificate, after which he is allowed to engage in the business of undertaking. This is another form of the combine that we should strike at as well as the other forms. I am quite sure that if the Government accepts the resolution of my hon. friend, the farmers will appreciate it and be duly grateful therefor.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. As a farmer and one who knows what he is talking about, I desire to make a few remarks on this subject. Last session I made a short speech on this subject, and when I went to my constituency for re-election, the Reform papers said that I had come to the rescue of the Government, to save the monopolists and the great rings that surrounded the farmers of this country. I want to say to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that until he can prove on the floor of this House that the Canadian farmer is paying more for his twine than the American farmer has done for the last ten years, he has no case. Now, if I went into his dry goods store and attempted to teach him about his business, he would tell me to mind my own business; and so I can assure you that I am talking as a farmer now about something that I know. I know nothing of what stand the Government intends to take on this matter. Although I speak as a farmer, and not with the polished tongue of some hon. gentlemen who have been born with silver spoons in their mouths, still I think I know what benefits the farmer as well as any other member in this House. I would also say to my learned friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), who has been down in my riding talking binding twine, that if I went into his office and told him that he did not know anything about getting up a brief, then he might reasonably say to me: You do not know anything about my business, but I do myself. I want to

say also to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), that if I went into his machine shop and told him that he knew nothing about machinery—

Mr. WATSON. Or on my farm.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. I do not know whether you are on a farm or not; I understand you are a machinist. The hon. member could tell me the same thing if I undertook to instruct him in machinery. I may say that I have given this subject a good deal of study; it was my duty to give it a perfect study before I gave my last vote and made my last short speech in this House; and I am able to say that the American farmer has paid as much for his binding twine during the last twelve years as the Canadian farmer. I have affidavits in my possession from six different states of the Union, made under oath, and giving the prices of binding twine. These were sent to me last year when I was assaulted by the binding twine ring, and they proved conclusively that we are not paying more for binding twine than the American farmer, consequently the hon. gentlemen opposite have no case. This is a broad question, and as a farmer I have a right to express my views upon it. Perhaps in the last fourteen months I have had more election contests on my hands than most men in this House, and I ought to have a fair idea of what the views of the people of the country are on this and other questions. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pointed across the floor of this House the other evening to the Ministers of the Crown, and he said that they were driven from pillar to post to seek a policy. Let me give hon. gentlemen an idea of the policy announced by hon. gentlemen on the other side during the three electoral campaigns in the south riding of Victoria. I can see on the Opposition benches six or seven hon. gentlemen who were in my constituency propounding various policies as the policy of the Liberal party. In my first bye-election on the 18th December, the first bill-head announced that the policy of the party opposite was commercial union, the next that it was tariff reform, and the next that it was commercial union and tariff reform. But the people accepted none of these policies, and I was elected by a handsome majority. The general elections came around, and then they announced their policy as continental free trade, commercial union or free trade, and finally, at the end of the campaign, it came down to free trade and straight goods. Well, I was elected again. I can see three hon. gentlemen across the floor who opposed me in my next electoral campaign, and the placards distributed by their party through the country were headed, "Reciprocal trade and free binder twine." One gentleman spoke for continental free trade and tariff reform, and the other gentleman went for reciprocity and tariff reform, and if that is not evidence of their hunting for a policy on the Opposition benches, I do not know what hunting is. We as Conservatives have but one plank in our platform, and the platform is as broad as this fair Dominion of ours. It is: Canada for Canadians and the National Policy. That is our policy, and that is the policy which the people of Canada have decided upon. If I were a member of the Opposition, and if I got such rebuffs from the people as they have received time and again, I would be ashamed to say I belonged to the party at all. I have come to the conclusion that nothing but fault-finding is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) came to my riding last election to oppose me, and he spoke for five hours in that constituency, addressing two meetings for two and a half hours each. I will do him the justice to say that he was different from some of the other Liberal speakers, and he did not call me out of my name. However, he said I was a farmer and a very poor one, but I do not complain very much at that. I may remind the hon. gentleman that in the two places he addressed in my riding for five hours I got 198 majority, and I am thankful to him in part for that. If that is not a fair rebuff to reciprocity and free binding twine, I do not know what is. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson), a gentleman whom I know every member in this House respects for his manhood and ability, did my constituency the honour of visiting it, and he so addressed an audience on free binding twine that in that locality where there were seven votes against me at the previous elections I had 64 majority after his speech. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was once Finance Minister of this country, went into a Reform hive in my constituency the night before the election. I wish he had come sooner and stayed longer, because in the place where he addressed an audience on continental free trade and free binding twine and all his other policies, I got 18 more of a majority than the most sanguine of my friends ever expected. I have only one complaint to make of that hon. gentleman; I sent him a letter of thanks and congratulation for the benefit he had done me, but he never answered my letter. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) surprised me the other night, and I felt sorry for him, when he stated that the farmers of his country had been boodled and bought and voted against their own interests. I repudiate that charge, not only on my own behalf, but on behalf of my brother farmers, the hard working and honest citizens of Canada. The farmers of this country if they are let alone can paddle their own canoe as well as professional men, and if they have a grievance to be removed they will not go to the doctors for advice, but will appeal to the Ministers of the Crown, in whom they have confidence, to remedy any burden they may labour under. The hon. gentleman also said that the farmers of this country were driven out of their natural market—the United States. Does he not know that the English and European market is the market for the surplus Canadian products as it is the market for the surplus of the United States? The farmer can send all his products to the markets of the great consuming emporium of the old world, and I cannot see how it can be argued with reason that the farmers of Canada could get a market in the United States when the farmers of the United States have ten times more surplus products to export than we have. When that Chinese tariff wall was put around the United States, intended for the benefit of the American farmer I have no doubt, our Government sent their commissioner abroad to seek for other markets. We had no more to do with the McKinley Bill than the man in the moon. That was the business of the American people and they had a perfect right to do what they thought best in the interests of their country. But when the McKinley tariff was framed our Government did not fold their arms

and say that they could do nothing for the farmer, but they sought and obtained other foreign markets which are proving more beneficial to our farmers than ever did the markets of the United States. I wish to make just one remark to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He said the other night that two-rowed barley was not worth sowing. He said all he could to discourage the farmers of this country from sowing it, instead of giving the Government the credit of doing the best they could under the circumstances. He asked for names, because he said he had tried it, and it was a failure. Well, I hope he is a better dry goods man than he is a farmer, for I can give him names to-night. I know a farmer who sowed 12 bushels of two-rowed duck-bill barley—I saw the bills and I know the fields, and he had bills for 504 bushels from 10 acres with 12 bushels of seed. If the hon. gentleman can make a better showing than that, by giving six-rowed barley, I would like to know it, and I think I have grown as much barley as any other gentleman in this House. Now, I am going to give the policy-seekers a few figures, and if it is desired I will give affidavit after affidavit from men who have come from the other side of the line, proving that the American farmer pays more for his binding twine than the Canadian farmer. I am also going to repeat a statement made by the President of the Reform Association of South Victoria. I met him on my way to Ottawa the other day. He had a large farm in Dakota, and he was over here buying horses. I asked him: "What are you at Peterborough for?" "Well," he said, "Fairbairn, I am going to be a loyal man like the rest of you Canadians; I am abandoning my Dakota farm, and I am going to Manitoba where I will meet my two sons, and we are going to break up a large farm and settle down as loyal Canadians." I will give hon. gentlemen his name if they desire it; he told me I could use it here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. William Ayers, Esq. I sat with him in the county council for many years.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He was a Tory then.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN. No, he was not a Tory, but he is a Tory now. Now let me say that the quantity of twine manufactured in Canada is over-estimated by over 4,000,000 pounds. I desire to give you some letters from American manufacturers, and some from Canadian manufacturers, which will show the prices of binding twine in the two countries:

"FARIBAULT, MINN., 4th April, 1892.

"DEAR SIR,—Your letter of 2nd April received. Our prices for twine to farmers were as follows:—

	Sisal.	Manila.
1887	13½ cts.	16 cts.
1888	14 "	15 "
1889	16 "	17 "
1890	14 "	16 "
1891	9 "	12 "

"Respectfully,
(Sgd.) "T. H. LOYHOD & SON."

"WEBSTER CITY, IOWA, 2nd April, 1892.

"DEAR SIR,—Answering your request of this date, I find that retail dealers have charged farmers the following prices for sisal and manila twine in the five years last past:—

	Sisal.	Manila.
1887	14 to 15 cts.	16 to 18 cts.
1888	14 to 15 "	16 to 18 "
1889	15 to 16 "	17 to 18 "
1890	11 to 12½ "	15 to 19 "
1891	9 to 10 "	14 to 16 "

"The variation in price being determined by quantity bought and terms of sale.

"Respectfully yours,
(Sgd.) "C. E. FISHER."

"LA FAYETTE, IND., 4th April, 1892.

"DEAR SIR,—The price of pure manila and sisal binder twine for the five years from 1887 to date, according to our books, are about as follows:—

	Sisal.	Manila.
1887	13 cents.	15 cents.
1888	13 "	15 "
1889	12½ "	13 "
1890 (with variations, cuttings)	10 "	14 "
1891	9 "	13 "

"These prices varied one-half cent according to terms, customers, &c.

"Yours truly,
(Sgd.) "JAMIESON BROS."

"IOWA CITY, 2nd April, 1892.

"DEAR SIR,—Replying to your favour of 1st, we take pleasure in giving you the prices at which we have retailed pure sisal and pure manila binder twine, from the year 1886 to 1891, inclusive:

	Pure Manila.	Pure Sisal.
1886		
1887	15 cents.	12 cents.
1888	15 "	13 "
1889	13 "	16 "
1890	15 "	13 "
1891	12 "	09 "

"If you have any 'inside' on twine please quote us prices, we have not yet bought.

"Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) "THOS. C. CARSON & SONS."

"ABERDEEN, 9th April, 1892.

"DEAR SIR,—In answer to your enquiry as to the prices of binder twine in this territory, I beg to submit the enclosed list of prices, and being in the binder trade I have taken the prices from the retail sales books for the year named. Our prices are mostly for time sales, as a majority of our farmers are compelled to buy that way, currency being scarce until after threshing in the fall.

(Sgd.) "S. HAWKINS."

(COPY.)

"Retail prices to farmers at Aberdeen, South Dakota.

	Pure Manila.	Pure Sisal.
1887	18 cents.	15 cents.
1888	18 "	15 "
1889	17 "	13 "
1890	16 "	12½ "
1891	13 "	10 "

"JANESVILLE, WIS., 10th April, 1892.

"JOHN F. STAIRS,
"Ottawa, Can.

"DEAR SIR,—I enclose a list giving prices at which binding twine has been sold to farmers in this country for the last seven years. Hoping it will be of use to you.

"I am, yours respectfully.
(Sgd.) "W. T. KING."

(COPY.)

	Manila.	Sisal.
1885	15 cents.	14 cents.
1886	12½ "	11 "
1887	15 "	13 "
1888	17 "	14 "
1889	17 "	15 "
1890	14 "	12 & 12½ "
1891	12 & 14 "	8 & 10 "

Now we come to Canada:

"BRAMPTON, ONT., 7th April, 1892.

"DEAR SIR,—Your favour of the 6th ultimo to hand, contents duly noted; in reply to your request *re* binder twine, we have much pleasure in handing you memo. of prices, say from 1887 up to 1891:

First year of 1887..	No. 1 Manila.....	13½ cts.	per pound.
" ..	No. 2 "	12½	" "
2nd " 1888 ..	Manla..	14½	" "
"	....Mixed.....	13½	" "
3rd " 1889....	Red Star Manila..	15½	" "
"	....Blue Ribbon.....	16	" "
"	....Red Cap.....	16	" "
4th " 1890....	White Ribbon.....	15	" "
"	....Blue Ribbon.....	15	" "
"	....Crown Brand from 12½ to 13		"
"	....Red Cap from 15 to 15½ cts		"
5th " 1891 ..	Crown Brand from 10½ to 11		"
"	....Red Cap from 10½ to 11 cts.		"
"	....Blue Ribbon from 13 to 14 cts		"

"The above memo. of prices have been taken from our books and orders in the years named as above and are correct.

"Yours truly,
(Sgd.) "PEAKER & RUNIANS."

"PORT HOPE, 6th April, 1892.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter and telegram *re* twine, would say that I called on the twine dealers here and obtained the prices that twine was sold to the farmers, in 87, 88, 89, 90, 91; and now enclose you a list of same. In some cases twine was sold at a cut price to farmers where the dealers were running each other; at Cobourg last year Red Cap was sold to farmers at 12½ cash, 13½ credit, and silver composite at 9½ cash, 10½ credit. Trusting that list enclosed will be of service to you, I remain

"Yours truly,
(Sgd.) "THOS. CARSON."

"PORT HOPE, 6th April, 1892.

	Cash.	Credit.
1887. Mixed Twine, your make	12	12½ cents.
1888. Blue Ribbon, Pure	13½	14 "
1889. Red Cap, Pure.....	16½	17 "
1890. Red Cap, Pure.	15	15½ "
1890. Red Cap, Mixed	14	14½ "
1890. Silver Composite.....	10	10½ "
1890. Common Sense.....	10	10½ "
1890. Crown Brand.....	12½	13 "
1891. Red Cap.....	13	13½ "
1891. Crown Brand.....	12	12½ "
1891. Silver composite.....	10	10½ "
1891. Picture Tag, Pure.....	15	15½ "
1891. Common Sense.....	10	10½ "
1891. " "	10½	11 "

"Prices at which binder twine was sold to the farmers of the United States under the undermentioned years, compiled from letters extracts of which are attached:

SISAL.

Place.	1887.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.
La Fayette, Ind....	13	13	12½	10	9
Iowa City.....	12	13	16	13	9
Wisconsin.....	13	14	15	12½	10
South Dakota.....	15	15	13	12½	10
Faribault, Minn.....	12½	14	16	14	9
Webster City, Iowa	14	14	15	11	9

MANILA.

Place.	1887.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.
La Fayette, Ind....	15	16	18	14	13
Iowa City	15	15	18	15	12
Wisconsin	15	17	17	14	13½
South Dakota.....	18	13	17	16	13
Faribault, Minn.....	16	15	17	16	12
Webster City, Iowa	16	16	17	15	14

"The average price of binder twine to the farmers of the United States from the foregoing tables is about as follows:—

	Sisal.	Manila.
1887	13½ cents.	16 cents.
1888.....	14 "	16 "
1889.....	14½ "	17½ "
1890	12 "	13 "
1891.....	9½ "	13 "

"In Canada the prices to the farmers as nearly as can be ascertained were as follows:—

	Sisal.	Manila.
1887.....	12 cents.	12-13½ cents.
1888.....	13½ "	13½-14½ "
1889.....	13½ "	15½-16 "
1890	12½ "	12½-15 "
1891	10½ "	10½-15 "

Now, I feel that the position of hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to binding twine is not a logical one. We have proved conclusively by their own figures that the Canadian farmer pays less for his twine than does the American farmer. It is not to-night that I have learned that, because the necessity was imposed on me of defending myself in this matter, as the cry raised about my vote in this connection last session was the strongest cry raised against me during the bye-election. I wrote to all the dealers and had all the facts and figures before me, which satisfied me that my vote last session and my speech was not against the interests of the farmer, and that vote and that speech I have never since regretted. I wish to say that I have no knowledge what stand the Government intend to take in this matter, but as an individual, if I stood completely alone in the House of Commons, unless hon. gentlemen opposite could prove to me that the American farmer is getting his twine cheaper than the Canadian farmer, I would stand by the position I have taken against all odds. The whole opposition against me at the bye-election simmered itself down to the agitation on the binding twine question. At the first audience I addressed I told my constituents that if they sent me back to Parliament I was prepared to take again the very same stand that I took the previous session. I am confident that I understand this question as well as any professional man in this country, because, I have seen more of it, and I am surprised that hon. gentlemen who never sat on a binder in their life should presume to dictate to the farmers of this country. This binding twine question was a thing I had to contend with, it was that with which the Reformers were going to tie me hand and foot, it was that which was going to prevent me, as a public man, ever holding up my head again; but I am happy to say that my opponent, who is the highest calibre of a man, a man weighing 250 pounds, I tied up so tight with the binding twine, that he and his friends have been scarcely able to shake him loose since. I tell you, if you saw that demonstration in the town of Lindsay with 80 Union Jacks waving in the breeze and every lady and every gentleman with "rosettes" of binding twine in their button holes, you would have come to a clear conclusion that there could not be very much in the policy of the Opposition when it had whittled down to a ball of binding twine. I came here as a supporter of the Government, and it would be a pretty queer vote I would not give in favour of that Government, especially when now I am pretty well acquainted with the Opposition. It is a sad thing to find that the policy of those gentlemen opposite has come down to a ball of binding twine. I do not wonder at hon. gentlemen getting a little discouraged when all their schemes are brought so low, and I hope that, until they change their policy, they will remain where they are, in Opposition, as they will, unless I mistake the farmers of this country, if their policy is limited to a ball of binder twine. I am here to support a Canadian Government, I am here to support a Government that is not looking for a policy, I am here to support a Government that has an established policy that the people have fallen in line with, and the longer they know that Government and its policy, the better they appreciate it, and the late vote shows that to be true. When the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr.

Mills) tells the Ministers of the Crown that they are running from pillar to post, running to Washington and elsewhere looking for a policy, I think it comes with a very bad grace from him. I now resume my seat.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I am always very happy to meet a brother farmer who knows his own business better than any other person. I do not pretend to know so much about my business. I never pinned my faith to the coat tails of an individual or a party. I heard a speech of the hon. gentleman in 1890, and his policy was nothing but to endorse the private and public acts of Sir John Macdonald, and to say ditto to every word. He says that, if we could show that the Americans got their binding twine cheaper than the Canadians, we would gain a point. The hon. member for Muskoka said about the same thing. You will remember the committee that sat in 1888 when Mr. Massey, the implement manufacturer, was brought before the committee, and he stated that he could buy binding twine in the United States, pay the duty, and have it as cheap as he could buy it in Canada. He also said:

"We had to import a large quantity for the North-West last year. We could not get it in Canada. We laid it down in Manitoba at about the price we had to pay in Nova Scotia, and duty added."

That shows conclusively that the duty on binding twine is added to the cost of the article here. The American farmers are being imposed upon by the combines there, and the combines that bleed the American farmers will bleed the Canadian farmers, if they get the opportunity. Here is an extract in regard to the great cordage trust in the United States:

"The greedy binding twine trust is not satisfied with the enormous profit accruing from last year's operations. One million four hundred thousand dollars was cleared in 1891 by the trust. That sum, considering its opportunities in the field of legalized robbery, is now regarded as being short of actual requirements. It is to be greatly exceeded this year, and to that end the price of twine for the coming season has been advanced from 3 to 4 cents. Competition has been shut out by the duty, and this is the secret of the trust's unholy raid on the pockets of the wheat growers of the west. But what are the farmers going to do about it? Knowing that the protection afforded the trust by the Government makes the robbery complained of possible, do they intend to vote for a continuance of the fiscal policy that bears so heavily upon them? That is the question."

That is the question with us in Canada as well as with the farmers in the United States, and now that this large trust in the United States has got hold of the cordage companies in Canada, we may expect to suffer more in the future than we have in the past, and, if it is true that they are raising the price of cordage from 3 to 4 cents a pound for the next season, we may expect that they will not give us the binding twine any cheaper. It is one of the most grievous burdens on the farmers of this country. There may be some reason for a duty when the money goes into the treasury of the country, but, when it goes simply into the pockets of a company, particularly when it is a combination of foreigners who have bought up all the cordage manufactories in Canada, it is a different thing. I should like to hear if the Government and their supporters are willing, in view of their policy, to allow this binding twine to come in from another country. We had a letter read by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) from a gentleman in Belfast who stated that he could send binding twine in here for 9½ cents a pound. I saw a statement that it could be manufactured for 8 cents a pound, which would bear out the statement of the hon. gentleman that it could be brought from the old country and laid down here at 9½ cents a pound. During the last year we imported 196,000 pounds on which we paid something over $6,000 in duty, which makes about 3 1/10 cents per pound on binding twine imported in Canada. That shows what the price of the twine was here because the cordage companies were not going to sell their twine to any extent lower than the price of the twine inported into the country, especially as they had purchased from the cordage company. That is proof that we do not get twine any cheaper than its price in the United States with the duty added. Now, how much money has it cost in the Province of Ontario to bind our crops? In 1891 there were 849,956 acres of fall wheat harvested; of spring wheat, 510,634 acres; of barley, 553,166 acres; of oats, 1,840,636 acres; of rye, 67,867 acres, making a total of 3,822,257 acres. But there is a considerable quantity of barley that is not tied, that is cut and put loose into the barn, so that would reduce the quantity of twine to be used. If we estimate that one-half the barley acreage is so cut, that would leave 3,545,674 acres of grain, which at two pounds of twine per acre would give 7,081,348 pounds, which at 3 1/10 cents per pound, would give us $212,740 that the Province of Ontario had to pay for binding twine. Now, if we deduct the duty paid on imported twine $1,612, we find that the Province of Ontario alone, which requires nearly as much binding twine as all the other provinces in the Dominion of Canada, paid $211,128.44, which went exclusively into the pockets of the manufacturers. We find that the total quantity of land in the Province of Ontario that is occupied at the present time is something like 21,000,000 acres, of which something between 10 and 11,000,000 acres are cleared land; so that for every 50 acres cleared there is a tax of $1 and for every 100 acres of cleared land there is a tax of $2 on account of binding twine. Take the County of Huron, one riding of which I have the honour to represent. We find that in 1890 there were, of fall wheat, 44,978 acres; of spring wheat, 9,379; of barley 32,386; of oats, 94,630; of rye, 306, making a total of 181,679 acres, which would employ 363,358 pounds of twine, which at 3 1/10 cents per pound, would make $12,717 for the County of Huron alone. But as we cut about one-half the barley and put it into the barn loose, that would reduce the amount to about $11,590 which the County of Huron has to pay for binding twine. Now, I hold that is something that ought not to exist. The Government might have some plea for retaining the tax if the money went into the treasury, unless they consider that every article that pays a tax, whether into the combines or into the treasury, has a right to the protection of the National Policy, as was hinted at by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). If that is the case, we cannot expect to get much relief from the Government. But I had understood from what has passed in this House, that the Government was about to submit some change in the tariff, be it little or be it great. Now, I would have stuck closely to this question of binding twine, had it not been for the challenge that was hurled across the House by the hon. member for

South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) who said that Britain was the market where the Canadian farmer gets the best returns for his produce. Does he know, as a practical farmer, that barley is the crop to-day that pays the farmer in the Province of Ontario better than any other crop we have raised for a large number of years? In 1891, 4,056,848 bushels of barley went into the United States, upon which we paid 10 cents a bushel. Then there was 922,752 bushels that paid 30 cents duty, so that $682,536 was paid to get our barley into the United States. Now, they may tell us that the United States export a large quantity of barley. True, they do export a certain quantity, something like 900,000 bushels during 1891. But if they did export that amount, that is an advantage to us if the purchasers for the United States market will come into Canada and give us a better price to-day than we can get from the British market, although it displaces a certain amount of their own grains? That is our profit and it is theirs also, otherwise they would not come and buy it from us. Now, about horses. We have been told time and time again that England is our best market for horses. I state without fear of successful contradiction that the English market require very few of our horses. I find that in 1888 there were imported into England 11,505 horses; in 1889, 13,832; in 1890, 19,286, or 44,643 during those three years. Now how many horses did they export during those same years? In 1888 they exported 11,281; in 1889, 13,668; in 1890, 18,981, or altogether 43,930, so that the exports and the imports were very nearly equal, with a difference of only 1,024 in favour of the imports during those three years. These figures are taken from the last British agricultural returns, showing conclusively that Britain is not a market where we can expect to sell our horses with profit. We find that the continental countries of Europe can supply the British market much more readily and with far less risk of loss than, we can. For instance, Denmark supplied the British market in 1890 with 2,489 horses, Germany with 12,600, Holland with 1,575, Norway with 294, Spain with 156, the United States with 364 and Canada with 225, that was the total import of horses from continental countries and from the United States and Canada into England during the year. Now, we find that in 1890 the United States imported 37,675 horses; that was the year before the McKinley Bill came into effect. In 1891 they imported 7,631 horses at $30 per head, 7,965 at 20 per cent and 368 at 30 per cent. In all, the United States imported during that year the McKinley Bill came into force, 15,964 horses, showing that there was a falling off in that year of 21,711 horses on account of the change in the duty. The United States exported only 3,110 horses in 1891, which left a market for 12,854 horses in the United States against a market of 1,026 in Great Britain, showing conclusively that the United States is a better market for us than Great Britain can be for our surplus horses. I state from practical experience that we cannot establish with Great Britain a trade so successful and profitable as we can with the United States. The long sea voyage causes great loss, and then we have to pay heavy insurance in transporting our products and animals across the water. Let me say that the United States, instead of increasing their imports of horses during the last year, decreased the number by 157,000, showing again that that is the market upon which we must rely to a greater extent than any other, for horses. We have been told that Great Britain is our best market for all sorts of grain. I gave a statement to the House this year in reference to this and I challenge its contradiction. In the *Empire* of the 23rd of April I find the following prices quoted for fall wheat, spring wheat, and barley, in the cities of Buffalo and Toronto. Fall wheat, Buffalo, 94 cents; Toronto, 84 or 85 cents; or a difference of 9 cents in favour of Buffalo. Spring wheat, Buffalo, 92 cents; spring wheat, Toronto, 82 to 86, or a difference in favour of Buffalo of 7 cents. This was a special despatch to the *Empire*, in which it was said that 7,000 bushels of barley were sold in Buffalo at 86 cents as compared with 50 cents in Canada, or a difference of 36 cents in favour of Buffalo.

Mr. TAYLOR. What has that to do with binder twine?

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). It has got to do with an answer to the gentleman who spoke on that side of the House. Why do you allow license to one when you attempt to circumscribe another; that is the policy of the Conservative party. I hold that the markets of the United States are the most profitable markets we can have, provided we had unrestricted reciprocity, and I believe the day is not distant when the people of this country, Conservative and Reformer alike, will arise in their might and demand unrestricted reciprocity. There is no country so cursed with party politics as Canada is. Many a Conservative has stated to me within the last three months that he was in favour of unrestricted reciprocity with the States, and that he would ten times rather have it than allow the Grits to come into power. They are afraid on the other side of the House that if Reformers come into power we will get unrestricted reciprocity, and some hon. gentlemen opposite have a feeling that the Government have not behaved honestly with the people of this country in their late trip to Washington with respect to the question. This binding twine is a grievous matter for the farmers, and it is one that has to be repeated every year. During last year I bought 175 lbs. of binding twine and it took 2⅞ lbs. to each acre, or in other words it cost me 9 cents per acre of a duty within a mere fraction, so that I paid $5.42 duty on that 175 pounds of twine. Every farmer in Canada who has got improved machinery, and who carries on his farm in a proper manner, has to pay this tax, and it is a burden that comes around every year, and when the twine is used once it cannot be used again. Will the Government take this into consideration, and see that justice is done to the farmer of Canada. Why should the fishermen of the Lower Provinces get free cordage and free salt, and why should the farmers of Ontario be assessed to contribute to a bounty of $150,000 annually, when they are denied the same privilege as the fishermen have of getting their twine free? I hold that this is a gross injustice. I believe myself, that if the Government do not give us some relief in this matter, that next year we will be worse pinched on binding twine than in the past, on account of this large cordage company having the whole supply of the States and Canada under their control. I trust that the Government will see their way to remove the duty on twine, so that we

can get our supplies from the old country. That would encourage trade with Great Britain, and it would be acting loyally, and gentlemen opposite would not be going against their principles of loyalty or waving the old flag. They would be assisting trade between the old country and Canada, and that is the only way in which I see that we are likely to get relief. I hope that every farmer in the country will take this into his serious consideration, because I know that the time has come when Conservatives and Reformers alike believe that the Government should give some relief to the farmers in this matter.

Mr. SMITH (Ontario). I do not intend to detain the House at any length in discussing this question, and I do not know that I would ask that indulgence were it not for the fact that the riding I have the honour to represent is deeply interested in this matter. The National Policy has been for thirteen years under trial, and it has been fairly and fully tested. It was tested with a series of bad crops, and it has been tested by the severest opposition of our friends of the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken, has on all occasions since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, opposed the National Policy. In fact, Sir, he reminds me somewhat of the minister who settled in his riding a short time ago, and who had not long been stationed there before one of his people died. When the funeral service was over, he thought, as he was somewhat new to the section of the country, that he could say nothing about the deceased, and he believed that it would be well, perhaps, to ask some of the neighbours to say a word or two about him. After a pause, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) rose, as the hon. member for South Huron can rise upon an occasion of that kind, and he said: Well, as no one seems to care to say anything about the deceased, I will take this opportunity of discussing unrestricted receprocity and free binder twine. I say, Sir, that the National Policy has been severely tested. The gentlemen in Opposition to-day are attacking it piecemeal as they have been doing for the last four or five years. They single out one particular article and in that way they try to bring influence to bear, especially upon the farmers of this country, against it. To-day they have singled out binder twine, as an object of attack. There can be no doubt that, if the position taken by hon. gentlemen of the Reform party were correct, if it were true that the farmers of Canada were actually losing by the duty on binder twine, then there would be some semblance of force in their contention, and if it were true, the contention of these hon. gentlemen would soon make the farmers rich if they were once in power. But from first to last, during all the days that this matter has been under discussion, they have failed, and failed in every particular, to prove in any way that binder twine is at present, or has been in years gone by, dearer in Canada than in the United States. That being the case, their whole argument falls to the ground. If we had the duty taken off binder twine, the result would undoubtedly be that this twine, instead of being manufactured in Canada, would be manufactured in the United States. Controlled as this article is by a large company in the United States, there is no question at all that the whole of the binder twine consumed in Canada would be

manufactured in the large concerns in the United States if the duty were removed. I may also point out that this cordage combination, which we heard the member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) speak about, has an interest in England as well as on the other side of the line. Well, if this is the case, it appears to me that it is in the interest of Canada and in the interest of the farmers, so long as we cannot get the twine any cheaper, that it shall be manufactured in the country. If the duty were taken off, there can be no doubt that on account of the earlier harvest on the other side we would have great difficulty in getting our supplies. We would simply have to depend on their surplus, and our Canadian dealers would be afraid to invest in the article. To-day we are manufacturing twine from flax, and I understand that a manufactory of some considerable importance in the western part of Canada is employing in the neighbourhood of 100 hands, and that it will manufacture this year 300 tons of this twine. This flax is grown by our farmers, and they are to a certain extent engaged in the manufacture. These hands are employed in Canada, and the whole of the money remains in the country. The mover of the amendment has in the North-West the finest land under the sun for growing flax, and if the duty is continued hundreds and hundreds of tons of twine necessary to bind the grain of the North-West would be manufactured there from the flax grown in that country. If that is the case, it would be much better all round that the duty should continue as it is. Hon. gentlemen tell us that we can buy our twine from the mother country, and that it can be laid down here for 9 cents a pound. They know better when they make that statement. It is laid down in New York for 12 cents a pound. If we in Canada were paying a so much higher price than we should pay, there can be no question that the twine would come from the mother country, even with the duty left on. Now, allusion was made by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) to the cordage combine of 1888, and he stated that it was conclusively shown by Mr. Massey that the farmers of Canada were paying more for twine than the farmers of the United States. That may have been Mr. Massey's contention, but the difference is so small, amounting to something under 25 cents a ton, that I think the hon. member for South Huron was not justified in making that statement. These are my views on the amendment of the hon. member for Marquette. I have stated them because I did not want to give a silent vote on this question, and believe it is better to retain the duty and to stand by our country when we are not injuring ourselves.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not my intention to detain the House at any length. I do not think it is necessary to go around the world to gather up something to throw in the face of the House and call it argument in a matter of this kind. It seems to me that this question may resolve itself into a very small compass indeed. My reason for making a statement at all at this time is that during my election on the 28th of January last, I was very much interested in the question of the duty on binder twine, which was a very prominent question in that election. I told the Patrons of Industry, who opposed me on that occasion, that if at

any time they would furnish me with any evidence to satisfy me or any reasonable man that by reason of the duty on binder twine it was enhanced in price to the farmers of this country, I should demand of the Government the removal of that duty. Since that time I have not heard from the Patrons of Industry in the County of Halton. In fact, I have not heard that there are any of those so-called Patrons of Industry left. I have not had any petition from them to present to this House asking for the removal of the duty, or any suggestion whatever from them in that direction. The arguments advanced on that occasion evidently so thoroughly convinced them that they did not pay the duty on binder twine and that they obtained it as cheaply as the farmers of the United States, that they are contented that such is the case. Now, I make this statement because I wish to say why I give the vote I am about to give on this occasion. The resolution which has been introduced by the hon. member for Marquette was certainly introduced very briefly. I was surprised indeed that he did not advance any stronger argument than he did in support of his contention. In fact, I think he totally failed to support his resolution in any intelligible way at all. He read a petition from the Patrons of Industry in Manitoba, which set forth, first, that the duty operated to the disadvantage of the consumer, and secondly, that the cost of binder twine, owing to the duty, was higher to the consumer; but he did not advance a single argument in support of these two contentions. He seems to take it for granted that because there is a duty on binder twine coming into this country, the article manufactured in this country must be necessarily higher in price. Now, that is certainly not true. If that were the case with binder twine, it would be the case with other things, and I am sure that this House is satisfied that that rule does not prevail. For instance, take the case of sugar, which has been mentioned to-night. One of the arguments advanced, and I think very unfairly advanced, is that by reason of our having a higher duty on refined sugar in this country than the United States have, our people pay a higher price for sugar. My contention is that notwithstanding the fact that our duty on refined sugar in this country is three-tenths of a cent higher than the duty in the United States, we have cheaper granulated sugar, and a better article, than the people of the United States. Now, I do not simply make that statement, because a bald statement without proof should go for nothing in an intelligent House like this. I remember on the 26th of September last, when the sugar question was under discussion in this House, quotations were given, I think by the senior member for Halifax, which were not disputed. He stated that on that very day he had received a quotation from New York that granulated sugar was being sold there at 4½ cents a pound, while on the same day at Halifax it was being sold at 4⅝ cents a pound, or ⅛ of a cent a pound less. Now, I was curious to follow that up and to see whether it was a single isolated case or not, and I made enquiries from the very best available market report to be obtained in the city of Toronto. They are the most reliable men who are engaged in dealing in the article of sugar. On the 3rd October I find the quotation in New York was 4⅜ cents, and in Canada 4·27. On the 10th of October it was the same in New York and 4·27 in Canada; on 14th October it was the same in New York, and 4·27 in Canada; on 17th October the quotation continued the same in New York and in Canada; and on the 21st November it was 4¼ against 4¼. I find that up to the end of the year, at various times, and at the end of the year, the quotations of granulated sugar in our Canadian refineries in Halifax and Montreal were in favour of Canadian as against American sugar. Therefore I say that the fact that there is a higher duty on binding twine coming into this country than there is on binding twine going into the United States is no evidence whatever that we pay higher for our binding twine than the people of the United States. Why, if the duty would make the article higher in price, the same argument would hold in the United States. If 25 per cent duty on binding twine makes it higher to the farmers of this country than it is in the United States, then seven-tenths duty in the United States would make it higher to the people there than it is in Canada, and I do not see that we can place any dependence on the argument in either case. So much then for the argument advanced by the hon. member for Marquette who has introduced this resolution. He spoke of a Mr. Braithwaite, and gave quotations from Belfast, but I think you could not rely on binder twine being brought from Great Britain and Ireland when our harvest is going on, because we know this article must be put upon the market and sales made in the short space of about three months of the year, and it would not be safe for the people of this country to rely upon getting an article, which is wanted on a few days' notice, three thousand miles from home. I do not think, therefore, we can depend on Great Britain for an article of that kind. With regard to the large profits referred to by the hon. member for Marquette, I do not pretend to follow him on that question. But as he introduced the name of A. W. Morris, as an evidence of the profits made in the manufacture of binding twine, I propose also to introduce the name of A. W. Morris as proving in the same combine report that we really have our binding twine at lower rates than the American people pay for it. Mr. Morris's opinion is given in the Combines Committee's report. When the question was asked him: "How do prices of Canadian binding twine compare with the prices in the United States, say for the year 1887?" He answered: "I think for the greater portion of the year Canadian prices were very much lower. At the close of the season in the United States there was an arrangement among all the manufacturers and the prices were reduced considerably, but for the average of the year I think the Canadian prices were considerably lower; I mean the prices to the farmer." There, I think, is an evidence from a gentleman whose name the hon. member for Marquette gave in testimony, that even if the manufacturers of cordage have made money, the price of twine is cheaper in Canada than in the United States. I trust they do make money, for it would be an unfortunate thing for this country if people who engaged in such industries, which, I understand, are of a very risky character, did not profit by them. They are risky because the raw material they use fluctuates in price very much, I understand, from £25 sterling per ton to £60 sterling, and it is quite uncertain when a man buys the raw material, whether he will be able to sell at a profit or at a

very great loss. I think, however, if we accept the testimony of Mr. Morris with regard to profits, the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution must at the same time accept the evidence of Mr. Morris as to the value of binding twine in this country as compared with the United States. He told us, however, that the difficulty in this country is that there are no quotations? This season he says there are no quotations. I am very much surprised at that. I find no difficulty in getting quotations both in this country and the United States as to what binding twine is likely to be sold at during the current year. He tells us that one of the reasons he introduced this resolution so hurriedly was in order that quotations might be given to the farmers in the North-West, as the dealers there would not consent to do so until the action of the Government was known. My impression is that the dealers out there do not think at all about the action of the Government but are waiting rather for the action of the hon. member for Marquette, because his speech delivered to-day and the speech delivered a short time ago and the other speeches of the hon. gentleman on this subject, which have been printed and circulated throughout Manitoba to show that by reason of the duty on binding twine the farmers have to pay so much more for it, have the effect of enabling every one of his friends engaged in the business to get one to three cents a pound more for it. I am convinced that is the effect of the hon. gentleman's speeches, though I do not attribute any desire in that sense to him. I believe the farmers of this country are paying more for their binding twine perhaps than they ought to do, just because they are educated by such speeches to believe that the price is really higher than it ought to be; and the dealers take advantage of this to extract from the farmers of the country a price which they are not entitled to pay at all. The hon. gentleman seconding this resolution put his statement very briefly. He said he had very little to say. I do not suppose he had, and I dare say he said all that could be said in support of his contention. He seemed to rely chiefly upon some letter which he obtained from Mr. Wilkie, the secretary of the Dominion Grange. Mr. Wilkie had told him that binder twine in the United States was sold at 8½ cents. Now, I assume, from what the hon. member for North York said, that that was the price to the Grange for very large lots, possibly 100 tons, very large lots at any rate. But I would like to look at the matter in this way: Standard twine, as I understand the brand, is a brand in which, if it contains anything at all of manila, the quantity is so light that it is scarcely discernible. The Standard brand in the United States to-day is almost pure sisal, containing nothing of the better quality of raw material that enters into the composition of binding twine. At 8½ cents, we are told by the hon. gentleman this article is supplied the Grange. Well, I just like to look at it in this way. We are told by Mr. Wilkie also that this is a quality of twine that was sold last year under the name of Red Cap in this country. There is the unfairness of the whole letter. Red cap twine, I believe, consists of about two-third of manila and one-third sisal. Crown twine has about one-half of each. And I say it is unfair to compare a twine which is almost pure sisal with a twine two-thirds manila, and that is what Mr. Wilkie is doing when he informs the hon. member for North York of the price. A short time ago I also received a communication from Mr. Wilkie. I was desirous of getting all the information I possibly could, because I was anxious to learn from the farmers what their views are and what arguments they had in support of the contention of the hon. member for Marquette. I wrote Mr. Wilkie, and told him I would be very much obliged to him indeed if he would kindly send me down such statements and arguments as he had in support of his contention, as he desired my support in favour of the removal of the duty from binder twine. Now, Mr. Wilkie says this in reply:

"All the evidence I had has been sent to Ottawa."

I listened to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and all the argument he used was that duty was imposed; and he said something in regard to the sugar question:

"All the evidence I had has been sent to Ottawa."

I presume it was sent to the member for North York. He says:

"It might not be considered legal evidence, but it was circumstantial or corroborative at least."

It may be circumstantial, but I do not think it corroborates very much the contention of hon. gentlemen. It is contented that twine at 8½ cents, equal to our Crown brand or Red Cap, can be manufactured by the people of the United States. I call attention to the fact that the manila which we use more than sisal, which is generally used in the United States, is sold for prices from £25 up to £58 sterling. If we refer to the combines which have been spoken of by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), we will find evidence that the manila has been sold for prices ranging from £25 to £40. Take the medium price at £32 a ton, and you will find that it would amount to about 8 cents a pound. The raw material is admitted free of duty into this country and into the United States. The manufacturers start on an even basis. It is unreasonable to believe that any manufacturer, Canadian or American, is going to take the raw material, allow for the waste, the doing of the work, and all the rest, for a simple advance of ¼ a cent a pound on the cost of the raw material. That is so unreasonable that I do not think any one will accept the statement of the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) or of Mr. Wilkie as to that being a fair price at which binding twine can be sold. Now, as another evidence that binding twine is sold as cheaply in this country by Canadian manufacturers as it is sold to the people of the United States, I will quote again the same article which was read by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), but I will not read it as he read it. I will read it as it is. I will not change Nova Scotia to New York in order to make an argument, but I will give it as it is in the Combines Report which every one can get, and can see from that whether I am correct or not. I hope the hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution this afternoon, and who made a similar mistake in reading the evidence of Mr. Massey, will not again make the same blunder. Mr. Massey was asked by Mr. Bain:

"What is the actual cost, including the duty, of the American article?—We had to import a large quantity for the North-West last year. We could not get it in Canada. We laid it down in Manitoba at about the price we had to pay in Nova Scotia, and duty added. It cost us about the duty extra."

I believe that now this country is capable of turning out twice as much twine as is required by the people of Canada. Had Mr. Massey bought this in Nova Scotia, he would have got it cheaper by the amount of the duty, but it cost him the duty extra. But the hon. gentleman reads it in this way:

"We laid it down in Manitoba at about the price we had to pay in New York."

Putting New York instead of Nova Scotia. I hope this is the last time we will have that mistake made. I think we should not go to the United States for names or terms. These evidences are very satisfactory. They are sworn testimonies. They are honourable men. They must be honourable men, because the hon. gentleman on the other side introduced their names as honourable men who should be trusted, and whose word should be accepted as a matter of evidence. Why should we not accept the testimony of such men and give to Canada the manufacture of its binding twine as long as that article is supplied as cheaply as the people of the United States supply it. I am not going to quarrel with my hon. friends on the other side as to the quantity of binding twine consumed, but I think they are a little wide of the mark. I think a fair estimate would be about 10,000,000 lbs., but it does not depend upon the question whether the farmers of Canada pay $400,000, $300,000, $200,000 or even $100,000. If I believed that the cost would be dearer by $10 in a year to the farmers of Canada than it would be if there were no duty on this article, I would support the resolution which has been moved. But I believe that the duty has not enchanced the cost to the people of this country, but that they are getting their twine as cheaply as the people of the United States, and for that reason I shall vote against the motion in order to give to the Canadians the manufacture of their own binding twine as long as they are prepared to supply it as cheaply as the manufacturers of the United States. I have already said that the raw material is free to the manufacturers of each country. We can manufacture this twine as cheaply as they can, we have as good machinery as they have, we have as good workmen, and we have as good brains to manage the cordage factories, and the manufacturers themselves say they make that article as cheap as the people of the United States do. If that is the case, why should we remove the duty and give up the market of this country to a foreign country? The duty was never put on binding twine for the purpose of raising a revenue. It is altogether different from the article of sugar. We have been told over and over again that when the duty was taken off sugar, the price immediately went down. Well, was it to be wondered at? Who in this House or out of it ever thought that anything else would occur? When the duty was put on sugar long ago for the purpose of raising a revenue, it was done because it was considered that sugar was a fit subject for duty, and so a duty was put on raw sugar. But when the Government of the day found, after years of economical administration, that they were able to do without the three million and a half dollars obtained from sugar duties, they removed that duty and sugar went down in price. Now, the raw material of binding twine is free of duty just as well as the raw material for the manufacture of sugar. We have always contended that if the Canadian manufacturers can produce as good an article and as cheaply as the manufacturers of the United States, we are bound to protect them in their own market, and so a duty was put on that article for the purpose of giving the Canadian manufacturers their own market, giving them an opportunity of supplying our own workingmen, who, in turn will consume the products of our Canadian farms. Now, we want to continue that policy, we want to provide markets for the products of Ontario farmers by those men down east who manufactured binding twine, we want to continue that policy rather than give an open market in binding twine, or in any other commodity, to the foreign manufacturers, so long as that commodity can be supplied as cheaply by Canadian manufacturers as it can be bought elsewhere. I think the Canadian manufacturers this season will make every effort to supply the article of binding twine as cheaply to the Canadian farmers as it could be obtained if the duty were removed. There are reasons why we should preserve that manufacture in our own country. Our Canadian makers understand the requirements of this country; they ascertain by a fair estimate what quantity will be necessary, and they make provisions for that quantity. Now, on the other side of the line it is not known what quantity will be required from year to year because the extent of the crops is uncertain and variable. If they should have a very large crop their whole supply of binding twine might be consumed, and our own Canadian farmers if we relied on the United States market, might possibly not have enough to bind 25 per cent of their crops. What a nice condition our farmers would then find themselves in were we to rely entirely upon makers in a foreign country. I understand, besides, that Canadian manufacturers of this article, take all the reponsibilities themselves, they take all the risks; even when they sell at this season of the year, or earlier, they do not fix the price, but they agree that any drop in price will be allowed to the dealer. That dealer sends in his order, and if he fails to sell the whole quantity on account of a shorter crop, the manufacturer takes back the unbroken packages. Now, we could not expect any such consideration from foreign manufacturers. You will readily see the advantage this is to the farmers of this country, because when a dealer is able to buy from the manufacturer on such favourable terms he can sell that article at the very closest profits and not subject himself to loss by carrying the articles over to another season. Therefore, I say that we had better remain as we are, unless hon. gentlemen opposite, before this debate closes, are able to show us how we could do better. It has been contended, I think, by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan), that the fishermen have certain privileges in the lower provinces that are not afforded to the farmers of Ontario. Now, I really think this little privilege that is granted to the fishermen is almost too trifling for the wealthy Province of Ontario to take notice of. I understand that there is a certain kind of twine used by the fishermen in making nets, that is not manufactured in this country, and which I am told cannot readily be manufactured in this country. A limited quantity of very fine twine is allowed to come in free for those fishermen, and there never has been a duty on it, I am told, from

the beginning of the world to this day. These fishermen had this twine free to start with, and the Government did not feel disposed to ask them to pay a duty on an article which was not manufactured in this country. That is according to the principle of the National Policy. If an article cannot be made in this country why then let us admit it free, so that our people can get it at the lowest price. But on the rope and cordage used by these fishermen which can be manufactured in this country, they pay a duty just the same as other people; therefore there is nothing in the argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I desire to draw attention to a few figures which I have obtained with reference to the great question before us; because the real question is: Have we our binding twine as cheap as the farmers of the United States have it? Now, in my own province there is a firm known by the name of Peaker & Runians, a firm that the hon. member for Peel knows very well, and every statement they make I am quite sure the hon. member for Peel will accept as thoroughly reliable. They live within a short distance of the county I have the honour to represent, and they sell a very large quantity of binding twine in that county. I have had occasion to make enquiries there as to the prices which this firm obtained for their binding twine. I will mention a few figures which have been obtained from their own books; they are no fictitious prices, they are the prices at which the article was actually sold by this reliable firm:

1st,	year of	1887	No. 1 Manila	13½ cts.	per pound.
	"		No. 2 "	12½ "	"
2nd	"	1888	Manila	14½ "	"
	"		Mixed	13½ "	"
3rd	"	1889	Red Star Manila	15½ "	"
	"		Blue Ribbon	16 "	"
	"		Red Cap	16 "	"
4th	"	1890	White Ribbon	15 "	"
	"		Blue Ribbon	15 "	"
	"		Crown Brand from	12½ to 13	"
	"		Red Cap from	15 to 15½	"
5th	"	1891	Crown Brand from	10½ to 11	"
	"		Red Cap from	11½ to 12	"
	"		Blue Ribbon from	13 to 14	"

Now, there is a statement going over five years. I have other statements from various parts of the country and from various parts of the United States. I obtained the services of a gentleman last winter to communicate with a number of persons in the United States whose names I gave him, for the purpose of getting information with respect to this binding twine, and I am glad to place before you quotations which I believe are reliable, and they all go to show this fact, that binding twine in this country is as cheap to our farmers as it is to the farmers of the United States. Now, I want to give a comparison of prices with Minnesota between the years 1887 and 1891. In 1887, sisal sold at 12½; in 1888, at 14; in 1889, at 16, and in 1890, at 14 cents. Manila sold in 1887 at 16; in 1888, at 15; in 1889, at 17, and in 1890, at 16 cents. In 1891, sisal sold at 9 cents and manila at 12 cents. The average price of binder twine to the farmers of the United States from the reliable tables is about as follows:—

	Sisal.	Manila.
1887	13½ cents.	16 cents.
1888	14 "	16 "
1889	14½ "	17¼ "
1890	12 "	15 "
1891	9½ "	13 "

Mr. HENDERSON.

Now, these are the average quotations of five different states where this article is sold.

Mr. CASEY. What was the Canadian price of manila in 1891?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will give you for the same five years the price to the Canadian farmer as nearly as has been ascertained.

Mr. CASEY. I asked for that last year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, you will get it now. In Canada the prices to the farmers, as nearly as can be ascertained, were as follows:—

1887	12 cents	to	13½	cents.
1888	13½ "	"	14½	"
1889	15½ "	"	16	"
1890	12½ "	"	15	"
1891	10½ "	"	15	"

Mr. CASEY. Not for manila?

Mr. HENDERSON. Manila would be the highest price and Crown brand is the lowest. I understand there are very few quotations indeed of 15 cents and the bulk of the sales last year were 10½ to 12½ cents; that is 10½ for a mixture such as Crown brand, although in some cases pure manila used only in limited quantities was sold as high as 15 cents. We, therefore, see that the prices were lower in Canada than in the United States, as the bulk of the sales for twine used in this country was at 10½ to 12½ cents. The Crown brand was one of the most saleable articles in the country last year. It was a good twine, about half and half manila and sisal, and answers the purpose well. With such a comparison of prices as I have given I fail to see that any man can come to the conclusion that by reason of the duty on binder twine the farmers of the country are suffering to the extent of one cent. After looking at the matter fairly and without being carried away by prejudices or feelings of any kind, I think we can only arrive at the one conclusion and that is, that Canada can produce as good and as cheap an article for the farmers of this country as the manufacturers of the United States can furnish for their people. We are told by hon. gentlemen on the other side that no quotations could be obtained this year. I can quite understand that. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) had not yet delivered his speech in the House of Commons and consequently the quotations were not forthcoming, but I have no doubt that now they will be forthcoming very soon. Just as soon as the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side, telling the farmers that by reason of the duty they will have to pay two or three cents more per pound for their twine; just so soon as these speeches are scattered broadcast over Manitoba and Ontario, I have no doubt that the friends of hon. gentlemen engaged in the binding twine business will issue their price list, and it may be a high one too, because these speeches will be quoted as an evidence of why these high prices should be paid, and the farmers may be made to pay a price for the article which they ought not to pay. I do not pretend to be a prophet or the son of a prophet, but I have been making some enquiries about the probable price of binding twine this year and I will leave the future to verify whether my figures are correct or not. I understand that there will be four brands made in the United States this year. One of them, the standard brand of my friend from North York, will be sold at 11 cents a pound. He quoted it at

8½ cents, but that is not the price at which it will be sold to the farmers. The price at which the standard brand will be sold to the farmers is 11 cents. A man taking ten or twenty car loads may be able to buy at 8½ or 9 cents, I do not know anything about that; but at any rate when it gets to the hands of the farmers it will necessarily cost a little more than it would in large quantities. No man is going to take a 100-ton lot and sell it at the same price by the 50 lbs. or the 100 lbs. He will sell it first to the man who will buy 50 tons and he will make a cent; that man will sell it by 10 tons and he will make one half cent more, and then the man who deals in small quantities of 50 or 100 lbs. will require another half cent, so that 11 cents is about the price it will be placed on the market to the American farmers. They will make standard mixed containing a small quantity of manila which will be put before the farmers of the United States at 12 cents per pound. That will spin out about 525 to 550 feet to the pound. They will manufacture what is called manila twine which is made to spin about 600 feet to the pound, and though it may not contain very much manila, it will sell for 13 cents. They have what they call pure manila, although I fear it is not very pure, and it will sell for 14 cents. These are the American quotations at the present time and any hon. gentleman can get them the same as I did. Now let us see what our Canadian farmers will pay for twine during the year 1892. The prices and qualities I will indicate to hon. members who are farmers and they can take note of them because, I have no doubt that my statements will be quite verified when the season comes to buy binding twine. At any rate I give you the advantage of these quotations, so that when the dealers come to you and tell you that by reason of the duty binder twine is going to be dear, you can tell them that you are not afraid, you are not going to buy to-day you are going to wait a little and get the proper prices. In Canada these qualities will be sold to the farmers as follows:—

Crown.....	about 525 feet to pound,		11	cents.
Red Cap.....	" 550	"	12	"
Blue Cap.....	" 600	"	13	"

We have, therefore, the prices in Canada of 11, 12 and 13 cents, as against 11, 12, 13 and 14 cents in the United States. Now, Mr. Speaker, with such evidence as this before hon. gentlemen, what could induce them to vote that the duty should be removed from binding twine, that the manufactures of twine in this country should be closed up, and that the whole manufacture of twine should be transferred to a foreign country, and leave us dependent upon a foreign country for the supply of an article which, when we require, we want to get it in such quantities as we need, and at just such times as it is necessary we should use it.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the Government side in support of the tax on binder twine have been giving us the old story. They have not been dealing in argument, but they have been dealing in what seems to be considered as a sort of magic formula on that side of the House to ease their consciences and to quiet the feelings of their constituents who have thought that their interests were injured by this duty on binder twine. It has been used with reference to every article on which a protective duty falls, and it may be applied in the same words to each, merely changing the name of the article. They say: This article is made cheaper and better in Canada and sold at a lower price here than the United States, therefore we could not endure the competition of the United States manufacturers in this article. You cannot call it an argument, Sir, it has not even the form of an argument. They said that about refined sugar; they asserted that we made better refined sugar here than we could import, that it was sold cheaper, and yet they were not willing to have competition with foreign manufacturers. Well, Sir, when the duty on refined sugar came to be reduced, it appeared that the Canadian article did fall in price in accordance with the reduction of the duty. The magic formula was broken in regard to sugar, and these hon. gentlemen do not seem to see that that breaks it in regard to every other article. The great and sacred National Policy, venerated by the Government like the great temple of Diana of the Ephesians, has had one of its columns broken; the people find that the consumers have to pay the taxes, and every farmer who buys a pound of binding twine knows that he pays the duty on it just as he had paid the duty on every pound of sugar he bought before that duty was removed. Now, Sir, if it were not that these hon. gentlemen believed the electors of Canada to be utterly devoid of reason, they certainly could not lay before them such a formula as this, that because Canadian binder twine is cheaper than American binder twine, we are afraid to allow competition. The hon. member for Halton said: Why should we give our market to the Yankees by removing the protection from Canadian manufacturers who give so much better and cheaper twine? Why, Sir, if the home manufacturers are giving us better and cheaper twine, how could they fear that competition with the Yankees would give our market to them? Does he suppose that the better and cheaper article of the Canadian manufacturer, is going to be driven out by the dearer and inferior twine of the United States? It is an insult to the intelligence of this House to lay such a pretense of an argument before us. Now, Sir, The hon. member for Halton displayed a great deal of knowledge of this subject—a knowledge which he did not possess at the time he ran his bye-election—a knowledge which I see him now looking in his desk. He held in his hand the brief which enabled him to tell us exactly what binder twine was going to cost in the coming season. He said: "I have no doubt my statements will be verified." I have no doubt his statements will be verified, because, he evidently got them from headquarters. Whether he got them by the back "stairs" or by the front "stairs" we can only guess; but we know that there is a "stairs" which leads to information on that subject, and which undoubtedly furnished the hon. gentleman with his brief. These stairs are reported to take their origin in Halifax; how high they may lead, we may find out later on. The hon. gentleman who used the brief, laughs at the joke; but the brief does not appear to have been in his hands long enough, because, when he referred to the different kinds of twine, speaking of sisal, red cap, and green cap, standard and other kinds of twine, he floundered most hopelessly, and could not stand the slightest cross examination. He got the figures into such a muddle that I doubt if the author of

them will recognize them when they appear in *Hansard* to-morrow. I think the hon. gentleman to whom I have been referring under several aliases would have done better had he followed his own example of last year, and plead his case in his own words. Now, let us look at the prices set down in the brief. The hon. gentleman gave us the prices of certain kinds of binder twine: standard, mixed manila and pure manila. He has not told us that these are the only kinds to be had. The prices he gave are evidently the prices fixed by the combine, to which my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) called attention in the earlier part of this debate, and to which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) belongs. They are the combine prices for binder twine, and they appear to have been made uniform for three of these grades, both in the United States and Canada. The hon. member for Halton spent fifteen minutes proving to us that binder twine is cheaper in Canada than in the United States. The figures he gave us at the wind-up of his speech were identical with the prices in the United States, disposing of the argument that our prices are lower. But the hon. gentleman wishes us to forget that the combine, of which the hon. member for Halifax, who instructed him, is a member, does not include all the manufacturers of binder twine in the United States? That combine does control all the mills of Canada, but it does not control or pretend to control all the mills of the United States. What does its annual report say:

"Many of the properties now owned or controlled by the company, including all the mills in Canada and several of the largest mills in Boston, and in the west and south-west, came under its control about 1st November, 1891. Consequently, the profits shown by the financial director's report merely represent the profits of the mills formerly owned by the company, whereas now its manufacturing capacity has been very largely increased and its earnings should be increased correspondingly."

Now, Sir, supposing that this combine, to which all our Canadian mills belong, did charge uniform prices, both in the United States and Canada, it is admitted by them that they do not control all the mills in the United States. Therefore, if you take away the duty on binder twine, you will have competition with those United States mills which are outside of the combine, and that fact alone would materially reduce the price of binder twine in this country. In another line of figures which the hon. gentleman gave, he quoted what he called the average price of twine in the United States with the average price of twine in Canada. Now, an average price means nothing unless you know the proportion of the higher-priced articles used compared with the lower-priced articles. You cannot know whether a farmer buys more of the higher or more of the lower-priced twine. The average price is one part of the confusion into which the hon. gentleman has managed to throw the whole subject. Every one who buys twine knows that the figures he gave are not the prices we have to pay. The price last year ran up to 18 cents a pound for the ordinary twine, and instead of the manufacturers being so obliging as the hon. member says they were, I was told by dealers that at that time of the year when the use of twine was reaching its maximum, they could not get it when they needed it, but the manufacturers stinted the supply, waiting for an advanced price. Now, the hon. member for Halton says that my hon. friend from North Wellington was astray in saying that binder twine could be manufactured at 8½ or 9 cents a pound. Let me quote from the *Farm Implement News*, which is apparently the official organ of the manufacturers of binder twine, under the head of "A Few Twine Figures." After giving the quantities of twine used in the United States at 100,000,000 pounds the article states:

"If sold by the makers to the jobbers at 8 cents a pound 1 cent of which was profit, by the jobbers to the retailers at 9½ cents and by them to the farmers at 13 cents, as it should, the gross sales of the three would be $30,500,000, the gross profits $6,000,000. Of this latter amount the railroads would have received $500,000 for freight."

This newspaper says that the manufacturer can make a profit by selling his twine at anything over 7 cents, and as this is a manufacturer's paper, probably it is putting the price as high as it can be reasonably be put. I have seen during one of the late campaigns a letter which was put in my hand purporting to be signed by a gentleman in the State of Michigan, the head of the organization of the Patrons of Industry in that state, stating that they had made an arrangement with a large firm of twine makers in the United States, evidently not belonging to the combine, and they had agreed to supply the Patrons of Industry with binding twine at 5 cents a pound, and this gentleman offered to lay it down in car lots at 5 cents a pound, freight paid, in St. Thomas, leaving the consumer to pay the duty. It could be laid down at that price in the County of Elgin, if there were no duty. Hon. gentlemen can compare at their leisure that price with the prices the farmers could obtain it at now. Of course, it would not be so low at retail, nor anything like it, but, if it were introduced in car lots the retailers would not handle it but the farmers would buy in car lots and divide it. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) had his fling at the Patrons of Industry, some of whom opposed him by running a candidate against him at the last election. He sneers at them about their having said something in regard to binder twine during the election and having said nothing since. Of course, he knows his own patrons best. If he thinks they were humbugging when they talked about binder twine during his election, it is for him to settle with them and not for us. I rather fear that a number of Conservative Patrons of Industry preferred the interests of the great Conservative party and the National Policy to the interests of their pockets in reference to binder twine, however much their pockets might have been affected in any other way. I notice that the hon. gentleman is one of the noble band who promised their electors that, if they saw that this tax cost the farmer anything extra, they would vote for its removal. The hon. the Minister of Finance was one of those and the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) was another. I remember, when the Minister of Finance was in St. Thomas supporting the member for East Elgin, he said that, if he found the binder twine interest was controlled by a combine, he would see that the duty should be removed and the combine broken up. That took place in the drill shed in St. Thomas, and it was largely on these promises and others similar to those that those hon. gentlemen obtained the support of the farmers and the Patrons of Industry in East Elgin. It is since we last voted on this question that the

Canadian mills have gone into this combine, viz., in November, 1891, as shown by the report of the twine combine, and I now call upon these gentlemen to vote upon this question according to the promises they made. I call upon the Finance Minister, now that it is placed under his nose that this is not simply a combine but a Yankee combine at that, to do what he pledged himself to do. I call upon the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) also to carry out his promise on the strength of which he received the farmers' votes, and to give value for the votes he did receive. Let them carry out their pledges or let it be held in future that their promises are to be considered as mere pie-crust pledges to be broken whenever they have secured seats in this House. I think this treatment of the farmer which taxes his raw materials, or the implements of his handicraft, while it admits free the raw material and many of the implements and tools used in other callings, is an injustice to the farmer and a proof that his interests are not considered alongside of those of the manufacturers, who can put their hands in their pockets and contribute to election funds. The farmers do not form combines, and subscribe for election funds. Let us see how far the Government have carried out the plan of admitting the raw material used in different trades. We find that, in regard to pottery, China clay is admitted free, crude gypsum and plaster of paris are admitted free, although they enter into competition with our own products. Nickel is admitted free. Ores of all kinds for manufacturing purposes are admitted free. Precious stones in the rough are admitted free. Diamonds unset, diamonds uncut or in the rough are admitted free. That is some consolation for the farmer who has to pay a duty on his binding twine. Salt imported from the United Kingdom for use in the fisheries is free. Salt for the fisherman is free, but nothing is free for the farmer. Hemlock wood is admitted free, oak and tanners' bark is admitted free. There are many farmers who would derive very considerable revenue from the sale of these articles if they were not subjected to foreign competition. Several articles of hickory wood worked so as to be used in the manufacture of carriages, carts and sleighs, are imported by the manufacturers free when used in the manufacture of these vehicles, but the farmer cannot import the parts of a vehicle which he may desire to put together himself without paying duty. The manufacturer can import them free, but the farmer has to pay the duty. So with regard to hickory billets and other articles of lumber, our farmers are run out of the market by the cheaper wood imported from the United States. Hides are admitted free, while leather is taxed heavily for the benefit of the tanner who imports foreign hides, so that he may get them cheaper and deprive the Canadian farmer of the profits he would otherwise derive. Wool not specified is admitted free. I would call attention to the inequality of the tariff in this respect, because here is a point at which the farmer could be protected. If a duty were put on all kinds of wool imported into Canada, the farmer would get exactly so much more a pound for wool than he does now, but of course the dear, sweet, kind woollen manufacturers who are so good to the Government about election time must be considered before the farmer, who is merely a clod who raises sheep and goes to the trouble of cutting the wool off their backs and bringing it to market. It does not matter what price he gets for his wool, so long as the poor dear manufacturer gets his dose of soothing syrup. Therefore, the manufacturer can receive free all the kinds of wool which enter into his manufactured article while the farmer has to compete against a foreign product. Broom corn, a very valuable article grown largely in my county and the counties west of that, is admitted free in competition with the Canadian article. Esparto grass, and articles the pulp of which is used in the manufacture of paper, are admitted free. Mexican fibre for manufacturing purposes is admitted free. Of course, the raw material for the manufacture of binder twine comes in free, and the hon. member for Halton says our manufacturers make a cheaper twine out of it than is made in the States, yet he is not willing to enter into competition with the United States market. I might go on with a number of other articles, such as cotton yarns of different kinds, and manila grass, and jute and other raw materials; and nets and seines and fishing twine for the use of fisheries—all sorts of raw material, all sorts of special articles designed for the use of special manufactures are admitted free to encourage the home manufactures. But what is admitted free to encourage the farmer? I challenge the Minister of Finance or anybody on that side to show me an article which is admitted free for the benefit of the farmer. He is not taken into question at all, but is taxed on his wearing apparel from 40 to 75 per cent; he is taxed 35 per cent on binders, and on axes, hay knives, rakes, forks and so on, he is afflicted with a compound tax, both specific and *ad valorem*, which amounts in many cases to considerably over 100 per cent. It is shown by importers that large quantities of shovels, rakes and axes are imported for the use of farmers, on which this compound tax amounted to 100 per cent or 110 per cent duty, the whole of which is paid by the farmers. I say this continued disregard to the farmers' interests, this continued hocussing by election promises, which are falsified as soon as a chance occurs to fulfil them, must lead to some action on the part of the farmers calculated to withstand the combine, I might call it the conspiracy, which is organized against them. I had hoped, when the Patrons of Industry came to the front in western Ontario, that it would be an effective society, that it would put the interests of the farmers as a class before the interests of party, that it would make its organized weight felt in this House at the bye-elections and at the next general elections. I regret to see, however, that the Patrons of Industry do not seem to have been as faithful to their class as they were to their party feelings. I regret to see that they have sent from the magnificent County of Halton a gentleman to represent that county nominally on the floor of this House and who has to-night represented, with the aid of official documents, a Yankee combine which has got control of the Canadian twine industry and which is laying its plans to rob the farmers further in the future than they have been in the past.

Mr. LISTER. Representing an agricultural constituency, I feel that upon this question I would not be properly giving expression to the opinions

of my constituents, did I give a silent vote. Sir, I have waited until this late hour, twenty minutes after eleven, mainly for the purpose to see whether the hon. member for Halifax, who, I understand, is the owner of one of the most extensive twine manufactories in this country, and which, I believe to-day is one of the great combines which are taxing and oppressing the farming population of this country, would speak on this question. We had a right to hear from that hon. gentleman. I understand that all afternoon he and the other hon. member for Halifax have been in consultation with the Minister of Finance here, no doubt discussing this very important question, and I think this House and the country had the right to hear from that hon. gentleman at the very opening of this debate. I think it was an impropriety on his part, to put it in the mildest form, to place those figures in the hands of the hon. member for Halton who knows nothing about this question, who, I understand, is merely a merchant in a small town up there, and has no practical experience or knowledge of the question he discussed with such apparent learning. This is an important question to the farmer. That the farmers look upon the tax as a real grievance, there can be no doubt, because for the last two or three sessions we have had petitions from every section of the country against it. Hon. members here representing constituencies in the Province of Ontario and the North-West, as well as the Province of Quebec, have received petitions from their constituents, which they presented, as was their bounden duty, to this House, asking the Government to take off this burdensome duty from the farmers of this country. But the fact is we are paying in this country greatly more than they are paying in the United States, and it is for that reason that the combine of the United States, controlling the institution of the hon. gentleman from Halifax, and controlling him in this House, opposes the removal of the duty which the farmers of this country want removed. I venture to say that there is not a farmer in Canada, if he gave expression to his honest opinion, who would not say that this tax is a burdensome tax and that it ought to be removed. It is nonsense for hon. gentlemen to argue here that this tax does not increase the price of the article to the consumer, because if it did not do so, and if we produced an article equal in quality to that produced in the United States, then there could be no objection whatever to the removal of the duty. Last year the hon. the Finance Minister travelled through this country trying to get his Government supported, and promising to the farmers that if it was shown that the manufacturers of twine had entered into a combination, that moment would the Government remove the duties upon the productions of these manufacturers. Those were the promises they made. They have stated in this House, both with reference to this article and others, that if it could be shown that the result of the tariff was to create combinations, the Government would consider it their bounden duty to remove the tax from those articles in order that they might break up and destroy those combinations. Sir, it has been shown here to-night, beyond all controversy, that all the manufacturers of twine in the Dominion of Canada are members of the North American Cordage Company, that the factories here are under the control of a great foreign corporation having twenty odd million dollars at its back, that the concern of the hon. member for Halifax is in that combination, that it has bought out the manufacturer in the city of St. John and closed down the factory, for the purpose of limiting the production in this country. That state of things is the legitimate offspring of the infamous system of taxation this country has to-day; and I, in the name of the farmers of the county of Lambton, call upon the Government to redeem the pledges they made during the last election, as it has been proved by incontrovertible evidence, namely, the reports of those great combinations themselves, and by hon. gentlemen who sit in this House, that the manufacturers of binding twine in Canada are members of this combination. It must be a wonder to this House, and it will be a matter of remark in the country, that the hon. member for Halifax was not the first to speak upon this all-absorbing question. It is of no consequence at the present moment to ask whether the price of binding twine is higher or whether it is lower; the result of the tariff has been to create a great monopoly, that monopoly is controlled by American capital, by American citizens, and it is the duty of the Government to redeem the promises they made by taking off the duties so as to destroy the monopoly which the farmers of Canada believe to be burdensome and oppressive.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat in the course of his remarks undertook to lecture another member of this House and to attribute to him what he was pleased to term an impropriety. The hon. gentleman said that he considered it was an impropriety that the member for Halifax—I assume he meant the junior member—had not addressed the House during the course of this debate. When an hon. member undertakes to lecture another member of this House on an impropriety, he should at least be satisfied that the statement which he himself was making, was strictly accurate. The hon. gentleman has been guilty of a greater impropriety than any other member of this House during this debate, when he stated that the members for Halifax had a conference this afternoon with the Finance Minister for the purpose of discussing the duty on binder twine.

Mr. LISTER. I asked the hon. gentleman if the junior member for Halifax had not had an interview with the Minister of Finance this afternoon.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman must adhere strictly to what he stated before the House. He stated distinctly that the members for Halifax had a conference this afternoon with the Finance Minister for the purpose of discussing binder twine. Sir, I may not be as competent a judge of an impropriety as the hon. gentleman, but I say that there is not the slightest foundation in fact for his statement. Neither to-day, nor on any other day during the last four or five years that I have had the honour of a seat in this House, have I discussed the duty on binder twine with the Finance Minister, or with any other member of the Government.

Mr. LISTER. How about your colleague?

Mr. KENNY. My colleague will be able to speak for himself when it is necessary. Some of those very gentlemen—I do not know whether the gentleman who spoke last was one of them—con-

demned my colleague last year, and accused him of impropriety because he spoke on this question in which he was said to be interested. These hon. gentlemen are exceedingly difficult to please. I regret to have to refer in this manner to the statement of any hon. member of this House, but I think that the courtesy of debate might be observed, and that in referring to each other we should be more accurate than the hon. gentleman has been. Now, Mr. Speaker, to deal more immediately with the question which is before the House, one hon. gentleman opposite, I think it was the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie), during the course of his remarks, stated that there was in his county a factory in which binder twine or rope "had been manufactured, and that factory was a great public benefit to the county." I hold to the opinion that every factory in the Dominion of Canada which employs Canadian labour, is a benefit, not only to the community in which it is placed, but to the whole country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have laid down the extraordinary doctrine this afternoon that the duty on binder twine should be removed immediately for the reason that a large amount of American capital has been invested in this country in the manufacture of that twine.

Mr. LISTER. Oh, no.

Mr. KENNY. That is exactly what hon. gentlemen have contended, that because this American capital has come in here for investment, in manufacture, therefore we should take the duty off the article they make. They are pleased to term it a Yankee speculation, a Yankee investment, as if that was a good reason why this Parliament of Canada, in solemn conclave assembled, should take the duty off binder twine. Hon. gentlemen in this House know very well, that, before there was a pound of binder twine made in the Dominion of Canada, the Parliament of Canada had imposed a duty on binder twine. I forget the exact percentage of that duty I think it was very nearly the percentage which exists to-day. I have no doubt that that very duty which was put on binder twine, was an incentive to men of capital to invest their money in it, and the result has been advantageous to Canada, inasmuch as a large number of people have found employment in that industry. Now that it has largely passed out of the hands of Canadians, these gentlemen lay down the extraordinary doctrine—they must permit me to call it the immoral doctrine—that because this foreign capital has come into Canada for investment and to give employment, that this is a reason why this Parliament should remove the duty on binder twine. Not one of these gentlemen has dared to make the statement that there is one Canadian less employed in the manufacture of this binder twine since this change of ownership has taken place.

Mr. LISTER. The St. John mill is closed altogether.

Mr. KENNY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there is less binder twine made in Canada than before?

Mr. LISTER. That is another matter altogether.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman cannot show that there is one pound less of twine made, and consequently there are just as many people employed as before, and there is the same amount of money expended in labour. One gentleman has stated, and in fact the resolution cites it as an argument in favour of the abolition of this duty, and the surrender of our National Policy, because that is really what it means: that the revenue which we derive from binder twine only amounts to the insignificant sum of $6,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, if that argument is to have any weight in this Parliament of Canada, we might for the same reason take the duty off bleached and unbleached cottons which are manufactured now so extensively in this Dominion that the Customs revenue from these articles is very insignificant. You might also for the same reason take the duty off plain woollen goods, because the ordinary tweeds which are used in this country are nearly all made in the Dominion of Canada. These gentlemen might contend with as good reason that we should take the duty off these articles, and that we should make an onslaught on the National Policy to please them, because we derive no Customs revenue from such articles. In the same way take the trade in ready-made clothing. There is comparatively little duty paid on ready-made clothing imported into Canada, and for that reason these gentlemen may argue as logically that we should remove the duty from that article. It is evident then, Sir, that this duty which has been placed upon binder twine was placed there largely to encourage its manufacture within our own territory. The figures which have been submitted to Parliament by my hon. friend from South Victoria (Mr. Fairbairn) and my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), giving the prices of binder twine, have not been refuted by hon. gentlemen opposite. I find that the figures which have been submitted to the House are actual prices, with the names of the firms which sold the binder twine at these particular prices given as a guarantee that they are correct. When we have such accurate and definite testimony as that, it is of infinitely more value to us than any mere wild assertions which hon. gentlemen opposite may make. These figures prove incontestably that during the last five years the farmers in Canada have on an average bought their binder twine cheaper than the farmers of the United States.

Mr. LISTER. That is not so.

Mr. KENNY. I hold that if these figures are accurate, and there can hardly be any doubt that they are, that such is undoubtedly the case. After all, Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to make mistakes in figures and quotations, and these mistakes may occur very unintentionally. Every business man knows that in the sale of many articles there are what are called trade discounts allowed by manufacturers to the trade, but what hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House desire is, that we shall endeavour to satisfy ourselves that our farmers are paying no more for this important article than are the farmers across the border. To show how easy it is for hon. gentlemen to make mistakes of this kind, I will refer to the debate on this question which took place on 6th July of last year, when a motion was made by the hon. member for North York, on the same line as that which is now under consideration. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) then stated as follows:

"I am informed on what I consider reliable authority that the prevailing price of binding twine in the States to-day, in car loads of ten tons is (and he quotes the prices). In Canada in similar quantities (that is in ten-ton loads) the prices are as follows: Pure manila 14 cents, and pure sisal from 11 to 12½ cents."

Now, as a matter of fact, I am sure the hon. gentleman did not desire to mislead the House when he made that statement, but as a matter of fact the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has given us the prices at which that twine was sold last year to the farmers in Ontario. In the town of Brampton the firm of Peaker & Runians, which is stated to be a highly respectable firm, state that they sold their manila at 14 cents, and that they sold the Crown brand at 10½ to 11 cents per pound. In other words that they sold this twine in Canada last year as cheap to the farmers in small quantities as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) last year told us it could be bought in ten-ton lots. Again, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) told us in the same debate last year, that "Red Cap, which is two-thirds manila and one-third sisal"—I notice there is a disparity between the views of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) as to the quality of these twines, because the hon. member for North York talks about pure sisal, while the member for Marquette, whom I will accept as an equally good authority, but they can settle that between themselves, told us that there was no pure sisal and that the price of Red Cap in Toronto was 12 cents. Now this firm in Brampton tells us distinctly that they were selling that twine to the farmers at from 11½ to 12 cents, and that the Crown brand was sold to the farmers from 10½ to 11 cents. I merely mention this to show how easy it is for hon. gentlemen to make mistakes as to prices. Then again, the Blue Ribbon, pure manila, the hon. member for Marquette told us was selling in Toronto—I imagine he meant by the jobbers, because he went on immediately afterwards to quote the prices from the jobbers in Chicago—at 14 cents a pound. Now, this firm in Brantford told us that in the same season they sold the farmers pure manila at from 13 to 14 cents.

Mr. WATSON. What is the American price?

Mr. KENNY. The American price of pure manila was 12¼ cents. I do not desire to question the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's figures, but I have shown that he was mistaken as regards the prices at which these twines were sold last year to the farmers of Ontario. It is just possible—I do not mention it is a fact, because I do not know it as a fact—that he may have been equally mistaken as regards the prices of twine sold in the United States. I have always been in favour of a full and fair measure of protection to our Canadian industries. In the community in which I reside, I have always taken the stand that it was to our advantage, as a people, that we should encourage in every way the development of industries in our own country, and in many cases the result has been that whilst our people have found employment in these various industries, the rest of the community have not been over-taxed. My attention has been directed specially to cotton goods and woollen goods, with which I am more familiar, being my own line of business. The Canadian consumer is buying these goods on as favourable terms as he did at any previous date, and the same is true, I think, of binder twine. I am glad to hear from hon. gentlemen who have evidently taken pains to make themselves familiar with the question, that our farmers whom it is our duty to protect in every way, are paying no more for their binder twine than their competitors, the farmers of the United States. When this question was brought up last year, it was known to both sides of the House that there were a number of bye-elections pending, and it was imagined, perhaps uncharitably, that the resolution may have been introduced to influence the farmers in the approaching bye-elections. Well, judging from what has taken place in Ontario, I am forced to the conclusion that the appeal had not very much influence on the farmers of that province, and to that fact I may probably ascribe the appearance in this resolution of a reference to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, who, it says, pay no duty on the twine which is imported and used by the fishermen. It would seem as if these hon. gentlemen wished to antagonize the farmer and the fisherman—as if their idea was to raise a little sectional cry and set the east against the west—another slight attack on the shreds and patches of the Maritime Provinces, which never receive much favour at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Halton has explained to the House that the twine which the fishermen use is entirely different from binder twine, being made from hemp, flax and sometimes cotton. It has never been manufactured in Canada, for the simple reason that the quantity consumed is so comparatively small that it would not pay to start the manufacture of it in the Dominion. But it is different with binder twine. We import the raw material free of duty, and we have a measure of protection on the manufactured article which has encouraged people to invest their capital in its manufacture; and we have the satisfaction of knowing, on positive assurance, that our farmers are paying no more for the binder twine which they use than their competitors across the border. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire at this late hour to take up the time of the House. The question has been very thoroughly threshed out; but as one who has always been in favour of the National Policy, I desire to record my vote against this onslaught on that policy. The general attack on the National Policy which has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite has signally failed, and it would seem as if they had changed their tactics and had now decided to make the attack in detail on each outpost of the manufacturing industries of the Dominion; and to that motive I think we may attribute the resolution which has been under the consideration of the House to-day.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down seems to think that it is very important that the tax should be kept on binder twine, and that it is equally important that the tax should be kept off the twine used by the fishermen.

Mr. KENNY. It is not manufactured in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And the hon. gentleman I suppose would be equally ready to tell us that if there was no tax on binder twine, that would not be manufactured in Canada either.

Mr. KENNY. During the course of my few remarks, I reminded the House that a duty had been imposed upon binder twine before one pound of it

had been manufactured in the Dominion of Canada, and that the consequence of the existence of that duty has been that binder twine has been manufactured within our country. I do not know enough about the business to go into the details, but I believe that is a fact.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, the facts are precisely as I have stated them. The hon. gentleman says there was no binder twine manufactured in Canada until the duty was imposed.

Mr. KENNY. I said there was a duty on binder twine before there was a pound manufactured.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is precisely what I have said, that until there was a duty imposed upon binder twine, there was none manufactured in Canada, and the hon. gentleman says that the binder twine used by the fishermen is not manufactured in Canada. There is no tax upon it, and I suppose, that according to the theory of the hon. gentleman, that as long as there is no tax upon it, there will be no fishermen's twine manufactured in Canada. That would be the inference from the argument put before the House by the hon. gentleman? Well, the hon. gentleman and his friends have told us more than that. The hon. gentleman says that the duty does not increase the price. There is some one pays a duty. There is a duty imposed, and it falls on some person or other, but the hon. gentleman said it does not fall upon the consumer. Well, if that be true, I do not see why the hon. gentleman and his friends do not propose a duty upon the fishermen's twine also, for, of course, if there was a tax upon the fishermen's twine, it would not be paid by the fishermen. The Government would get the tax, but not out of its own people. It would be compelling the foreigners who produce this twine, to contribute a considerable sum to the public treasury. That is the argument which has been addressed to the House. We have heard for several years from the Minister of Finance and his predecessors that the imposition of a duty upon sugar did not increase the price of sugar, that it was just as cheap in Canada as it was anywhere else, in New York at all events, and that as long as the duty was kept on, the consumer in Canada got sugar as cheaply as he did before. Well, we were told by these hon. gentlemen last year, when it was proposed to take the duty off sugar, that they were remitting to the people of Canada $3,000,000 of taxes which they had before paid. If the Government propose to put a duty on, it never falls upon the population of the country, and when they take the duty off, they have relieved the people of a portion of the burden they had to bear before, and so every year we hear from hon. gentlemen opposite the same theory. The senior member for Halifax tells the House that the farmers of Canada get their twine just as cheaply as do the farmers in the United States. I would like to know to what extent the duty may be increased without adding anything to the burdens of the farmer. You have 25 per cent now. Can you make it 50 or 100 per cent? Can you increase it to 200 per cent and leave the price just as it is now? At what point is it that the tax or a portion of the tax will begin to fall on the man who consumes the article. Let us learn something of this system of political economy which is preached daily to the House and the country by hon. gentlemen on the other side. Let us know just how much taxes they may feel imposed upon a particular article before the price of that article will be affected to the party who requires it. It would be important to us to know. In some instances they have imposed 50 per cent and they argue that that does not increase the price. They have 25 per cent on the binder twine, and they tell us it does not increase the price. If that be so, why not make it 50 per cent? If the burdens do not fall upon the farmers, to stimulate the article the Government should impose someting more. It is true they do not get much taxes, because in a large degree they cut out the foreign article, but they get something, and according to their theory they would get still more if the rate of taxation was increased. Hon. gentlemen may address a preposterous argument of that sort to this House and they may get hon. gentleman on that side to prepare figures in order to establish their proposition, but nobody outside the House is so far divested of his rational faculties as to suppose that the imposition of 25 per cent on a foreign article will not affect the price of articles which enter into competition with it and are produced in the country. It is true if you add free production, the imposition of duties might not enable the party who produces the article to keep up the price, but great care is taken to prevent over-production. You have a combine. You have gentlemen coming from the other side of the line and investing their money, not in creating establishments, but in purchasing those already existing. The hon. gentleman asked us if we are opposed to the introduction of American capital here? Well, I say this, that the introduction of American capital, if it is for the purpose of introducing new enterprises, cannot do us any harm and will do us good, if the enterprises rest upon their own merits and are conducted upon business principles, but the investment of American capital in establishments already existing leaves matters as they were before. In this case matters were not left as they were before. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) has pointed out to-night that the cordage manufactory in his constituency has been bought by these combines and is closed up, and the former proprietors are paid over $7,000 a year while the establishment is kept closed. Now, where does that $7,000 per year come from? And what are the circumstances which warrant foreigners in coming here and investing their money in these establishments and paying over $7,000 a year to the former proprietors for keeping their establishments closed? There was an establishment in the city of St. John which had been bought by Americans and closed, and I understand the former proprietors are receiving $15,000 a year to keep it closed. Who is paying this? Where is the money coming from? Are these men coming to Canada and investing their money in an enterprise where they are making but a reasonable profit and another going to these establishments and closing them and paying the parties from whom they have purchased large sums of money, as a mere gratuity, without any advantage to themselves? Where does the advantage come in? Certainly there is an advantage somewhere. How is it that these gentlemen who have made these purchases are enabled to close up these establishments and pay the parties large dividends upon the capital which was represented

there, unless indeed they are compelling the agricultural population to purchase the products of their enterprise at a higher rate than the actual value. It is not simply the cost of production with a fair profit. It is the cost of production with very much more than a fair profit. There is the cost of production and a fair profit on the capital employed and on the capital unemployed. If you undertake to pay out for a manufacturing establishment several times more than it is worth, how are you to get interests upon the capital you have invested? How are you to get a dividend on that capital, unless you are charging for the products of that portion of the business you keep in operation a larger sum than should be paid? That is what is done. We know what combines have done on the other side. We know that the great salt manufacturing establishments in various parts of the United States were closed up by a similar combine and that large sums of money were paid annually to the parties who had formerly owned them—closed to the public detriment, and the public seriously injured. The price of what is produced shows an enormous increase in consequence, and the hon. gentleman knows that is the case with regard to this particular article. I do not care what the price may be in the United States. I have before me evidence taken last year, which shows that the price in Canada for binder twine is very much higher than it is the United States, but I do not care how that may be. I am looking at this fact, that the capital invested in manufacturing establishments is rendered idle. You have the establishments closed, you have a few of them kept in operation, and on those that are kept in operation you are paying a dividend. You are paying a profit not only upon the capital of the business now in operation but also upon the capital of establishments that were bought out and closed, and I say that cannot be done unless you are extracting from the population who consume these products a very much larger sum than you ought to obtain from them. That is what you are doing with regard to this article. It may be shown that, apart from this duty, it could be laid down in Canada at a very much lower price. I want to know what advantage there is in the maintenance of industries of this sort by high protective duties when you are imposing upon the community, the vast majority of the agricultural population of this country, a far larger burden than they would be called upon, apart from your legislation, to bear. I say it is clear that the rule laid down by the hon. gentleman that the imposition of duties has not affected the price is an absurd one in this case. The closing of the establishments at Argenteuil, at St. John and elsewhere, and the payment of a large dividend on the capital of the establishments so closed, contradicts the statement of the hon. gentleman. It shows that that statement cannot be true. It shows that the statistics read to us as to the comparative prices are altogether erroneous, but, if the United States imposed at one time duties on certain raw materials that were free in this country, if the United States have combinations and trusts which put up the prices far beyond what the market prices ought to be, the hon. gentleman may institute a comparison in favour of the prices in Canada, but that only shows there is a wrong done elsewhere as well as a wrong done here, and the wrong done elsewhere is no justification whatever for the wrong which is done by the legislation of which complaint is made, and the tax which my hon. friend by his resolution seeks to remove. Now, what makes up the price of an article? We know that, unless a profit can be made, continued production cannot exist. You have the cost of the original material, the amount of capital invested, the cost of labour, the profit on the capital, you have repair and waste to provide for, and, if you impose a tax upon the article, you increase the price by that tax until there is such a production in the country that competition will cut it down. Where can you have competition if you have a combination, when all the factories pass into the hands of that one combination? The only competition must be foreign competition, and you put a barrier in the way of that foreign competition by imposing a duty of 25 per cent. The hon. gentleman has not proposed that there shall be a tax on the twine used in the fisheries. He says this is a sectional argument to employ in this House, but I say the sectional argument is created by the action of the hon. gentleman and his friends. How is it possible, if you were to treat the two classes of the population in the same way, that an argument of this kind could arise? It can only arise because you place the article consumed by one class on the free list and tax the same article consumed by the other class. Why not put them both on the same footing? If the price is not affected by the tax, there can be no objection to this being done, and the hon. gentleman ought to be the first to propose it. If he has confidence in his own theory, he ought to give it effect not only in regard to the article consumed by the agricultural population, but he should apply his rule to the article consumed by the fishermen. I notice a statement made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) early in the evening, that he might feel inclined to support the proposition if the motion were not made on going into Committee of Supply. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken in regard to the rule of Parliament as to amendments or motions in amendment to going into Committee of Supply. That is the proper occasion upon which to move an amendment or propose a redress for every grievance that can be appropriately corrected in that way. That is the English parliamentary rule, and I venture to say that a few cases will be found in the English practice where a Government have treated an amendment to going into Supply as a vote of want of confidence in the Administration. It is the right of Parliament, when the Crown is asking for taxes, to propose the redress of every grievance, the correction of every wrong that may present itself, and which may require the attention of Parliament, so that, when the Finance Minister proposed to go into Committee of Supply, it was the proper occasion to ask for the removal of any grievance borne by any section of the population. It is only two years ago when I proposed an amendment to the proposal to go into Committee of Supply, and the late Prime Minister accepted it and it was carried by the House. That is the English rule, this is the proper occasion when redress should be submitted to the House, and it ought never to be treated as a motion of want of confidence by the Administration. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) gave that as a reason for opposing the motion. He admitted that the duty ought to be removed, that the article ought to be placed

on the free list, and said, were it proposed otherwise than on going into Supply, he would be prepared to give it his support. I am pointing out that that statement is founded on a wholly erroneous idea of what are the rights of Parliament on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman should do the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) justice. That is not the only reason he gave.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is always so perfectly fair in the arguments he addresses to the House that he is beyond all others the hon. gentleman who ought to correct an observation made by me. I will say that the hon. genman objected to the preamble of the resolution, as he called it. But that is not a matter that I am called upon to consider. The member for Muskoka approved of the principle of the resoultion, that this tax ought to be removed, and he gave as his chief reason for not supporting that proposition, that it was moved as an amendment to going into Committee of Supply. I am pointing out that it is on going into Committee of Supply that such a motion ought to be made.

Mr. BOWELL. I am extremely sorry that I cannot return the compliment of the hon. gentleman as to fairness in his arguments.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I always admire the frank and open defence that our friends opposite, like the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), present to this House in defence of the National Policy. I respect a man who comes straight out and says he is prepared to stand by that policy when it is applied to a particular case like this. He says that the existence of these duties on binder twine has created the manufacture of that article in our midst. he attacks the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) because he points to a large vacancy in the completeness of the National Policy, where $425,000 worth of twine and cordage comes free into Canada, because it happens to be wanted for the use of the fishermen. If the National Policy is so great a benefit to the people of this country, if it is no burden to the consumer of those articles upon which the duty is imposed, why make this gap for the benefit of the fishermen? Why cry sectionalism when we ask that another part of the community be treated in exactly the same way as the fishermen? I would like to ask the hon. member for Halifax how he justifies his position when he says that binder twine is not increased in price by the 25 per cent duty, yet he tells us that it would not do to put a duty upon fishermen's twine, because it might not be beneficial to the fishermen. Now, we have learned to-night that there are two very large sections of the farming community who rightly or wrongly believe that the imposition of a 25 per cent duty on twine increases the cost to them. We have the fact that both from the Patrons of Husbandry and from the Grangers, both farmers' associations, petitions have come in large numbers asking that the duty be removed. Side by side with that fact I want to place before you this other fact, that it is admitted by gentlemen opposite that there is now no competition in the production of cordage in the Dominion of Canada, that it is not even a Canadian arrangement. Our friends are very loyal when they are talking before country audiences and waving the grand old flag, but they do not have any compunctions of conscience in becoming a joint in the tail of a great American combination, if they think by that means they can add to their profits. We have the fact which is not denied here that several of these establishments which were formerly running, are now closed up. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked if the owner of the cordage works at Lachute is paid for doing nothing and is drawing to-day $6,000 or $7,000 a year, where does it come from when their machinery is standing idle and their factories have ceased to produce? And the operatives that used to be employed in these establishments—where are they? The operatives are scattered somewhere else, while the burdens on the community are still retained. I sympathize with the position taken by the hon. member for Muskoka, because I think there are other gentlemen besides him on that side of the House who realized that this cordage combination is rapidly getting to the position in which the salt operations were within the last year or two. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has quoted to us a long array of figures. I can only say to my hon. friend that when he quotes so glibly from the brief presented to him by these parties interested in the combine, perhaps he is not covering all the facts in the case. It is only a week ago when I was at home that I talked with the only remaining dealer in binding twine that the National Policy has left in that town. I said to him: "What sort of prices are you going to quote for binding twine this year"? Well, he said: "I have got no prices at all yet. The fact is I have received several circulars from the business firms I usually deal with and they ask me to wait, we are not prepared to give you quotations now, but by no means place your orders with anybody else; just wait, and we will do as well by you as anybody else." That was only one week ago. My hon. friend talks to you to-night with calm assurance as if the market had been open and these goods could have been bought and prices quoted all along. Such are not the facts in my experience in my own county. Now, with respect to the quotations in these extracts that he read from the evidence taken before the Combines Committee in 1888, I must say that I regret very much the tone in which he presented those observations. Heretofore we have been in the habit of accepting each other's statements in good faith when presented in contradiction to each other's position. But it has been reserved to my hon. friend to get up and tell this House that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) deliberately misstated the facts in connection with that investigation. I was myself a member of that committee, and I think my hon. friend has misapprehended the drift of Mr. Massey's evidence. I shall not accuse him of wilful misrepresentation, I do not deal in these lines; but I think that after due examination of Mr. Massey's evidence my hon. friend will come to the conclusion that he ought to retract his statement. Now, I will read from Mr. Massey's evidence a little more *in extenso*. It was given before that committee when he came, as he said himself, to give evidence in connection with other branches of his business. He was asked to make some statement before the committee by the chairman, I think it was Mr. Wallace. This is what he said:

"What did you pay for twine four years ago before this combine was formed?— I cannot tell back as far as four years ago. This of course is sprung upon me, although I had some figures in coming down on some business with the Government, because we considered it was a grievance and an injury to the public in this combination putting prices on the twine, by which the farmer has to pay so much more in proportion to the raw material than he had two or three years ago; and also so much greater than what we can buy it for in the American market. We can buy the same material that is sold here, the same finished twine, from the Americans, paying a duty of $1.79½ per 100 pounds cheaper than we can buy it in Canada. On that we pay the duty.

"Are you buying in Canada?— Yes; because we prefer patronizing the home market if we can. But we say it is an injustice to the public when a combination is formed that will put up the price beyond what they are warranted in doing in view of the cost of the raw material. Combinations are an injury when they exact extortionate prices from the consumer."

These are Mr. Massey's own words recorded by the stenographer on that occasion and they distinctly prove that Mr. Massey objected to the combination that was formed then: a combination not quite so solid as it is now, because there were some establishments outside of it then, while at present I understand that the American Cordage Company has included all the binder twine manufacturers in Canada. Again he gives the figures:

"But if you can buy elsewhere outside of this combination at a cheaper rate, what would be your complaint? I say that they have that advantage: that they get the raw material free and we have to pay the duty on the cord, which they get the benefit of on the cord.

"If you can buy elsewhere and get a better bargain what is your complaint?— If you are obliged from the combination that would be a different thing. I say we can buy it and lay it down cheaper than we can get it from the Canadians after paying the duty; but then the difference is so small. I will give you the figures. The Canadian price for pure manila delivered in not less than 50 ton lots is $12.50, and then there is a 5 per cent discount in 15 days off that which brings, it net $11.83½. I do not see any advantage in the rebate because the twine is not used until July and August. The American quotation is $11.50, less one and a half discount. That is $11.32½ net. Freight 25 cents, total $11.57½ as against $11.87½. Take the duty from this, the duty of 1½ cents per pound on the raw material paid by the American manufacturer, which is not paid by the Canadian, and it brings it down to 10½ cents per pound,"

That was Mr. Massey's distinct statement. Then comes the question that my friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) quoted a portion of to-night to establish that Mr. Massey said just the reverse:

"What is the actual cost, including the duty of the American article? We had to import a large quantity for the North-West last year. We could not get it in Canada. We laid it down in Manitoba at about the price we had to pay in Nova Scotia, and duty added. It cost us about the duty extra. The ground of complaint is that although the Americans are paying a duty on it they can afford to offer it to us at less than the Canadian figures. I have been in correspondence with large dealers and they tell us they have been buying it at the same rates as those who sell to us."

I say, Mr. Speaker, that nothing could be clearer than Mr. Massey's evidence that the Canadian combine had the effect of increasing the price of binder twine, and that he complained of that increase, and that the result of that combine was prejudicial to the interests of the Canadian farmer. I do not quote the evidence of a man who says "I think" as my hon. friend did with respect to Mr. Morris's statement, that binder twine was cheaper in Canada than on the American side. Mr. Massey does not deal in any such sayings as "I think," but he says flatly and directly these are the facts, and he gives the figures in his own case. Here is a business man who spoke of his own business transactions and who spoke whereof he knew, and although he said he was a protectionist himself, he complained that this combination had unfairly and unduly increased the price of binder twine to the Canadian consumer. To-day we find ourselves in a worse position. At that time Mr. Morris who was a member of the combine gave his evidence to show that one manufacturer, Mr. Conners, drew from $5,000 to $7,000 per annum out of the combine, and only made two tons of binder twine the whole of that year. That is one of the results of the production of any line of industry being in the hands of one concern, and I venture to say that those gentlemen who talk to us so glibly and so fluently about binder twine being cheaper to the Canadian farmer, are the very men who will take care that the Canadian farmer does not get an even start with them or anybody else in the consumption of this article. If they produce so cheaply why are they anxious to keep a 25 per cent duty on? At the time Mr. Massey speaks of the American producer was handicapped with a duty of 1½ cents per pound on his raw material, while the Canadian manufacturer got his free, and at that time we find one man drawing from $5,000 to $7,000 a year for allowing his machinery to stand practically idle. To-day we have had the evidence from the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) that one of the establishments in his constituency is closed up and the operatives turned adrift to find their living as best they could, for these men care nothing for the operatives when it is a question of making money for themselves. They are paid for allowing their machinery to stand idle, and where does the money come from to pay for keeping it idle if not out of the pockets of the consumers of this twine. It is just such cases as this that will discredit the National Policy, and I sympathize with an honest supporter of that measure such as my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) when he feels that when the manufacture of this article is gathered into one combine, that the farmers are at the mercy of a combination that will have no mercy on them. While these gentlemen argue so fluently that the prices are low, they take particularly good care to retain the duty so that they are not exposed to the competition. If the American combine finds seven-tenths of a cent per pound sufficient to protect them, why does our Canadian combine demand a 25 per cent duty to keep it standing upon its legs? These gentlemen may talk until doomsday, but the farmers feel the difference and they realize it, and sooner or later they will realize that they are being taken advantage of for the purpose of benefiting one huge monopoly. If that is the line that the National Policy is going to develop in Canada, I say farewell to the prospect of building up the industries of this country, because it will inevitably result that production will be simply limited to meeting the particular wants of the community, and when we come to touch the field of export, we will find ourselves handicapped right and left, and the result is that, failing to compete on the foreign markets with other manufacturers, we will simply confine ourselves to find the home demand. I do sympathize with the farmers of the North-West on being taxed to the extent of 25 per cent duty, for the purpose of keeping up this monopoly in binding twine. Notwithstanding the fallacious arguments that my friend

from Halton (Mr. Henderson) with his ready-made brief presented to this House to-night, I say that he will fail to convince the farmers at home whether they be Patrons of Industry or Grangers, or farmers outside of any organization, that this sort of thing is in their interest. It is fashionable with certain men to sneer at organizations of farmers, and I admit that in a good many respects the farmers' organizations have been clumsy and ineffective, but I point you to the fact that while these organizations may fail, that they are immediately revived in some other form, and that it is an indication when they fail, that there is a difficulty in existence, and that they are not getting fair-play under this National Policy. Sir, I would have been pleased to have heard from the Government that they would place our farmers on at least an equal basis with the American farmers with respect to protection, and not handicap them to the extent of 25 per cent on this binder twine. If seven-tenths of a cent per pound is sufficient for the American manufacturer against outside competition, it ought to be sufficient protection for the other end of the great big American concern that has reached to Canada, and controls all the cordage manufactures in this country. For that reason, if for no other, I shall have great pleasure in supporting the resolution presented by my hon. friend from Marquette.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Watson:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,
Armstrong,
Bain (Wentworth),
Béchard,
Beith,
Bernier,
Bourassa,
Bowers,
Bowman,
Brodeur,
Bruneau,
Campbell,
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casey,
Charlton,
Choquette,
Christie,
Colter,
Davies,
Dawson,
Delisle,
Edgar,
Featherston,
Forbes,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillmor,
Godbout,
Guay,
Innes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Leduc,
Legris,
Lister,
Livingston,
Macdonald (Huron),
McGregor,
McMillan (Huron),
McMullen,
Mignault,
Mills (Bothwell),
Monet,
Mulock,
Murray,
Paterson (Brant),
Perry,
Proulx,
Rider,
Rinfret,
Rowand,
Sanborn,
Semple,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Vaillancourt,
Watson,
Welsh, and
Yeo.—63.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker,
Barnard,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bowell,
Boyle,
Cameron,
Carignan,
Carling,
Carpenter,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Chapleau,
Cleveland,
Coatsworth,
Corbould,
Corby,
Craig,
Curran,
Daly,
Denison,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyer,
Earle,
Fairnbairn,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Girouard (Two Mountains),
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guillet,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Ives,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
Lépine,
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Mackintosh,
McAlister,
McDonald (Victoria),
McDougald (Pictou),
McKay,
McLean,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Masson,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
Northrup,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pelletier,
Pope,
Pridham,
Putnam,
Reid,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Savard,
Simard,
Skinner,
Smith (Ontario),
Stairs,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville), and
Wood (Westmorland).—107.

Mr. BORDEN. My name is recorded as having voted in favour of the amendment. I did not vote, did not intend to vote, and could not vote, because I am paired with Mr. McKeen of Cape Breton, and I would like my name to be struck off.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Cape Breton has not voted.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am paired with Mr. Brown of Chateauguay.

Amendment negatived, motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Committee rose and reported resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 27th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 75) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Carl Auer Von Welsbach.—(Mr. Stairs.)

WORK ON YAMASKA RIVER.

Mr. MONET (for Mr. MIGNAULT) (Translation) asked, 1. What is the total cost of work done at the Yamaska River, near its mouth; for the building o

the lock and dam and for the dredging of the said river? 2. What has been the cost of the work of maintenance and repair of the said lock and dam? 3. How many lock-keepers are there, and what is their yearly pay? 4. How many steamers and other vessels passed through the said lock during the course of last year? 5. Did the Government receive tolls at the said lock, and if so, what is the yearly amount?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The cost of the lock, the dam and the dredging of the river was, on the 31st of March last, $130,318.06. The cost of maintenance and repair of the same works was $14,504.07. Two lock-keepers are employed there, and their salary is $40 per month during the season. As to questions 4 and 5, answers to them may be obtained from the Minister of Inland Revenue.

C. E. W. DODWELL.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. BORDEN) asked, Whether C. E. W. Dodwell was an employé of the Department of Public Works in February last? And, if so, in what capacity? Did said Dodwell examine the works at Hall's Harbour, N. S., on or about the 10th day of February last, under instructions from, by direction of, or with the knowledge of the department? If so, were the instructions in writing, and what was the nature of the examination? Has a report been sent in to the department?

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Dodwell was employed as district engineer. He was at Hall's Harbour on the 10th of February, acting under instructions from my department. The instructions were in writing, and the object of the examination was to determine the possibility of getting rid of the sand bar in the harbour by means of a dam and sluice-way at the head of the harbour. A report has been sent in.

DUTY ON SAW-LOGS.

Mr. RIDER moved for;

Copies of all correspondence, memorials, departmental orders and Orders in Council, respecting or in any way relating to the removal of the export duty from saw-logs and other unmanufactured lumber exported from Canada to the United States.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this motion I desire to say that although this subject was quite thoroughly discussed following the introduction of the resolution of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives), asking for re-imposing an export duty upon saw-logs and spruce pulpwood exported to the United States, yet no information was given by the Government during that discussion why the export duty had been removed from spruce saw-logs exported from Canada to the United States without securing in return a corresponding reduction in the United States import duties upon Canadian spruce sawn lumber. I hope the papers when brought down will give the information desired, and that they will be forthcoming as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

EXTRA PAYMENTS TO PERMANENT CLERKS.

Mr. TISDALE moved for:

Return showing all payments made to permanent clerks for extra work done by them in their own department and in other departments, during the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878:—1. The name of each such clerk; 2. The page of the Auditor General's Report on Public Accounts upon which each of such payments may be found; 3. Department in which said clerk was permanently employed; 4. Department for which extra work was done; 5. Nature of such work; 6. Amount of each such payment; 7. The fund from which each such payment was made.

He said: In making this motion, I wish to state shortly some of the reasons why I trouble the House with it. During the somewhat lengthy debate which took place in this House some days ago, in reference to the irregularities in the Civil Service, I was somewhat surprised, on reading the speeches, to discover that hon. gentlemen opposite gave the House and the country to understand, that there had been no illegalities during the time they were in power; further, that there had been very few, if any, irregularities; and lastly, that no permanent clerks—at all events none who ought not, under the terms of the Civil Service Act, to have been paid for extra work during the time they were administering the affairs of the country—had received any considerable amount. I was still further surprised to see in the speeches of some hon. gentlemen, that it was doubtful if there had been any Civil Service Act at all in force at that time. Now, to set that question at rest, I shall read to the House the clause of the Civil Service Act in force during the time of the administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was passed in 1868, and it reads as follows:—

"No allowance or compensation shall be made for any extra service whatsoever which any officer or clerk may be required to perform in the department to which he belongs."

That was not changed until 1882, when it was made to read as follows:—

"No extra salary or additional remuneration of any kind whatsoever shall be paid to any deputy head, or officer or servant in the Civil Service of the Dominion, unless such sum shall have been placed for that special purpose in the estimates submitted to and voted by Parliament."

It will be noticed, therefore, that, so far as permanent clerks were concerned, it was illegal for them to be paid for extra services performed in the department to which they belonged; and that was recognized by the House, and no votes were taken in the House for such payments. Well, Sir, I find, by a cursory examination of the Public Accounts, that permanent clerks were paid for extra services in the departments to which they belonged, not only during one year, but during every year of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. I find that in 1875, $2,136.29 was paid; in 1876, $2,574; in 1877, $2,129.30; and in 1878, $2,685.51; or a total of $9,524.23. These amounts are what I obtained from the contingent fund; I do not know how many others may have been made. The departments in which these illegal payments were made were the Interior, the Finance, the Customs, the Post Office, the Receiver-General's, the Public Works, the Governor General's Secretary's, the Secretary of State's, and the Inland Revenue; and the grossest and largest irregularities took place in the Finance Department which was under the charge of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have taken the names of just four clerks by way of illustration: W. L. Orde received $1,668.40; J. Barry, $922.50; T. F. Watters, $516; and H. J. Morgan, $685—a total of $3,791.90 paid to these four clerks for extra services in their own departments. Last but not least, I find in the Public Accounts of 1874-75 these items:

The hon. Receiver-General, amount paid sundry persons employed in counting and destroying notes, $6,278.70; amount paid sundry persons for extra services in savings bank branch, $629. In 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1878 there was paid under these headings a total of $21,626.80; and I find enough to satisfy me that the great bulk of that sum was paid to permanent clerks for extra services in the departments to which they belonged. There is no further explanation—no entries as to the details, and no names mentioned. I presume that the Government will in some manner be able to trace those payments, and see whether I am correct or not. I am satisfied that these are not nearly all the payments which have been made, and I hope the return will disclose them. As so much was said in the discussion the other day with regard to the irregularities in the Civil Service during the administration of this Government and its predecessors, I thought the statement I am moving for would be an interesting appendix to put in the *Hansard*, so that the whole record of the administrations of both parties in this respect would go to the country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has asked for a return relating to the years in which another Government were in office. Now, I do not know precisely in what year the Act relating to the Civil Service came into operation, but I suppose the hon. gentleman does not want a return as to the employment of permanent clerks at a period of time when there was no legal objection to the employment of these clerks. I suppose the hon. gentleman wishes to ascertain how far the law was violated. I have not the statute before me, but it would be important to look at the year in which the statute came into operation, and make the return begin with that particular period, and extend down to the present time. If we are to have a report, it ought to be a report which would enable the House to see how these irregularities grew up, how they grew up, and when steps were taken to prevent them. It would be important to see who was responsible for them and the extent to which they exist, and the return asked for by the hon. gentleman will give the House no such information. I apprehend the House is not particularly interested as to whether a former Administration did as badly as their predecessors or worse than their successors, but in order that a comparison may be instituted, in order that information may be had of some practical value to the House, the return for which the hon. gentleman calls should begin with the beginning of the impropriety and extend down to the present time, and I ask the House that the return asked for by the hon. gentleman should be corrected in that particular; I ask that it should give us the opportunity of knowing the whole truth, and in order that it may be of value, it should serve that purpose.

Mr. TISDALE. My object is to commence with the time covered by the discussions before the Public Accounts Committee, and that was from the commencement of the Mackenzie administration. That is the reason I fix that time. Last year and this session, in the House and before the Public Accounts Committee, the impression was certainly given that these irregularities and illegal payments, payments in contravention of the Civil Service Act, did not exist during the Mackenzie administration, and for this reason it will be extremely interesting to have a return covering the two periods. Whether or not such a return would justify the action of the Government is a matter for people to judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are fourteen years since 1878 which the hon. gentleman is leaving out, and concerning which it would be equally important to have information as during the few years he has mentioned. It would also be important to have information concerning the few years before those he has mentioned, when the Act was also in operation.

Mr. BOWELL. These illegal payments, or what are termed illegal payments, were investigated by the Public Accounts Committee from the time this Government took office.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, in a great measure. At the Public Accounts Committee, last session, it was stated boldly that these irregular payments had been made by the late Government alone. I read at one of the meetings of the committee the clause of the Act which has been in existence since 1868. My hon. friend to my right read that clause, and pointed out to the House, when making his remarks, that such illegal payments were just as much a contravention of the Civil Service Act prior to 1879 as after that period, and yet the hon. member for Bothwell rose and asked that a return should be made and the law should be quoted in order to ascertain whether, during the period he was himself in office, the same irregularities had existed, though my hon. friend had read the clause to the House, which I have no doubt he heard, because he usually pays very close attention to what is going on. For his edification I will read it again. It is in the Act 31 Victoria, chapter 34, passed in 1878:

"No allowance or compensation shall be made for any extra service whatever which any officer or clerk may be required to perform in the department to which he belongs."

Such was the law until the amending Act was passed. Of course it will be seen, by the reading of this clause, that it might be held legal to employ a clerk in any other department than that to which he was attached. But the amended Act was passed, in order to prevent what Parliament considered a wrong and an abuse of the Act, providing that they should not be employed in any department.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What year was that?

Mr. BOWELL. In 1882, 45 Victoria, chapter 4, section 149.

Mr. LAURIER. The object of the hon. gentleman, as he has frankly avowed, is to show that these irregularities, which were discussed last year, have prevailed during the previous Administration. The Minister of Militia stated a moment ago that the whole subject had been investigated, in so far as the present Administration is concerned. I take issue with the statement, which is far too broad. It is not accurate to say that the whole subject has been investigated, in so far as the whole period covered by the Administration is concerned. On the contrary, the investigation last year only referred to a part of the period covered by the present Administration, and to the Department of the Interior almost exclusively. My hon. friend points out that if you want to establish a comparison of guilt, if

you want to show that the late Government has been as remiss as the present, let us have a full return, and certainly if any sense of justice is to prevail, if the hon. gentleman's motion is not simply a catch motion, the suggestion of my hon. friend is one that ought to commend itself to his sense of fair play. Therefore he should amend his motion so as to include the whole period since the law has been in existence, that is from the year 1868, and then we will see where the guilt lies and what portion is attributable to one party or the other.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not understand from the explanation of my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) that he is seeking to establish a comparison of guilt. I do not understand it is a question of guilt at all. It was alleged that certain irregularities have grown up gradually in connection with the Civil Service by infringement of the provisions of the Act, and it is not a question of guilt in regard either to the previous Government or to this Government. The other night, when the Estimates were being discussed, a particular point was in controversy as to whether such irregularities existed under any previous Administration, and a number of members of the House, including some who were members of the previous Administration, were under the impression that no such irregularities did exist at that time. The hon. member's information is different from that, and he asks for more light upon it. If any other hon. member desires to have more information on the subject, let him move an amendment or a substantive resolution, and it will be carried.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think, if we are to have a return of any value to the House, one which will enable the House to see how the question stands, it will be necessary for this motion to be amended so that we may have an opportunity of seeing whether a departure has been made in any period and in what period. I, therefore, move in amendment that the return shall include every year from 1869 to 1891 inclusive.

Mr. TISDALE. I have no objection to that.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence, documents, memorials and petitions in reference to the proposed construction of a system of canals known as the Ottawa Ship Canal.—(Mr. Devlin.)

THE LONDON ELECTION.

Mr. LISTER moved :

That a copy of the petition laid upon the Table of this House from Thomas Hobbs and others, complaining of the conduct of William Elliott, Esquire, County Judge of Middlesex, in relation to the revision of the voters' list for the Electoral District of the City of London, be forthwith furnished him for his information and to enable him to make such statement or answer to the charges therein contained as he may deem proper, and that the said petition and any such answer as the said judge may make be referred to a special committee of this House, to enquire into the truth of the several allegations therein, with a view of finding whether such charges should be investigated by a commission.

He said : Before submitting the resolution which stands in my name to the judgment of the House, I shall take this opportunity of simply narrating the facts involved in that resolution. I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that on the 1st April instant, there was printed in the Votes and Proceedings of this House a petition signed by a number of the electors of the city of London, and I have no doubt that that petition has been read by every hon. member of this House. I will say furthermore, that if the statements contained in that petition are true, about which I do not pretend at the present moment to express an opinion, that gentleman who is attacked and complained of in that petition has degraded the high office of a judge and by his action he has deprived a citizen of this country of the right which he possesses, of the right which the electors of the constituency have declared he should have, and in his place an hon. gentleman sits who has no more right to a seat than a messenger at the door. Hon. gentlemen are of course aware that the conduct of William Elliott, Esquire, the judge of the County Court of the County of Middlesex, is involved in this motion. That learned judge has been for many years the judge of the County Court of the County of Middlesex, and his son-in-law, Mr. Fraser, was appointed by the Government as the revising officer for the electoral district of the city of London. Not being a judge under the Franchise Act, an appeal lay from the final decision of the revising officer to the judge of the County Court in matters pertaining to the revision of the voters' lists. On the 10th November last that court was convened, Mr. Fraser presiding as the revising officer for the purpose of revising the voters' lists for the electoral district of the city of London, and the purpose, or one of the purposes for which the court was sitting was to hear and investigate and try the complaint of one F. W. Lilley, who had objected to and petitioned against 609 names which had been placed upon that list which he contended had no right to be upon the list. Objection was taken by the legal gentleman who was there to support the right of the names of these people to be upon the list, that the notice of objection which had been served in the interests of Mr. Lilley upon the people whose names he claimed had no right to be upon that list, was not sufficient, inasmuch as the words "not qualified" were the words used in the notice. That is to say, the people whose names appeared upon the list, appeared there as having a certain and particular qualification under the statute, and the notice that they were not qualified simply contained the words "not qualified," traversing and contradicting, and putting in issue, the qualification upon which they sought to have their names so put upon that list. Now, the revising officer, as he had a right to do, decided that the notices were not invalid, that the notices were not void, but that they were simply defective; and under the powers which the statute gives him, he had a right to adjourn the court and direct that new notices should be given to the people complained against. Acting within the statute, acting as he had a clear legal right to do, acting as a person wishing to decide fairly and honestly between the two parties, would have done, the revising officer declared, as I said before, that the notices were defective, but not void or invalid, and he adjourned the court for two weeks, or until the 27th day of November, and directed that new notices should be given to all the parties complained against. Although I do not think that the revising officer ought to have so ordered, as the court has since said that the notices were sufficient, that they

were legal, I think he ought to have proceeded with the hearing of the complaints, but in the exercise of the discretion which the statute gives him, he adjourned the court for the purpose which I have stated. These notices were all served, 600 new notices were served upon the persons whose names appeared upon the list, and whose qualification was objected to. Immediately after the revising officer had so ordered, those who were acting for the people whose names were complained against, appealed to Judge Elliott against the decision of the revising officer, holding that the notices were defective, but not invalid and void; they appealed to Judge Elliott against that decision of the revising officer, with the hope, no doubt, that Judge Elliott would decide that the notices were utterly invalid and void. Now, I may state here that the Court of Queen's Bench in Ontario has unanimously held that there was no appeal to Judge Elliott against that decision of the revising officer, that it was a matter over which the revising officer had exclusive and final jurisdiction, and that having decided that these notices were defective only, and not void and invalid, there was no appeal, and the cases should have been gone on with and should have been tried by the revising officer without the intervention of Judge Elliott at all. However, an appeal was taken to Judge Elliott against that decision of the revising officer, and of all the decisions that a learned judge has placed on record, I challenge the production of one equal to this. In the first place he decides as follows:—

"I am of opinion that under the 33rd section my power is confined to the action of the revising officer in dealing with the list; that is to say, as to proper admission of names or the exclusion of them being as to something which is or should be in the list or which ought not to be in it. It is not said that there is an appeal to the county judge as to the proceedings of the revising officer, which would be a comprehensive term, such as is used in section 26. I consider that I have no authority to interfere with the action of the revising officer in amending or adjourning the court to a future time."

Then he goes on to say:

"Whatever may be the importance of my ruling as to the question whether the notice in question is insufficient or invalid and null and void, as I am pressed to decide I do so, and rule as I have said, that it is invalid under the Act and so far the appeal is sustained, but in respect to my authority to interfere with the revising officer's power to order amendment or to adjourn the court, I do not entertain the appeal."

He holds that he had no authority to interfere with the revising officer. He again expresses a doubt, as to his right to interfere with the revising officer's power to order an amendment or to adjourn the court; but he expresses the opinion that the notices served by Mr. Lilley upon these people were invalid. Now, Sir, if that decision had stood, if there had been no further investigation of the matter by way of appeal, the result of that decision of Judge Elliott would have been to leave 600 names upon the voters' list that it was contended had no right to be upon that list. But as soon as Judge Elliott gave that decision, the revising officer at once refused to proceed with the hearing of the appeals which he had ordered might be heard upon a new notice being given to the people complained against. He notified the parties who were proceeding, Mr. Lilley and of his friends, that in view of the judgment of Judge Elliott he felt that he could not proceed with the investigation under and in pursuance of the order which he made, directing that new notices should be given, and that further consideration of these appeals should take place on the 27th day of November. Then Judge Elliott having so held, an application was made to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice in Toronto, and the whole matter was there fully argued, the application being made for a mandatory order compelling the revising officer to hear the appeals under the general notice served, namely, the notice given as a reason for the appeal, that the parties whose names were upon the list were not qualified. Sir, the matter came before the Queen's Bench Division on that application, and I will read from the judgment:

"A notice under sec. 19 of the Electoral Franchise Act, R.S.C., chap. 5, as amended by 52 Vic., chap. 9, sec. 4, to a person whose name was objected to, for the purpose of having the name taken off the voters' list at the final revision, simply gave 'not qualified' as the ground of objection:—

"*Held*, sufficient.

"The revising officer (who was not a judge) having ruled that the notice was valid, the person whose name was objected to appealed from that ruling to the county judge, who held that the notice was invalid, and the revising officer thereupon refused to go on and hear the complaint.

"*Held*, that no appeal was given by section 33 of the Act from the revising officer's ruling; and therefore, the proceedings before the county judge were *coram non judice*.

"A mandamus was granted."

The judgment of the court is a short one, and I will read it:

"The court held:—

"1. That the notice was sufficient.

"2. That no appeal is given by the Act to the county judge from the revising officer's decision that the notice was valid; and therefore, that the proceedings before the county judge were *coram non judice*.

"Madamus order granted."

An order was issued by the court, in pursuance of that judgment, to the revising officer commanding him to go on and hear the appeals of Mr. Lilley and to dispose of them, and the trial of these appeals was proceeded with and 340 names appealed against were, by order of the returning officer, stricken from that list. The respondent, or the persons who were appealed against, then appealed from the decision of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, to the Court of Appeal. After the revising officer had heard the appeals, after he had stricken 340 names off the voters' list, they appealed against the judgment of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, to the Court of Appeal of the Province of Ontario. The matter came on for argument and the court therein declined to give a formal judgment, for the reason that the mandatory order directed to be issued by the Court of Appeal had been obeyed and there was nothing for that court to do in the premises. But, Mr. Speaker, I will call the attention of the House and yourself to the fact, that upon that argument, and after the court had expressed its opinion that as the mandamus had been obeyed, there could be no object in giving a judgment upon the question in dispute; yet at the request, at the urgent solicitation of Mr. Hellmuth, who was acting for the respondent, concurred in by the counsel who was acting for the appellant, at the joint solicitation of these two learned gentlemen, the court was urged in the strongest terms to give an expression of opinion for the guidance of Judge Elliott, before whom another appeal had been taken. I should mention that after the revising officer had stricken off these names, they again appealed to Judge Elliott; that appeal was pending, and for the guidance of Judge

Elliott, on the solicitation of the counsel for all parties stating expressly that that was their object, the court consented, after some hesitation, to give an expression of opinion. I may say that, before this appeal was taken to the Court of Appeal, Judge Elliott had given a judgment upon the second appeal to him from the revising officer, and his language was as follows :—

"An appeal was taken before me on the 20th November last, the question being whether certain notices of the 20th October, 1891, which had been given by one Frank Lilley objecting to certain names being allowed to remain on the voters' list for the city of London were valid and sufficient to authorize the removal of these names. I then decided that in my opinion these notices were invalid for the reason that no grounds of objection were stated therein as required by the statute. The result of this decision, if carried into effect, would be to retain on the list these persons in respect of whom the alleged defective notices had been given. But this decision was never carried into effect, because by a decision of the Court of Queen's Bench the said notices were held to be sufficient, and under a mandate of the said court the revising officer proceeded to deal with these notices on that footing. This decision of the Court of Queen's Bench is now, it appears, appealed against, and the appeal is now pending before the proper appellate court. In this situation of matters, I reserve judgment on the question which is now brought before me as to the retention or removal of their names until the result of this appeal shall be known. (Signed), W. Elliot, Judge, County Middlesex, 31st December, 1891.'

Judge Elliott had given this statement upon the second appeal to him after the court had issued its, mandatory order and while there was an appeal pending against the judgment of the Queen's Bench Division to the Court of Appeal. This judgment, Mr. Speaker, or rather these utterances of Judge Elliott showed that at the time they were penned by him, his intention was manifest that he intended to give effect to the opinion, or to the judgment it may be, of the Court of Appeal, whatever that opinion or judgment might be. He held the judgment back, he reserved it, he retained it for the purpose of knowing what the opinion of the Court of Appeal was upon the question that had been decided by the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court of Queen's Bench having decided that the notices were valid and that the revising officer should proceed with them. As I said a few moments ago, when the matter came before the Court of Appeal that court expressed the opinion that there was nothing to deal with because the order issued by the Court of Queen's Bench had been obeyed by the returning officer. Now, Sir, on the 25th of January last, an appeal came before the Court of Appeal of the Province of Ontario, and the court dismissed the appeal on the ground that the mandamus had been obeyed, but, as I have also stated, the court was strongly urged by counsel on both sides to give an opinion as to the sufficiency of the notices for the guidance of the learned judge, who was holding back his judgment until the opinion of the court should be known. This, Sir, is the language of the court :

"Both parties united in requesting the opinion of this court as to the disputed sufficiency of the notices served on the parties whose qualification was challenged, and with some hesitation we have thought that it is better that we should comply with such request."

Chief Justice Hagarty, after discussing the question and pointing out the difference between the English Act and ours, concluded as follows :—

"I am of the opinion that the amendment allowed by the revising officer was within his power, and that the notices so amended sufficiently comply with the statute. The columns as to the character in which the voter is in the list, 'Owner,' 'Tenant,' must be read into the notice, and I think it sufficient to state 'not owner within the Act' or 'not tenant within the Act.'

"The distinction seems made in the Imperial Act as to objection to the nature of the interest, and to the value, as discussed in Simey *vs.* Dixon. Our Act does not draw this distinction, and I do not think we can hold these amended notices insufficient. They specifically attack the voter's interest, that is, his position as owner or tenant, and his right to that character as defined in the Franchise Act. Under such a notice he would not I conceive be liable to attack on a merely personal ground, as a post office or customs official, etc., etc. The unamended notice appears to me to be more open to argument. It amounts to this : 'You are on this list as assessed on income.' 'I object that you are not qualified.' It may be argued that this is substantially the same as if amended like the other cases. It is in effect : 'you are assessed for income and your income (if any) does not meet the requirements of the Act,' or that you cannot fill the character of one qualified to vote on income. It seems rather difficult to point out a reliable distinction and I feel a difficulty in attempting so to distinguish. I think on the whole that the unamended notice should be held sufficient."

Mr. Justice Burton said :

"Although it is not usual or desirable for a court to give a mere opinion upon questions not before them in a manner to be enforced by a judgment, I think that, under the circumstances, we may, without impropriety, make this an exception to the rule and yield to the urgent request made to us by the counsel on both sides to express our opinion as to the sufficiency of the original notice of objection which was alone before the Queen's Bench. I abstain from offering any opinion upon the new or amended notice.

"Speaking for myself, I cannot say that I feel any doubt as to the sufficiency of the notice of objection read as a whole.

"The list contains :

"1st. The name and address of the voter.

"2nd. His occupation.

"3rd. His qualification, whether as landlord or tenant.

"4th. The description of the property.

"To this the complainant in his notice, after setting forth the same particularly, objects that the party so referred to is not qualified.

"If he had added 'as alleged' I cannot conceive how a more precise and definite issue could be framed.

"But surely it cannot be expected that these notices should be framed with all the niceties and formalities of a plea in the old days of pleading where such an issue without the words 'as alleged' could only have been objected to by special demurrer.

"As to the suggestion that the revising officer could under it enter upon the consideration of another and distinct ground of disqualification, my inclination is against it, although it is unnecessary to venture a final opinion ; but to call in aid again the old system of pleading and the reasoning by analogy upon it, I think it would have assumed the shape of a plea in confession and avoidance —thus : we admit that you are apparently qualified as a landlord, but we set up that you are disqualified as an alien or as one of the parties disqualified under the Act, and possibly without such an affirmative statement the objection would not be open, but there is much force in the view entertained by some that looking at the unlimited powers of adjournment and the fact that if qualified the party whose vote is objected to must know it and cannot be taken by surprise, the whole question may be open on the general denial of qualification, the intention of the Act being to afford the greatest facility to purge the list of those not entitled to be upon it."

Mr. Justice Maclennan said :

"We are requested to give our opinion upon the validity of the notices in question, and in deference to that request, I have considered them, and I have no hesitation in saying that I consider the notices sufficient. The notice must be read with the list to which it refers just as a statement of defence is to be read with reference to the statement of claim, and that being so the objection 'not qualified' clearly and distinctly traverses the qualification specified in the list. It is not necessary to go so far as to uphold the present notices, but I am unable to see why such a specification of objections as we have here should not be sufficient to negative not merely the property or other qualifications mentioned in the list, but all the qualifications mentioned in section 3 of the Act, entitled 'Qualification of Voters,' for the voter can never be taken by surprise by any of these objections, seeing that the knowledge in respect of them, all must be within his own breast. The object of the proceedings

of the revising officer is to purge the roll of persons not entitled by law to exercise the franchise, and the attainment of that object should not be bridled or degraded by technical objections or by a narrow construction of the legislation, but should be promoted as far as possible, without doing violence to the language of the enactments. It would be an intolerable scandal if, in an ordinary action in the High Court, such an objection as we have here under consideration could be allowed to defeat the rights of any of the parties, and I do not see why it should not be legally so, in a proceeding concerning the franchise. The very large powers conferred on the officers by sections 24 and 26 of the Act, show that Parliament intended that the administration of the Act should not be frustrated by objections of form."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the extracts which I have read are from the judgments of three of the four judges of the Court of Appeal in the Province of Ontario. I have shown that it was Judge Elliott's intention to await the judgment of the Court of Appeal before he undertook to decide the important matter which had been submitted to him by way of appeal; and the judgments of these three gentlemen show beyond any question whatever that in their opinion at all events the notices which had been given by Mr. Lilley, complaining of the six hundred names which were on the list and which he contended should not be there, were sufficient under the Act for all purposes, concurring in the judgments of the three judges of the High Court of Justice. One would have thought, under the circumstances, that the learned judge of the County Court would have had no hesitation in following the *dicta* of the Court of Appeal and the High Court of Justice. Although I do not contend that he was bound to do so, because I recognize that the judgment of the County Court would be, in a proper matter of appeal, a final judgment; yet, Sir, in accordance with the invariable practice in this country and in England, I do not hesitate to aver that it was the plain and manifest duty of Judge Elliott to have followed the decision of three judges of a superior court and the expressed opinion of three judges of a still higher court. But, Sir, he thought proper not to do so, although his own paper, penned with his own hand, shows that before the matter went to the Court of Appeal it was his intention to follow the opinion of the judges of that court. When their judgment turned out to be against the contention of the respondent, we find Judge Elliott suddenly determining in his own mind that he will not follow the judgment of the higher tribunals of the country, but that he will give a judgment of his own; he made up his mind not to be governed by those judgments. Sir, for the purpose of delaying proceedings, because events subsequent to that date show that what took place afterwards was merely done for the purpose of delay, Mr. Hellmuth, acting for the respondents, appealed from the judgment of the court in review to the Supreme Court. He gave notice of the appeal, but nothing further was ever done. No steps were ever taken to perfect it, and I state here that I believe his object was simply to postpone judgment in the case until after the election. Whether that object was known to Judge Elliott or not, I will not say; but, at all events, he took advantage of the delay, and said that while there was an appeal pending before the courts he would not give judgment in the matter. And so the matter stood until after the election had taken place. Sir, two days before the election, Judge Elliott was asked to give judgment, and I state here, on my responsibility as a member of Parliament and for the purpose of showing the intention of the judge, that it can be established that he said he would be governed by the decision of his colleagues. Yet he postponed giving judgment until after the election, although he had been asked to give it two days before the election. He was asked by Mr. Lilley's counsel to give judgment, and the request was opposed by the counsel on the other side on the ground that the matter was before the Supreme Court by way of appeal. He was asked to postpone his judgment, and he did so. The appeal to the Supreme Court was never completed, it was never perfected; there never was, as a matter of fact, anything in it; and on the 26th of February the election took place in the city of London. These names were upon the revised list still. Although they had been struck off by the revising officer, they still remained upon the list as *bonâ fide* votes, and out of those votes that were stricken off by the revising officer, numbering 131, 128 voted for Mr. Carling and 3 voted for Mr. Hyman. Striking off those 131 names, Mr. Hyman had a majority of 16, previous to the recount before the junior judge of the city, and after that recount he had a majority of 22 of the legal votes of the electors of the city of London. He is, therefore, to-day entitled to the seat usurped, I say, by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. He is entitled to it by a majority of 22 of the legal and qualified voters of the city of London. Sir, by the grossest act of usurpation that has ever been perpetrated in this or any other free country, he is prevented from taking that seat and enjoying the honour which his fellow-citizens thought proper to confer upon him. On the 9th of March, after the election had taken place, after the High Court of Justice had decided that those notices of appeal were sufficient, and ordered the revising officer to hear them, after three out of the four judges of the Court of Appeal had declared, at the request of all parties to the proceedings, that these notices were sufficient, after Judge Elliott had declared that he would be governed by the decision of the Court of Appeal after he knew that without those bad votes Mr. Carling could not take his seat, he decided, in the face of all this, that those bad votes should be counted, and it is by virtue of those bad votes, and by virtue of the decision of Judge Elliott, the hon. gentleman holds his seat in this House. Sir, I say furthermore that it can be shown that the friends of the Conservative party in the city of London knew, the day before the judgment was given, holding that these votes should remain upon the list, what the judgment of Judge Elliott was going to be. I state here again that, during the time these appeals were pending before the judge, within a few days of the day in which he gave that judgment, he was taking an active part in the political contest then going on in the city of London. I can prove, and I state it here on my responsibility as a member of this House, and if it is not true I am willing to take the consequences of my statement, that he was a contributor in the London *Free Press*, the Conservative organ in that city, of leading articles, letters and correspondence, under an assumed name, favouring the candidature of the gentleman who now sits here as a representative of that city and opposing the gentleman who was then contesting the seat. I say that if these facts are true, Judge Elliott has degraded the high position he fills. He has subordinated his duty as

a judge to his feelings as a partisan, and he has forever destroyed his usefulness as a judge in this country. It is charged that his whole conduct showed that he used the machinery of the law for the purpose of putting his political friend into a place which the people of London declared he should not occupy. He has defied the will of the people of London in a matter of the gravest importance to the state. The dangers which we feared when this infamous act was first placed upon the Statute-book are being verified. They are being given substance, if the charges contained in that petition are true. Sir, that gentleman has defied, as I say, the voice of the electors of London by placing in the seat of the gentleman elected by the majority of voters of that city one who received the minority of votes. He has done the greatest and gravest wrong that can be done to the citizens of a free country in defying their opinion and keeping the candidate of the minority in the seat he has no right to occupy. If these charges be true—and their truth can be proved—Judge Elliott has impaired his usefulness, nay more, he has destroyed his usefulness as a judge, and it becomes of paramount importance to the people that matters of this kind should be thoroughly ventilated and investigated. I need not here call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the utterances of the independent press of this country. Go where you will throughout Canada, and wherever there is an independent newspaper, with leanings to the Government, that paper has come out openly and boldly in denunciation of this act of Judge Elliott as it is possible by words. I need only call the attention of the hon. gentleman to an article which appeared in the *Evening Journal* a short time ago. The first few lines of the article place the matter in a light as strong as it is possible to place it from the standpoint of the independent journals of this country. The article says:

"It is rarely, indeed, that the bench is impeached in Parliament. Judge Elliott, of London, attains a very unusual notoriety. Intrusted with the dispensation of justice to his fellow men, almost the most sacred trust that can be placed in the hands of a human being, Judge Elliott is accused of wilfully, deliberately, and for low and mean ends, violating his sacred trust. This which he is accused of doing is a far graver crime than any ordinary felony. If the accusation is proven in Parliament to be well-founded, the petition which a Liberal member, Mr. Lister, offers calling for a declaration of Judge Elliott's unfitness to remain on the bench, should neither be disregarded nor dodged by the Conservative majority."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that, if the charges contained in that petition are true, if the representations made by 30 or 40 of the leading citizens of the city of London and contained in the petition presented to this House, are true, there is no man, I believe, on either side of this House but must admit that that gentleman is unfit and unworthy to enrobe himself with the ermine, that he is unfit to be a judge of any court in this land. The charges made are specific. They are that he has disregarded the judgments of a higher court, that he has shown himself to be a political partisan and that he has subordinated his duties as judge to his feelings as a partisan. I do not know what position the hon. gentleman leading the Government intends to take on this question. It may be that they will say that this House has nothing to do with investigating the charges which have been made against this judge. If that is their contention, I at once take issue with them on that statement of the case. We have here the fact that under an old statute he might have been impeached before the Governor in Council. We have the Consolidated Statutes creating a Court of Impeachment which was afterwards abolished by the Revised Statutes of the Dominion of Canada, and that provides that the Governor in Council may issue a Commission for the purpose of investigating charges made against a County Court judge. I say that, as far as these charges are concerned, this House, being the high court of this country, has a right to investigate these charges for the purpose of ascertaining whether there are sufficient grounds for asking the Government to refer them to a Commission under the statute, and that is the course I am pursuing to-day. Although Mr. Bourinot, in his work on Constitutional History, lays it down that it is competent for this House to deal with County Court judges the same as Superior Court judges may be dealt with, still the argument may be used, that a peculiar tribunal having been created to investigate cases of this kind, these charges should be relegated to that tribunal. I repeat that we have a right to ask that these charges contained in a petition which has been laid on the Table of the House should be investigated by the House, and, if these charges are proven, then we can invoke the power the statute gives, we can invoke the action of the court the statute creates, to investigate the charges contained in that provision. I beg, therefore, to move the resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I think that the importance of this resolution requires that it should have at the hands of this House a careful consideration. To deal with a charge affecting one of the judiciary of this country is a subject most delicate in its nature indeed, and I think, as Mr. Bourinot in his work says, in all such matters the House cannot proceed with too great a caution and deliberation, and I hope that both sides of this House are prepared to deal with this question and to investigate it according to the language I have used, with great caution and great deliberation. I think, if there is any class of people whom in this country we have a right to be proud of, it is the bench. I presume that at present it is more proper to speak of the bench of Ontario, whose unsullied reputation, the integrity of its judges, the ability they have displayed, are all, I think, matters of congratulation for us, and, if there is anything we have a right to feel proud of, it is the long list of names of the judges of this country who honour and adorn the bench. We have a petition before us to-day the first four or five pages of which set out a history of the facts of the different dates of the judgments and the different applications that were made to Judge Elliott and to the different courts in this province. I presume there is no person in this House who dreams for one moment of asserting that an error of judgment is to be a cause of impeachment in this country. We are to be congratulated that such is not a cause for impeachment, because, if it were, the time of our courts would be constantly taken up in reviewing, in impeachment trials, the judgments of judges which they were revising. Such a course would be absolutely absurd, and every person in this House, I am sure, would repudiate it. There have been, in this House, two or three occasions where matters of this kind have come before it. I will read to you an extract from the remarks

of Mr. Blake, when a member of this House, on an application for the impeachment of a judge, I think the judge of the County of Kent. In explaining what was an impeachable offence and what action of a judge could be impeached, Mr. Blake said:

"It is not an error of judgment, but a betrayal of trust, wilful and knowing, that is the charge which alone could make it proper to have him brought here."

I think this House will agree with me that that is a fair statement of what should justify the bringing of a judge before us for impeachment. Now, the hon. gentleman who has preceded me (Mr. Lister), has taken upon himself a certain amount of responsibility, and at the same time not a great deal, either. That gentleman, for the purpose of backing up, I presume, his opinions and this petition, has said that the independent press of this country have assumed to act judicially and have assumed to try Judge Elliott, and have found him guilty and condemned him in their columns. Sir, I do not think the idea will commend itself to this House for one minute, that because a few newspapers have condemned Judge Elliott, therefore the House is bound to condemn him also. Sir, if there is anything disgraceful connected with this London election, it is the partisan and violent articles that have filled the columns of the Reform newspapers since and before the decision complained of was given. The Reform press, prior to judgment being given, attempted, I may say, to burke justice, and by threats to influence the judiciary of the County of Middlesex to give a decision in accordance with the desire of the Reform party. The result of the London election was to place the Hon. Mr. Carling at the head of the poll; I say this without fear of contradiction, notwithstanding the assertions of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). Nevertheless, the Reform press, and the London *Advertiser*, the press of the gentleman whom Mr. Carling defeated, have used expressions against Judge Elliott that no man can possibly approve of at the present stage of matters. On the 1st April that paper, in speaking of Judge Elliott's action, said:

"Every day the press of the country is becoming fully seized of the methods pursued by Judge Elliott and his co-conspirators to secure a seat for Mr. Carling to which he can lay no legal claim."

Stating on their own authority that Judge Elliott was a co-conspirator to defraud the citizens of the city of London of their due representation. Sir, that is a very bold statement to make, and it is one that no person, even on the floor of this House, would dare to make. On the 22nd March, the same paper, in speaking of this matter, describes the Hon. Mr. Carling as the member for Judge Elliott. Perhaps that may be taken as a joke, but it is not a class of writing that ought to find acceptance in this country. He has also been compared with Judge Jeffries, in 1685. Prior to any investigation having taken place that paper, and others in the country holding the same political opinions, have chosen to speak of Judge Elliott in that way. My hon. friend took a great deal of pleasure a few moments ago in quoting the judgment of the Court of Appeal in this case. He must know that the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal is the Hon. Mr. Justice Hagarty, a man with unsullied reputation and a credit to the bench of this country. The hon. gentleman forgot that the same Chief Justice Hagarty, whose judgment he is to-day quoting against that of Judge Elliott, but a few years ago came under the lash of the same paper from which I have read these extracts. Now, let me remind the House that a few years ago an election took place in the city of London between the Hon. Mr. Carling and Mr. Walker, and Mr. Walker defeated Mr. Carling by means that I need not waste a moment's time in attempting to describe to this House. Every member knows it who has read the record. Sir, what did the London *Advertiser* say at that time, when Chief Justice Hagarty pronounced judgment against Col. Walker, disqualifying him? The *Advertiser* of January, 1874, said:

"By special telegram we learn from Toronto that Major Walker has been disqualified by the bench of judges. This prevents him from being a candidate for election to the House of Commons during the present Parliament. There were several reasons which led to the expectation that this result would be arrived at. Twenty years of Tory power have had the effect of packing the bench with violent political partisans, some of whom can ill conceal their leanings in favour of their own colleagues and allies. * * * * By the assistance of Justices Hagarty, Gwynne and Galt, the Tories have managed to have the most severe penalty inflicted upon Major Walker. Let them revel in their short-lived triumph, it will do them little good."

Sir, I think the hon. gentleman who moved this motion might very well have left the comments of his own press alone. Now let us consider this petition. The petition, as the mover stated, sets out the circumstances in detail. For a moment let me call your attention to what the hon. gentleman at the time said; it was as follows:—"I do not at the present moment attempt to express any opinion as to the truth of the petition." The hon. gentleman presented his petition here as it had been presented to him, but in his opening remarks he said that he wished it to be understood that he did not attempt to express any opinion as to its truth. Now, Sir, what is this petition? The first few pages of it are a detail of the different applications that were made to the different judges. It is true an application was made on the 10th of November to Judge Elliott, in reference to the validity of certain notices that had been served by one Lilley. I will call the attention of the House to the fact that at this time the trial of the Hyman protest had not come off, and Judge Elliott was not even aware that the London election would have been upset and a new election ordered, but at that time, and at the earliest moment when the question was brought before him, he declared that the notice was invalid, that it was not a defective notice, but that it was one that was invalid and thus incapable of being amended. These proceedings took place as you are aware, and after the election the question came back to that same judge to decide upon the validity of this very same notice. What did he do? He maintained his former opinion, he never changed it, he gave the question his careful consideration and pronounced a judgment that is abounding in authority and in law, and a judgment that is approved of by many a revising barrister, and by a number of the judges of the different County Courts of this country to-day. Before going into the petition any further there are one or two things which I think we have a right to look into. The hon. gentleman who introduced the petition will not vouch for its truth, therefore let us see what class of persons have signed the petition asking this House to take the extraordinary step of impeaching Judge Elliott. I look at the list of

names on the petition and I find it commences with the name of one Thomas S. Hobbs, and it ends with the name of one George M. Reid. I certainly am not going to take up the time of this House by referring to all the different names, but I think it would be very interesting for the House to know what part Thomas S. Hobbs took in the election, and I think Judge Elliott has a right to know who his accusers are. He has a right to know, scripturally speaking, whether they are in a position to throw the first stone, and so I will occupy the time of the House for a few moments in quoting from the evidence at the London election trial, which I think will show that this Mr. Hobbs, the purist who leads off this petition, is a man who was around when there was a good deal of lager beer and cheese going. It was such evidence which guided the judges who tried the election petition in declaring that Mr. Hyman had not been unduly elected. I will call your attention now to the evidence of Albion Jones, and I take this from the *Mail* as being probably an independent paper:

"Was at two meetings in band room. John Stevenson notified me to attend. He first said I was needed there with the band, and they were engaged, and Hobbs would be responsible. I got there at the first meeting about nine o'clock on the 20th of February, the night Sir John spoke in the drill shed. Brown and Hobbs were there. Hobbs had a list of names: called them out and asked how each was going to vote. Hyman was not there then but came in afterwards. Hyman made a speech and said if he was elected it would be for the benefit of the country. Just after he closed refreshments were brought in by Halpin in a clothes basket about the size of the reporter's desk. One basket had bottled ale and the other had glasses. There were somewhere between two and three dozen bottles in the basket. The basket was open and passed close to Mr. Hyman. The basket was shoved under the bench. Frank Halpin and Durkin opened the keg and it was then passed round. There was a box of cigars brought there to; it was on the desk; they were passed round. A subscription list was passed round. It was while Mr. Hyman was there. Men simply signed their names. Mr. Hyman did not sign. Thomas Hobbs has it. Mr. Hyman said he could not have anything to do with it now but he might afterwards. I was at another meeting on the 24th or 25th. Hobbs was there. I went at eight o'clock. There were speeches made. Hobbs spoke. There were two quarters of lager drunk that night. It was drunk by all that were there. Crackers and cheese were given with the beer. It was going on when I left about 10.30. There were 25 or 30 present."

At which Mr. Justice Ferguson remarked:

"Is it possible so much liquor was drank in so short a time."

So, Sir, the person who heads the list of names on this petition was the moving spirit at the lager beer meeting in the city of London. The gentleman whose name closes the list, George M. Reid, was the treasurer of the election fund during that election, and he had charge of the books, and when the election came on these books were all out of the road, so that his Lordship remarked at the trial, that this manner of destroying books which was so frequent at the different elections was something that had to be stigmatized very severely when the opportunity arose. This same Mr. Reid, in giving his evidence, said:

"Now, do you know who took that box away?—I don't know, it was taken away while I was absent from the city.

"Now, you took up the subscriptions?—Yes.

"Where is the book?—I destroyed it. It was on that condition that the subscriptions were entered in it.

"When did you destroy it?—Not later than May—perhaps April.

"Will you swear that you destroyed it before the election petition was filed?—No.

"Will you swear it was after the filing in April?—No.

"You were trustee of that fund?—Yes.

"How much did you collect?—About $2,000.

"And what did you do with the money?—I kept no account.

"Now, was there only one subscription book?—Yes.

"How did you destroy it?—I sent it to the paper mill."

There is the evidence of this Mr. Reid who is the last named on the list. Now, Sir, it will be also interesting to look for a moment at the character of a few of the groups on this list. There are four names here—Williams, Macpherson, Ferguson and Sabine—to which I wish to call attention. I can very well understand how those who carried around the petition got the signatures. They went into Mr. Pavey's store and asked him to sign it, and he said: I decline to sign this petition against Judge Elliott, but there are plenty of clerks upstairs, and you can go up and get it signed by as many as you want. So they got all the clerks in Mr. Pavey's store to sign it, but not Mr. Pavey himself. Then they went to Mr. Struthers, who is one of the leading merchants of London, and asked him to sign it. He said: I do not want to sign any petition against Judge Elliott, I know what kind of a man he is, but you can get my clerks to sign it. So they went upstairs, and got six of his clerks to sign it: but Mr. Struthers's name is not on the list. You can very well see the class of people whose names have been brought forward and placed upon the list. Now, immediately prior to the election, a meeting in Mr. Hyman's interest was held of what are called the coloured folks in a certain part of London, at which 50 or 75 people were present. A number were there who had come from a tea meeting to attend it. The chairman of that meeting was examined at the trial, and here are a few quotations from his evidence:

"*The Chairman:*

"They began to leave the tea meeting for the beer? When did you think you had enough to start your meeting?—About 10 o'clock.

"How many?—About 50.

"You had speeches and the band played?—Yes.

"What time did Mr. Hyman come in?—About half-past 11.

"Did he make a speech?—Yes.

"Who served the beer?—I don't know.

"Were the barrels empty?—No.

"When was the word given to attack the beer?—A quarter after 12 was the first I saw any beer.

"Do you mean to say the beer stood in the corner all that time, and that you kept the coloured voters there till quarter past twelve without a drink?—I saw no beer drank before that.

"Why was it not tapped sooner?—There were a good many people in the room who were not expected there.

"In fact, the less people the more beer; 24 gallons would not go very far. And you waited till the crowd reduced before the order 'to the taps' was given?—I don't know.

"Where was the beer kept?—In the corner of the platform, near the teacher's desk. I saw it when I took the chair.

"You didn't sit on the barrel?—No.

"Were there any other form of refreshments there?—A man came in with a basket of pigs' feet pickled.

"You did not get anything to eat at the social?—No.

"What time were the pigs' feet served?—They were passed around about eleven.

"What were the order of proceedings?—We had pigs' feet, the band played, and there were speeches as I told you.

"Did it [the beer] stand there openly in front of the congregation?—There were overcoats on the barrel."

Now, Sir, turning to the petition itself, I find that it purports to make three charges, neither of which is specific, and neither of which, in fact, amounts to a charge. One sets out in detail the proceedings referred to by the hon. member who moved the motion, giving Judge Elliott's judgment and the

judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench. Well, I may tell you that the Court of Queen's Bench gave no written judgment, but merely decided on the spot that the notices were sufficient. The petition also sets out the views of the judges of the Court of Appeal. I admit that the opinion expressed by the judges of the Court of Appeal is not in accordance with the views entertained by Judge Elliott prior to the election trial, or his subsequent decision, both of which, by the by, were the same. Now, this House should bear in mind that the views expressed by the Court of Appeal was no judgment whatever. It was merely an expression of opinion, given, not at the request of Judge Elliott, but at the request of the counsel whom the mover of this resolution named, and I defy any hon. gentleman here, who examines the whole record of Judge Elliott's decision, as well as all the arguments and statements in this whole transaction from first to last, to say that he ever professed or undertook to be guided by or to follow the opinion of the judges of the Court of Appeal, as stated by the mover of this resolution. In no place will you find anything of the kind. Judge Elliott fills a responsible position; he had considered this matter when it came before him at the first; he decided that the notices were invalid, but out of deference to the request of the different lawyers engaged in the case, he withheld his decision until the Court of Appeal had expressed its opinion. That court gave no judgment, and one of the judges, Mr. Justice Osler, said that he would express no opinion on the question, because it would only be an *obiter dictum* at any rate. There is another peculiarity of this petition. Though it states that Judge Elliott's opinion is one way, and the opinion of the Court of Appeal another way, there is not a word in it to indicate whether Judge Elliott's decision was right, or the opinion of the Court of Appeal was right. I suppose that the person who framed this petition, a lawyer in the city of London, must have done it carefully, and must have had all the facts before him; and yet he could not frame a charge—which would be the foundation of an impeachment—to the effect that Judge Elliott was knowingly and wrongfully perverse in giving the decision he did. If you will read the petition from beginning to end, you will not find a single expression in it indicating that Judge Elliott's judgment is wrong, it may be perfectly right. It is not for this House to say, and it is not part of my argument to say, whether his judgment is right or not. The question is whether it was given conscientiously or not, and whether or not it comes within the class of cases described by Mr. Blake in the remarks he made which I have quoted. Now, the second charge in this petition is that Judge Elliott has written newspaper articles of a violent and partisan character; but before passing to that I think it would be only proper that we should for a few moments consider some of the reasons that Judge Elliott himself has given for coming to the decision he did. Now, I must tell you that the Court of Queen's Bench itself is the court that directed the revising barrister to proceed with a hearing of the appeal. They decided that the original notice of appeal was good, and they issued a mandamus directing this revising officer to go on and hear the appeals. Now, only a few weeks after that a similar application was made to the Chancery Division of the High Court of this province, some of the judges of which court had previously directed the issue of a mandamus to other revising barristers in just such cases as this; but when the three judges of the Chancery Division came together, Chancellor Boyd and his associate judges, in the case of the North Perth voters' lists, in *re* Hesson and Lloyd, they held that they had no authority whatever to control the action of a revising barrister by mandamus. To quote a few words from the judgment:

"To assert the jurisdiction now invoked would savour, to my mind, of unwarrantable judicial usurpation, both because the revising barristers sittings are not subordinate judicial courts *quoad* the province, and because these functionaries are officers of Canada engaged in the public work of the Dominion, over whom the High Court of Justice for Ontario has not inherent or statuable jurisdiction."

Now, you will see that in our own High Courts we find three judges of the Queen's Bench issuing a mandamus to a revising barrister, and we find in the Chancery Division, within a month of this decision, that division refusing to issue a mandamus against the revising officer for North Perth. Under such circumstances, it is almost a wonder that the newspapers have not teemed with abuse against one or other of those courts because they have taken each an entirely different position, three judges holding that there is jurisdiction and the other three holding that there is no jurisdiction whatever in the High Court to make such an order. I would like to refer for a few moments to the Act itself and show the cause of all this trouble. Now, the notice of appeal that was given in the city of London and which is the beginning of all this trouble, was an appeal notice against a number of people who were on the voters' list. The notice did not give any reason of appeal. It simply, in the column under which a reason for the appeal should have been given, used the words "not qualified." Now, the judge of the County of Middlesex has held throughout that that was no ground or reason whatever, that it might have been just as well to leave out the words "not qualified" and simply say: "I object to your name being on the voters' list." That is the contention. It might be fair to look at a few of his reasons and see whether this contention is not a very reasonable one indeed. If you will refer to the section of the Act, you will see that any person desiring to appeal against another whose name is upon the voters' list, shall give a certain notice in a certain manner to the person whose name he desires to have struck off the list. A form of notice is given in the schedule, marked D. Let me read it:

"I, of the electoral district of under the Electoral Franchise Act, give notice that I will apply to have the list of voters for polling district number of the said electoral district, for the year , as preliminarily revised, amended to add to or corrected (as the case may be.)"

Then follows: "State the name or names objected to, with the grounds therefor." It says distinctly you are to give "the grounds therefor." Now, Judge Elliott held that unless some grounds were given the notice would be invalid from the beginning and not even amendable; and in support of that opinion, he quoted an authority which is well worth looking at. He quoted, among several others, the case of Bridges *vs.* Miller. That was a case under the English Act, which is not exactly the same as ours, but which has very large powers of amend-

ment. The power of amendment in that Act reads as follows:—"The revising barrister may correct any mistake which is proved to be made in any claim or notice of objection." So that in England the revising barrister has power to correct any mistake which is known to have taken place in the notice. By our statute, there is also a very large power of amendment. The question as stated by Judge Elliott is this: This notice is invalid, it cannot be amended, and he quotes the case of Bridges against Miller, Law Reports, 20 Queen's Bench, page 287. That was a case similar to our own, in which the reasons of appeal had to be given, and the reasons given in that particular case to have the voter's name struck out were that he had not resided at 12 Clifton Street, Norwich. Well, a person would naturally think that when that notice came before the revising officer, he would allow the party objecting to amend his notice by specifying the particular qualification wanting. The fact of a person not residing at 12 Clifton Place would not be ground for striking his name off, but if it were stated that he had not resided there for six calendar months, that would have been a sufficient reason. The revising officer allowed the amendment, and the other side protested. The other party contended, as the Conservative party in London contended, that the notice was bad *ab initio*, and they took the case before the Court of Queen's Bench in England, which is presided over by Lord Coleridge. They contended that the revising barrister ought not to have amended the notice, which was wrong from the beginning. It was argued by the opposite side that the notice was amendable. What does Lord Coleridge say? He said:

"I am of opinion that the notice of objection was bad. In order to be registered as a parliamentary voter, a freeman of Norwich must have resided within seven miles of the city polling booths for six months."

The only insufficiency in that case was the omission of the words: You had not resided at No. 12 Clifton Street, for six calendar months; and Lord Coleridge held that that omission vitiated the notice from the beginning:

"This objection, which is dated August 12, simply says: 'You do not reside at 12 Clifton Street, Norwich.' Take it that Clifton Street is in Norwich, and that the non-residence imputed is proved, there is still nothing to show that the freeman either has or has not resided for the six months required by law. The objection, therefore, is no objection at all. It has been amended by the revising barrister; but there are limits to his statutory power of amendment. He can 'correct' a 'mistake,' but the defect in this objection is in no sense a 'mistake.' The objection is accurate enough in point of expression. Its fault is that it is bad, and the revising barrister, in making it good, has exceeded his power of amendment. The appeal must be allowed."

In that Justices Pollock and Hawkins concurred, and the notice was held to be bad from the beginning, and the amendment made by the revising barrister was struck out and the names were allowed to remain on the voters' list as if they had never been appealed against. Such is one of the decisions referred to by the judge who has given this question his most careful consideration, and it must be remembered that his decision was formed, not after the seat was vacant, but weeks and months before the election trial came off and before it was known that there would be another election for the city of London. Let us think over this matter for a moment. If no reasons for appeal were to be given, see what a hardship you would inflict upon the voter. There are different classes of franchise voters. There are income-franchise voters, there are tenants, there are property holders, all subject to certain rules under the statute entitled to be on the franchise list. Take the case of an income voter. The first requisite is that he shall be of age, the next is that he shall be a British subject, the next that he shall be a resident of Canada, the next that he shall have an income of $300, the next that he has derived that income for 12 months preceding, and that he has been a resident of Canada for 12 months and is a resident of the polling district. If the words "not qualified" are to be considered a ground or a reason to be given to that man for his name being struck off, see the position in which you put him. He would not know which of all these grounds his vote would be challenged on. It would be just as well to omit the words "not qualified" and simply to give him notice that he is appealed against. Can it be supposed possible that Parliament intended that, instead of giving a reason for the objection, the appellants should throw a *carte blanche* notice at the voter and simply say he is not qualified. That is the position which the judge took, and I think it is very reasonable. A man might be ill and unable to come to court. What witnesses has he to send there? He would have to send a witness to prove that he was of age. He would have to send another witness to prove that he was a British subject, another witness to show what his income was, and also another witness who could trace him twelve months back and show that he had received that income all that time. Would it be reasonable to suppose that that would be a proper construction of the statute? Even if you think that this contention of the hon. judge of the County of Middlesex is wrong, and that the notice is quite sufficient, that by no means makes him liable to impeachment, it is sufficient to consider, whether he came to a conscientious conclusion, or whether he was perverse and gave a judgment which was knowingly improper for the purpose of keeping Mr. Carling in his seat. Let me call your attention to section 33 of the Act which provides for an appeal from the decision of a revising barrister to the judge, and about the middle of the section you will see that it is provided that, when any person desires to appeal from the decision of the revising barrister, it is not enough for him to say he appeals, but he must give at least one reason for appealing against that decision. There is no stronger language in one section than in the other. The one section says he must give his grounds. What are grounds but reasons? This section says he must give at least one reason. Now, when this Franchise Act was being discussed some remarks to which I will refer were made on that very question which we are now discussing, as to the meaning of the words that a reason or a ground must be given for the objection. I quote from the *Hansard* of 1885, page 2361. Let us see what the House said on the subject then. Sir John Macdonald says:

"At least one reason—we can put it in that way."

"Mr. MILLS. If I understand the First Minister rightly, he proposes to leave it discretionary with the judge to say that, if the party proposes to proceed upon any other reason than that expressly assigned, he need not investigate the matter, and may throw the whole thing out.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I did not say that at all. That is not my intention.

"Mr. DAVIES. I suppose the hon. gentleman means by this that there must be a substantial reason for appealing stated in the notice. Suppose while a man is out of court for a moment the revising officer strikes his name

off. The man wants to appeal; he may give as a reason for being on the list, I own a property; but what reason would he give for appealing against the decision? He must state that the decision is wrong for some reason.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No man would appeal without having some reason.

"Mr. BOWELL. Suppose the reason he gives is: I am qualified. Suppose the revising officer says, you are not of age; he says, I am.

"Mr. DAVIES. Even a Minister of the Crown can be astray on this matter. No County Court judge would receive the appeal."

That is what the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says. Further on, in discussing the same section, Mr. Davies says:

"There is a distinction which, perhaps, the hon. gentleman did not see. The reason for appealing must be part of the notice, and without your reason for appealing your whole notice fails."

So that the crime of the county judge of the County of Middlesex is that he has given a decision in accordance with the common-sense views expressed by the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). Now, having shown, I think, very clearly that the judge has not only not acted in a perverse or wrong manner, but that he has the weight of authority to bear out the decision which he gave, let me remind you at the same time that there is no allegation whatever made that he has come to a wrong conclusion, so that, perhaps, in arguing as I have done, I may have been taking up the time of the House, because no one will find in the whole of this petition any charge or allegation of wrong-doing in the decision which the judge has given. Now, the next charge in the petition is that he has been guilty of writing articles in the public press in the city of London. Every person knows that when a charge of impropriety is made against any one, it ought to be clearly and distinctly made. I find it stated in Bourinot's work that if it is intended to proceed by a petition against a judge, all the allegations should be specifically stated so that the judge may have a full opportunity of answering the indictment as presented against him. Now, I would ask any hon. member if there is any indictment here against the judge in respect to the second part of the petition? The second part of the petition says that he wrote articles in the newspapers of a political character. Well, Sir, I never knew yet that a judge was prevented from having political opinions upon public questions. I do not think that that is either law or right. I fancy if you polled the whole judiciary in this country, you would hardly find a judge who would hesitate to give you his views upon the trade question of this country. Have you ever found a judge yet who considered that his mouth was closed in respect to political matters? Does any man in this House consider that because a man occupies a seat on the bench, he ceases to hold any views on political questions, that he never reads the newspapers, that he never discusses political trade questions? I can see no ground whatever for impeachment in that. Now, the petition goes on to say that he wrote newspaper articles of a violent and partisan character, bearing upon the revision of the voters' lists and upon the political questions of the day. Such an assertion is made in the petition, although the hon. member who moves this motion would not vouch for the truth of it. If the hon. gentleman knew Judge Elliott had been guilty of writing violent and partisan articles that would be condemned by people of common sense, why does not the hon. gentleman produce them, when he has only to step but a little way from this Chamber to find them?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is not the charge.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I will read the charge:

"The said William Elliott, during the said election and while the said appeals were pending before him, contributed editorially and also under an assumed name to the London *Free Press* newspaper, articles of a violent and partisan character bearing upon the said revision of the voters' list and political questions of the day, and particularly upon the said election for the said electoral district and in support of the candidature of the said Carling and against the said Hyman."

That is exactly what I said before, he is charged with writing violent partisan articles concerning this election. I repeat that we are the tribunal who ought to have an opportunity of judging whether the articles are of a violent or partisan character; and if the writings are to be found within a few steps of where we stand now, they ought to be produced, and the gentleman who moved the resolution ought to take upon himself the responsibility of saying: I pledge my position here, as member of this House, that Judge Elliott wrote those articles. Or, at any rate, he ought to produce the affidavit of some person of veracity who would say to this House that there was ground for believing that he did write these articles. The hon. gentleman, at the beginning of his remarks, said he would not vouch for the truth of what is contained in the petition, but when he comes to that part of the petition concerning articles in the *Free Press*, and the files of that paper are at hand, he should at least bring them forward and point out the articles, and let us judge whether the articles were proper to be written by a judge or not. Now, if the judge came here to respond to charges in that petition, he would have a right to know what the articles were that he was charged with writing, so that he might be asked whether he wrote them. The very object of bringing the charge here is, first, that it may be brought to our knowledge, and that we may ourselves judge whether the article alleged to have been written by this man is one that, in our opinion, a judge ought not to have written. But such is not the position. The article is not produced, we have nothing whatever upon which to base an indictment. Charges like this are too vague upon which to base an indictment of the meanest criminal that was ever brought before a court. Now, can you fancy an indictment like this which would stand for a moment? The only conclusion I can come to is this: I have a right to assume that there was no article in the *Free Press* ever written by Judge Elliott that would not stand the light of day before this House of Commons. I have a right to assume that, because this petition has been carefully drawn, and the best showing that could be made has doubtless been made by the lawyer for the Reform interest in the city of London who drew up this petition. The next part of the charge is:

"After the said election and before deciding said appeals, the said William Elliott in strong and violent language denounced the said Hyman and his supporters and stated to several electors of the said city, that the said Carling would certainly get the seat in the House of Commons for the said electoral district."

Well, now, will any hon. gentleman attempt to say that this is a specific allegation sufficiently plain to

be sent to the judge for the purpose of answering it? It does not state the person to whom the language is used, and, above all, it does not state the language itself by which we can judge if it was improper to be used by a judge. I would call attention to the different cases of a similar character that have come before us. There was a case in reference to Justice Wood, of Manitoba; there was another, I think, in reference to one of the County Court judges. I fail to find a petition in any one of these cases that does not specifically and clearly set out the allegation. Even in the case of Chief Justice Wood, of Manitoba, the very position that he was in when he made the statement charged against him as improper was set forth, he is alleged to have been sitting in a barber's chair at the time. It was not merely said that he made an improper statement, but the actual statement itself was given in the petition. No person in this House can for a moment undertake to say that the charge made in this case, which is simply that he used certain expressions, would be sufficient to entitle us to call upon Judge Elliott to come here to give an answer to nothing, because that is what the petition really is. I therefore believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be proper for this House to come to the conclusion that no impropriety whatever is embraced in the first part of this petition, and that neither the first charge, nor the second charge, nor the third charge in the petition is of such a character that we should call upon any person to answer. Unable, as I said, and as we must assume that the framer of the petition was, to specifically allege any charges of improper conduct against the judge, it certainly was an unkind cut indeed to make these general charges without any specific allegation against one of the purest and most conscientious judges who sits on the bench in Ontario. The parties to this petition, unable to make any specific charge that would hold water against Judge Elliott, have cast their imputation in a general way so that it may cut as deep as it likes. Sir, it would not be out of place for me to say, that any person occupying the position which Judge Elliott does, must feel deeply hurt at the vile charges that are made against his decision in this case. He must feel that he has been stabbed in the dark, and wounded by the motion which has been made to-day against him. I am sure if Judge Elliott had an opportunity to speak on the floor of this House, he would demand: What charge is made against me: have I done any wrong in doing what I did? Neither the petition nor the mover of the petition have charged him with writing anything improper, and there is not a man in the House who can point to an article which Judge Elliott ever wrote that it was improper for him to have written. If that charge could have been made it is quite certain that it would have been stated in the petition. There is no person in this House who can state what language Judge Elliott used that was improper for him to have used, or upon what occasion he used it, or else it would have been stated in the petition. I say, therefore, that it was an unkind cut to make this general charge to go broadcast to the country, without making any specific allegation against him. I most sincerely hope for the credit of the city of London itself that the action of the political promoters of this petition has neither, as I may say, been born in defeat nor nursed in vindictiveness; but it does seem to me, Sir, that this defeat and the vindictiveness shown is the cause of this judge being persecuted in the way he is. Mr. Speaker, when this House has deliberated over this matter for some time longer, which it is only proper that it should do with the greatest care and the greatest of caution, I do hope that in the discussion which follows that party feeling will not at any rate go so far as to seek to condemn a judge on a petition of this kind. If such should take place in this House, it would show the wisdom of the Act of Parliament which has been passed removing impeachment trials from the political arena, and from the range of party feelings. I feel that if I should come to any other conclusion but that, I should vote against this resolution. I should do myself wrong, and I should do my conscience wrong. I cannot, Sir, in the face of the petition and in the face of the avowal that the mover of it has made in this House, favour for one moment the calling of Judge Elliott before the bar to answer charges that are mythically made in this petition, and which I do not believe can be substantiated. I do not believe that any charge could be substantiated against the judge which would warrant the general aspersions which have been made here. If such specific charges could be made, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe they would have been more particularly set forth in this petition and that we would all have had an opportunity of judging of the articles that it is alleged were written, and of the remarks he made. I believe, Sir, that the good sense of hon. members will cause them to see the injustice done to Judge Elliot, by this motion.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 96) respecting the St. John and Maine Railway Company and the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Hazen.)

Bill (No. 18) respecting certain Railway Works in the City of Toronto.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Ross, Lisgar.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guillet.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Canso and Louisburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Gillies.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Masson.)

Bill (No. 73) to amend the Act to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

CHARGES AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Edgar, that certain charges of corruption against Sir Adolphe P. Caron be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is, perhaps, just as well that a considerable interval of time has been allowed to elapse between the initiation of this debate and its present stage. Looking at the great importance of the question submitted for the consideration of the House, it is certainly desirable that every member of this House on either side should be in a position to feel that he had considered fully and completely all the issues that are involved in the proper decision of this question, that no man should be allowed to plead hereafter that he was taken by surprise or that he gave his vote, whatever it may be, hurriedly or under a misconception of the true issues involved in this question; and I cannot but hope that the opportunity for reflection which has been given to the members of this House will elicit from both sides some condemnation of the subterfuges by which it has been attempted to diminish the rights and dignities of Parliament and to screen the alleged offender from the investigation which, under the circumstances, ought most assuredly to be made into the charges preferred. As I have said, the question is one of the most grave possible character, and surely those of us who recollect the events of the last session, surely those of us who know how gravely the fair fame of Canada has suffered from the revelations which were made of corruption in the various departments of Government, should hesitate before committing this country to the still further degradation which I regret to say was prefigured in the speech delivered to the House on this question by the hon. Minister of Justice. Up to this time, it has been possible, though with some reserves, for members on the other side to say that at any rate they had not wilfully and deliberately impeded the process of investigation into charges made against members of this House. I say with some reserves, because I cannot at all admit that everything that was done last session warranted the assertion that the present Government have always abstained from wilfully putting obstacles in the way of the investigation of charges against members of the Cabinet. In the first place, I want to call attention to the nature of the charge preferred by my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) against the Postmaster General. That charge, which has now been for more than three weeks on our Journals, sets forth in terms that the hon. the Postmaster General was instrumental during the period of time from 1882 to 1891 in procuring large sums of money to be expended for the benefit of two railways, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway and the Temiscouata Railway. That during the whole of that time, if I understand the charge aright, that hon. gentleman was actively engaged in, and profiting more or less from, the receipt of these large subsidies which he, a Minister of the Crown, had advised to be granted to these railways; that besides, he had corruptly used a large proportion of the subsidies granted by Parliament for the purpose of debauching the electors in a large number of counties. Now, I want the House to understand that if these charges be proved, that the Minister beyond all question stands guilty of conspiracy and embezzlement, he stands guilty of more, he stands guilty of having committed this embezzlement for political purposes, that being one of the gravest offences that can possibly be committed against parliamentary government. The charge that is made against the Postmaster General is, in terms, the charge of treason against this commonwealth. He, a Minister of the Crown, doubly bound, first, as a member of this House, and next, as a Minister of State, to see to it that every farthing of the people's money is applied to the object for which it was granted by this House—he stands accused of having conspired to steal the property of the whole people of Canada, and of having used it for the purpose of debauching a large section of the electors. Sir, he stands guilty, if these charges are proved, of a breach of trust of the worst possible kind. Let me ask this House: For what end were these subsidies granted? They were granted on the solemn assurance of the Government that these railroads which it was desired to assist, were works calculated to advantage the whole of this Dominion. Whose duty was it to see that that money so granted was expended as this House had ordered it to be expended? Whose duty but that of the Minister of the Crown in the first place, and of this Parliament in the second? On whose advice, I ask again, were these large sums of money, close upon $2,000,000, granted to these railways? On the direct advice and responsibility of the Ministers of the Crown, of whom the Postmaster General then and now was one. Now, Sir, the allegation is that the Minister, if these charges be proved true, has violated his oath of office, and he is charged clearly and distinctly with embezzling the public funds, and doubling his crime by the use to which the stolen money has been put. That is the charge specifically made, with full and ample notice, placed several days before it was advanced, in the hands of the Government and in the hands of every member of this House; and, Sir, the Minister of Justice rises in his place to tell us that he sees no harm in charges like this; the Minister of Justice of this Dominion can see no ground for investigation, if the facts stated by my hon. friend are proved by him to be true, he dares to tell us that in all this he sees nothing which calls for the attention of Parliament. He presumes to talk to us of other courts being open in which actions of this kind may be more fittingly brought than in the high court of Parliament; he presumes to talk of the vagueness and indistinctness of the charges preferred by my hon. friend. Sir, it is not the vagueness that troubles this hon. gentleman, it is the fact that these charges are clear, distinct and specific, involving, as they do, the right of a great many members in this House to occupy the seats they now hold. That is the reason, and none other, why the hon. gentleman objects to these charges being investigated. Mr. Speaker, for my part, I find it very hard indeed to say which the plea of the Minister of Justice lacks most, whether it is most deficient in logic, or whether it is most deficient in morality. But what it lacks in logic and what it lacks in morality, at least it makes up in downright effrontery. Sir, I hold in my hand two very remarkable declarations, one made a very short

time ago by the hon. gentleman himself; another made on a somewhat different occasion by the present leader of this Government, which I will, with your permission, read to the House. Here is what the hon. Premier said in another place, directing his language to the Opposition in that place:

"I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to join with us in trying to find out what the facts are about this alleged rascality. We ask them to give us the benefit of their experience in this enquiry, to assist us in ascertaining the facts and placing them before the public, in order that they may be dealt with properly, and, if found guilty, that summary vengeance may be exercised upon those who are found guilty of appropriating public money—stealing—be they high or low. That is the determination of this Government and this side of the House."

This, Sir, was the declaration of the Premier of this Government no longer than the 7th August last, as I find it reported in the Debates of the Senate on the subject of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Scandal. That was the virtuous resolution come to and solemnly announced by the present Premier. And not to be behindhand, a very few months after, we find the present Minister of Justice unburdening himself in the following fashion:—

"He (Sir John Thompson) repeated the invitation made elsewhere, that if any one has any evidence of wrong-doing against any official or member of Parliament, he pledged his honour that the fullest investigation should be made and the information used in the prosecution and punishment of the guilty party. Mr. Abbott's Government was fully determined and pledged to investigate, root out and punish wrong-doing wherever they found it."

Brave words, Mr. Speaker, most excellent brave words. And now that the charge is made, now that the accusation is brought forward with all possible due formality by my hon. friend, this House had the exhibition, but a few weeks ago, of how the Minister of Justice is prepared to redeem his solemn pledge, what interpretation he puts upon the declarations of himself and of his leader. Sir, I am not in the slightest degree disposed to extenuate the offence alleged to have been committed by the Postmaster General, if he be found guilty of what my hon. friend has charged against him; but I will say that the Postmaster General is, in my opinion, the honester man of the two. There are certain cases, and this is one of them, in which such a defence as was submitted to us the other day, is a worse crime, is calculated to do more injury to public morality, is calculated to degrade the country, of which such men are Ministers, more, even, than the acts which we condemn. Now, Sir, although, to judge from the silence with which these remarks were received by his own followers on that occasion, they did not agree with him and I might therefore pass them over more lightly. I will proceed to analyse the flimsy sophistries which the Minister of Justice was good enough to entertain the House with on this momentous occasion. He told us that charges such as I have described, charges of that gravity and weight, did not really call for the attention of Parliament. Let me ask this House, let me ask this country, for what purpose does Parliament exist? Sir, Parliament exists, as I understand it, for these three chief ends: Parliament exists, first, to vote supplies from the people of Canada for the purpose of carrying on the Government of this country. Next, Sir, Parliament sits here at great cost to the people of this country, for the purpose of seeing that these moneys are honestly and properly expended, and for the purpose of punishing any delinquents, be they high or low, who abuse the trust that Parliament has reposed in them. I would like to know whether the Minister of Justice, or whether any of his friends opposite, will dare to rise in their places and tell us that they consider, that if it be true large sums of money have been taken from these subsidies voted for the construction of these railways and have been expended for the purpose of debauching a large body of the electorate, that they consider that that money was properly spent, that they consider that a rightful use of these railway subsidies is for the purpose of corrupting and debauching the electorate of Canada. I would rather, for my part, reverse the position, and I would rather ask these gentlemen to explain if they can, what fault can by possibility be greater than the fault which is charged against the hon. Postmaster General. It strikes not merely at the root of parliamentary government, it strikes at the very foundation of our liberty, and I cannot help but regretting that a gentleman like the Minister of Justice of whom we once hoped better things, should have lowered himself and lowered the dignity of his high office by becoming, or appearing to become, the apologist for such conduct. Sir, I had hoped, and so had others on this side of the House a year ago, that although the hon. gentleman was in exceedingly bad company, yet that possibly he might have shaken himself free to some extent from the trammels of his evil associations: but in his case as in many others we have to repeat the old adage, *facilis est descensus Averni*. I likened him some time ago to a grey sheep among a lot of black ones, but I am sorry to say that his fleece is become of quite as inky a blackness as theirs. I am sorry to say that these evil associations, or it may possibly be the imperative political exigencies of his position have driven him to assume an attitude before this House, of which I would fain hope he and his followers alike are ashamed in their hearts. I tell the Minister of Justice that the very chiefest end and object of Parliament is to form a court wherein these powerful offenders who cannot be dealt with by ordinary means and by ordinary courts of law, may be brought to justice, and where their offences may be exposed. I tell him, further, that the man who denies that that is one of the main functions of Parliament does all that in him lies to bring Parliament and parliamentary government into contempt. Sir, the Minister of Justice talks to us of other courts being open for the purpose of impeaching the Postmaster General for such acts. Where are these courts? He did not name them, nor have I heard any one of those who followed him on the other side of the House undertake to name them. Let him state the tribunal, if he can, which is capable of taking cognizance of such acts as those of which my hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) has impeached the Postmaster General. Let him tell us in whose name the action should be brought. Are we to bring it in the name of the Minister of Justice, who sees no harm in these things, so that he may at his convenience and for his colleagues' advantage, enter, I suppose, a *nolle prosequi* and put an end to the proceedings. Mr. Speaker, it is trifling with this House, it is trifling with this country, to find a gentleman in his position talking to us of being able to try these matters in the election courts. Surely his own experience, surely the experience of

the Minister of Finance, surely the experience of the Minister of Marine would have been enough to teach us what sort of tribunal these election courts are when you want to indict Ministers of the Crown of bribery and corruption. Three of these hon. gentlemen, if my memory serves, have been indicted of bribery and corruption: not one of them has been brought to trial yet, and apparently, judging from what we see, there is the extremest difficulty in bringing any of them to trial at all. More than that, Sir, no man knows better than the Minister of Justice that these facts have only come into our possession within a very short period, and that it is the merest mockery to talk now of invoking the election courts: election courts which have discharged their functions for years and years, and election courts which under no possible circumstances could be utilized for the purpose of proving those acts which my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has charged. Is the Minister of Justice going to repeat here to us the monstrous doctrine that if these hon. gentlemen are able to cover up their tracks, if these hon. gentlemen are able to conceal from the House and from the country the very pretty pranks they appear to have been playing during the late elections, and the preceding elections, that therefore, because with all the aid and resources of the Government to back them, they can conceal their tracks for a certain time, they are consequently entitled to absolute immunity? Was a more monstrous absurdity ever propounded by either clerk or layman? The Minister of Justice knows well, and we are all of us, I fancy, sufficiently acquainted with legal proceedings to know that if there is one doctrine better known to English justice than another it is: That men who occupy the position of trustees, as the Postmaster General and his colleagues do in a double sense, cannot under any circumstances plead limitation of time as a bar to action against a breach of their trust. Monstrous as the allegation is, that because, as I have said, they have succeeded for a time in concealing their iniquity, they should, therefore, escape punishment and exposure, it is at least equally absurd to bring the charge of vagueness against the accusation of my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar). If ever transactions were plainly and distinctly stated they are stated in this set of charges which I now hold in my hand. You have the dates given, you have the places given, you have the *modus operandi* fully entered into in every shape, and my hon. friend over and above all that professes to be prepared and ready to give ample and minute proof of all that he has asserted. I repeat that what these hon. gentlemen opposite really do fear is not the indefiniteness, but the exceeding definiteness and precision of the evidence which my hon. friend is prepared to submit. Then, Sir, to turn to another aspect of this case. I am amazed, I am astonished at the intolerable cowardice which this Government with their huge majority display on an occasion like this. I could understand the action which the Government are taking if they were being dealt with as the Premier of one of our provinces was lately dealt with by the Lieutenant Governor thereof. If they had been called upon to plead their case before a Commission, a hostile Commission, mainly composed of men known to be hostile to them and appointed by a political enemy, then I could have understood, perhaps, their hesitation at committing their fate to such a tribunal. But what does my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Edgar) propose? He proposes to bring his charge before a body composed, two-thirds at least, of this gentleman's own most staunch supporters: two-thirds of whom they themselves selected and chose, according to the rules of our House. Why, Sir, before such a tribunal does any man doubt that the accused party would get the benefit of every possible doubt that could be raised in his favour? Does any man doubt that before such a tribunal every legal plea, or every legal quibble, I might say, which could be urged in his behalf, or for the purpose of averting and balking the investigation, would, to say the least of it, receive its full weight? And yet the Government dare not face such a tribunal as that. Mr. Speaker, the evidence is irresistible, the evidence is clear, the evidence is plain: the Government must know that my hon. friend's proofs are of a character that cannot be gainsaid or denied, or otherwise it would be their clear interest to court investigation before such a body as that, knowing that if they could find a flaw in my hon. friend's indictment, he could not possibly escape from such a tribunal without severe censure and rebuke. Sir, the very climax of absurdity appeared to me to be reached in that part of the speech of the Minister of Justice in which he declared that he, forsooth, objected to going before the Committee on Privileges and Elections because it was a partial tribunal. Consider, Sir, his nice sense of honour—the Minister of Justice had rather go before no tribunal at all than before a tribunal which he thinks might be too partial to himself. That is his reason as given in the speech in *Hansard* for objecting to a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Well, Sir, again I have recourse to the old maxim, *volenti non fit injuria*. My hon. friend takes the risk; his is the loss, his the danger, nobody else's; and the nice scruples of the Minister of Justice surely cannot lead him any further, when my hon. friend who prefers the charge and takes the risk is willing to submit his case to such a tribunal as I have described. Sir, there is a reason, and I suspect an exceedingly good reason, why the present Government object, and object very strongly, to deal with the offence alleged to have been committed by the hon. Postmaster General. We have not sat in this House so long without understanding thoroughly that the hon. Postmaster General has been for many years one of the inner ring, and thoroughly familiar with all the machinery by which fields were fought and won in electoral campaigns. We have not been here for so many years, Sir, without knowing enough of the character of that hon. gentleman to know that being thus thoroughly familiar with all the inner details of those campaigns, he is not, and I do not blame him for it, disposed to be made the scapegoat and to pay the whole cost of any little delinquencies that may come to light. Mr. Speaker, what my hon. friend has brought to light, and what I know well he will prove if the opportunity is given him, is after all only part and parcel of that colossal scheme of corruption by which and under which Canada has been governed for the last fourteen years. I know well, Sir, and the Ministers of the Crown know well, how the elections of 1882 were won, how the elections of 1887 were won, how the elections of 1891 were won, and how the recent bye-elections, if they will

have it, were bought and sold likewise. Sir, we know that the merest corner of the veil was lifted by the disclosures of last session; and I say to this House that if this investigation and the others demanded by the Opposition, be had, we shall see, and all Canada will see, with regard to the mode in which Canada has been governed for these many years past, that not on this continent, Tammany Hall itself not excepted, has there ever been such a system of organized corruption as that investigation and others like it would expose. There are many other forms of corruption and abuse to which this system of railway subsidies has been put. I do not mean to say that among the hundred or more subsidies granted of late years there may not have been some half dozen, more or less, which did to some extent redeem the pledges on which they were given, and which may have been for works for the real benefit of the country at large. But I do say that, taking the railway subsidies as a whole, they have been one of those sources of organized corruption by which the Government have held and kept their power; and I for my part do not wonder in the least at finding many men objecting to this investigation, knowing as I do how these same railway subsidies have been used for the corruption of members of Parliament, how they have been tolled for the private advantage of members of Parliament, how stock formerly worthless has been made valuable by means of subsidies got by political influence, how in many ways they have been used in debauching representatives and constituencies alike; and it will be well for hon. gentlemen opposite to remember that if they object to these broad statements, as they call them, their refusal to investigate charges like these justifies and proves them in the eyes of the public, and in the eyes of every honest man. More than that, Sir, there are other and grave consequences which may flow to the people of this country if the ill-advised declaration of the Minister of Justice is sustained by his supporters. Sir, I warn hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that although they may vote this motion down, although they may abuse this majority of theirs got by the means I have indicated, for the purpose of preventing this investigation, most assuredly—and I pledge my honour to the Minister of Justice to that effect—most assuredly the matter shall not end there. Let them refuse, Sir, if they dare. I want to see if there are enough among the 120 or 130 members who support the hon. gentleman to save Sodom from destruction. The number is not great, and I hope to see them stand forward. But, Sir, whether they do or not, I pledge these hon. gentlemen that whether or not they vote us down, they shall not vote this matter down in the public eye. I tell them that these things shall have publicity, and that if they refuse an investigation, all Canada, all England, the whole of the United States, every English-speaking community, shall ring with the tidings of their shame; and Sir, I leave it to them to consider, each and all of them, how they will like it when under these circumstances they find themselves forced to bring actions in courts of law or sit down convicted and dishonoured for ever. Sir, it is easy to see how one evil precedent brings another. I could hardly have believed that the hon. gentlemen would have ventured this length but for the political exigencies which compelled them, in spite of their own repeated declarations, to refuse last year the investigation asked for by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) into the doings in connection with Section B, and I can easily understand what a lever that refusal has been in the hands of the hon. Postmaster General, and how justly, for the matter of that, from his point of view, he can plead that if you do not investigate the misdoings of other members of the Government, you have no right to investigate mine. Then there is a third consideration which most assuredly ought to have weight with hon. gentlemen opposite. Those hon. gentlemen are continually talking to us of the superior loyalty of their policy and the superior loyalty of their principles. Well, I have often expressed here and elsewhere my own private opinion of the commercial value of their loyalty, and not many hours have elapsed since we had the opportunity of seeing how ill-disposed, when called upon, they were to give effect to their loyalty to the mother country by touching the pockets of their own supporters. But I would ask the House and these gentlemen, and more especially I would ask the advisers of the Crown, to consider well the sorry position in which they are placing the Crown by the advice they are apparently now giving the Crown to refuse all investigation into charges brought against one of its Ministers. I said a little while ago that the Postmaster General had a double responsibility. He is, in the first place, a member of this House, and in that capacity a trustee of the people of Canada, but he is likewise a member of the executive committee of the Privy Council and a sworn adviser of the Crown. Now, unfortunately, perhaps, for Canada and for the Crown, the Ministers of the Crown have, to a certain extent, the honour of the Crown in their keeping; and I tell them they have given most evil advice to His Excellency if, as I must presume, before they came down here the other day to make the statement they did, they had advised His Excellency that it was expedient to refuse an investigation into the conduct of one of his Ministers. I say that they could do no one thing more likely to bring the honour and dignity of the Crown into disrespect than to give such advice. If they had plotted to destroy the dignity of the Crown, they could do it in no better way. And when we compare what took place under our own eyes in another province, when we compare the action taken by a deputy of the Crown, under circumstances not calling in half so extreme a degree for the action of the Crown as those enumerated in the charges brought forward by my hon. friend, all I can tell them is this, that they are doing their very best to provoke men to make comparisons in no way to the credit of the responsible advisers of the Governor General here. I make no comparison. It is not my place on the present occasion to do so, but I can tell hon. gentlemen that in every part of Canada those comparisons are being drawn, and if the dignity of the Crown suffers, it is owing to the evil advice given by these evil advisers. It is to their disloyal and treacherous advice that any injury which may accrue to our present form of government must fairly be traced. But it is not enough that these hon. gentlemen should dishonour the Crown. They must likewise strike at the very root of parliamentary government, they must likewise strike at all public morality besides by this refusal of theirs to have the charges investigated. If this refusal be

persisted in, if, when charges like these are preferred, Ministers of the Crown continue to deny the right of Parliament to investigate them and ascertain on what evidence they have been made, and to inflict a fitting punishment if they are sustained, then we can come to no other conclusion but that the Ministers of the Crown in Canada are prepared to proclaim that it is the duty of Ministers to steal funds wherever they can get them, to betray their oaths of office, and to use those stolen funds for the purpose of debauching the electorate. For that and nothing else is implied by their refusal to investigate the charges preferred by the hon. member for Ontario. I repeat, and it cannot be too often or too clearly stated, that in a case like this, refusal to investigate is of necessity tantamount to a confession of guilt. All men so interpret it, all men must of necessity so interpret it, and all men, I may say, apart from the pledged supporters of the Government in this House, are even now prepared to so interpret it. It is not a question for casuists, but it is becoming a very practical question whether, if the Government of Canada confess, as by refusal to investigate they do confess, that such are the doctrines they teach and preach, whether to a Government like that any allegiance is due. If those charges be true, their parliamentary majority for long years has been maintained by means which can be characterized as nothing else than the proceeds of deliberate theft ; and I again add that if that investigation be still refused their parliamentary majority is used as an instrument for the condoning and perpetration of robbery. It may well be said that in Canada, at any rate, parliamentary government is on its trial, and it may be added that by such a refusal as this the very existence of Canada is gravely imperilled. Men are asking in many parts of Canada why they should submit to bear the tremendous losses they are daily obliged to encounter, when they find such doctrines as this abound, when they find the most ordinary justice is denied to the members of the Opposition when they bring forward charges of this gravity. Do they suppose that such a course is going to reconcile men to bearing quietly these losses? Do they suppose that such a course is going to intensify the feelings of loyalty of the people to the Crown, and make them bear patiently losses which have driven so many of them to seek a refuge in another land? They may very well ask what useful end such a Government as this can profess to serve. If Government is good for anything, it is for the purpose of promoting the moral and material welfare of the people. I would ask what moral end such a Government as this can subserve? How they have advanced our material welfare, the records of the last census tell but too well. Last year the revelations then made went a very long way, I am sorry to say, to destroy the respect all men would like to feel for the Government of the country in which they live, and for the Parliament with whose aid that Government administers the affairs of the country. But if this last degradation be inflicted, I tell hon. gentlemen opposite they go extremely far towards destroying the last vestige of national self-respect. If they wish that Canada shall henceforth be known as a country, not merely in which shameful frauds have been brought to light, but as the one country, perhaps, among all English-speaking nations enjoying representative institutions, where such frauds, when exposed, escape punishment and are rewarded with immunity, they have merely to persist refusing this investigation. They will not even go through the mere form of justice. They will not even allow my hon. friend to state in detail the reasons and give the proofs on which his charges are based, and finally, we have of all men in the country, the Minister of Justice, the man who is bound by his oath of office to see that no evil-doers can escape punishment, if the proof only be brought forward, the man who has pledged his honour again and again that any charge preferred in Parliament or out of it against any supporter of the Government, much more against any colleague, shall receive full and complete investigation : we find him, with these words scarcely ceasing to vibrate on his lips, rising in his place, becoming the chief apologist of criminals and deciding to use his high position and great parliamentary majority for the purpose of thwarting and defeating the ends of justice.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to follow the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the line of argument he has adopted, but I am sure that he must feel gratified that this motion has been made, if for no other reason than because he has had an opportunity afforded him of scattering some of that store of parliamentary vitriol with which he is so largely supplied. The hon. gentleman began with an attack upon the Minister of Justice, he followed that by attacking the Conservative party generally, he then made some insinuations which would seem to be intended to intimidate the representative of the Queen in this country, and he wound up with a general denunciation of our country, Canada, itself. I am only glad that his remarks did not seem to excite very much enthusiasm among the gentlemen who sit behind him. I will proceed as shortly as I can to discuss, I hope in a somewhat different temper from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, the serious question now before the House, and I hope I feel the importance of the question, one which is fraught with importance to the House itself and to this country. There can be no matter of greater importance to this country than the purity and integrity of this Parliament and its members, and alongside of that we have to consider some other interests which are also involved. We have to consider the rights of the members of this House as individuals, and we have to consider the rights of minorities in this House. I propose to discuss shortly the matters involved in this question, and in so doing I would like to state briefly my view of the law in regard to charges of this nature. This is a pure matter of law. It does not seem to me to be a matter for such declamation as we have been treated to from the other side of the House. It is a purely legal question. A proposition is made to the House, charges are made against an hon. gentleman similar in character to an indictment in a court, and it is a question of law whether this Parliament should enter into the investigation of that charge or not. Now, in the first place, I wish to say a few words with reference to what charges have in the past been investigated by Parliament when made against its members, and I wish to say that the Minister of Justice, though perhaps not fully stating the law on that subject, was more correct than the leader of the Opposition seemed to think he was.

I understood the Minister of Justice to say that this Parliament was not a court of justice to enquire into the private conduct of its members. I believe that statement is correct, and I would like to read to the House a statement of Mr. Morley, in his Life of Edmund Burke, dealing with the question of privilege as it existed in the time of Burke, and he, a philosophic statesman of great repute in England and a profound thinker, gives his opinion on page 97 of the Life as follows:—

"The bulk of the members in those bad times, as on many previous occasions and some since, could not divest themselves of the idea that the House is a court of law. The mischief flowing from such a doctrine is sufficiently obvious. The public liberties were as much in peril from these arbitrary assumptions of an oligarchic chamber, as they had ever been from the arbitrary assumptions of an unconstitutional sovereign."

And that doctrine is borne out also by Hallam's Constitutional History, a work which, for absolute fairness and profound thought, I think any gentleman in this House will admit to be an authority. The hon. the leader of the Opposition was extremely unfortunate in the two cases he selected as instances against the rule laid down by the leader of this House. The cases of De Cobain and Sadleir were not cases supporting the leader of the Opposition. As was pointed out by the Minister of Marine, these gentlemen were expelled from the House of Commons for altogether different reasons. The House did not investigate the offences. Mr. Sadleir's case was investigated by a commission, and he was found guilty of the offence, but the House held no investigation into it, nor did it into the case of Mr. De Cobain. As far as I have been able to arrive at a conclusion on this matter, the House has no power to expel a member except for an offence committed in his capacity as a member of the House, or when he is convicted by some outside tribunal of some serious offence such as a felony, or when he is an outlaw and has fled from justice, as in the case of Louis Riel in this Parliament. There is another case, and that is the misapplication of public money. These, as far as I have been able to learn, are the only cases in which the House of Commons in England has ever exercised its jurisdiction. There is one case to which I will call attention, and that is the case of Mr. Cawthorne. In Bourinot's Parliamentary Practice it was stated that he was expelled from Parliament for conduct unbecoming a gentleman and an officer. If that were a correct statement, it would be going a very long distance, because any one having a seat in Parliament would be compelled to square his conduct day and night with the views of the majority as to what constituted conduct becoming an officer and a gentleman, but investigation shows that that was not the case in regard to Mr. Cawthorne. He was found guilty by a court-martial of disgraceful conduct, and the House based its action on that finding of the court-martial but made no investigation itself, and he was expelled because he had been found guilty by the court-martial. It is necessary that this House should proceed carefully with these matters. This Parliament of Canada has had occasion more than once to regret action it has taken on matters of privilege. The English House of Commons has also had reason to regret it. We are all familiar with the case of Mr. John Wilkes, who was expelled and in regard to whom the House of Commons was obliged a few years afterwards by the force of reason to expunge all the minutes in regard to him from their records because they were found to be unconstitutional. The same thing took place here in regard to Mr. Lyon Mackenzie, and in England the case of Mr. Bradlaugh was somewhat similar. So that it must be quite clear to the House that in proceedings of such a serious nature as the investigation into the character of one of its members, the House should proceed deliberately, temperately and calmly. I would like to direct the attention of the House to the procedure given in May's Constitutional History, which is quoted by Bourinot with regard to these matters. May says:

"Both Houses of Parliament must act within the limits of their jurisdiction, and in strict conformity with the law."

He is now speaking of expelling members of Parliament:

"An abuse of privilege is even more dangerous than an abuse of prerogative. In the one case the wrong is done by an irresponsible body: in the other the Ministers who advised it are open to censure and punishment."

I want to draw particular attention to the next paragraph where May says:

"The judgment of offences should be guided by the severest principles of law."

So I say that in approaching this question we are not to assume that because an hon. gentleman gets up on the other side of the House, or upon this side, and makes a charge, therefore the House is bound to enter into an investigation of that charge. The House has another and a higher duty to perform; it has to regard the precedents that have been established, and it has a duty to the House that will follow it to establish, in its turn, good precedents; and this charge of the hon. member for West Ontario must now be investigated in the light of the precedents and in the light of the principles laid down by May and Bourinot. Now, coming to the charge itself, there is, I may say, a legal presumption that it has been made as strong as it could well be made. I am quite sure that the hon. member for West Ontario had the assistance of the many able legal lights that sit close around him. I am quite sure they burned the mid-night oil over this charge; I am sure that every word was carefully weighed and put in its proper place, and the piece of mosaic made as highly coloured as it could possibly be made. The same rule applies in criminal matters in courts of law. Indictments are to be very strictly construed; and a charge of this sort by one member of this House against another, must be construed strictly, the language must be taken in the natural sense in which it is written, especially in a case like the present, where it is drawn by a legal gentleman of great experience, assisted no doubt by others of equal talent. Therefore, I think the House can, at any rate, congratulate itself that these charges are made as strong as possible. There are omissions in this charge which I think tell in favour of the Postmaster General. In the first place, it is only fair that the attention of the House should be drawn to the fact that there is no charge that the Postmaster General profited personally in this matter; there is no charge that he used any of this money for his personal benefit. Whatever there may be in this distinction, the Postmaster General is entitled to the benefit of it. The Postmaster General is charged with political corruption, if corruption it be, but not for his own

personal benefit. It is also clear from the charge that these subsidies were properly granted to these companies. There is not a word in the charge hinting that the Government was wrong in granting subsidies to these railways. It is clear these subsidies were regularly paid over to these railways; it is clear that the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company paid the subsidy money over to their contractors; and the wrong-doing, if any, was between the contractors and the Postmaster General. So that as far as that is concerned, we obtain some important admissions from the form in which the charges are drawn. Now, I wish to direct attention particularly to the ninth and tenth charges, and I desire to point out what is, of course, evident, that in a resolution of this sort which we are invited to adopt in its entirety, the charge is like a rope, it must be judged by its weakest part. If there is one section containing a serious charge in this indictment which this House should not entertain, then that paragraph must be struck out, or the resolution must be voted down. Certainly it is fair that a man who is put upon his trial should have some definite information of what he is charged with; he must have some notice as to what the particular items charged against him are. Now, we find that this charge covers the period from the year 1885 to 1892. It is important to notice that in sections 9 and 10 there is no allegation that the Postmaster General received any of the subsidies; there is simply an allegation that he received money from men who were interested in the subsidies. Now, it must be perfectly clear that any stockholder in these companies would be interested in these subsidies. He is also charged here with receiving money from other public contractors; that is to say, if this charge were allowed to go to a committee, evidence could be given of political subscriptions by any public contractor in the Dominion. It would cover all the numerous contracts with regard to post offices, the number of which we heard the other day; it would cover every public contractor in the Dominion. Sir, it must be evident to any hon. gentleman that it would be grossly unjust to ask a man to meet a charge of that general character, covering the names of thousands of persons who would possibly be implicated; it would be grossly unjust to ask him to face a charge of that description, covering the general election of 1887 and of 1891, and all the bye-elections since 1885 up to the present time. It certainly must strike this House to be contrary to conscience to ask a man to stand his trial for everything he has done during all these elections. I wonder how many hon. gentlemen opposite would like to be put upon their trial for everything they had done since 1885 up to the present time, without any more notice than has been given in this matter. I think that point alone is quite sufficient to establish the absolute unfairness of charges of this sort. Supposing this were a question of larceny, supposing a charge of larceny was made against some one, committed within the last seven years, and in 21 counties of the Province of Quebec. No court would try a charge of that nature, because, the experience of the criminal law from the earliest days up to the present time, has shown that it is only fair-play to give the accused party ample notice, not only ample notice, but specific notice of the charges made against him, that he may not be taken by surprise, but may be able to make his defence. If a resolution of this sort were adopted you might go back, not only six, or seven or ten years, but you might go back 20 or 30 years and make a general charge, that something had been done during that time in election campaigns which caused a member to be guilty of personal corruption, and you might therefore ask that he be expelled from the House. These grounds may, perhaps, be held to be technical, but if technical, they are only nominally so, because they are founded upon the experience of criminal lawyers the world over. Although that ground would be quite sufficient to show that these charges should not be entertained, I propose to deal with the actual charges that are made, apart from the question of their not being explicit. If I understand sections 9 and 10 of the motion, the substantial charge that is made there, is, that the Postmaster General received money from public contractors of the Government and that he spent that money illegally in elections. In my humble judgment that is not a charge that this Parliament should investigate, and I will shortly give the House my reasons for so saying. In the first place, is it an offence which Parliament should investigate to accept election subscriptions from public contractors, independent of how it is spent, and in the next place is it an offence which Parliament should investigate to spend money corruptly in elections? It does not make the matter one whit stronger to say that the money came from public contractors and was spent in elections. If a wrong is done either in receiving money from public contractors at all, or expending money corruptly in elections at all. Now, Sir, to receive money from public contractors whether it be an act which one should condemn or not, is not now the question. The receiving of money for election purposes from public contractors, is not a charge that this House should investigate. Any gentleman who will look over the precedents carefully will come to the conclusion that this is a charge which should not be investigated in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says "hear, hear." The hon. gentleman assumes that the public contractors paid the money that they obtained from the Government, and that by a scheme between a public contractor and the Postmaster General the public money actually went to the Postmaster General. That, Sir, is a thing which Parliament should investigate. But we must remember that is not the charge that is made here, and the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) best knows himself why he did not make the charge. The fairest way to test the matter is this. What evidence would prove this charge if it were before the committee? That charge would be proved by showing that a man who had a contract did subscribe money to the Postmaster General's election fund, and I ask any hon. gentleman in this House, even assuming it to be true, if that is a matter which we should investigate here? No, Sir, it does not come within any of the cases which I have referred to before as having been investigated by the English Parliament. I may remind the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that some of his political friends have lately pronounced their opinion with regard to receiving money from public contractors. I believe that in the Ontario Assembly,

led by a gentleman who stands pretty high in the morality of the Liberal party, and I believe also of the country, he and his supporters in that Assembly declared that it was not wrong for members of that House to receive money from contractors of the Government. Perhaps the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will accept the authority of the Hon. Mr. Mowat as pretty good on the question of political morality. It would be a very serious thing if this resolution were adopted on that ground, because some person might find out that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) had had an election fund. I suppose I am assuming a very improbable case, but somebody might discover that a gentleman who held a contract for a post office in the hon. gentleman's constituency, had contributed to this fund, and he might charge the hon. member with corruption and ask that he be expelled from the House, because he had received money for his election fund from a Government contractor. I am sure that although the hon. gentleman himself may be perfectly innocent he will have enough regard for those who sit behind him not to introduce any such dangerous doctrine as that. The next point is whether the illegal spending of money in elections is a matter which we should investigate in this House. It is charged here, and charged definitely enough in one respect, although very indefinite in regard to time, that the Postmaster General had spent money illegally in elections. That also is a question, Sir, which it is not for us to investigate in this Parliament. For many years the House of Commons in England and the House of Commons here, investigated what was done by members during their elections, and Parliament vacated their seats if corruption was found to have been committed during the contest. By the deliberate judgment of this House that power was relegated to the election courts, and the fundamental reason for our relinquishing that power was that the rights of minorities were not safe if Parliament could enquire into election matters and turn men out of the House for alleged corruption in their contests. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) put his case very ingeniously by saying: Oh, if this money goes into an election fund, then enquiry must be stopped, and you must not enter into that sacred precinct. That was a very ingenious way for the hon. gentleman to put his argument, but he cannot escape from this dilemma, that if enquiry is allowed into the expenditure, either personal or by agents of members, at election contests, all that was done by this House formerly in divesting itself of that authority is ineffective, and the House can go back twenty years and investigate charges of corruption in elections. Does any hon. gentleman suppose that with a strong majority having those instincts, which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) seems to have injected in his imagination into the majority on this side, that the rights of the minority would be safe? Suppose that a majority was really vicious, it is quite possible that members of the minority might suffer perhaps unjustly. Instead of being tried before an election court or before a judge, to which he has a right now, he could be taken before a partisan committee, and the minority would then be at the mercy of a vicious majority, just as they were fifteen or twenty years ago, before the election courts were established. The hon. member for Bothwell shakes his head; but if the principle set forth in this branch of the resolution were adopted, it would put the minority at the mercy of a tyrannical majority; and, Sir, I am rather surprised that the hon. gentlemen opposite wish to put themselves at the mercy of a majority of which they seem to have such a mean opinion as the majority on this side of the House. The only conclusion I can come to is that they think better of us than they say. Now, it may be said to me: Well, if these charges are not specific, why not move an amendment and strike out the part that is not specific? Sir, I cannot make the charge against the Postmaster General. I have no papers, no information in my possession that enables me to make any statement on which to found a charge against the Postmaster General. The information is in the possession, presumably, of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and upon him lies the responsibility of making this charge specific. He must accept the responsibility, and he cannot throw it upon me or upon any gentleman on this side of the House. So much for the legal aspects of these charges. I have another objection to them, which is perhaps in its nature more especially political. I do not wish to impute motives to hon. gentlemen opposite, but I must say that the form in which these charges are drawn gives colour to the statement that they are drawn for fishing purposes. Sir, look at the scope of the charges. They include the elections in twenty-two counties in the Province of Quebec. They are so framed that if a committee were granted upon them, every detail of election expenses and election proceedings in every one of those counties could be gone into before that committee. That is what I call a fishing charge. Now, Sir, I am not here to say that the Liberal-Conservative party is always correct in all its doings during elections. I am sorry to say that I myself stand here as an example to the contrary, because I was unseated by the election court. But while I do not stand here to say that I am free to confess that I have no absolute confidence in the entire purity of hon. gentlemen opposite. Some investigations have been held with regard to the record of the two parties in elections matters. They have not been held before partisans; they have been held before the sworn judges of this country; and, Sir, when the hon. member for Quebec East who leads the Opposition considers that he came into this Parliament a little over a year ago with about 90 members behind him one-third of whom were elected by corrupt means and have since been unseated, I think he is quite right in coming to the conclusion that it is about time to change the venue from the courts to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Sir, the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite with the courts has been singularly unfortunate. Now, they propose a new procedure. They say: We will investigate you before a committee; we will investigate you in batches of 22, and it will be heads we win and tails you lose, because we are not subject to that investigation, we will proceed, because we do not take any risk ourselves, and we will put you to all the trouble we can before that committee. Sir, that does not commend itself to my mind as

a fair proposition. I have admitted that, so far as I am concerned, I do not propose to say that the Liberal-Conservative party is immaculate: but I will say this, and say it with full confidence and belief, that in an investigation held on fair terms, the Liberal-Conservative party has nothing to fear in a comparison with the Liberal party in the matter of purity. Sir, these hon. gentlemen have had some experience in fighting election protests and in paying costs. They propose to try the Liberal-Conservatives now with public funds. They propose to have an investigation at Ottawa, into the elections in 22 constituencies of the Province of Quebec, in one batch, to summon what witnesses they like, and to pay them with public funds. Sir, that does not strike me, looking at the two parties as contending for mastery in this country, as an eminently fair proposition; and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to produce one precedent in England or in Canada, since the trial of election petitions has been relegated to the courts, of a proposal ever being made to investigate the expenditure of money in constituencies, before a Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Such a case could not arise in England, because no member could be charged there.

Mr. DICKEY. Sir, the virtue of the hon. gentleman from Queen's has bubbled over; I thought it would. If there is one recompense that one has for leaving one's home and business, and coming here at a loss of money, it is to observe from time to time the virtue of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a constant object lesson, and if one could forget the past, if one could forget the records of the election courts, if one could forget the little things that have happened in the Province of Quebec, one would be perfectly happy; but these recollections obtrude themselves sometimes. Now, Sir, if this charge is bad, as I think I have established, if it is a charge which this House should not entertain, if it is a charge which is not sufficiently specific to be fair to the accused, if it is a charge which would occupy an intolerable deal of the time of this Parliament and an unlimited amount of public money, then, Sir, this resolution as it stands should not be adopted by the House. The charges in reference to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway are a little different. Is it charged that the Postmaster General received money out of the subsidies themselves? It is charged that he received money out of the said subsidies and from money raised upon the credit of the same and from parties beneficially interested in the same. It is not necessary to pass judgment upon that charge. It is not necessary to say whether that charge be sufficiently specific or not. But I would advise the hon. gentleman, if he is reframing his charges, to make his statement with regard to that one more specific. He has here strung together three alternatives: from the subsidies, from moneys raised on the subsidies, and from parties benefically interested in the subsidies. I think that I have shown that the statement that money was received from parties benefically interested in the subsidies is not a charge for this House to investigate. If he means that the Postmaster General received money out of the subsidies, let him say so. Let him charge that specifically, and then ask this House for an investigation. To hear the hon. member for South Oxford, and the leader of the Opposition as well, one would think that the voting down of this resolution would conclude the matter. One would imagine that if this motion were disposed of by voting it down, there never could be an enquiry or investigation into the matter. If the hon. member for West Ontario desires to make these charges specific, there is ample time and opportunity for him to do so; and if he puts the motion before this House in a shape so vague and indefinite as I have shown this to be, he must take the consequences of being set right by the House and being instructed to make his charge more definite and bring it more within the precedents and rules of the House. But I do not understand that this matter is concluded at all. Speaking for myself, and myself only, I say that if there are definite charges, within the scope of parliamentary enquiry, to be made against the Postmaster General, not only must they be investigated, but they will be. Because this charge is rejected by the House is no reason whatever that this matter should not take another form and be brought to investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not exactly understand the meaning of the ironical cheering of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know whether it foreshadows this, that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to shirk investigation and not make charges. Possibly it may mean that, but time will tell. The members on this side, so far as I know, are willing and ready and anxious to investigate any legal, proper and definite charge. It matters not to them who falls or what falls as a result of the investigation into those charges, but they do not propose, in order to gratify hon. gentlemen opposite and assist them in their own political schemes, to violate all fair-play and set a bad precedent for all time to come, a precedent which would be capable of being put to bad uses by a vicious majority and made an instrument of oppression to the minority in the future. I may say for myself, and this will be a good opportunity for hon. gentlemen opposite to cheer, that I have confidence in the Government as regards an investigation into these and all similar charges. The Government has established a record with regard to investigations. The country has accepted and endorsed the record of the Government in this matter. The leader of the Opposition admitted that the country had accepted the statement of the leader of the House in the matter of these charges. He said that the country had taken him at his word, and, Sir, a reputation of that sort in this House and before the country, endorsed and established by the country, is not to be over borne by the rejection of a motion such as this, a motion as I have shown which does not deserve the consideration of the House. The hon. member for South Oxford addressed some rather violent observations this evening to the leader of the House, and the leader of the Opposition also favoured the leader of the House with some very strong remarks. I began to think that it was really the leader of the House who was in the box. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition said that Mr. Pacaud had done nothing which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice had not justified. I do not know whether on reflection the hon. gentleman is prepared to take back that remark. I regret very much that

he thought fit to make it. I regret very much that he thought fit to connect the name of Mr. Pacaud and the Minister of Justice at all. It is not a light matter that the leader of the Opposition should make a charge of that character against the Minister of Justice. From the position of the two gentlemen, it is in my judgment a highly serious matter. It would have been very easy for the leader of the Opposition, if the Minister of Justice had said anything of that character, to quote what the Minister of Justice said, but he did not take that course. His statement was absolutely unfounded. Mr. Pacaud's crime, as I understand it, was a bargain by which he agreed to pay over a subsidy provided he got a certain portion. That charge is not made in this case nor anything like it : but in any case I defy the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition to find one word in the statement of the Minister of Justice to justify the charge made by the member for West Ontario. He simply addressed a legal argument to the House, and instead of meeting that legal argument, the leader of the Opposition took the ground of abusing the Minister of Justice in the way I have said. I think the leader of the Opposition is the last man who should have used Mr. Pacaud as a stalking-horse. I think as a matter of taste he would have done better to have left Mr. Pacaud alone. The leader of the Opposition has said that Mr. Pacaud received his punishment at the hands of the Province of Quebec. That is perfectly true. Mr. Mercier also received his judgment at the hands of the electorate of the Province of Quebec. Sir, when that judgment was being held, when the Province of Quebec was considering its judgment on that important question, what position was taken by the hon. the leader of the Opposition himself? Mr. Mercier, when he appealed to the Province of Quebec, tried to draw a herring across the trail by raising a constitutional question. The leader of the Opposition followed him in that effort. The leader of the Opposition invited the people of the Province of Quebec not to condemn Mr. Mercier and Pacaud. If the views of the leader of the Opposition had been accepted by the people of the Province of Quebec, the leader of the Opposition would not be able to say to-day that Mr. Pacaud had received his punishment at the hands of the people of the Province of Quebec. I do not wish to discuss the issues that were before the people of Quebec at the last election, but I wish to say that Mr. Mercier and Mr. Pacaud had been tried before they went to the people, they had been tried by a tribunal to which Mr. Mercier had consented himself. They were then appealing to the great tribunal in constitutional countries, the people themselves, and this country will not easily forget and the gentlemen who sit behind the leader of the Opposition will not forget, that the great weight of the talents of the leader of the Opposition on that occasion was used to prevent the people of Quebec pronouncing a verdict upon Mr. Mercier.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not true.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman no doubt reads the Toronto *Globe*, and on the 8th March, the day after the election, that newspaper said :

"Men of all class, parties, races and religions joined in the general denunciation of the late Government."

The *Globe* forgot for a moment that the leader of the Opposition was not one of these.—

"We cannot regard the result with unmixed feelings either of regret or of satisfaction. We do not like to see even the name of Liberalism in Canada associated with defeat or dishonour. * * The best feature of the situation is that the people of Quebec have undoubtedly acted from worthy and honourable motives. They were determined that whatever other result might follow they would make it impossible for these men to govern the province. They were tired of extravagance and corruption. Their verdict was distinctly a vote for better, more honest, more economical government. It is the most hopeful sign that has been seen in Canada for years."

In that statement, the leader of the Opposition was condemned by his own chief organ. By that statement the leader of the Opposition was shown to have stood in the way of an effort to get "better, more honest and more economical government," and the leader of the Opposition was shown to have endeavoured to prevent the exhibition of "the best sign that has been seen in Canada for years." I suppose the hon. gentleman exercised his franchise on that occasion, and, although it is illegal to ask him how he voted, I have no doubt that he voted as he spoke, and supported the Mercierite candidate. Now, this may be somewhat irrelevant.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, rather.

Mr. DICKEY. The hon. gentleman says "rather." It is not irrelevant when we take into consideration the spirit the hon. gentleman showed the other day. It all depends upon whose ox is gored. When corruption is rampant in his own party in the Province of Quebec, the hon. gentleman endeavours to stifle enquiry, he endeavours to prevent the people of the Province of Quebec from visiting that corruption with the punishment it deserves ; but, when there is supposed corruption here in the Liberal-Conservative party, the hon. gentleman treats us to an address such as we had the other day. I admit that the last part of my remarks has been extremely political. I have endeavoured to separate it from the legal argument I made, and I hope I have induced some gentlemen in this House to agree with me that an investigation into the charges now as they stand would be establishing a bad precedent and would be unfair to be accused. In closing, I wish to reiterate my confidence that the Government will deal justly but firmly with this matter foreshadowed in this resolution, and to pledge myself to assist in any investigation that I believe honestly comes within proper parliamentary lines.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I stand here to-night to reiterate with all the emphasis of which I am capable that I am prepared to prove by sworn evidence the charges which I have made and the impeachment which I have levelled against a Minister of the Crown. One word as to the arguments which we have heard against this enquiry from the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). He told us, to start with, that this was a pure matter of law. Perhaps he is satisfied to take that view of it, but I do think that the people in this country believe that there are some very important facts at issue in this case and not a mere quibble of law, as he wishes to make out. He began his speech by treating it as if it were a motion I was making to expel the Postmaster General from the House. His quotations and arguments were with reference to motions which have been made for the expulsion of members. Well, Mr. Speaker, it may come to that later on, but that is not what is before the House to-day. Take the case last year. The charges were made from this side of the House in connec-

tion with the Tarte-McGreevy matter. One expulsion arose out of that, and there might be out of this; and there was a case which arose out of that which was not an expulsion from the House but was an expulsion from office, and so that I think at least would follow the investigation of these charges. The hon. gentleman told us, to my amazement, that I had made no personal charge, no charge of a personal nature against the Postmaster General. Well, I do not understand the English language if section 5 is not a charge of a personal nature. I say that:

"During this period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies."

Now, if that is not a personal charge, a specific charge, and a charge of corruptly receiving public money, I do not know how the English language can make it so. He also tells us that this House has no right to investigate a charge of taking money from contractors. Well, that may be so in his view, but I wonder whether the jurisdiction of this House over its own members is any narrower than the jurisdiction of the Senate across the way over its members. I wonder whether the leader of the Government did not last session advocate that that House should investigate the charge of taking money from contractors. They did it, and did it very thoroughly and profoundly. The hon. gentleman also says, just as the Minister of Justice told us the other day, that we must go to the courts to have these charges investigated. He failed to tell us, I was waiting to hear him tell us, how you could frame a petition before the courts of justice, now or at any time, to attack the expenditure, by a Minister of the Crown, of $100,000 in 22 constituencies. Then there is another matter, and if he will consider it calmly for a few moments I do not think he will hear any other argument of that kind brought forward in this debate. Out of these 22 constituencies in which I charge and believe that so much money was corruptly spent on that occasion in 1887, the Government, with all their efforts and all their expenditure, were only able to carry seven seats. Well, now, a petition might have been filed against those seven members so elected, but I wonder how petitions could have been filed by us against any of the 15 cases where we elected members. There is only one way, under the electoral law, of raising a petition against a successful candidate, and that is for the simple and solitary purpose of disqualifying him. Now, in those 15 cases there is nothing in my charge seeking to disqualify any of the successful candidates, therefore, no petition could lie for a charge of this kind, it is only made against the Postmaster General. Therefore, to say that we should now, or at any former time, have been relegated to the courts to investigate this charge, is most unreasonable. Now, the hon. member professed himself horrified at the unfairness of our trying in this way to make a one-sided investigation into election matters in those counties. I am sure if it would please him, and if he will only supplement this charge, or if the other side will agree to it in any other way, we will be delighted to investigate all the expenses on the Liberal side in those counties on that occasion. Sir, I would challenge him or them in any way they choose, before even a tribunal appointed by the majority of this House, to go into an investigation of our election expenditure at any of those elections referred to here. So that we do not want to have it *ex parte* only, the hon. gentleman must help us a little to carry out the investigation if he wants it in that light. He challenged me to produce an English precedent for a course of this kind. Well, Sir, I am sorry to say for the sake of Canada, but proud to say for the sake of the mother land, that I could not get any precedent of this kind in England. If he wants to know the reason why, let him read the English press and their comments upon the investigation that took place before the Committee on Privileges and Elections of this House last year, and he will find out why I could get no precedent for any such case as this. Just before he sat down he referred to the fact of the Quebec enquiry. I wonder he was not ashamed, after the speech he had made, to refer to the enquiries in the Province of Quebec. Why, Sir, they were not resisted there by his Conservative friends. The constitution was strained to make these enquiries, as he knows; and I can tell him that he and his friends are straining the constitution to-night to resist this enquiry; so I think he should not have referred to Quebec. When I brought forward these charges I did not make any remarks in supporting them on the assumption that they would be at once acceded to by the House, by the Ministers, and especially by the Postmaster General himself. I thought then, and I think still, that the Postmaster General should have felt that these charges were certainly of so serious a character as to demand the most prompt and the most thorough investigation on his own account. Can he say that they are not serious? I suppose if he took the views of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken to-night, he might think they were only matters of law and not serious at all. But I would call the attention of the House to what the Minister of Public Works, a colleague of the Postmaster General's, said about these charges the other day. He said:

"These are charges by which, I believe, it is intended to take away that gentleman's honour."

That is the way the charges are looked at by one of his colleagues, a charge which would take away the hon. gentleman's honour. I think the Minister of Public Works was quite right in his view of the charges, and surely a charge that would take away a colleague's honour, ought to be investigated. Now, I noticed shortly after making these charges, an article in the Quebec *Chronicle*, a Conservative newspaper, almost an organ, as I understand it, of the Postmaster General himself:

"Mr. Edgar has brought a fearful accusation against the Postmaster General which, if proved, would result in his permanent retirement from public life."

That is the view the *Chronicle* took of it, and that, I think, is the view the public will take of it, and the casuistry of hon. gentlemen opposite will never persuade the public that that is not the true view. What did the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) say? The hon. gentleman very often, in his speeches, gives considerable support to the views on this side of the House, but seldom goes so far as to give us a vote. I suppose he considers his tongue is his own, but that his vote belongs to his party. However, when his tongue got loose the other night, he said, although he is going to vote against this enquiry, I understand:

"If the statements which have been made are true there has been a gross and outrageous violation of trust." "A gross and outrageous violation of trust," and still these charges are too trifling to be investigated by a committee of Parliament. Most of us remember, Sir, an investigation which was held here on a comparatively trifling subject, in connection with Mr. Charles Rykert, and which resulted very seriously to him. I do not know that any of us consider that hisopinion of parliamentary honour was too refined, but what did he say about the charge from his place in the House. He said:

"I ask hon. members to give me an opportunity of defending myself before a committee, where I can have the charges investigated."

That is what Mr. Rykert said, but a Minister of the Crown to-day in this Parliament thinks otherwise of infinitely more serious charges. I see the hon. Minister of Militia there, and I remember and he remembers, when some years ago in this House, I made a charge from my place with which his name was connected—the hon. gentleman stood up in his place like a man with the courage which he has, and he demanded prompt investigation and he got it, although the report has never been adopted by the House one way or the other. That showed a sense of honour in another of the colleagues of the Postmaster General. I thought, Sir, that if the Postmaster General himself did not consider this a proper case to investigate, that he would have had colleagues who would have insisted upon it, but what do we find? I find that the Minister of Justice solemnly stated in his place, on his responsibility as leader of the House, that there was no allegation of any public money having been appropriated. Why, Sir, what does he mean? Were not the subsidies public money; were they not misappropriated? Oh, I see, Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Justice means. He knows they are public moneys, but he thinks they were appropriated for their proper purpose when they were placed in the Conservative fund. I see it now, though I never could see it before. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, from that point of view these public moneys were not misappropriated and the Minister of Justice is probably correct as usual. These railways which are involved in this charge were aided by the Dominion and Provincial Governments, and what I complain of is, the appropriation of Dominion subsidies by the Postmaster General. I remember an occasion not so very long ago, when it was thought that the Parliament of Canada had jurisdiction to follow up and hunt down the expenditure of provincial subsidies of a railway because the Dominion also had contributed, or was going to contribute, something to the same road. What did the leader of the Minister of Justice say in the Senate on the question of an investigation before the Private Bills Committee on the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. Mr. Abbott, the Premier, said last session:

"This Dominion is engaged in a sort of joint account with the Province of Quebec in constructing this road. There are $175,000 of this public money which our copartners have invested with ourselves, which have been diverted from the purpose of the grant, and are we not interested in finding out what has become of it?"

He goes on to say:

"This matter is one in which it strikes me we are particularly interested, one that it is particularly the duty of this House to investigate, and I think that we should insist upon making this enquiry as far as the law and the practice of the House enables us to do so."

I could not use language more appropriate than this to the present occasion, if I tried for a long time; but I could go a great deal further and say that these subsidies now in question are our subsidies, and that we have a ten-fold greater duty to find out what has become of them. The speech from which I have quoted was the celebrated speech in which the Premier wound up by appealing to the public to assist him in punishing the culprits, be they high or be they low, be they rich or be they poor. I do not know whether the Postmaster General can escape from some of these descriptions of his leader, but I would rather have supposed that he was either high or low or rich or poor, and that he should be reached by the strong arm of Parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, remember that in that Baie des Chaleurs matter there was no misapplication of Dominion funds charged as it is here: remember that there was no member of the Senate charged with misapplication of these funds and that there is a member of this House charged here; remember, Sir, that there was no Minister or Privy Councillor implicated there, when there is both a Minister and a Privy Councillor implicated here. The Minister of Justice also criticised these charges which I now make, and said that they were vague and indefinite. Well, Sir, I will not repeat what his colleague the Minister of Public Works said about them, or what the Quebec *Chronicle* said about them, or what the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said about them, and I will not further argue that he can possibly consider them vague, when the whole independent press of this country, without exception as far as I have been able to learn, has said that these charges are not vague, but that they are explicit and clear and ought to be investigated. Perhaps I had better allow the Postmaster General to draw up these charges himself and let him have them just as he would like them to be. I do not know how else I can satisfy hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I dare say if the Postmaster General had the drawing of these charges he would limit them, for instance, to the charge that he received from the Lake St. John Railway Company so much money out of the subsidies, and another charge, that he received from the Temiscouata Railway Company so much money out of the subsidies, and then he would valiantly disprove those charges. I imagine that these are the charges he would like to see there, from the fact that although there is not a syllable of allegation in my charge from beginning to end that he received money from either of these corporations as corporations, still, when he got up he told us with a great flourish of trumpets that he had voluntarily received telegrams or letters from the managers of those two companies saying that he had never received any moneys from those companies. Why, Mr. Speaker, nobody said he did. Does he imagine that anybody would think or believe that a railway corporation like that of the Lake St. John Railway, with a board formed, for instance, of representatives of the city of Quebec, would calmly sit down at their board meeting and pass a formal resolution, or that a meeting of shareholders would pass a resolution to pay so much money out of their subsidy to the hon. Postmaster General for himself or his elections? No, Sir, it is absurd, and the hon. Postmaster General when he made that declaration was simply setting up a man of straw and knocking him down again. I think

one of the most refined and beautiful arguments that I ever listened to in my life, so delicate that it required the greatest possible attention to catch it, was that of the hon. Minister of Justice, when he solemnly contended that we could not be said to be charging a member of Parliament with these political crimes, because he had not the whole time been a member of this House. That was a most refined and delicate argument, but the Minister of Justice forgot for the moment that his colleague, if not always a member, was always a Minister of State and always a Privy Councillor, and that during the whole of that time he was either a member or a candidate. I would like also to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that the election law is levelled against candidates more than against members, and if he was only a candidate and not a member he was much more open to accusation. I do not propose, Sir, to go into the proofs that I am prepared to lay before a committee if I get it, but I would like just to say that I shall be able to prove that when the Postmaster General was a candidate, in 1887, for the County of Quebec, at which election his agent returned his total election expenses of every kind, personal and political, at $901, the hon. Minister personally superintended and directed and authorized the expenditure for that election of considerably more than ten times that amount; and I suppose that would be nothing discreditable for a Minister of the Crown to do. Perhaps it would not be discreditable to a Minister or a member of this House, but the statute makes it a misdemeanour and a crime in a candidate. Then, the Minister of Justice contended that we must show, as if I had not shown or offered to show, that the offence was committed by the Postmaster General in his capacity as a member of this House. I do not know what he means exactly by that; but, he cannot perhaps have seen the case of Mr. J. W. Hastings, a member of the English House of Commons, who on the 21st of March last, was expelled from that House unanimously for doing something which certainly he did not do as a member of the House. What was it that he did, Sir? I find by the report of the occurrence in the London *Times*, that Mr. Justice A. L. Smith had sent a letter to the Speaker reporting the conviction of Mr. Hastings. The *Times* report does not give the nature of that conviction, but a letter which was read in the House, sent to the Speaker by Mr. Hastings himself, and which was commented upon and not disputed by either Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Balfour, stated the nature of the conviction. The letter is to this effect:

"I thought it right to plead guilty to the indictment preferred against me, as I did undoubtedly dispose of trust property without due regard to the provisions of the will under which it came into my hands; nevertheless, it was without any intention of appropriating the money to my own use, or of wilfully defrauding any person."

Now, if the Minister of Justice can show that this was done by Mr. Hastings as a member of the House of Commons, he will be a great deal more clever than I give him the credit of being.

Mr. O'BRIEN. That was the judgment of a court of law.

Mr. EDGAR. That is not the point which I am referring to, although I will tell my hon. friend what I think about that in a moment. What I said was this: I said that in the *Hansard* report of the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice, you will see that he claims that I did not show that the offence was committed by the hon. Postmaster General in his capacity as a member of this House. I say that that has nothing to do with the matter, and this case of Mr. Hastings and many other English cases on which it is founded, show that a member will be expelled from the English House of Commons for an offence committed not at all as a member of the House, and even for the comparatively venial offence of misappropriating trust moneys under a will. Now, Sir, surely the trust which the hon. Postmaster General had of the public funds was infinitely more sacred than the trust which this man had under a will; and if he did what I charge him with doing with those public funds, will the hon. member for Muskoka deny what he himself said the other day, that this would be a gross breach of public trust?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Undoubtedly the hon. gentleman is correct so far as that goes; but he cannot avoid the distinction that only in the case in which a felony has been charged and proved against a member of the House of Commons he would be expelled——

Mr. EDGAR. That is not a felony.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Suppose the hon. Postmaster General had been tried at an election court and there had been proved guilty of conduct unbecoming a member of this House, this House would be justified in expelling him. But that is a totally different thing from this House undertaking to investigate charges which should be investigated in a different court.

Mr. EDGAR. I am very glad of the interruption of the hon. gentleman because it will enable me to clear up that point to his satisfaction. His claim is that we cannot investigate a charge of that kind against an hon. member but that he must be convicted by some court outside. Very well. The Sadlier case, which has been quoted before in this debate, is a well-known case. It is not in itself on all fours with the present one. It was a motion for expulsion in the first place, but in the arguments of eminent men who spoke on that case, such as the Attorney General for Ireland and Lord Palmerston, we find the principle laid down, as the House will see by my quotation, that a man may be expelled on conviction by a court, on his own confession, or on the report of a committee of the House. In the English *Hansard*, No. 143, page 1402, Mr. Fitzgerald, the Attorney General for Ireland, lays this down as his view of the law. He says in 1703 Mr. Askill was expelled. The resolution stated that the House had examined several witnesses and found that Mr. Askill was the author of a certain book and, therefore, ordered him to be expelled. Now, that was not a court of justice and it was not a conviction. It was an investigation by the House of Commons. In the same volume, at page 1405, Lord Palmerston, in the Sadleir case, says:

"We should not take proceedings in the nature of expulsion without being able to found them on some formal, indisputable ground, such as conviction or confession or a report, after due examination of a committee."

I hope the hon. gentleman now will be satisfied that we have English precedents for examining into serious matters of this kind. We have always done it. It was never refused until last session, when it was refused in the case of the then Postmaster

General, now the Minister of Railways, and that, he will find, started them, and the Government propose to continue and make precedents in this country which he will not find in England, and which were never found in Canada before. In another volume of *Hansard*, the Sadleir case comes up again, remember that was a case of expulsion, that was a stage beyond this; and the arguments that were advanced in favour of expulsion are not necessary for an enquiry into the conduct of a Minister and a member. Mr. Roebuck first moved it, and it stood over, and then at a later day the Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Fitzgerald, moved it himself. He said:

"I have looked into the precedents and they show the right of expulsion may be exercised either for (1) positive crime; (2) offence against House; (3) acts bringing religion into discredit; (4) or that were discreditable; (5) members have been guilty of fraudulent practices; or (6) other acts which showed them unfit to exercise the trust which their constituents had reposed in them."

If proving these charges does not show that the Postmaster General is unfit to exercise the trust which his constituents have reposed in him, what would it show? The Minister of Marine made a nice point when he said I had not, as I should have, charged his colleague with public robbery. Well, I did not put it in those words,—but in words which I certainly intended to mean robbing the public. If it is not public robbery for a member to take money out of public subsidies, I would like to know what is. Then the Minister of Public Works drew another beautiful defence. He said that I had failed to set out conspiracy, that conspiracy was not shown in terms in my charge; and therefore it should fail. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer. Does he not know the law of conspiracy? Let him read up his Russell on Crimes, and he will see it is there declared that "an unlawful conspiracy is to be inferred from the acts of the parties." And I have tried to make clear what the acts of his hon. colleague were, and does not Russell go on to say that, "not once in a thousand times can it be otherwise proved?" So I think, if I get a chance to go on and prove these charges, there will be what is under the law, unless the Minister of Justice should change it in his new criminal code, a most abominable conspiracy. The Minister of Public Works was perhaps more candid than any of them. He said that I was trying to draw the Conservative party into the mire, and they were not ready to submit the whole party to investigation. We thus really find the reason why the party is to be called upon to vote down this enquiry. The Minister of Public Works has stated it squarely and frankly, and I have no doubt it is the real reason. They fear should they consent to an investigation, the system of corruption of the Conservative party will be disclosed. That part of the charge the hon. gentleman thinks does not only involve the Minister or the Government but involves the whole Conservative party. Well, if it does involve one of the great parties in this country, it calls all the more for investigation. I think the country will believe that if the Minister of Public Works is right in saying that we are attempting to drag the whole Conservative party into the mire by proving the truth of these charges the sooner we do so the better. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is right. Twenty-two counties are involved, only one-third of the Province of Quebec, and one-tenth of the whole Dominion. And if that district was attempted to be bought up by $100,000, a simple rule of three will show that it would require, what I have no doubt it did, $1,000,000 for the whole Dominion. Why Sir, after all the expenditure of $100,000 in 22 constituencies they only carried seven or eight of them, and I wonder how much it cost them to carry the 130 or so seats they carried at that election. That is perhaps again a proof that the Minister of Public Works was quite right when he thought that this investigation would bring the whole Conservative party into the mire. Now, I think, and I thought that the whole Government as a Government ought to insist upon this investigation, because it is not the matter of the Postmaster General alone. Under our constitution, the whole Government collectively are responsible for the act of a colleague, and they are not going to say or to pretend, I fancy, that they are not the same Government, that the shuffle of one or two seats which took place last summer changes the Government. Why, they are proud of being the same Government, with the same policy, and, if they are the same Government, they have a retrospective responsibility for all the acts of each colleague unless they publicly and specifically repudiate these acts when they are first brought to their notice. That there can be any doubt of that I question. It is important enough, however, I think, to make it clear. Lord Derby, on that subject of collective responsibility of the whole Cabinet for the acts of a colleague, said, as reported in the English *Hansard*, No. 150, on the 14th May, 1858:

"Now with respect to the liability of all the members of a cabinet for the act of a single member, I wish to say that no man can put forth more distinctly or clearly than I do the constitutional doctrine that every member of the Government is responsible for the acts of every other member, whether these acts were previously known or not, provided the members of the Government continued to act together as a Government. Remaining in office and acting together all the members of the Government take upon themselves a retrospective responsibility for what their colleague has done which they can in no way attempt to shake off."

Now the Ministers are absolutely and entirely just as responsible as the Postmaster General is himself for the weight of these charges, unless and until they have repudiated his conduct and disclaimed responsibility for him and expelled him from the Cabinet. The honour of one is in the keeping of all. There is a name they are accustomed to conjure with on the other side of the House, and I am sure they will not dispute the view Sir John Macdonald took in a very recent case indeed as to what should be the attitude of his government when charges were even indirectly levelled at them. Sir John Macdonald, as reported in the Canadian *Hansard* of 1890, page 450, when the Rykert case was under discussion, said:

"I can only state that if that correspondence in any way, in any phrase or sentence, reflects upon the honour of the Ministry, or of any member of it, we are quite ready to defend ourselves, and to ask for the assistance of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the investigation.

Perhaps these charges do not reflect on the honour of the Ministry or any member of it. I rather think they do. I think the country will say so, and Sir John Macdonald then said that he would ask for the assistance, as he did ask for the assistance, of members on this side of the House in a committee to investigate those charges. Now, I think and I thought that, for the honour, if not of

themselves, for the honour of the Crown that they represent, they would have instantly demanded this investigation. They represent the historic dignity of the Imperial Crown of England, and surely the honour of the representative of that Imperial Crown in this country should have been protected by these Ministers. I am not saying that the representative of the Crown should take this matter into his own hands. I am saying that the Ministers of the Crown should have been the first to protect his honour, and they are his sworn advisers. Then, what is more important, what I feel more strongly about, is that this Ministry represents the honour of the Crown which is the symbol of the dignity and the power and the majesty of the people of Canada, and it is that which is insulted by a charge of this kind remaining for a moment uninvestigated. Why is it that the Postmaster General is defended so strenuously, so bitterly by his colleagues? What is the reason? It is a little puzzling to us on this side of the House certainly. He is not a man of signal ability. I do not think his friends will say that. He is not a man of vast usefulness to the Cabinet as an administrator or as a debater, but he is a man no doubt of great boldness as an operator, and a proof of it is in this transaction contained in these charges. He is not as meek as the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), he is not as meek or as timid as that hon. member. I can imagine the hon. the Postmaster General saying to his colleagues: "Well, gentlemen, what are you going to do about it? We will hang together or we will hang separately;" and they had determined to hang together. Why, after all, should they not defend their colleague: looking at it from a political point of view—a short-sighted point of view, perhaps, but one which commends itself to most men on the other side? They have a majority strong enough to vote down anything they like. Arguments are not necessary. The majority is large enough, and very well under control. I am sure also that the Ministers and their followers feel now, and often shake their heads about it and say, that the Tarte-McGreevy enquiry of last session was a great mistake and they should never have given it at all, and they are determined that that mistake shall not be repeated, that they must put their foot down at last and have no more enquiries. I can understand that position as one that commends itself to their judgment. Besides, nearly all those critical bye-elections are passed and the danger is over for about four years, and hon. gentlemen can do just about as they please, and trust to the shortness of public opinion to forget all about it before they appeal to the country again. Besides, a man who can raise the wind for election purposes so well as the Postmaster General, is invaluable to that party, he cannot be spared: they will have more elections, and they will want him again. How insignificant, after all, were the efforts proved last session of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane)—here and there a miserable $200 picked up from some bridge tender. His intention was praiseworthy, I admit, and he is to be commended for his good intentions, but he did not go about it with the hand of a master, as the Postmaster General did, sweeping in his tens and hundreds of thousands out of the subsidies granted to these great corporations. Why, over $1,000,000 was granted in one case, and $650,000 in another case. During that time the hon. gentleman was in the Cabinet and was voting for the subsidies. How simple it would have been for him to levy a toll of, say, 10 per cent on those subsidies. I am just supposing the case, we have not gone into the evidence yet, we will see that more in detail when we get there. No doubt the supporters of the Government will consider, and even the Minister of Justice, I suppose, with the casuistry which distinguishes him sometimes, will convince himself, that after all the end justifies the means. And what is the glorious end that is accomplished by this boodling? Why, Sir, it is to maintain the loyalty and unity of Canada to the British Empire, to maintain the old flag and the old monopolists, and surely that end justifies a great deal. The means to that end are the votes of public money, and what object could be more patriotic than to allow a reasonable and sufficient proportion of those public moneys to filter into the pockets of the Minister and then be disseminated among the electors for the good of the old flag? Quite as honest as the Franchise Act, quite as honest as the Gerrymander Act, I do not see much difference myself. But I understand now why they are sticking to it, and going to vote it down; the country will understand it, too. Of course, last session there was an enquiry into the charges made by Mr. Tarte. They were not as direct as these, but there was no quibbling about them, they were allowed. The present leader of the House was not the leader of the House when that enquiry was begun; but he became leader of the House as the result of that enquiry. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) was allowed by the majority on the other side to escape with a very narrow squeeze. He was just squeezed enough and blackened enough to put him out of his place in the Cabinet, and as leader of the House, but he was not blackened enough to put him out of his seat as member for Three Rivers, and so he meekly and mildly consented to retire from the Ministry, continuing to support the Government, grateful for having been let off easier than his friend Mr. McGreevy. Now, I will not continue my remarks any further. So far as I am concerned I will leave this matter, as I must leave it, in the hands of the representatives of the people in this House. I hope yet, before they vote this down, they will hesitate longer, and perhaps see new light; but if they do not, all I can say is this: that my convictions are so strong, and my knowledge so accurate, as to the truth of these allegations, that I shall, if the opinion of this House is against me, appeal to the people and to the press of the country to see what they think about it. I hope it will not be necessary to do so, but I give notice to all my colleagues in this Parliament that I am not going to let this thing drop, even if there is a hostile vote on this motion to-night.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, following, as he did, an hon. gentleman who had made a very learned and a very appropriate address upon the value of the issues before the House, has certainly disappointed those who expected that he would make some attempt, at all events, to meet the argument put forth by the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), instead of contenting himself with speaking upon a variety of subjects having more or less, but generally speaking very much less, reference to the

point at issue, and occupying the time of this House without any profit or advantage whatsoever. He ended his speech by saying that if this motion was voted down he would appeal to the public of Canada and to the press of Canada. I can tell him, speaking for myself, and speaking, I believe, for a large number of members on this side of the House, that if the charges were brought specifically and in such a manner as that they could be fairly investigated, an investigation would be granted if those who think as I do have votes enough in this House to do it. The hon. gentleman has refused to take up the gauntlet that was thrown down to him by the hon. member for Cumberland when he declared that the charges were not specific enough, that they were subject to very grave objections. I supposed that he would have endeavoured to show that these charges were sufficient, that they were specific, and were such as an hon. gentleman occupying a seat in this House would be expected to meet for his own honour and for his own dignity. Instead of that, he occupied the time of the House with a dissertation upon the joint responsibility of each and every member of the Government, just as if anybody had challenged anything of that kind. He spent his time telling us how this House had power to investigate the charges against any one of its members, just as if anybody had alleged the contrary. The only thing that has been said in an adverse direction was that the charges should be made in the same manner that the meanest criminal in this country has a right to demand that charges against him should be made. Sir, we are here in this Parliament face to face with what is supposed to be a charge against the honour and the character of one of the public men of this country, and a member of the Administration of the day. One would suppose naturally that in view of that fact, hon. gentlemen would approach this question with something like a judicial spirit. We are told by the leading members on both sides of the House that we are here in our judicial capacity to investigate any such charge as this; but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask those who have been listening to the speeches that have been made, what kind of a judicial spirit has been manifested on the other side of the House in this matter. What kind of a judicial spirit was manifested in the closing remarks of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) when he dragged in everything that could possibly arouse party spirit and party hatred in the breasts of men here. What was the judicial spirit manifested by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to-night, a gentleman who commenced his speech some weeks ago in this House, who continued it at Ingersoll, and who wound it up here this evening. In each and every sentence that he addressed to the House, was there a judicial spirit manifested, or was there not merely an attempt made to shatter the proud reputation of the hon. Minister of Justice in this country, a reputation which he envies, a reputation which no man on the opposite side of the House has ever yet achieved, and a reputation that has carried the Conservative flag to victory all over Canada. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) attempted to destroy that reputation when he said to-night that the defence made by the hon. Minister of Justice was worse than the horrible crimes that were imputed to his colleague. The Minister of Justice was told by that gentleman that he had disgraced his high office, and that he had degraded himself. In every word from beginning to end of that speech, made by one of the oldest parliamentarians in the country, there was an attempt made at defamation and vilification of the worst kind. I am satisfied when that speech goes to the country to-morrow, side by side with the speech made by the leader of the Opposition the other day, the people will find that there is no desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to see justice done to the gentleman accused here, or to insure that justice to him which would be meted out to the meanest criminal in the land brought before a court of justice. There is not merely an attempt made to destroy his character, but an attempt to impugn the honesty of the Minister of Justice and to degrade him in the eyes of the people who now hold him in such high esteem. I will refer now to the statement made by the hon. leader of the Opposition a few minutes ago. He said:

"The language of the Minister of Justice is far different when he speaks on the hustings and when he speaks on the floor of the House. When the hon. gentleman was before the people of this country and when the Government of which he was a member was assailed for bribery and corruption, for winning elections by vicious practices the honourable gentleman was brave, and he stated that he was willing to give a hearing to every man who made a charge against the Government or any of its members, that he was welcome to make that charge and to have it investigated, that the Government was afraid of nothing. When the hon. gentleman is taken at his word, and charges are made, how does he answer? He answers by the merest quibbling and pettifogging ever heard in any court of justice to defend a vicious case."

I like to hear the leader of the Opposition talk about bravery, especially with recent history before our eyes as to his own conduct in matters that are now notorious throughout the country. I would not have brought this matter into the debate were it not that it was introduced by the last speaker and others on the opposite side of the House. Last year when we had an investigation against the ex-Minister of Public Works, the leader of the Opposition showed his bravery when he danced the war dance, and set up the war whoop, and brandished his tomahawk over the prostrate form of his adversary in politics; and when I told him on the floor of this House of an investigation that was taking place elsewhere, and of his polititial friends that were being proven to be steeped to the lips in corruption and robbery of the public funds of the country, he said: Let the proof be made, let the charges be established and I will denounce those who have been guilty of these crimes. Well, Mr. Speaker, the charges have been proved, and not only was the proof made of the miserable $100,000 in the Baie des Chaleurs affair, but it was shown that letters of credit were teeming for fifties and hundreds of thousands of dollars and that the Province of Quebec was robbed by the band. What was then the position of the brave man who now censures the hon. the Minister of Justice for lack of bravery? Why, in the very opening of the proceedings, he spoke of the conduct of the Lieutenant Governor, whose action brought to light this rascality by which many hon. gentlemen opposite occupy their seats in this House, and he described that action of the Lieutenant Governor as conduct that would reduce the Province of Quebec beneath the position of the republics of Spanish America.

According to the leader of the Opposition it was the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec who was degrading the province and it was not the band of robbers, it was not the rascals, it was not those who say to the present day that all they did and all that they stole was for the leader of the Opposition and his friends. Only last week when the constable was at the door of some of these men that utterance was made, as it was made on the public hustings during the election. The investigation in Quebec proved that public honesty was outraged, that public morality had been outraged, that honour had been trampled under foot, and that religion had been degraded, but the honourable and brave man who leads the Opposition in this House, and who attacks the Minister of Justice showed his bravery then and fulfilled his promise made to this House and to this country, by starting off to the Province of Ontario and valiantly telling the people there that he was ready to answer for his own sins, but not for the sins of those with whom he had been associated. That was the grand denunciation, that was the display of bravery. He dare not denounce the man who was guilty, because that man had him in his power and he has him in his power yet. Let me ask what was the value of the taunt cast at the Minister of Justice and what was the basis for it? I will quote the words of the Minister of Justice on this very subject. He said:

"I have to repeat again that if these gentlemen have any charges to make against any member of the Government in regard to the propriety of granting these subsidies we are here to meet them and this is the place to meet them."

There he challenged hon. gentlemen opposite if they had any charge to make in regard to the granting of these subsidies, if there had been any conspiracy in the matter in regard to the giving of these subsidies between the Government and any member of the Government, that they were prepared to meet them. In another part of that speech the Minister of Justice says:

"I have already assured the House that if any charges are framed which do come within that category they will be entertained, and there will be no opposition on this side of the House to an investigation. I have already stated, in so far as the Government is concerned, that they are here to meet any accusations which may be made in that regard."

Was this language plain? Was this language emphatic? Did any one misunderstand it? And yet, in the face of that, we are told that different language was used here on the floor of this House from that used on the hustings throughout the country, and hon. gentlemen opposite expect that the members of this House and the people of the country are going to take stock in such statements so insolently made in such an insulting language. Now, this matter presents itself to my mind in three different phases. The charges as laid refer, first, to the Postmaster General personally; in the second place, they may be treated as to the allegations affecting principally the elections of 1887, as I understand the reading of the document, although other gentlemen seem to think that they apply to elections extending from 1882 to 1891; and thirdly, we are asked to deal with this question by referring it to a committee of the House. Now, the position we take is this: we complain of the vagueness of these charges. We say they should be specific and should present a *primâ facie* case of guilt against the accused. Well, the hon. Minister of Justice, whose speech seems to form the theme of all that has been said on the other side, made this statement as to how these charges should be laid before the House:

"Sir, before considering in detail what these charges are, or whether they come up to the standard of making an accusation of misconduct by a member of this House in his capacity as a member of this House I wish particularly to direct the attention of the House to the importance of observing that that rule is strictly complied with by any person who desires this House to exercise its judicial functions, and to sit and deliberate upon the conduct of a member. It will not do at all to say that some charge is implied, that some charge is put forward which may be capable of one construction, and equally capable of another construction. The House has to see especially, when charges are deliberately framed as these have been, that they bear that plain construction upon their face, and that the member who makes them shall not afterwards be in a position to say that he did not intend to make such a charge, but that he intended to charge some personal impropriety, some breach of the election laws upon the member whom he accuses."

I propose to defend that position, first by the precedent established by the Liberal party in the Province of Ontario in 1872, and secondly, by the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite in their speeches since the beginning of this debate. Let me first refer to the motion made by Mr. Cameron in the Ontario Assembly in 1872, wherein he asked for a select committee on a general charge in the following words:—

"A select committee to enquire whether any and what corrupt inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. Edward Blake or any other member of the present Administration while members of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, said committee to have power to sent for persons and papers."

Now, it would seem to the non-professional reader that this was very straighforward and plain language, that what was meant was stated; but let us see how this demand for a committee was met by Mr. Blake, the party accused, who was at the head of the Government, and by members of the Government, who without being named were also implicated. In a very elaborate argument based upon what had been said by Mr. Blake, during the debate in the House, the *Globe* of the following day said:

"It might be supposed that, on moving this resolution the grounds of the charge would be stated clearly and distinctly to the House. This was the more necessary from the extreme vagueness of the resolution itself. It will be observed, first, that no responsibility was assumed therein by the member making it; secondly, that the nature of the alleged inducement is not specified: and thirdly, that the other members of the Administration said to have been parties to the transaction are not named in the indictment."

The *Globe* lays down the doctrine further:

"Certain principles, perfectly well defined, govern the course of the House under such circumstances. The function assumed is judicial, and it is necessary to provide, as absolutely as possible, in the first place, that the charge shall, if true, be brought home; and, in the next, that the accuser shall have no chance of going back on his words, if he is found to have charged his fellow member falsely.

"The very basis of the whole proceeding should be the possession by the Assembly of a strong *primâ facie* (case) of guilt against whoever may be the offender or accessory to the proceedings complained of. Without this no such charges should ever be made. Even the meanest felon is entitled to this much at the hands of a grand jury before he can be put upon his trial."

The *Globe* elaborated the same argument as that put forward this evening by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey), and went on to show what principles were involved, and here is what he stated:

"A principle, and a most important one too was at stake. In an Assembly whose proceedings are strictly regulated by precedent, a very grave responsibility rests upon the Government representing the majority to do or allow to be done nothing that will curtail the privileges or jeopardize the rights of those who or now, are may be at a future time, in a minority. Here was a vague charge levelled at five gentlemen by a member who would not say to which of them he expected to attach the stigma of so foul an act as the bribing of an adviser of the executive to forsake his colleagues in the midst of a crisis when the existence of a Government was trembling in the balance. But suppose that the case were reversed; that the accuser was a Minister with a strong majority at his back and the accused some too aggressive member of a weak Opposition. The charge might be as vague as suited the purposes of the accuser; the committee struck with due regard to the wishes of the Government; the proceedings postponed from time to time,—perhaps from session to session;—the charge still kept hanging over the unfortunate victim, it might be a general election, and the precedent of yesterday quoted in justification of a refusal to make the indictment so clear and specific that there should be no pretense for evading a decision if a satisfactory answer were forthcoming."

Thus we find that the very ablest man in the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, upon an occasion similar to this, when a charge was brought which was certainly far more pointed, intelligible and easily disposed of by way of evidence than that now levelled at the Postmaster General, attacked the charge on account of its vagueness, and on the ground that it would be unjust not to take a legal stand, a stand that would be consistent with the practice of the British Parliament and our own Parliament up to that time, and to preserve in the strictest integrity the rights of every member of the House, whether he was a member of the Government or not. So we find in the mouth of their strongest exponent of constitutional doctrine, the very argument that we are now placing before this House and the country in meeting the charge which has been levelled against the hon. Postmaster General. Now, will it be contended that this charge is more specific than the one presented by Mr. Cameron? Will it be contended that the Postmaster General is not entitled to the same protection as the meanest felon in the country? Is it not the duty of this Government, not only to protect the one who is in a majority here, but also to hesitate establishing a precedent which may be most dangerous in the future for the minority and not in accord with the constitutional law of Parliament. We have, in the words of the hon. member for Bothwell, a justification of the position taken by the Minister of Justice. I pointed out, in my opening remarks, what the Minister of Justice said, and will take the liberty of doing so again. He said that the House has to see specially, when charges are deliberately framed, as these have been, that they bear that plain construction upon their face and shall not be susceptible of two or more constructions. Well, we find that the hon. member for Bothwell, with these charges in his hand, answering the Minister of Justice, told us:

"This House is the custodian of the public treasury. The hon. gentleman who holds the public moneys of this country is a mere agent of this House; and we have a right to enquire, even though the enquiry should extend back to 1882. If a charge of misappropriation of public moneys is made against a man in public life, he is not fit to be there in charge of the public treasury. If he advised the Crown to make these appropriations, and had an understanding with one of the railway companies participating in them, that these moneys or a portion of them should go to him, we ought to know it; we are entitled to know it: and Sir, we are entitled to know it by an investigation conducted by this House, and conducted solely by this House. That being so, this motion ought to be carried, and it will be an admission that there is something wrong, that concealment is necessary, if the proposition is voted down."

I am prepared to agree with the hon. gentleman that if any Minister or any member had advised the Crown to make certain appropriations, and had an understanding with a railway company to receive a portion of the amounts, we ought to know all the particulars. Into a charge such as that, if brought before the House, no Government could refuse to grant an enquiry. If the charge, out of which the hon. member for Bothwell says he can wring such an indictment, were properly laid in unequivocal terms before the House, there could be no objection to an investigation. But there is no such charge. With all his legal ability, the hon. gentleman cannot find, from the beginning to the end of this accusation, a single line to the effect that there was an understanding between the Postmaster General and any railway company, whereby he advised the Crown to make these appropriations on condition that the company should make him a participant in the moneys they received. There is no man in this House, including the hon. member for Bothwell, who can find any such charge in the resolution before us. In that respect we have a justification of the statement made by the Minister of Justice. But we have more than that. We have not only the fact that two or three hon. members opposite have each given a different construction to these charges, but we have the hon. member for Bothwell himself saying that he understands these charges to be capable of two different constructions; and he goes on to say, in speaking against the appointment of a commision which might possibly be granted in this matter, a subject to which I shall address myself briefly in a few moments:

"A commission is a creature of the Administration. It is appointed, not to investigate the conduct of the Government, but to investigate the conduct of those who are subordinate to the Government and who are responsible to the Government. If one of these hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches is charged with wrong-doing, can it be for a moment said that they themselves are the proper parties to advise the Crown as to who shall be appointed to investigate their conduct? To whom is the report to be made? Why, to themselves. Who is to advise the Crown upon that report? Why, the very gentlemen who are accused, and nobody else. They are the parties who are to tell the Crown whether they ought to be dismissed or whether they ought to be retained, upon the evidence that the commission has taken. Is it not clear that if these hon. gentlemen have the appointment of the commission by whom they are to be tried, that they will make it, so far as they are concerned, a very merciful tribunal, indeed."

So that we have it here, not merely that the Postmaster General stands accused of having conspired with this railway company, but that the whole Government of the Dominion are pointed to as a band of traitors, to use the words of the loyal knight who addressed us in the beginning of the evening, and are every one of them upon their trial. We have it from one hon. gentleman that this is a huge conspiracy, a conspiracy in the broadest and worst possible form. But there is no allegation to show that this is a conspiracy. There is nothing to show that the position taken in the first instance by the hon. member for Bothwell has any justification, or that the position taken by him in the second case is at all justifiable, and that all the members of the Government are implicated and unable to act in a matter of this kind. It will be satisfactory to all those who have followed this debate to know that the position taken by the Minister of Justice is

justified, not only by precedent of this country as well as precedent in the mother land, but by the utterances as well of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is another point which has been variously dealt with by different speakers, and that is the statement of the Minister of Justice that the second branch of the subject should have been dealt with by the election courts. He said:

"We have to consider whether the accusations which are brought forward are accusations which some better qualified tribunal in this country is not clothed with powers to determine. If the constitution has erected a tribunal in the country which has jurisdiction over such matters and if the laws which govern us all, us as well as our constituents, give to these tribunals a right and a procedure to carry on investigations, it is most proper that the House should, if possible, decline to exercise any judicial functions on its part, and leave to the tribunal which is qualified by the constitution and the statutes of this country, the power, the right and the duty to determine and investigate the complaint, whether it be of a member who desires to make an accusation here, or of any person outside of this House."

Now this worried the hon. member for Bothwell a great deal, and he replied:

"Unless men interested in the trial of election petitions choose to file a petition, you have no redress. Parliament is perfectly helpless. A wrong may be done in twenty constituencies: half a million of the public money may be stolen from the public treasury and so applied: but if you cannot find twenty men in those constituencies to file petitions, the other 195 constituencies have no redress."

Well, it was the deliberate policy of this Parliament, as it has been of the Parliament of Great Britain, that these matters, which had so long occupied the House of Commons with such very unsatisfactory results, should be referred to a court of justice. But the gentlemen opposite, upon various occasions, whenever it suited their purpose, have never tired of iterating and reiterating that this House had not abnegated its jurisdiction, that it had concurrent jurisdiction with election courts in such matters, and that it was not only our privilege but our duty to drive men from this House who have been proved guilty of corruption, although these matters should be more properly relegated to the courts of justice. I like consistency. It is a matter of congratulation that the policy enunciated by the Minister of Justice is one which on this side of the House has always been followed, but I can hardly say there is much consistency in the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me remind the House of a case which was very widely spoken of and written about throughout the length and breadth of Canada a few years ago. You will all remember that in 1887 this side of the House lost one of its most promising members, one of the most promising young men in Canada, Mr. Donald McMaster, through an election held in the County of Glengarry, where he was opposed by the late Mr. Purcell who belonged to the other side of the House. That matter was in the courts. Mr. McMaster went before the judge, and proved not merely that corrupt practices had prevailed in that election, but that sums of money unprecedented in the history of elections in this country had been lavished there, and that he had been defeated through that lavish expenditure. Moreover, he proved to the satisfaction of the presiding judge that the candidate opposed to him had been guilty of personal corruption, and not only was the election voided but Mr. McMaster's opponent was disqualified for seven years. According to the present statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, that gentleman was unfit and unworthy to sit in this House, but his case being brought before the Supreme Court, not upon its merits, not upon the merits of the judgment which had annulled the election and deprived him of his franchise for seven years, not because the evidence was discredited of any one out of the host of witnesses who proved that money had flowed like water and that Mr. Purcell had expended it himself, but on a mere technicality that a few hours had elapsed after a certain notice should have been given was not given in time, the judgment was reversed on that ground, and that gentleman came into this House and sat here by the side of the leader of the Opposition. We knew that the matter had been referred to the courts, we knew that the policy of the country expressed through Parliament had consigned those matters to the courts either on the merits or on technicalities, as the case might be, and therefore, when he took his seat, not one man on this side took any objection or said: This House had not abnegated its right, its concurrent jurisdiction with the courts, and had a right to expel a man who has been proved guilty of those crimes and offences, and we might have urged that this young and reputable politician who had been driven out of public life by those nefarious schemes should have been given his seat and natural right prevail. We did not do so: and the hon. gentlemen opposite say that our concurrent jurisdiction should be exercised there? Not at all. They allowed the matter to pass because the question had been decided in the court. They had the vote of that gentleman from that day to the end of the Parliament, and yet they have the face to stand up before this House and say they are honest.

Mr. BOWELL. And they applauded the decision.

Mr. CURRAN. Yes, they will applaud almost everything.

Mr. MULOCK. We draw the line at you.

Mr. CURRAN. Out of all the counties mentioned in the motion, we find that in Champlain, Montmorency, L'Islet, Berthier, Quebec County, Gaspé, Montmagny, Quebec West and Three Rivers, election petitions were filed and they went before the courts, where those who were attacked had the right to file counter-petitions. This is a phase of the question that forcibly struck me the other day. We have had these matters before the court, and now we have all this vituperation poured upon the head of the Minister of Justice because he asks that we shall abide by the law of Parliament which has been on the Statute-book for years, and which any hon. gentleman who felt himself aggrieved could have taken advantage of. We have also had from the member for Bothwell (Mr Mills) a warning that it would never do for this House to have these charges, improperly made and levelled against an hon. member, referred to a committee. I do not know what the intention of this Government is, but I have my own views as to what should be done with any charges properly made which may be laid before this House. In speaking of that, I will refer the hon. gentleman to the remarks made by my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) the chairman of our Committee on Privileges and Elections last year at the close of the investigation which has been so often referred to to-night. Speaking of the majority and minority reports, he said:

"The consideration of this division (a strict party one) which took place in the general committee without any debate, leads me at the very beginning to consider whether the Committee on Privileges and Elections is really the best one that can exist for the protection of members of Parliament against whom serious charges are made, like the present one, and at the same time to protect the dignity of the House of Commons. A division adopting the report of the majority took place in the committee on a strict party vote. I am not surprised at that result. It has been the history of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in almost every instance since I have presided over that committee from 1882 to the present time."

The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), speaking on the same subject said :

"It is very unfortunate that on a question so grave as this, the decision is to be left to a popular assembly of this kind. It may be that under our system of government, it is impossible that any other or better way could be found, but I think that if the same course that was followed in the Parnell investigation had been pursued here, if the matter had been referred to three independent members of the bench where we know we could find judicial impartiality, while this House and this country would have been saved the enormous expense of this enquiry, a more satisfactory conclusion would have been arrived at."

Now, I am satisfied that these two gentlemen echoed the sentiment and the honest opinion of every member who followed that investigation from beginning to the end. The subject is one well worthy of deepest consideration. When we consider the enormous expense attaching to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the time which is taken up by the members of the House in attending the proceedings of that committee, when we consider that an investigation by that committee may so lengthen the session as that members will demand increased indemnity, when we consider the charges that are likely to be heaped up there, when we consider the unsatisfactory results of investigations of this kind, and when we consider that this country, especially since the recent investigations in Quebec, will prefer that these investigations be held before honourable and upright judges who command the respect and confidence of the people, I say that it is high time that the Minister of Justice and his colleagues should determine that the same justice ought to be meted out to the Postmaster General or to any other member as was meted out to Mr. Mercier and his colleagues in the Province of Quebec. There we had a commission of judges, and when questions were put to the witnesses they were ordered to be answered or otherwise, as men trained in the law considered they ought or ought not to be answered. But before the Committee on Privileges and Elections we have a hue and cry raised if a man is not ordered to answer every question that may be asked him no matter how irrevelant or improper ; and if a question is put to a vote in that committee as to whether any document should be submitted, the vote is always a party vote, and on the whole the result is very unsatisfactory. I have no interest in this matter whatsoever, except the interest that any member of Parliament may feel in seeing the affairs of this country properly carried out. I take no stock in the charges and countercharges that are made here. I approach a question of this kind in an altogether different spirit from the one which has been manifested by some hon. members in this House when an hon. member is laying under an accusation of this kind. We should approach this question in a spirit of sorrow rather than one of exultant anticipatory revenge. We should approach it in a judicial spirit, knowing that the people of this country are desirous and will demand that every complaint properly lodged shall be investigated, either by a committee of the House or by a royal commission appointed by this Government. I believe that this Government thoroughly appreciate the responsibility that weighs upon them and that they will properly discharge that responsibility. I think the Government have shown their desire to do what is right in charges of this kind in the past, by having them investigated, either by a committee of the House or by the courts. They have a record to which they can appeal with pride and satisfaction. The people have approved of their course in the past, and I am satisfied the Government will pursue that course in the future, and that when an hon. gentleman makes charges against another member in such a manner as that they can be investigated, the investigation will be granted. I think the Government of this country will meet such a charge against the Postmaster general, either by granting a committee of the House or, what would be still better, by appointing a royal commission where a verdict could be arrived at that would satisfy public opinion. I believe the Government to be anxious and desirous of having an honest and fair investigation into all charges properly brought against members of the House or individuals, to use the words of the Prime Minister, be they high or low.

Mr. MULOCK. I will endeavour to follow the example of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat by bringing to bear upon this question that judicial spirit which he doubtless thinks he has done, and which he commends to others. As he portrayed our duties, I thought what a loss the bench of Quebec has sustained in his decision, which I read in the paper to-day, not to sacrifice himself in that way upon the altar of his country ; and perhaps I was able to discover some reason for the earnestness with which he has come to the rescue of his friend, the Minister of Justice, and given him a certificate of character. Having, as it was announced to the world that he had, been an unsuccessful kicker for a place in the Cabinet, he wishes to let them know that his heart is still true, and that he is still in the market when they choose to buy him. He gives arguments why the motion in question should not be adopted. One of his strongest arguments, the one that almost caused him to explode, was his condemnation of the conduct of the leader of the Opposition. That was the principal logical defence that he advanced against the granting of this resolution. Having fired his best bolt first, he had little left to say in the end, but that little consisted largely in casting reflections upon the character of a fellow-member of this House, and a fellow-countryman of his own, a gentleman who is no longer in the land of the living to defend himself against the accusations. When he attacked my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, the principal charge against him was lack of courage. It occurred to me that the hon. gentleman would have manifested possession of a greater quantity of that article if he had made this charge face to face with the person whom he accused ; but he took advantage of his absence from this chamber to make these observations which were couched in that judicial spirit so *apropos* of the discussion. But when the hon. gentleman re-

turned to the chamber we find no allusion whatever to his record from that time on. It only flowed from the lips of my eloquent friend when the hon. gentleman was absent from the chamber. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) is general endorser for all the members of the Government who protest against the granting of this enquiry. I do not discover that he has advanced anything original, but whatever these gentlemen said, he said likewise. I myself desire to import nothing into this discussion except what is pertinent to it, and I hope I shall carry out that intention with better success than attended the probably well-meant efforts of the hon. gentleman who last spoke. I desire to bring nothing but a fair spirit to bear on the consideration of this question. The charge is that a portion of public money voted by Parliament for a specific purpose was diverted for another purpose, and that this misappropriation took place through the connivance of a member of the Cabinet, a gentleman who had been a member of every Cabinet and of every Parliament that had to do with the voting of that money; and as an incident, but not as the gravamen of the charge, it is said that that money, after being misappropriated was spent illegally and corruptly in other ways. There are two distinct charges, and hon. gentlemen opposite seek to escape any enquiry by centring their objections upon the particular resolution which refers to the application of the fund. The first question however is: Was there a misapplication of the money? If there is anything that the representatives of the people should guard it is the public treasury, and I cannot conceive of our having any more responsible duty cast upon us than to bring into the light of day any such transactions as are alleged to have occurred in this case, so that there may be, not only punishment for the past, but a warning against any similar occurrences in the future. I maintain that it is not only our privilege, but that it is our duty to trace to their ultimate end the public moneys that are voted by Parliament, and should any money voted for a public enterprise be diverted from its proper channel, it is due to the people that it should be known, especially if that diversion has been occasioned by the action of the trustees of the people, the Government of the day, who are responsible for such misapplication. What is the process by which these votes of money are secured? The Government advises His Excellency and His Excellency then sends down a message to Parliament to express its opinion upon it. The Government of the day, having a working majority, practically controls the House, and the decision, in the first instance, in Council really controls the voting of the money. Under our system, the Government practically control the treasury, and surely, if there is a misapplication of the funds by a member of the Government, there can be no clearer duty cast upon the people's representatives than to have this misapplication made known, and, if possible, to have the wrong-doers punished. Now, let us see what defence the Minister of Justice has advanced? The first excuse offered is, that there is no allegation of misappropriation or maladministration of public money. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that it were proved, or suppose, for example, that the Postmaster General were to stand up and say: I do admit that I received, for my own personal use, corruptly, a large sum of money out of the subsidies that had been voted by Parliament at my request and when I was a member of the Cabinet and a member of Parliament to aid a certain railway, and after it was voted portions of these moneys were handed over to me corruptly, and I again ask the Government to ask His Excellency to get more money from Parliament. Now Sir, if the Postmaster General were to make that admission what excuse would any one offer? Would any one for a moment say that there should be a refusal of an enquiry under such circumstances? And yet the Minister of Justice has told us that if we prove every single allegation in this resolution it amounts to no misappropriation or maladministration. If the Minister cannot see, and if this House cannot see, in such a misapplication of money as that a gross breach of trust, then I can conceive of no diversion of public funds that could be so characterized. The Minister of Justice as a second defence says that whilst these transactions complained of were going on, the charge alleges that the Postmaster General was a member of Parliament, that that is not true in fact, and for that reason the charges should fail. In reply to that I may point out that substantially the Postmaster General was a trustee from the time he first took office, prior to the initiation of these votes, until the present day. It is true that for a few odd days here and there, in the interval of the three general elections that have taken place, he was not a member of the House: but from the very commencement of these transactions to this moment he was a member of the Government and had a voice in effecting the decision of Parliament in regard to procuring these public funds. It is the veriest technicality—one that does not commend itself to any fair-minded person—that such an excuse as that should be offered as a reason for not granting this enquiry. The very fact that such a flimsy, trifling excuse as that should be advanced under such circumstances, shows how weak must be the cause of those who seek to burke the enquiry. Another defence that the Minister of Justice advanced is, that the proper place in which to try this matter is the election court. In reply to that, I would ask what election court or what court is there in Canada in which the first charge can be tried? The first charge, practically, is that public money has been embezzled. I ask any lawyer in this House to explain to me what court in the land to-day could take up the charge of misapplying this money? If it is within the jurisdiction of the courts, how comes it then that the Minister of Justice has not put the courts in motion, as it is his duty to do, in view of the warnings which are now given him. Suppose such a charge were brought to the knowledge of an employer in his private capacity; suppose he were informed by some responsible person that his money had been so dealt with by his employé, by his manager, do you not suppose that he would set an enquiry on foot pretty soon? Do you not think that he would say: That charge is specific enough; I will call upon my employé to make an answer to it. He would say: My employé was entrusted with my money in my absence, and instead of using it honestly he is charged with having appropriated a portion of it to his own use. Do you not suppose that he would probe such a charge to the bottom? Now, who is to look after the proper administration of the people's money except their representatives in Parliament? Hon. gentlemen

opposite cannot be sincere, because not one of them, eminent lawyers though they are, has pointed out what tribunal outside of this grand inquest of the people, has jurisdiction to enquire into such matters. Another defence set up by the Minister of Justice was that the charges were vague. Paragraph 5 is as follows :--

"That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and from moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same."

It is there charged in plain language that Sir A. P. Caron received corruptly large portions of the subsidies voted by Parliament to the railway of which he was one of the controlling spirits at both ends ; he was the man to deal out the money to the railway, and he had an interest at the other end, the allegation being that he obtained a portion of those moneys corruptly for his own benefit.

Mr. WELDON. It does not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. I have read the full text, and now I am giving the significance of it. It means that he corruptly obtained the money and diverted it from the purpose for which Parliament voted it ; and it is immaterial, so far as this branch of the subject is concerned, what he did with it afterwards—whether he threw it into the sea or not. It went into his own pocket corruptly ; whether after that he took it out and distributed it for other than his own personal purposes, is immaterial when we are dealing with this branch of the question. Yet, in the face of these specific words, we are told that the charge is too vague. Why, Mr. Speaker, what do hon. gentlemen want ? Do they want us to tell the exact number of dollars he took, the exact day he got the money, the messenger by whom the money was transferred from the treasury of the railway or construction company to the bank account of Sir A. P. Caron, whether it passed by cheque or by bills or in some other way ? These are mere matters of evidence. The substance of the charge is that money was voted by Parliament for a certain purpose, and that Sir A. P. Caron corruptly obtained a portion of it ; and that charge is plain enough and specific enough for any one who wishes to investigate it. The next contention of the Minister of Justice is that it is unconstitutional for a committee of the House to try the Government. That I think is a proposition of law which this House should not sanction for one moment—that a committee of this House cannot investigate charges against the Government. Why, Sir, it has happened over and over again that committees of Parliament have had to investigate matters affecting the Government. Last session when we investigated the McGreevy charges were we not then investigating charges reflecting on the Government. It is true, the Government chose to repudiate a certain amount of responsibility, as technically they were a new Government, and there was only one Minister who was in the long run affected. But seeing that Parliament last session took upon itself to investigate the conduct of one Minister, could it not take upon itself this year to investigate the conduct of another or of the whole dozen ? If so, with that precedent before us, I fail to understand the meaning of the expression of the Minister of Justice when he says that it is unconstitutional for a committee of Parliament to try the Government of the day. On the contrary, Parliament itself can I presume delegate to a committee such investigations as took place last year. It did so then, and the point was never taken that the committee had no power to carry on that investigation. On the contrary, it brought forth results, and those results appear to have the sanction of the law. I presume that the course we adopted last year, had the sanction of the law and will not be repudiated to-day. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether it is the duty of Parliament to endeavour to abnegate its powers and to say that there is no tribunal anywhere to enquire into wrong-doing if there has been any. I do not desire to say that there has been ; I am simply taking up the charges and arguing the matter in the abstract. I say that the Parliament of Canada, being founded on the principles of the Imperial Parliament, has within itself inherent jurisdiction—not a juridiction of a latent character, but jurisdiction which it is bound actively to use in order on all occasions to investigate such matters as are now inviting our attention. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries came to the rescue of the Government as he perhaps deemed it his duty to do, and endorsed the arguments of the hon. Minister of Justice ; but he dwelt a little more on one branch of the case. He said that this was simply an attempt in a cheap way to enquire into the methods by which the Conservative party carried their elections in 1887 ; that was his argument. Well, I do not think he could have given the country credit for common intelligence when he presented that flimsy explanation. I think he could not have been sincere in offering that as an excuse for the Government's refusal to grant this enquiry. Again hon. gentlemen opposite, plead the statute of limitations. They say, what you should have done was within the time provided by the Controverted Elections Act, within the thirty days to have filed a petition in each court for each county where this money went, and threshed the matter out in that way. But inasmuch as the various persons who fingered the money were clever enough to hide their tracks all these long years, they having outwitted you, there is now no remedy. That is the proposition. Well, I cannot assent to that. As the honourable and judicial member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) says, the House still retains its concurrent original jurisdiction, and I am sure he will admit this is a most opportune occasion in which to set that jurisdiction in force. Either we have to resort to the jurisdiction of this House for a remedy or there is none, and the hon. gentleman can choose which horn of the dilemma they like. If they are desirous that the light of day shall be let in on these transactions and that wrong, if done, shall be punished or that, in case any charges are wrongly made, the character of the person against whom they are made shall be vindicated, they will be the first to urge the Government to recede from the false position in which they have put themselves and in which they are putting their loyal followers. If the supporters of the Administration desire to do the Government a service, they cannot do a better one than to bring it at the earliest moment from this unsound and unpatriotic position which they have taken, and stand by the rights and liberties of the peeple. The Minister of Justice said that in his action he was not moved by any desire to

conceal wrong-doing, but that he felt impelled to defend the liberties of the members of the House. He felt impelled to stand up for the dignity of Parliament. Who is going to stand up for the dignity of the people? Who is going to stand up for the rights of the people? Surely they are to be considered, and if the two are to be weighed, I would like to know whether the rights and liberties of the people are not paramount to those of their servants. Then the Minister of Public Works got into the boat, and he advanced the most extraordinary defence of all. Each one had been searching for a defence and exercising his ingenuity in devising something to add to the record; and so we have the Minister of Public Works advancing this doctrine. He said, in so many words, that the only ground on which you could find the Postmaster General guilty of handling this money would be by alleging conspiracy to rob the treasury. He said:

"My contention is this, that to indict the Postmaster General as guilty of some offence against the statutes or the unwritten law, he ought to have been charged with having conspired, before the subsidies were granted, with the parties applying for them, to get the subsidies in order to derive some benefit for himself."

All these essentials must be shown, according to the reasoning of the Minister of Public Works. He must beforehand have conspired with the parties, he himself being one of them, Sir Adolphe Caron, one of the leading directors and corporators of the railway in question, comes down himself, a Minister of the Crown and says: I, an officer and representative of this railway, apply to you, the trusted Minister of the Crown, to give to me, through the railway and myself, a certain sum, and I want you, Sir Adolphe Caron, Minister of Militia, to understand that when I get that public money, as director of the Construction Company of the St. John Railway, I am going to put some of it in my own pocket. That must be proved to convict him of any corrupt understanding. He must not know as Minister of Militia what Sir Adolphe Caron the railway director had in his mind. He, this poohbah, is to be entirely double in his mind, and what he knows in one capacity is not to be known to him in another. Why, there is no plainer proposition and principle involved than that if a trustee chooses to bring his trust into conflict with his personal position, his trust position is paramount and he is responsible as a trustee. He cannot escape responsibility by confusing his two positions. But does anybody suppose that when it is proposed to rob the treasury, the Minister has it all put down in black and white. Is not a wink as good as a nod to a blind horse? And if this year the promoters of the railway choose to come down to Parliament and obtain through political influence or otherwise, a grant of a large sum for a certain public enterprise, and if after that, while the money is still in *loco penitentiæ*, while the money is still in the treasury or under the control of the Government, any portion of it is intercepted on its way from the treasury to the donee, that interception amounts to a breach of trust; or if you choose to go through the form of putting it into the treasury of the donee, it is after all put there for a special trust purpose, for the construction of a railway, and if the donee, under the control and guidance, as seems to be the case here of the present Postmaster General, gives possession of that money or part of it to the present Postmaster General, then Minister of Militia, I would like to know if that is not a conspiracy after the fact. Yet the Minister of Public Works adds his ridiculous plea to the record. I was much pleased with the general tone of the speech of the hon. member for Cumberland and although he did make a mistake, he admitted with great sincerity, which pleased us all, that at one stage he had branched off into a political argument. I would not blame him for that, because we must admit there was some provocation. Nevertheless, although he attempted to be fair and temperate in his argument, he was too much of a technical lawyer, and thereby able to pick holes to his own satisfaction in a document which he would gladly see swept away. He made several points, but the strongest was that Parliament should not appoint a committee to enquire into the private conduct of a member. Assuming that this charge is correct, is the misapplication of public money by a Minister of the Crown a transaction of a private character? I think it is essentially of a public character. I cannot conceive of any transaction being more of a public character than the one in question. A Minister of the Crown obtains control of a portion of the public money corruptly, which money was obtained by him, which he knew was voted by the Government and Parliament for a different purpose altogether. That is the charge made against the Postmaster General. It is a charge against him in his public character, and so the whole argument of the member for Cumberland based on that defence has to be swept away, I think, as inapplicable to the case. Then the member for Cumberland says that, if the money were properley voted, that wipes out the wrong. I cannot agree with him there. The mere voting of the money or paying over the money does not settle the question. Parliament has a right to know whether the money was properly voted and whether it was devoted to the purpose for which it was intended, and, if we desire to control our public funds and to see that the public money shall accomplish what it is intended for, if we desire to prevent fraud and deception, we never can concede the proposition that the responsibility of Parliament ceases with the voting of the money. The money is voted for a special purpose, and, if it is not devoted to that purpose, the Government is responsible. If the Government calls upon Parliament to vote a larger amount than the public necessity demands, it is responsible to Parliament for that. I would like to know why the Government asked Parliament, as in this case they apparently did, to vote $100,000 more than was required for this work. Surely, if the advisers of His Excellency and of this House ask us to vote money for a certain enterprise, we have a right to assume that every dollar of that money is going into that enterprise, and further I submit that any surplus ought to lapse again into the treasury. It is voted for a special end and for that only, and if the money voted exceeds the needs of the case, the Government that misleads the House by carelessness or otherwise is to some extent at all events responsible to Parliament, so I cannot agree to the proposition that all responsibility is over and that there can be no wrong-doing unless it is connected with the corrupting of Parliament or of the Government in procuring the original vote; and yet that is the argument of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). Then he says we ought to vote down this resolution for the

most extraordinary reason of all. He does not say that section 5 is not a good section. He practically admits by his silence that paragraph discloses a good charge, but he says that because in his judgment paragraphs 9 and 10 suggest another charge which he thinks ought to be dealt with in the election courts, for that reason he is not in favour even of sending the good charge for investigation ; he would not lop off what he considers the superfluous charge, but he would take advantage of that to prevent any investigation into the real charge with he considers good and valid. No one can consider that a good argument. On the contrary, if he is convinced that the charge in section 5 is well alleged, it is his duty to insist on that going to a committee, and, if it is necessary, to cut off paragraphs 9 and 10. Then he says that this is a fishing charge. He says that paragraphs 9 and 10 are a fishing charge. They are very specific in their allegations, and I fail to understand why we should be so anxious to prevent the discovery of important evidence, to verify these charges if they be true, or to disprove them if not true. I would consider that the Postmaster General from his place in the House has given an emphatic denial to these charges. He did not think they were vague. What was he denying? He evidently thought he saw a charge. What did he mean when he got up and said these charges were not true? He did not see any vagueness in them, and he did not think these charges were made against him in his private capacity. From his place as a Minister of the Crown, he said in fact, I understand the full force of these accusations. You charge me with having abused a trust which Her Majesty reposed in me. You charge me with having been one to abstract from the public treasury the large sum of $100,000. You charge me with having misapplied the money which should have gone to another source, and I have asked the railways involved and I have their testimony here. How is it then that, while he can see the charge, his bodyguard are unable to see it. Well, if they cannot see it, the public have seen it. There are those outside this House who have seen it, and they will not agree with hon. gentlemen who are blind in this instance. The Government, if they are anxious to free their colleague and to have the pledge of honour which he has given to the people approved, will give him an opportunity to prove his innocence? I am aware that he must be presumed to be innocent in the eye of the law until the contrary is proved. I would like to know why the person principally interested sees no vagueness in this resolution while others do. It seems to me that the Government have weighed the chances. I will not follow up the statement of the Minister of Justice who said that any wrong, any stealing of the public moneys is no matter. It seems to me that the Government had weighed the chances and have come to the conclusion that, bad as it was for them to refuse this request, it would now be worse to accord it. I will end with this question. When charges of this kind are made, if Parliament says: No matter what has beed urged, we refuse to investigate, I would like to know what safeguard there is hereafter for the public treasury? If to-day it is but $100,000, which is said to have been misapplied, to-morrow it may be ten times that. Are we going deliberately to establish a precedent that such transactions can take place and receive endorsement at the hands of the Parliament of Canada. If so, Parliament has failed, parliamentary institutions in Canada have broken down, and the people are practically powerless. I, therefore, trust that wiser counsels will yet prevail, that before this matter is disposed of the Government will see fit to recede from their position and adopt the only course I think that is now open, the only one that will satisfy public opinion, and that is, a full and open enquiry, whereby all evidence that is likely to cast any light upon these transactions may be given, that the accused, if guilty, may be brought to justice, and if innocent, may be so declared before the people. Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to avoid anything of a passionate character in my remarks upon this question. I feel that it is one requiring us to approach it in a judicial spirit, and in that spirit I have endeavoured to discuss it. I am anxious, as a member of the House, and for the sake of the House, that the truth shall come out, and being in that position I hope I have brought to bear upon the discussion that judicial spirit with was recommended by the hon. member for Montreal Centre.

Mr. BENNETT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand there are quite a number of members on both sides who wish to take part in this debate. I would suggest to the leader of the House that a day be fixed for resuming it. It comes in its natural order on Wednesday next at 8 o'clock ; I would suggest that it come at 3 o'clock on that day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection to that arrangement. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 28th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHARGES AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Edgar to refer certain charges against Sir Adolphe Caron to the Committee on Privileges and Elections be made the first Order on Wednesday next, after Questions put by Members.

Motion agreed to.

HARBOUR OF THREE RIVERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to authorize the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers to raise, by the issue of debentures in the manner provided by Chapter fifty-two of the Statutes of 1882, at a rate of interest not exceeding six per cent per annum, a sum not exceeding two hundred and eighteen thousand dollars to be applied to the purchase of wharves or beach property, or the construction

of wharves or other accommodation for vessels, in the Harbour of Three Rivers.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 11) respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 43) to amend an Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

Bill (No. 13) further to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act."—(Mr. Tupper.)

SUPPLY—DIPLOMATIC PAPERS.

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

Mr. LAURIER. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the attention of the House to the following resolution, for which I claim its most favourable consideration :—

That it is a necessary constitutional rule that the substance of all communications between representatives of this Government and the representatives of other countries on matters of public concern should be committed to writing and laid before Parliament as soon as completed, and any attempt by Ministers of the Crown to discuss the subject of such communications without laying them before Parliament is a dangerous infringement on the rights of the people.

He said : The principle involved in this resolution is such as it seems to me it is not necessary to affirm at the present day ; yet, if we remember that on a recent occasion this principle was deliberately violated by the Government, there is nothing left for Parliament to do on the present occasion but once more to assert that principle. When Parliament assembled in the month of February last, there was naturally great anxiety to know the result of the negotiations which had recently taken place between the commissioners of the Canadian Government and the commissioners of the American Government with respect to the subject of reciprocity. There was a natural anxiety to know not only the result but the nature of those negotiations, the nature of the proposals made and of the objections thereto, and what on the whole was the character of the views exchanged by the two parties. Parliament was dissolved last year upon this very question of reciprocity. The excuse given to the Canadian people for the premature dissolution of Parliament was that the Government desired to test public opinion as to the necessity of a new treaty of reciprocity between Canada and the United States. Naturally, everybody expected that the first thing the Government would do would be to lay before the House all the papers concerning the negotiations which had taken place, and it was naturally expected that reference would be made in the Speech from the Throne to the subject and that those papers would be promised. The subject was mentioned in the Speech but no promise made that the papers would be laid before the House. A motion would undoubtedly have been made for the early production of those papers, but early in the session, on the 8th of March, a Bill was introduced by the Government providing for reciprocity in wrecking between the two countries, and in the course of the discussion I enquired if that Bill was the result of the negotiations which had taken place with Washington. I was answered in the affirmative. I asked whether there was any correspondence on the subject and was told there was. I asked if it would be laid before the House and was answered in the affirmative. Sir John Thompson said :

"There is some correspondence which can be laid on the Table of the House, and I am able to say that nothing which transpired is precluded from being mentioned in the House.

"Mr. LAURIER. Is there any writing to that effect or is it purely verbal?

"Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, writing.

"Mr. LAURIER. I presume we shall have it at an early day?

"Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes."

Some few days afterwards papers were brought down which purported to be the substance of the negotiations. To some extent no doubt they were, but what I now charge is that they were not to the fullest extent. There is contained in those papers the proposal of the Canadian commissioners and the American commissioners for a settlement of the boundary line between this country and Canada. Then there is another proposal for the appointment of a Commission to consider the restrictions and regulations to be adopted for the purpose of securing the preservation of fish and fisheries in waters contiguous to the two countries. There is also the acceptance by the American commissioners of that proposition. Then there is a proposition made by the Canadian commissioners of reciprocal legislation in wrecking. This was also accepted by the American commissioners. Then it appears that the proposal was made by the American commissioners, and accepted by the Canadian commissioners, for the appointment of a Commission to determine the boundary line between the two countries in the waters of Passamaquoddy Bay. This is the substance of the papers brought down, but there is not a word on the subject of reciprocity, which must have been the primary matter discussed in those negotiations. There is nothing at all to show whether that subject was discussed or not. But we learned afterwards that it was. In the papers there is absolute silence on the subject, leading one to the conclusion that it had been treated simply as a purely confidential one, a conclusion to which I came all the more readily from the fact that it is of record that Mr. Blaine stipulated to Sir Julian Pauncefote when he was approached by him last year that the negotiations should be altogether irregular and kept confidential, if they did not mature in any arrangement, and be only given to the public in case they did mature in an arrangement. As nothing was brought down of the negotiations which had taken place, the conclusion was natural enough that they had been kept purely confidential, and were not to be disclosed in one or the other country. Yet, Sir, what was our astonishment, when some few days afterwards, the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech presumed to give to the House the substance, or at least the character of the negotiations. Not a written word has been brought down to show their character, not a written word has been given to the House to show that such negotiations had taken place at all. I need not tell the House that this was a most unparliamentary proceeding, that it was an abuse of the privileges of the hon. gentleman as a Minister of the Crown ; and to make the point doubly sure, I will quote the

authority of May on this subject. When the hon. gentleman was making his statement, my hon. friend beside me, the member for Bothwell, at once called your attention, Sir, to the matter by raising a point of order. The point of order was ruled against him. It is not my object now to go back on this point. It may be that according to parliamentary procedure the point of order was not well taken, but if the hon. gentleman on that occasion did not violate the laws of procedure such as they apply to this Parliament, there can be no doubt that he violated a far more important law. There can be no doubt that he violated the very principles upon which parliamentary government rests in all British countries. I quote from May, the edition of 1883, page 378 :

"Another rule or principle of debate may be here added. A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read *a quò* from a despatch or other state papers not before the House unless he be prepared to lay them on the Table. This is similar to that rule of evidence in the courts of law, which prevents counsel stating documents which are not produced in evidence. The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested ; when the objection has been made in time it has been thoroughly acquiesced in."

Now, Sir, it seems to me that the very authority which is here quoted comes very appropriately on the present occasion. The very authority which is here quoted is founded upon that rule of evidence and of common sense, I may say, that no man is at liberty to use a public document for the purpose of conveying an argument or stating a fact unless he is prepared to give to his opponents the substance of the authority which he urges. Otherwise there would be no safety in debate, there would be no safety in courts of justice, there would be no safety in public affairs, and the common-sense reason of the rule has been illustrated by the very language of the hon. gentleman, for I am prepared to say on this occasion, and I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact at once, that the statements he gave to the House in the parts which he did give were, in my opinion highly coloured, and that in the other part, he did not give the whole substance of the negotiations which then took place. The hon. gentleman stated that one of the first things, if not the very first thing, which had been referred to by the American commissioners was that there should be in any treaty which was negotiated a discrimination by the Canadian Government against British goods and British wares. I think this was, to say the least, a very highly coloured statement. If it was not coloured, I want to know why the papers were not brought down, but in my estimation the statement was coloured, because it is altogether improbable that the American commissioners would have required as a *sine quâ non* that there should be discrimination against Great Britain. If they had said that they wanted to know whether the Canadian commissioners would agree to the treaty even if it would involve in discrimination in their favour I could understand it, but to say, as stated by the hon. gentleman, that it was a matter which the American Government insisted on as a *sine quâ non*, that there should be absolute discrimination against Great Britain, seems to me to be very harsh diplomatic language on the part of the American commissioners, and to be highly coloured by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman omitted on that occasion to give the full tenor of the conversation. I do not mean to say that the statement he made is not correct so far as it goes, but there must have been some further statement also. The hon. gentleman has not forgotten that he is not the only one who has spoken on this subject. His namesake, General Foster, the coadjutor of Mr. Blaine in the negotiations, spoke in the city of New York on the same subject shortly afterwards. He spoke on the subject of reciprocity between Canada and the United States, and, after stating that the difficulties in the way of a treaty of reciprocity between the two countries were very great, yet not insuperable, he went on to show where he thought the principal difficulty existed in negotiating a reciprocity treaty between the United States and Canada. He said :

"The fact that Canada does not possess the right of negotiating her own treaties, but must have them negotiated for her by a distant power which is controlled by economic principles, is entirely different from those of the United States, and Canada constitutes the chief barrier to any arrangement so long as other interests than those of Canada control negotiations for commercial relations with such of our neighbours as recognize American (in its broadest sense) as paramount to European influence on this hemisphere."

This language of General Foster was spoken less than a fortnight after the negotiations which had taken place upon this very subject. He there points out that the primary obstacle to the negotiation of any treaty between Canada and the United States does not concern any question of discrimination to which the hon. gentleman alluded in his speech, but lies in the fact that Canada has not at present the right to negotiate her own treaties. It is hard to believe that, when General Foster pointed that out as the chief obstacle in the way, there was nothing mentioned on that subject in the negotiations between the American and the Canadian commissioners. For my part, I believe, and unless I am contradicted by the hon. gentleman I shall persist in believing, that one of the reasons pointed to the Canadian commissioners why the treaty could not be effected was this very reason that Canada has not the right to negotiate her own treaties. Under such circumstances, it seems to me that the rule laid down by May is well illustrated by what has taken place. The Minister may say that I am doing him an injustice. I do not say that I do not, but if I do he has only himself to blame for it, because he had no right to give the substance of these negotiations unless he was prepared to place the record on the Table, so as to give every man in this House the opportunity of scanning for himself the negotiations which took place, and not compelling him to accept the version which the hon. gentleman chose to give. Far be it from me to charge the hon. gentleman with bad faith, but after all the hon. gentleman is human, and he can be unconsciously biassed like others. It is not because we must necessarily distrust one another, that the law which obtains in courts of justice must also obtain here, but simply because of the obvious fact that the best evidence is always to be tendered and no secondary evidence is to be used when primary evidence is obtainable. The hon. gentleman had in his hand the evidence of the negotiations which took place in Washington, and yet, for reasons of his own, he has refused to give to the House the substance of those negotiations. What reason can there be for such a suppression of public documents ? The hon. gentleman has informed the House as fully as he could in reference to the negotiations as to the boundary

of Alaska, in reference to the measures to be taken for the preservation of our fisheries, and in regard to other matters of secondary importance, but he has not chosen to give to the House the information upon what was after all the very subject upon which the Canadian people expected to be instructed, and that is in regard to the treaty of reciprocity. The Canadian people wanted to know, above all things, the proposals which were made by the Canadian commissioners to the American commissioners on that subject, and what objections, if any, they had been met with; but, instead of that, the hon. gentleman gives an *ex parte* statement which it is impossible for any hon. gentleman to challenge, contradict or traverse. I say this is a violation of all the principles of parliamentary government. The rule has been as old as constitutional government in England, that all such matters must be reduced to writing, and then at the proper time submitted to the House. Let me quote the authority of Todd upon this subject. Todd, at page 355, speaks as follows:—

"It is a necessary rule that the substance of all personal communications between the representatives of the British Crown and the Ministers of any foreign country, upon matters of public concern, should be committed to writing, in order that a fair and complete record of the transactions between Great Britain and other states may be presented in the Foreign Office, and, in due course, submitted to Parliament. The English constitutional system requires that Parliament should be informed, from time to time, of everything which is necessary to explain the conduct and policy of the Government, whether at home or abroad, in order that it may interpose with advice, assistance, or remonstrance, as the interests of the nation may appear to demand."

Then, Sir, the author continues:

"It is unquestionably of immense advantage to the country that the diplomatic transactions and proceedings of the Government abroad should be freely communicated to Parliament, for thereby the foreign policy of the Crown receives the approbation of Parliament, and is sustained by the strength of an enlightened public opinion. This in itself confers an additional weight to our policy and opinions abroad."

Now, Sir, mark what follows, and this is a quotation that I would advise hon. gentlemen opposite to ponder well:

"On the other hand, it is notorious that the English system of giving publicity to information obtained by Government in regard to occurrences in foreign countries, is viewed with great disfavour on the continent."

This system of publicity, we see, which prevails in the British constitutional system, where nothing is withheld, where everything must be brought to light, never met with much favour on the continent where negotiations are very often concealed.

"A knowledge of the fact that all information procured by our foreign agents is liable to be made public, militates somewhat against their usefulness, and tends to place them occasionally in an embarrassing position."

Now, the rule is not absolute. The author says there may be occasions when a Minister of the Crown is justified in refusing to communicate to Parliament the negotiations that have taken place. The author goes on to say:

"But a certain amount of discretion must always be allowed to the Government in respect to communicating or withholding documents and official correspondence which may be asked for by either House of Parliament."

There may be occasions, as I said a moment ago, when a Minister of the Crown would be justified in refusing to Parliament the substance of negotiations, but if the Minister of the Crown will not give to Parliament the substance of negotiations between his Government and a foreign Government, then he is not at liberty to use those communications in debate or argument. But if he uses them, then it is only fair to accept from him that he will give the evidence upon which he bases his argument. Now, here is the only occasion when a Government is justified in refusing to give to the House the substance of negotiations which have taken place: it is when those negotiations are pending. So long as negotiations are pending the Crown are justified in refusing to give to Parliament the substance of those negotiations, for the very obvious reason that they are still pending and might be affected by a premature disclosure. Todd also says:

"Thus, it is generally inexpedient and highly impolitic to communicate to Parliament papers concerning diplomatic negotiations which are still pending."

Now, in the present case the negotiations are no longer pending; they were concluded when the commissioners left Washington. If the hon. gentleman had told us at any time that the negotiations were still pending he would be justified in keeping them secret as long as they remained incomplete. But they have been completed, and, under those circumstances, I submit to the judgment of the House that it is the right of Parliament to require that they be laid before us, unless we are to revert to the old Star Chamber days. Therefore, I maintain that the Government of the day have no right to keep those papers secret, and they should be submitted to the House. But there is more. These papers which were denied to this House have been communicated to the British Government, have been communicated to Lord Knutsford, Secretary of State for the Colonies. That fact has been revealed by the correspondence which was recently laid before the British Parliament on the subject of our negotiations with Newfoundland. Among those papers I find the report to Council signed by the Minister of Justice which was afterwards, on the 3rd March, embodied in the report of Council and transmitted to His Excellency for communication to the British Government. Here is what I find in this report:

"With further reference to the despatch of Lord Knutsford which transmits these documents, the undersigned note the observation of His Lordship, that, if your Excellency's Ministers should not succeed in obtaining a satisfactory arrangement with the United States, the attitude of Her Majesty's Government in regard to the signature of the convention will have to be reconsidered."

This is an important statement which we may have to discuss at a future date:

"They venture to express the hope that Her Majesty's Government will, at the same time, consider the principal reason why your Excellency's Ministers have not succeeded in obtaining a satisfactory arrangement with the United States. The record which has been transmitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies will show Her Majesty's Government that an arrangement with the United States for greater freedom of trade between the two countries and for a settlement of the fishery question was found to be impracticable unless Canada would consent to apply to the mother country the discrimination which Newfoundland and the United States proposed to apply to Canada."

So you have here a Minute of Council that the record of the negotiations between Canada and the United States, with, as is alleged, a failure of those negotiations, has been transmitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies; and yet while that has been transmitted to the British Government it is denied to the Canadian Parliament. Now, what reason can be urged why Canada should be thus

treated? What reason can be given by the hon. gentleman for this high-handed proceeding? The Government of Great Britain, to which hon. gentlemen are not responsible, is favoured with a record of these negotiations; but the Parliament of Canada, to whom the hon. gentlemen is responsible, is denied the communication of that record. Sir, it is a high-handed proceeding, it is destructive of all the principles of free government upon which our constitution rests. Such a thing should not be tolerated in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always speaking loudly of their loyalty to the Crown and to British institutions, yet not a year elapses but that those principles of British freedom that they profess to follow, are violated by those who, notwithstanding, always have them in their mouth.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The resolution moved by the leader of the Opposition has two parts: The first is a denunciation of what is styled a constitutional principle—a constitutional rule; and the second is the application of it to a particular case. I claim that the first part of the resolution is a very great extravagance, that the application of it attempted by the second part is exceedingly unjust, and that the remarks by which the hon. gentleman has attempted to support both are about as extravagant as anything that could be given to this House. Now, let us take up the matter and see whether the criticism I am offering is fairly based. This resolution states it to be a constitutional rule that all communications between representatives of this Government and the representatives of other Governments upon matters of public concern, should be committed to writing and laid before Parliament as soon as completed. I think that when the hon. gentleman undertook to ask this House to assert that something was a necessary constitutional rule, he might at least have cited some authority in support of that position; but the hon. gentleman has cited no authority whatever. He has cited a passage from May, to which I will refer in a moment, and which has not the slightest bearing upon this question. He has cited from Todd's Parliamentary Government a rule of propriety, a rule of diplomacy, a rule it may be, or a practice of Parliamant, but nothing approaching the dignity or force or importance of the necessary constitutional rule which it is here asserted to be. The hon. gentleman undertakes, however, in the second part of his resolution to declare, in reference to something which recently took place in this House—for that is the application of the resolution according to the speech he made—that an attempt by a Minister of the Crown, referring to the Minister of Finance, to discuss the subject-matter of such communications without laying them before Parliament, is a dangerous infringement upon the rights of the people. I venture to assert that the rule which the hon. gentleman has quoted from his authorities absolutely annihilates the position which he has taken here, and so far from showing that what has occurred in this House has been an infringement of that principle, the authorities cited by the hon. gentleman show that what took place here on a recent occasion was strictly in accordance with principle and with British practice. The British practice which my hon. friend is continually setting up in this House as something which we violate upon this side, and to which he is so fond of referring, is the branch of British loyalty to which he is most attached, and it is the only one, so far as I can learn, that he has faith in. Let us see what the position is as I understand it to be. It is obviously a rule of convenience, for the sake of certainty, and for the sake of definiteness and permanency, that communications which take place between the representatives of Governments should be reduced to writing, whenever that can be conveniently done. But there is no constitutional rule upon the subject whatever, and even the practice which exists in that regard has grown up in consequence of the fact that Great Britain, as well as other nations similarly situated, is represented at foreign courts by diplomatic agents of various grades and ranks. Those agents are very rarely Cabinet Ministers, and it is most important that the Cabinet should be definitely informed of what negotiations their agents have had, and even of their precise nature and effect. In the case under review the negotiations took place between Ministers of this country and the Minister of another country, and even the convenience upon which the rule is based does not apply to the same extent or with the same force to negotiations of that character. Let us see whether that is not so. An intimation was given that on a certain day it would be convenient for the Secretary of State of the United States to have a conference with members or representatives of the Government of Canada on a certain list of questions. It was stipulated then that that should be entirely informal and unofficial, and the hon. the leader of the Opposition is quite mistaken even in applying the term "commissioners" to the gentleman who represented the United States. So carefully was it provided that the conference should be informal and unofficial, that the Secretary of State for the United States stipulated that the terms "conference" and "commissioners" should be avoided, lest there should be any appearance of formality about the matter. If we had not been relieved to some extent of the obligation as regards informality and secrecy it would have been impossible for us to have committed to writing, or to have reported in writing what took place during that interview, because it was stipulated, as I have said, that nothing should transpire as regards what took place unless it came to some result. Yet this House is asked now to affirm that in a case of that kind, it is a necessary constitutional rule that all communications between representatives of this Government and representatives of the other Government should be reduced to writing and laid on the Table of the House. When the hon. gentleman admitted that there were occasions on which discretion ought to be exercised, he restricted his rule too narrowly when he said that the one case was when the negotiations had not yet reached a conclusion; because obviously, as I have said, this case down to a certain stage was precisely one in which the communications ought not to have been reduced to writing, and ought not to have been brought down to Parliament. But, Sir, having been invited to Washington, what occurred? An informal but full discussion took place on a programme which had been laid down as containing the subjects of conversation, and it was not until that negotiation was concluded that an understanding was arrived at that what had transpired might be communicated to Par-

liament. Now, then, the hon. gentleman states that we were greatly at fault when the conferences were concluded, in communicating the substance of them or referring to them in a despatch to another Government, and he declares that such a thing would not be tolerated in Great Britain. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken in his comparison. This Government and this Parliament are not in the position of the Government and Parliament of Great Britain, and for this obvious reason: We were there conferring and we were there negotiating in the presence of the British Minister and under his authority, and the first duty that we had was to communicate to Her Majesty's Government the nature of the negotiations which went forward. Having gone on that confidential mission with the approval of Her Majesty's Government and in company with Her Minister at Washington, notwithstanding the fact that we were at liberty as far as one Government was concerned, to make an announcement of what took place at that conference, our first duty was to communicate to the Government which authorized us to be there—because we were directly there representing the Government of Her Majesty although the official negotiators were the British Minister on the one side and the American Secretary of State on the other. I say, therefore, Sir, that our first duty was to intimate to Her Majesty's Government the substance and effect of what took place, as we have done, and as we have been blamed for doing, and, as the hon. gentleman said, would not be tolerated in Great Britain in reference to a foreign Government, and for the purposes of his argument he places Her Majesty's Government, of which we were *quasi* representatives there, in the position of a foreign Government. The communication which has been made to the Imperial Parliament —if any has been made, and I am not aware of that at all—has been made by Her Majesty's Government on their own responsibility. Another important point to bear in mind, when this House is asked to censure Ministers for not having produced documents to this House, is this: That we have incontestably produced to this House all the documents bearing in any way upon negotiations which came to any result and in relation to which any action on the part of this Parliament is asked. In the course of these negotiations, certain matters which were under discussion, were adjusted, and a definite agreement arrived at, and it was considered proper for the sake of definiteness and for the sake of precision, which are entirely the foundation of the rule on which the hon. gentleman is relying, that we were asked, or the other side were asked, it is immaterial which, that the propositions regarding those subjects should be reduced to writing and submitted for mutual acceptance. That was done, and accordingly the arrangements were arrived at with regard to wrecking and towage, with regard to the boundary of Alaska, with regard to Passamaquoddy Bay, with regard to the protection of the fisheries. Those arrangements were reduced to writing in accordance with the constitutional rule which the hon. gentleman states were interchanged and were produced in this Parliament before they were asked for. With regard to other matters as to which no result was arrived at, no writings were interchanged; but according to the hon. gentleman's resolution, if I understand it aright, it is a necessary constitutional rule that conversations which result in no agreement or understanding shall nevertheless be put in the form of diplomatic correspondence, and, I suppose, exchanged between the two countries and laid before Parliament. Let us consider whether this which is styled a necessary constitutional rule is any rule at all. Let us consider whether negotiations resulting in nothing should be reduced to writing, as the hon. gentleman asserts in his argument, if not in his resolution. Let us look at the history of other negotiations, and I will take the case which seems to tell the most strongly against me—The case of a treaty actually made;—let us consider the Treaty of Washington of 1888, or the Treaty of Washington of 1871. A result having been arrived at, just as in the case of the Alaska boundary, the case of Passamaquoddy Bay, the question of wreckage and towage and the protection of the fisheries, the result of the negotiations was put into the treaty and made public at once. Were the negotiations which preceded it, I mean, the discussions which took place between the representatives of the two countries, reduced to writing at once? I have no doubt they were. Were they submitted to Parliament? No, Sir; but by a simple understanding which prevails in all such cases it was agreed that those records should not be produced at all, and they have never seen the light of day in the British Parliament, in the United States Congress, or here, although here their production was pressed for time and again. Now, when the hon. gentleman states that it is a constitutional rule that negotiations should in all cases be reduced to writing, let him show a case in which negotiations preceding a treaty, conducted by word of mouth, were reduced to writing and produced in this House, and he will at least have a precedent for demanding that we ought to do so; but he will have to do something more before he can show it to be a constitutional rule. Now let us consider the statements which the hon. gentleman has made with regard to his authorities. Did the quotation from May support his position that negotiations which take place orally between the representatives of two countries shall be reduced to writing? Not at all. May has never written on that subject. He was simply writing on the procedure in Parliament, and when he wrote the dictum which the hon. gentleman read to the House, he was dealing with a question of order in debate, with a rule of debate, and that rule of debate is simply this, that when a Minister or a member quotes from a public document he ought to produce it. But the hon. gentleman's necessary constitutional rule for the support of which he invoked May is not that when a Minister quotes from a document he ought to produce it, but that when a conversation has taken place in the course of negotiations, the Minister should reduce it to writing and bring it down to Parliament. When the hon. gentleman asks this House to adopt a resolution affirming what he calls a constitutional rule, he ought to show some authority for such a constitutional rule, to show he is not seeking to establish a rule different from that established by British practice, for which he has so profound a reverence. The hon. gentleman referred to Todd, but he was obliged to read from that authority a quotation which does not refer to a constitutional rule at all, but to

a rule of practice existing for the convenience of Parliament, to a rule not referring to negotiations conducted by Ministers at all. It said that in due course the documents which were interchanged should be laid before Parliament—in due course; and Todd, not satisfied with that effort to avoid a torturing and misconstruction of his authority, goes on to say that a due discretion must be exercised in that regard. What, enquires the hon. gentleman, is the discretion? It is to be exercised, he says, in only one case, and that is where the negotiations have not yet been concluded; but he has no authority for that position, which he asks this House to crystallize into the form of a necessary constitutional rule. One can imagine many cases in which a discretion has to be exercised in that regard, and our memory will serve us to cite one. In the very last treaty which we had before this House for discussion, the discretion which Todd refers to was exercised, and the record of the proceedings was withheld. In the negotiations preceding the Washington Treaty of 1871 the same was the case. We have never yet had the narrative of those negotiations, and now and then some biographical history comes out containing very important and interesting notices of what took place during the conferences that preceded the treaty, not one word of which is to be found in the protocols which have ever been submitted to any of the Parliaments concerned in the ratification of that treaty. Now let me refer to the cases in which the hon. gentleman asserts that the Minister of Finance violated this important rule. The Minister of Finance and two of his colleagues had a conversation with a foreign Minister, and he was stating to the House the subject and effect of that conversation in so far as it bore on the question before the House. The resolution asks the House to pass censure upon him on the ground that he put the constitution in great danger by thus stating to the House what had taken place. On what authority? On the authority which the hon. gentleman read this afternoon, which was read to the House at the time the statement was made, and which has not the slightest bearing on this question—the authority that when a Minister cites from a public document he ought to produce that document in order that the House should have the same information that he has—a very sound and proper rule; but the reason for it does not exist here. The hon. gentleman does not say: You ought, after having had a conversation with a foreign Minister, to put it in writing so that we may know as much about it as you do; but he says: You ought to put that in writing and bring it here, because I do not believe what you said about it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. And when the hon. gentleman gave the reasons why he did not believe it, I think he satisfied the House that his reasons for not believing the Minister of Finance were anything but creditable reasons to be put forward, and anything but creditable reasons to be cheered at this moment by the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am glad that the hon. member for Bothwell agrees with me that it was nothing to his credit that he cheered that statement of his leader. The hon. gentleman had no doubt that this was a very highly coloured statement, because it was in the first place improbable. Well, I do not think it was. It was what a great many persons in this country predicted, on high authority in the United States, as not only probable but an absolutely necessary feature of any arrangement which could be entered upon with the United States on reciprocity. The other reason he gives is that a report has not been made of it and brought down, and, further, because General Foster, not referring to that conference at all and not pretending to quote one word uttered in it, made a speech on a different subject altogether in New York, two or three weeks afterwards, in which he expressed his opinion that one great reason standing in the way of Canada effecting a treaty with the United States was that we had not the right to negotiate our own treaties. That is not in the slightest degree a contradiction of what the Minister of Finance said, and I am sure no one would be more surprised than General Foster himself at the ingenious twist his language has been given this afternoon. Why, he had not in his mind the conference which had recently taken place, or if he had, he was referring to a different principle altogether. But my opinion is, he had not that conference in his mind when he made that speech, because it would be ill-applied to a conference in which Canada was actually negotiating for a treaty. We were there practically negotiating a treaty arrangement between Canada and the United States, and we had the great advantage of the presence of Her Majesty's Minister, so that when we concluded the arrangement, the treaty would not be ours but would be that of Great Britain herself. We have the great advantage that under the constitutional arrangements under which we live and carry out parliamentary government, we not only have the power to negotiate treaties for Canada, but we have in practice the right to make the treaties for Great Britain in which Canada is concerned. That is a much more valuable privilege than the mere right to appear in a diplomatic character for ourselves. If General Foster really had in his mind the Washington conference of February last, when he used that expression, he referred not to any want on the part of Canadian representatives to assume the diplomatic character in negotiation but to the nature of the treaty arrangements which we were free or not free to make. He did not, I am sure, refer to any technical obstacle as to the carrying on of negotiations, but he referred to the fact that while Canada remains a portion of the British Empire she must keep in view her obligations to the rest of the Empire, in making any treaty arrangement. Let me refer for a few moments to the observations the hon. gentleman made with regard to the way in which the papers were brought here. After the conference was concluded, an interchange of views took place as regards the expediency of taking off the seal of secrecy and confidence under which the negotiations were begun; and in so far as Mr. Blaine was concerned, he was asked to say whether anything had occurred which need not be stated here or elsewhere, and he replied that nothing had occurred which need not be made public. The House is asked by this resolution to vote censure upon the Government for not producing papers which down to this moment have never been asked for by the members on the other side except in this connection, that fault was found in debate, when the Minister of Finance stated the

nature of the negotiations, that the papers had not been brought down. The exception was taken as a point of order, and it was taken afterwards by the hon. member for Bothwell as a point of substance, that such a statement ought not to be made without the record being produced and laid before the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman himself promised me that he would bring the papers down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If I did, my memory is entirely at fault, and I will be obliged if the hon. gentleman would refer to the report. But I think he is mistaken. My recollection of what took place is this: The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition said, at one stage of the discussion on a Bill which was before the House, that he supposed the Bill to be one of the results of the visit lately paid to Washington by some of the Canadian Ministers, and he took this occasion to ask the Government if they proposed to lay on the Table any correspondence or any papers relating to what took place in connection with the visit. My answer was: There is some correspondence which can be laid on the Table of the House, and I am able to say that nothing which transpired is precluded from being mentioned in the House. The hon. leader of the Opposition asked whether there was any writing to that effect or was it purely verbal, and I replied: "Yes, there was writing." The hon. gentleman then said: "I presume we shall have it at an early day," and I replied: "Yes." I produced that writing. I produced the correspondence which the hon. leader of the Opposition asked for. But he complained this afternoon that there is more correspondence that can be laid on the Table. The hon. gentleman asked for correspondence, and I produced it. As I have assured the House time and again, all the correspondence we have has been brought down. But what this resolution complains of, and what it calls upon the House to censure, is that we have not made a record of the conversations and brought them before this House, and the hon. member for Bothwell says that he asked me to produce a record of these conversations and that I promised to bring it down. All I can say is that my memory is widely astray if that is so. I am not aware of his having made such a request, and I certainly made no such promise. The correspondence that I agreed to bring down I have brought down. With regard to any record which may have been made of the conversations that took place regarding a matter which resulted in nothing and on which the action of this House has not been asked and will not be asked, there is no constitutional rule requiring that to be brought down. It will be brought down whenever it can be, in due course and with due regard to the caution which should be exercised as regards consultations with other persons whose rights and interests were affected in that interview. It will, no doubt, be brought down, but the hon. member is somewhat hasty in asking this House to pronounce censure upon the Government for not having done so when he has not told us what interests are affected, or that they even asked, down to this, that that record should be laid on the Table. As I have stated, as will have been seen from the observations I have been offering, a great deal of importance is to be attached to the fact that the record the hon. gentleman refers to relates to the reciprocity question alone. It was upon that that his remarks were addressed to the House, and with regard to that subject, these negotiations not having ended in any definite result which requires the action of this Parliament, no constitutional rule requires that it should be produced, but courtesy to the House requires that it should be produced when it can be in due course, and that courtesy will be observed. Apart from that, no action by this Parliament has been called for as a result of those conversations, and the hon. gentleman has no right to ask that the Finance Minister should be censured for the reference he made to these conversations, or that the Government should be censured because down to this moment the record has not been produced to the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have listened with close attention, and I must say with some astonishment, to the observations addressed to the House by the hon. the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice says that there is no rule requiring that a record shall be made of the conversations and of the proceedings or interviews that take place between the representatives of one civilized Government and another when they are discussing matters of international or interstate concern, that there is no obligation on the part of Ministers to communicate these interviews to Parliament, and that there is a marked difference between the position of a Minister who undertakes to negotiate and the position of another party who may be appointed on the part of an Administration if he undertakes to negotiate. Well, Sir, I deny that proposition altogether. If the hon. the Minister of Finance had come down and informed the House of the financial circumstances of the country, and had said to the House at the same time, I have kept no record of what the Government have paid out or of what they have received; I ask the House to take my statement upon this matter as to what is the present position of the financial affairs of the country, every one would have at once seen how preposterous such a contention was, every one would have said: We care not how honest the Minister of Finance may be, we care not how great his regard for truth may be, we care not how retentive his memory may be, that is not the manner in which the public affairs of this country should be conducted, that is not the manner provided either by the law or by the conventions of the constitution for the conduct of the public business. Now, the same reasons which make it necessary that there should be proper accounts kept of the receipt and payment of public moneys require that there should be a proper record of the transactions of every department of Government, and this rule applies as strictly under the English constitutional system to the proceedings of the Foreign Office or to the proceedings of any Colonial Government who undertake, by permission or sufferance, to perform the work of a Foreign Office, as to any other department. The reason for the rule in the one case is the same as the reason for the rule in the other case, and the obligation is just as strict in one case as it is in the other. A few years ago a Minister of the Crown in England, Lord John Russell, was sent to Vienna to negotiate with Russia, Austria, Prussia and France with a view to the termination of the Crimean war, but, when he went there,

although he was a Minister of the Crown, it was not in his capacity as a Minister but as an ambassador, and he had in that capacity the same duties devolving him upon as if he had not been a Minister at all, and the protocols of those abortive negotiations show the accuracy of my statement. Then, if you take the case of the negotiation of the Treaty of Berlin, in which not only the Foreign Minister but the Prime Minister went as the representatives of the Government of England, did they come back and say: We have kept no record of our proceedings, we made no note, we are not in a position to report to Parliament because we are Ministers of the Crown, we stand in a position different from that of an ordinary or extraordinary ambassador? Not at all. These noblemen, when they undertook to negotiate the Treaty of Berlin on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom, stood in the same position as any other negotiators. There was still the same legal and constitutional distinction between their duties as Ministers of the Crown and their duties as representatives of the Crown in those negotiations as there would have been had the parties not been Ministers of the Crown at all. In that respect there was no difference. Thus a record is necessary. Does it depend on the importance of the Minister that there be no record? Are the other Ministers who remained in Canada during these negotiations of no consequence? Are they inferior persons? Are they men to whom the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of War are not called upon to account for what they did? Why, the position of the hon. gentleman is a most untenable one. It is a preposterous position, it is one utterly inconsistent with the principles of parliamentary government and ministerial responsibility. If a party outside had been appointed to conduct these negotiations, no doubt he would be called upon to make a report. The Government would not have been satisfied with a verbal communication, with an oral statement from such a representative as to what he said and what was said to him. They would have insisted upon a formal report, upon a memorandum of the interviews that were had, and what would have been the duty of an outside party who might have been appointed to conduct the negotiations and who would have been responsible to the Government, as the Government would be responsible to Parliament for his conduct, equally devolves upon these gentlemen if they chose to substitute themselves for the ordinary party who would be employed. They are responsible to the Crown, and it is their duty to report to the Crown, but that is not the end of their responsibility. They are responsible to Parliament. Parliament has a right to know why these negotiations failed, as well as to know why other negotiations succeeded. There can be no difference in that respect. How do we know how far these gentlemen have gone contrary to the well understood wishes of the people of this country? How do we know how far they have sacrificed in our estimation, and in the estimation of the people, the interests of the country in these negotiations? Do the hon. gentlemen deny their responsibility to us and to the country? Do they deny that we are entitled to know what they proposed to the Government at Washington? If they do, let us know it, because we have yet to consider fully the principles of parliamentary government and ministerial responsibility. Sir, there is an important constitutional rule stated in the resolution of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, and the Minister of Justice says it is not a constitutional rule at all. Well, I think I read a series of extracts from the discussions that took place on some half a dozen or more public matters in England, to show that it is a constitutional rule. And I tell the hon. gentleman more, that it is a constitutional rule so well settled that I defy him to produce an instance where the Government of the United Kingdom has initiated a discussion upon a public or a foreign matter, and at the same time have withheld the papers upon which that negotiation has been based. When the Minister of Finance made his statement with regard to the Washington Treaty, I objected to its being made because the hon. gentleman has not laid upon the Table of the House those papers in order to give us an opportunity of judging, not only of the skill and ability of the Government in those negotiations, but of the propriety of the propositions which they made and the propositions which they rejected. We were entitled to know that. These hon. gentlemen are responsible to this House; they are, at all events, still responsible notwithstanding that they may have refused to exercise their judgment and to assert their constitutional right in these matters. When the hon. gentleman came down to Parliament and undertook to make a statement, he ought to have laid upon the Table of the House all the papers necessary to enable Parliament to judge both as to the accuracy of his statements and the propriety of what he proposed and of what he had refused. No Minister of the Crown has any right to come down to Parliament and say: We want you to accept our word in this matter. No business is conducted in that way; no banker would for a moment be allowed to conduct business on behalf of a great corporation in that way; and it is not in that way that the constitutional functions of Parliament and the responsibility of Ministers to the House, can be discharged. These hon. gentlemen are entitled to proceed in a particular way, and they ought to give to Parliament certain information, and until they are prepared to give that information they ought not to initiate a discussion on the subject. I say again that the Finance Minister will look in vain through the whole history of English parliamentary government for an instance where the Minister of the Crown initiated a discussion on a public matter, and at the same time withheld the papers which were necessary to enable Parliament to form a judgment on the matter. Why, Sir, I referred to several cases on the 29th March, when the same subject was under discussion; I might refer to those same cases again, and observe that in every instance where a Minister was asked to give the House an opportunity of discussing a question, he stated that the discussion ought not to take place until the papers were brought down. Of course, if a private member undertakes to initiate such a discussion in the absence of the papers, and the Minister says that those papers cannot, with due regard to the public interests, be produced, then the House will say whether, upon that imperfect information, they will go forward. But mind you, that is not the case where a discussion has been initiated by the Minister. There is not an instance where a Minister has initiated a discussion, and at the same

time has withheld the papers. If he is not prepared to submit the papers, if it is not in the public interest that they should be brought down, then it is not in the public interest that the discussion should take place. In this case the Minister undertook to relate to us what was said by himself, what was said by Mr. Blaine and what was said by General Foster, and what transpired generally, without a single line being put before us in which there was a formal record of these negotiations. That was a most improper proceeding. I pointed out before that the telegram upon which the despatch to the Colonial Office was based, which was absolutely necessary to enable us to judge how these negotiations began, was suppressed, that everything relating to the subject of reciprocity was omitted from the telegram, and down to this hour it has not been communicated to the House. Why, Sir, the rule that my hon. friend has laid down is as well established as the rule that the House of Commons is elected for five years unless it be dissolved sooner by the Crown. The one rule of constitutional procedure is not any better settled than the other. I say again, there is not an instance in which a Minister has initiated a discussion, or in which he has ventured to carry on a discussion, on any matter of interstate concern, and has at the same time withheld the papers, the correspondence and protocols, or any memorandum of conversation, from Parliament. Parliament is entitled to full information upon these subjects; it is so entitled because Parliament is the master of the Government. It is to this House that the Ministers are responsible, it is for this House to say whether confidence in the Administration shall be continued. It is upon this House, in the last resort, that the responsibility rests for the full conduct of public affairs. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman said that in the Treaty of 1871 the protocols were not published. I think the hon. gentleman has not looked. Those protocols of 1871 were given to the House. The protocols in the Treaty of 1888 were very meagre indeed, but even in the protocols of 1888 what was brought down was represented as being the full record that was made on that occasion; if it was not, then the House was deceived. It is true, those protocols were very imperfect, they were not in the form in which the protocols in every other instance of negotiations that I know of, are preserved. When those papers were brought down here in the returns that were made to the House in 1888, it was an abuse to call them protocols, but they professed to be a full record as made. Now, I have here the protocols that were made when the Treaty of Washington of 1871 was being negotiated, and I find this, for instance:

"At the conference on the 19th April, the British commissioners proposed to the American commissioners to adopt the middle channel (generally known as the Douglass channel) as the channel through which the boundary line should be run, with the understanding that all the channels through the archipelago should be free and common to both parties. The American commissioners declined to entertain the proposal."

And so on. What does the hon. gentleman call that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is a record of the conversation?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)—

"The American commissioners declined to entertain the proposal. They proposed that the joint high commission should recognize the Haro Channel as the channel intended by the treaty of 15th June, 1846, with a mutual agreement that no fortifications should be erected by either party to obstruct or command it."

And so on. So you have the propositions and the counter-propositions made from time to time, from the beginning to the end. The hon. gentleman has said that he has brought down to the House all that there was of record. Why, Sir, look at the despatch, look at the Minute of Council which the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sent to Lord Knutsford. There is an allusion to the record of this very matter, and it is stated that it has been communicated to Lord Knutsford and that has not been communicated to us. The hon. gentleman says, that that understanding with regard to informality and secrecy that was imposed before the elections in March, 1891, was withdrawn. The seal of secrecy having been removed, there was nothing to prevent the Government making these communications to Parliament, and why, then, were they not made? Why was not as complete a record laid before this House previous to this discussion taking place as it was possible for the hon. gentleman to present either to His Excellency, to his colleagues who did not constitute the embassy, or in the communications made to the Foreign Office and to the Secretary of State for the Colonies? I repeat again, that the Government have no right to come to Parliament and ask us to take an oral report of this conversation. That is not the rule observed anywhere. There is no more propriety in asking it with regard to this than there would be in asking us to take a verbal statement on the whole business of administration. They are compelled to make a record and to conduct the business of this country in a business-like way, and it would not be conducting it in a business-like way if they simply discussed these subjects orally with these gentlemen at Washington, and made no report of all that transpired in these negotiations. I would like to know how it is possible for this House to approve of, or to censure, what the hon. gentleman did at Washington, upon the statement he has made to this House. What opportunity has he given us of judging of the propriety of the proposition which he made? He has given us none at all, and so, if the hon. gentleman persists in treating the House with contempt in regard to this matter, the House will be obliged to look to the proceedings reported to Congress by Mr. Blaine and Mr. Foster for that information which it is entitled to from its own Ministers. That being so, I say that the hon. gentleman's course was highly irregular, that his conduct was highly improper, and that the rule is perfectly clear and is as well settled as any rule can be; the rule which my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, read from Todd and which I read to the House on the 29th of March last. I contend that the hon. gentlemen went to Washington as ordinary negotiators; informally it may be, but they went there to accomplish a certain result. They went there for the purpose of influencing the elections. The newspapers referred to their visit to Washington in every bye-election that took place, and prior to their return we heard of their visit to Washington. All these proceedings were not secret and were not intended to be secret, and notwithstanding the pledge of secrecy to Mr. Blaine, it was disregarded within a fortnight of the time it was first

made. The House is, therefore, entitled to the information which we ask, and the hon. Minister of Finance had no right whatever to refer to these negotiations or to make them the subject of discussion here, until he was prepared to lay all the papers relating to them, the correspondence, the memorandum of interviews, and everything that transpired, before Parliament. The hon. Minister takes exception to the report contained in the speech of Mr. Foster at New York, and he says that that comprehended other matters than the mere subject of reciprocal relations. But that statement although broader is not quite reconcilable and will not harmonize with the statement made to this House with regard to what transpired, and this difference of opinion leaves the House in a condition of perplexity with regard to the matter. That is due to the fact that the hon. gentleman has disregarded the constitutional rule and treated the House of Commons of Canada with contempt. He has held from it the information to which it is entitled, and he has denied to it the opportunity of forming a judgment upon the negotiations as they actually transpired.

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me that this discussion, commenced by the hon. leader of the Opposition and continued by the hon. member from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with some warmth, partakes somewhat of the nature of a tempest in a teapot, and one is led to suspect that the warmth which has inspired these hon. gentlemen in respect to the statement made by the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech, is due to the substance and not to the form of the matter which he communicated to this House. The faces of the hon. members upon the front bench of the Opposition, of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), of the leader of the Opposition, of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) during the 12 or 15 minutes in which the Minister of Finance, in that debate, detailed coolly, calmly, clearly and dispassionately the conversation which our Canadian representatives had with the representatives of the United States in that matter, were something that none who saw them will, for a long time, forget. The hon. gentlemen were first interested, then they were bewildered, they then began to smart in pain, so much so that the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) could not conceal his pain, but like the suffering man in the dentist's chair he had to cry out and raise a point of order, but Mr. Speaker soon ruled, very properly, that there was no point of order, and in raising that point under the circumstances the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) indicated his frame of mind. This afternoon the matter is brought up again, and if the words of the hon. gentleman opposite are taken seriously at their face value, one would think that the liberties of the people were in danger by the course pursued by the Minister of Finance in this matter. It will be very difficult to make them believe that the liberties of our five millions of Canadians are to be secured by bundles of red tape. Are these the fortifications that a free people would throw around them to guard their liberties ?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. My hon. friend approves of that statement and I am glad that he agrees with me. It seems to me that the gentlemen who are guiding the councils of the Opposition are finding themselves very badly off for material, when they take up a half day or more of the time of Parliament, at this stage of the session, in introducing a want of confidence motion when the substantive matter is no graver than this. What happened in this case ? Here were three of the members of the Government of Canada invited to go down to Washington, informally to confer with leading American statesmen representing the United States and to discuss a number of questions, some respecting international boundaries on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, some, I think, with reference to the pollution of rivers, and injury to the fish in which both nations have an interest, and some with regard to wreckage and towage. All these matters and others were opened. Some of them were discussed at length, and some briefly. In respect of some of them conclusions were arrived at ; and as to those subject-matters in which conclusions were arrived at a report was given to us in writing. Complaint is made in regard to certain discussions that were had on the subject of trade relations—in which no conclusion was arrived at, in which it would appear but little progress was made—that the Minister of Finance, when announcing in his own Parliament the financial policy of the Administration of which he is a member, took frankly into his confidence his own Canadian people in regard to a matter in which it is true there was in the public mind of Canada very great confusion and uncertainty. The point was taken in the Budget debate that the hon. Minister was out of order ; it was taken again in a subsequent discussion ; and that point is once more taken to-day. It is laid down with a great deal of emphasis that the Minister of Finance initiated a discussion without producing the papers on which the discussion was based. That is not a correct statement of the fact. The Minister did not initiate a discussion on certain papers. He outlined a conversation which he had.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not say on certain papers.

Mr. WELDON. I took down the hon. gentleman's words on the instant, and I am satisfied that I am quoting them correctly. That is not a statement of the fact ; it does not state correctly what occurred. Now, I challenge the rule of procedure which the hon. gentleman lays down in broad terms. I have under my hand a precedent which warrants me in doing so, and which bears somewhat closely on the point of controversy as to whether the Minister of Finance was within his rights in referring to conversations which he had had with other gentlemen without laying on the Table of the House a written record of those conversations. I am quoting from the English *Hansard* of 1884, vol. 286, page 1022. One of the members of the English House asked the ruling of the Speaker on a similar matter. Mr. Stanley Leighton rose and said :

"I wish, Sir, to ask your ruling as to the application to the rules of debate of the precedents laid down by previous speakers. I desire to know whether the Vice-President of the Council, having cited official documents—namely, certain reports of Her Majesty's inspectors of schools, and having stated the tenor of them—is not bound to lay them on the Table ? I also wish to call your attention to these facts—first of all, that the report which I desire to have laid on the Table was made in consequence of a parliamentary pledge made to the House of Commons by the right hon. gentleman last session, and it would be to the public advantage that the honest opinion of the inspectors on over-pressure should be known. I wish also to point out that it is un-

reasonable for official documents to be considered confidential after the Minister in charge of them has published their tenor."

The ruling of the Speaker was as follows :—

"In reply to the hon. member I have to state that it is an unquestioned rule of this House that public despatches, documents and papers relating to public affairs should be laid on the Table of the House, if quoted by a Minister; but in this case, the right hon. gentleman the Vice-President of the Council made, I understand, no citations from any document whatever. He merely said that he had consulted the inspectors. The statement which he made, as to the result of his enquiry as to over-pressure in the elementary schools, was made on his own responsibility and he is under no obligation to lay any documents or papers on the Table of the House."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that citation is very much in point. Now, I have before me a rule which was quoted by a member of this House in the previous discussion as to what the rights and limitation of Ministers are in respect of matters of which there may not have been laid on the Table of the House a full report. I think the question arose in a discussion connected with the Chinese War. It was in 1863, when Lord Palmerston was First Minister. The objection was taken that Lord Palmerston was not within his rights in making the statements he did without laying on the Table of the House the documents in controversy, and Lord Palmerston laid down this rule in reply to Lord John Manners, who took the objection. He said :

"It is altogether a new doctrine to me that a Minister making a statement from information which has come to his knowledge, is bound to lay on the Table of the House the document from which that information is derived. I admit no such principle. It is perfectly true that when a Minister reads a paper he is bound to lay it on the Table."

In this case there was no document from which the information was drawn ; so that Lord Palmerston's doctrine was stronger than that which we are contending for here. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the substance and gravamen of the present complaint? What is the danger, what will go wrong, if the papers asked for are never produced? The whole point in the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition is that the memory of the Minister of Finance may have gone wrong, and that he may not have stated exactly what words passed between him and Mr. Blaine. The hon. member for Bothwell has gone further, having expressed doubts whether the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance was candid or not. Now, as I said when I began, so I say now, the whole substance of the complaint is that in a matter in which the public mind was greatly confused, in which there was great doubt whether the Liberal-Conservative party or the Liberal party were telling the truth as to the real mind of the public men of the United States on the subject, the Minister of Finance took the first favourable occasion, and the right occasion, to put before Parliament and the country what he and his colleagues had discovered to be the real mind of the United States Government on the question. If he had not done that, he would not have done his duty, and, for furnishing us with that information, instead of being censured, he is entitled to our thanks and commendation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I followed as well as I could the last speaker (Mr. Weldon) who appeared to me to have a curious want of appreciation of the objection contained in the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. member has not endeavoured to controvert the constitutional point raised in that resolution. He quoted some precedents to show, if I understood him correctly, that a Minister may quote from an official document or despatch without producing it. If he follows up the case to which he referred, I think he will find that Lord Palmerston's statement on that occasion is not borne out by the general run of the authorities. But that is not in question now. The hon. gentleman made a curiously inapt quotation from the English *Hansard*. I do not know why he quoted it, for it had no application to the proposition before us. Now, he says that he sees no harm at all in the Finance Minister adopting the course he did. In other words, he sees no harm in Ministers representing Canada, conferring with Ministers representing a foreign state on matters of the most momentous importance to Canadian interests, and returning to this country and submitting the result of their deliberations to the House in the form of a verbal statement. The hon. gentleman cannot be serious in that. As a constitutional lawyer he knows the importance of such matters being reduced to writing. He knows how impossible it is for a large body of the representatives of the people here to come to a conclusion in one way or the other as to the result of those negotiations unless they have a report of them which they can thoroughly rely upon. Surely the hon. gentleman does not contend that the representatives of the nation can consult with those of a foreign nation, come back to Parliament, and say : Our recollection is that such a thing took place, but we do not propose to place before Parliament any record. What are we discussing here? It is whether it is a constitutional rule that such consultations should be reduced to writing, in the first instance, and secondly, whether they should be communicated to Parliament. Nothing but the importance of the subject justifies me in calling the attention of the House again to the quotation made by the leader of the Opposition in support of his motion. He quoted from Todd's Parliamentary Government in England, not as to whether it was a point of order correctly taken, not as to the point of order whether the Minister of Finance could make this statement or not, because we have passed by that. The hon. member for Bothwell raised the point of order at the time the Minister of Finance made the statement. But we have passed away from the point of order and are now discussing the constitutional question, whether the action of the Government in this regard has been in accord with constitutional usage, and whether Parliament has been treated with proper respect in the matter or not. What does the leader of the Opposition cite in support of his proposition? He cites the rule as laid down by Todd, to be found on page 355 of his work, based on statements made with respect to that rule by no less eminent authority than Mr. Disraeli and Lord Palmerston ; and that rule is :

"It is a necessary rule that the substance of all personal negotiations between the representatives of the British Crown and the members of any foreign country should be committed to writing, in matters of public concern."

That is the rule, and it is embodied in my hon. friend's resolution, and the reason of the rule is, as there explained, "in order that a fair and complete record of the transaction between Great Britain and the other states may be preserved in the Foreign Office and in due course submittted to Parliament." So that there are two constitu-

tional propositions involved in the statement made by Mr. Disraeli and Lord Palmerston. One is, that when the representatives of Great Britain confer with the representatives of a foreign country on matters of national concern, their consultation should be reduced to writing. And the other is, after they are reduced to writing, this writing should, in due course, be submitted to Parliament in order that the representatives of the people may have an opportunity of passing judgment upon it. That proposition is contained in the resolution before the House and nothing more. There is a limitation placed upon that proposition apparently, and that limitation is that, in certain cases, a member of the Government may, upon his responsibility, withhold from the public certain information as he may judge cannot be afforded without detriment to the public service. That rule is universally recognized. When negotiations are pending between Great Britain and a foreign country and it is not in the interests of the public that these negotiations should be prematurely communicated to Parliament, a Minister frequently takes the responsibility of saying that in such a case he cannot make a public statement. But no such rule can hold here. Why? Because the negotiations are concluded and the confidential nature of the communications have been withdrawn by Mr. Blaine. The hon. gentleman knows that at one period it was considered that the negotiations between the representatives of Canada and the United States should be of a confidential character, but in a letter which Mr. Blaine subsequently wrote, the confidential character of the negotiations was entirely withdrawn. If it was not, the Finance Minister has committed a gross breach of confidence in making the statement he did in the House, but he was justified so far as that phase of the case is concerned, if the confidential character was withdrawn. The question then comes, whether the Government have adopted that constitutional rule. The leader of the House has stated that, so far as his knowledge goes, it is not customary, in negotiations carried on between commissioners representing two countries such as Canada and the United States, to reduce to writing offers made on the one side and not accepted on the other; in other words, that negotiations on any specific subject which have proved to be abortive, are not made the subject of a protocol. Why, I do not know how the hon. gentleman can reconcile that statement he has made to the House with the knowledge he must perforce possess of the negotiations which took place preceding the Washington Treaty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was a *résumé* of a treaty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is not only a *résumé*, it is reduced to the form of a protocol. The negotiations which subsequently proved abortive, and the suggestions made briefly on the one side and discussed by the other and subsequently rejected, are all reduced to the form of a protocol and submitted to Parliament. Now, if the hon. gentleman will turn to the papers on the Treaty of Washington, to be found in the year 1872, he will find the substance of the discussion which took place between the plenipotentiaries of the two countries on the subject of their trade relations reduced to the form of a protocol and submitted to Parliament afterwards, and this was done with special reference to those discussions which proved abortive in themselves. The hon. gentleman will remember, in the first instance, that the proposition emanated from the United States Government, who proposed to admit free of duty, on and after a certain date, coal, salt and fish in return for certain concessions we were asked to make. He will see their proposition set out in full in a protocol. He will see the facts set out in full that the Canadian commissioners considered that they transmitted it to the Canadian Government, that the United States commissioners some days after withdrew the proposition. Every fact connected directly or indirectly with the proposition, although verbal in its character, when first made, was reduced to the form of a protocol and afterwards submitted to Parliament, so that the statement submitted by the Minister is entirely at variance with the facts. He went on to say there is no further correspondence than that which is brought down. What position does the House stand in today? It stands in this position, that there is an official record made of the negotiations which transpired between the representatives of this Government and the representatives of the United States at Washington, and that that record has not been brought down to Parliament, that the Government have attempted to snatch a verdict from a Parliament and the country while at the same time they are deliberately withholding that record. The hon. gentleman states it was not demanded here. I don't know whether he was in the House or not, but when I had the privilege of addressing the House in reply to the Finance Minister I specially called for this document if it existed. I stated it was not conceivable to me that these negotiations should have taken place between the representatives of the two Governments, unless the official record had been kept, and I call upon the Government to bring that record down. Subsequently, the hon. member for Bothwell, on the 11th of April, 1892, called the attention of the House to the fact that the official communication and reports of the recent Washington negotiations had not yet been laid upon the Table, and that it was of great consequence they should be. The hon. gentleman sees that not once, but time and again, the request has been pressed upon the Government to say whether or not there are official communications, and, in the second place, to bring the record down, and not urge hasty discussion or decision on this momentous question before having this report. The hon. member for Albert talked about a tempest in a teapot. I can conceive of no question more important being brought before Parliament than the one now before us. The question is whether, in a matter affecting the trade of Canada and the trade relations of Canada with the neighbouring republic, and affecting it in a material degree, the information upon which alone a proper opinion can be based is to be given to Parliament or withheld. The hon. gentleman cannot now say that there is not such a record. We have before us the despatch signed by the leader of the House himself and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the Newfoundland matters, wherein it transpires that there was an official record kept of those communications which passed between Mr. Blaine and the Canadian commissioners, that that

official record has been transmitted to the Home Secretary for his information, and the House stands here to-day with the knowledge that that official record has been, and is being, deliberately withheld from it. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), a constitutional authority of high standing, says he is quite satisfied to give his vote without having the official record, or knowing what Mr. Blaine's opinions were, except what he may derive from the verbal report made by the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech. We are not so satisfied, and the country will not be so satisfied. If the hon. gentleman refers to that despatch, he will find it stated that:

"The record which has been transmitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies will show that an arrangement with the United States for greater freedom of trade between the two countries and for a settlement of the fishery question was found to be impracticable——"

Unless such and such took place. I want to see that myself. I want to form my own judgment upon it and to read in the record what Mr. Blaine did propose. I suppose it is all down. They say that record has been transmitted to the Secretary of State, and they go on to show what in their opinion is the result of the record. Is Parliament to be treated in that way, and is the hon. gentleman prepared to support the Government in withholding from Parliament a record of the importance of that which has been transmitted to the Colonial Office? They never said that it is not in the public interest that this record should be submitted. The negotiations are over, and therefore no harm to the public interests can result. The Parliament of Canada are, or ought to be, the masters of the hon. gentleman in this respect. The commissioners have made their report, and they refuse to let Parliament have that report. It is not treating Parliament with proper respect, and Parliament should not have been asked to come to a conclusion on this subject until this report was brought down. The constitutional rule which is formulated in this resolution is supported by Lord Palmerston and Mr. Disraeli, as cited by Todd, and no precedent can be found where any Government held a conference and transmitted a record of it to the Home Government and then asked Parliament to come to a decision on the results of that conference while holding back the record of that conference from Parliament. It is contrary to all usage or precedent, and I defy the hon. gentleman to show either in Canadian or British history a precedent for such action as that. Common sense shows it. You bring down the protocol with reference to Alaska, you bring down the protocol with reference to reciprocity in wrecking, and in regard to all those subjects which are of infinitesimal importance in comparison with the great trade question which you went there primarily to discuss, and, while you give Parliament all the papers upon the smaller issues, you withhold the record in reference to the larger one. As I read the books, it is unconstitutional and contrary to reason and common sense.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, if he has not satisfied the House that the authorities to which he has referred endorse the proposition now under consideration, has without doubt satisfied the House that there is an intense curiosity on the part of himself and his colleagues, not so much, I take it, that constitutional usage shall be carefully observed, as that gentlemen on that side of the House and the leaders of the Liberal party shall be in full possession of all the facts connected with the political questions of the day and particularly the question to which the greatest amount of reference was made. The hon. the leader of the Opposition showed, I think, that he is not only curious but he is dubious. The hon. the leader of the Opposition suffers on account of that anxiety the complaint of his colleagues. He stated to-day that he doubted the accuracy of the report as to the trade question which was given to this House by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and, if I understood him aright, that hon. gentleman stated as one reason for the doubt that it seemed an impossible position for Mr. Blaine to have taken on the question of discrimination, and to that question the hon. gentleman referred. I must confess my astonishment that the hon. the leader of the Opposition was either surprised at the statement made by the Minister of Finance or that, having heard it, he doubted it in the slightest degree. His colleagues, particularly the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he himself, as I have understood them, have been saying through this country that the only way in which reciprocity in trade can be obtained with the United States is by adopting that very principle which Mr. Blaine stated he intended to adhere to, and that is, that Canada should discriminate against other countries; and especially against Great Britain, if they desire to share in the great benefits of the trade of the United States. Let me remind the leader of the Opposition more forcibly of some reasons for my considering that he forgot for a moment the history of his party and the policy he himself has enunciated of recent years under that head. Take, for instance, the language of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Oshawa. Could anything be plainer? He was asked:

"Does the Liberal party favour discrimination against Great Britain by admitting American manufactures free, and taxing manufactures from Great Britain?"

The answer was straight and to the point.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Question.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the question which the hon. gentleman from South Oxford is answering. I know the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would rather hear me in my own language, but I must ask him to listen to the words of the hon. member for South Oxford. He said:

"Certainly we do, and I will tell you why. We have a perfect right to make our own tariff to suit us, the people of Canada. The interests of Canada demand that we shall have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. We can only get that by taxing the goods of every nation on the face of the earth except the United States. That is undoubtedly our policy."

Then also, the New York *Tribune*, the organ of the Republican party, pointed out, and the extract was republished in Canada, that that was the cardinal feature of any reciprocity treaty that would be possible between the two countries, and the report of the Minister of Finance showed that the two statements, the statement of the member for South Oxford and the statement of the organ of the Republican Administration published in New York, were on a par with, and showed exactly the views of Mr. Blaine and of the Administration of the United States, Now, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), incoming

to the resolution, forgot, I think, for a moment the exact language of that resolution which is now under consideration. He has extended it to some extent and shown the object of this resolution or what he comprehends it to be. He referred, for instance, to consultations and to international questions as the points that should be recorded *in extenso*. The resolution refers to all communications, and the hon. member for Queen's goes so far as to state that it is an undoubted parliamentary rule that these communications, including all the questions that would come up on an occasion of discussion of a treaty, and all the consultations, that is to say, all the conversations, should be reduced to writing. For that proposition he has given us nothing more than his *ipse dixit*.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Washington Treaty protocols.

Mr. TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman refers to Washington Treaty protocols. He will search those protocols from first to last, he will search the protocols of the Treaty of 1888 from beginning to end, and he will fail to find any attempt at reporting the communications between the two Governments, he will fail to find any attempt to report their consultations. In reference to the Treaty of 1888 he will find that this Parliament was told by the protocols that the commissioners met on a certain day and adjourned, and going on another day they met and adjourned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not quote the Treaty of 1888. I quoted the Treaty of 1871, the Washington Treaty.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. member falls back on the treaty——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not fall back at all. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman wants to misrepresent me. I never referred to the Treaty of 1888, and why the hon. gentleman thrusts it in my mouth I do not know. I referred to the Treaty of 1871. I hold the protocols in my hand. I did not read them all through, but I reaffirm now that they contain the discussions between the plenipotentiaries on both sides.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has more discretion than I gave him credit for, and he now says that he did not refer to the Treaty of 1888. I, however, do refer to it, and I call the attention of the House to the protocols of that treaty, and to the fact that no one on that side of the House thought it necessary, in maintaining parliamentary customs, to force such a debate as this upon the House, or to bring up such a question for consideration. But if the hon. member goes back to 1871, he will find that the only difference between the protocols of the Washington Treaty and those of the Treaty of 1888 is that the references to the meetings are a little more full, and he will find no other difference than that. To say that these protocols contain what the hon. gentleman contended to-day they contained, is, to my mind, absolutely monstrous.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They are there.

Mr. TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that those protocols contain the consultations of the commissioners extending over the period that they profess to cover? Does he suppose that any one reading those protocols ever imagined that they purport to contain the consultations? They contained just what the papers before the House contained, that is, the proposition on the one side and the proposition on the other, the reason for refusing one proposition and the reasons for entertaining another. These are there, and the information is on the Table of the House to-day in reference to all that took place upon which Parliament is asked to give its consideration. The hon. gentleman has not shown that where the Government of the day are not seeking for the advice of Parliament, in the absence of any request by Parliament for the production of certain papers, the Government should, on its own motion, produce those papers, or that it should produce them at the suggestion of any individual member. I submit that all the hon. gentlemen have shown is that it is the custom in this country and in the mother country when Parliament is asked to take action upon international matters, the information in the possession of the Government relating to those matters should be in the hands of members of Parliament. That position they take, and that position is easily established. But they cannot go on from that to argue, without producing more authority than they have done yet, that such is the constitutional rule, that every communication that takes place between the representatives of this Government and those of another, should be laid on the Table of the House. Now, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), I think, gave all that there is to be found in the authorities governing the procedure of Parliament on this point. I submit to the consideration of this House whether the hon. member for Queen's dealt with reference, for instance, to the ruling of the Speaker in 1884, in England, the case that the hon. member for Albert referred to. I certainly did not follow him if he did. Now, then, the hon. gentleman will see that there is no rule for the reduction of the oral discussions to writing, whatever has been the custom. The hon. gentleman's lecture, for the most part, is not merely directed against this Parliament, but his criticism is upon international action. The hon. gentleman is practically reading a lecture to the representatives of all civilized countries, and he has asked this Parliament practically to teach, not merely a lesson to the Canadian representatives on this subject, but to the representatives of the United States Government, when he says that all these negotiations and all the consultations shall be by the commission reduced to writing and laid upon the Table of the House. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) referred to the Treaty of 1888, and he referred to the alleged fact that the House was misled, if there were any further information to include in the protocols. It was not understood by the House in 1888 that the record was a full record of the proceedings in the sense in which he argued this record should be now. I call his attention to the fact that that subject was referred to, and this House was told that those protocols were not full, and the record was not produced, because it was agreed that the record should not be produced.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My statement was not that this was all that transpired, but that these documents professed to be the protocols, and if they were not the whole of the record, they were not the protocols. That is my point.

Mr. TUPPER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he desired on the occasion that the Government should produce the record of the consultations between the commissioners; I understood that to be his view, because, otherwise, I could not understand the application of his argument to the case now under discussion. I remind the House that in 1888 the House was informed that fuller records could not be produced without a violation of international confidence. I think that after the authority given by the Speaker of the English House of Commons in 1884, in line with the authorities quoted in the text book, it would have been idle for me to have pressed upon the House a further consideration of the matter. They stated the rule in reference to the obligation of a Minister of the Crown in dealing with public documents. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that in 1888 everything was plain sailing, and if there was further information than is brought down on that occasion the House was misled. However, we do not disagree on that point and I need not further refer to it. It was explained to the House on that occasion that further information could not be brought down without a violation of confidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is that pleaded now?

Mr. TUPPER. I say nothing about that. I am dealing with the facts as they are now before the House, and it is not necessary for me to express an opinion on that. I submit in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen have failed to show that there is such a rule as they have propounded, but it is obvious, that if that rule as understood and explained by hon. gentlemen opposite to-day, should obtain, and the Government was instructed by Parliament according to that rule, it would embarrass commissioners or representatives of this country in their future proceedings, and the commissioners would, perhaps, take a good deal of caution to say as little as possible upon such subject, when all that they would say, and all that was discussed, would find its expression in public reports, and be laid upon the Table of this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that neither the Minister of Justice, nor the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, has at all met the real point in this matter. The real question raised by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is that it now appears by documents laid on the Table of this House, that a record affecting the negotiations recently held at Washington was actually prepared, and was actually sent by the Canadian Government to the English Government. That point has not been denied, and consequently the point raised by my hon. friend has not been met at all. The position of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is this: That if there was such a record the House was treated with grave discourtesy by the Government, and notably by the Finance Minister, in keeping that from us, and in merely giving us a verbal statement of a matter which had been made a subject of record between the negotiators. That is the main complaint, as I understand it, which my hon. friend made, and I think no more just ground for complaint could well be submitted. Why, Sir, look at the very gravity and importance of the negotiations that took place between our commissioners, or our representatives, or our Ministers, call them what you will, and the gentlemen who represented the United States Government on that occasion. We know perfectly well that all the other questions, reference to which was made, were not merely of secondary, but of quite a third or fourth-rate importance as compared with this question. It was for the purpose, as members of the Government themselves have repeatedly stated, of obtaining the view of the United States Government on the question of reciprocity between Canada and the United States that these hon. gentlemen went to Washington at all. It was on that ground that more than a year ago they dissolved Parliament. It was on that ground the two parties in Canada have been arrayed against each other. If ever, Sir, in the course of any negotiations there was the extremest necessity that all possible precaution should be taken to have a written record of what passed between the negotiators of the two countries, it was precisely on this occasion which we are now considering. Now, Sir, I will not say that the hon. Minister of Finance stated in so many terms that there was no record, but most assuredly he implied and gave the House to understand that there was none. Most assuredly in reply to the leader of the Opposition, and to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and most assuredly in reply to myself did he time and again leave us under the impression that the reason that a mere verbal statement was made was because there was no written record. That was the impression left on our mind.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not responsible for that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was the impression intended to be conveyed.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was the impression left generally on the mind of the House and the country, but now in consequence of a chance allusion made in another despatch laid on the Table with quite a different purpose, we find that all this time there really was a record which was deliberately kept back by the hon. gentlemen for their own purposes. We find that they had that record and that they refused to give it to Parliament, although, forsooth, they could give it to the English Secretary of State for the Colonies, or the English Foreign Minister. I say that in keeping that back they certainly slighted the Canadian Parliament, and they certainly took every possible opportunity that they could to prevent us from understanding as we had a right to understand, and to prevent us being informed as we had the right to be informed, as to exactly what did pass between the hon. gentlemen and Mr. Blaine and General Foster on that occasion. I listened extremely carefully to the statements made by the Finance Minister in the Budget speech, and I do not hesitate to tell the House that I came then to the conclusion which I now entertain, that these hon. gentlemen went down to Washington with no honest purpose of negotiating a treaty at all; that they went down there for the full purpose of throwing a tub to the whale during the bye-elections that were going on, and also for the purpose of enabling them if they could, to return and tell the people of Canada that it was impossible to effect negotiations on reasonable terms with the people of the United States. Sir, the whole language, the whole tenor of the

statement made by the Finance Minister, as I pointed out on that occasion, went plainly to show that the object was not to smooth a way for a treaty of reciprocity between Canada and the United States, but to raise and suggest every obstacle which his ingenuity could imagine against bringing about a treaty between the two countries. We know very well, Sir, what was the language used by that hon. gentleman on many public occasions before his trip to Washington. We know what was the language used by his supporters, we know what has been the language used in this House, and we cannot fail to remember, Sir, the applause with which the announcement was greeted by his supporters, when they heard this question was finally closed and that there was no chance whatever for obtaining a treaty of reciprocity with the United States. I say, Sir, that from first to last, the Ministers went down to Washington with the deliberate purpose, not of effecting a reciprocity treaty, but with the deliberate purpose of putting obstacles in the way, and of presenting these obstacles to the mind of the American negotiators in such a fashion as to induce them to decline to proceed with the negotiation. That, Sir, was their purpose, and I have no doubt that they attained it. It is for that reason that it is of the greatest importance to us that we should know precisely what these hon. gentlemen stated in Washington, and that we should know exactly what propositions they made to the commissioners of the United States, and how these propositions were met. All that has been carefully concealed from us, and we are not going to get the information from these hon. gentlemen. Unless it is brought before the English Parliament or before the United States Congress, we are to be left in the dark. Now, Sir, we have ascertained that there have been certain communications, and I find that on 29th March, the leader of the House, speaking on this very subject, declared that every shred of the correspondence as far as he knew had been brought down. In another place he says :

"All that I say on that subject is, that, in the first place, every particle of the correspondence has been brought down, and that as regards any record or memorandum that may have been made as to our interviews, we are just as free to make a statement to the House as to what transpired from our mission to Washington, as if we had never put the matter in writing at all."

Now, it is a mere quibble, a not particularly worthy quibble, for the First Minister or his colleagues to tell us that the report which it appears was made to the British Government, does not fall under the head of correspondence ; and there is no doubt that when the hon. gentleman made this statement, he designed the House to understand that all the information in his power in writing had been put before the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Quite the contrary, because I said as to the report that I was afraid it could not be brought down. I admitted that there was a report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that he does not consider that a report to the English Secretary of State comes under the head of correspondence ? The hon. gentleman is an ingenious sophist, exceedingly skilful in hair-splitting, contriving subtle defences, and using words in a non-natural sense ; and most assuredly the word correspondence was used by him in a non-natural sense if he meant that it should not include the report sent to the English Secretary of State.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has just read the answer to his own unworthy insinuation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have just read the answer in which the hon. Minister declared that on this subject every shred of correspondence has been brought down, and at the same time keeps back the fact that a most important paper which was sent to the Home Government has not been communicated to us ; and I say that in so doing he is trifling with the House, and in using words in a non-natural signification. With respect to this question of protocols, I very distinctly recollect that in the negotiation of the Washington Treaty of 1871, very full information indeed was given to the House as to the various suggestions made from day to day, as to the various propositions which were made by one side and refused by the other. A very complete report was laid before Parliament ; and I do not admit that the very bad precedent which was set in 1888, of greatly curtailing and diminishing the amount of information to be communicated to the House, is at all a precedent which this House ought to follow. If I remember rightly, it was condemned at the time, and whether it was or not, it is no precedent by which we ought to be bound in considering negotiations of such great importance. Now, in 1874-75 we sent a commissioner to Washington in the person of Mr. George Brown for the purpose of negotiating a treaty, in which he made some progress, but which he failed to carry into effect ; and I find that on his return, a very full memorandum on the whole subject was submitted to the House, in which a great deal of information as to all that had passed between the two countries was given by that hon. gentleman ; and it is to be found in the correspondence which was presented to the English Parliament by the command of Her Majesty. I think it would have been much better for these hon. gentlemen to have followed that example than to have taken the course they have chosen of utterly refusing to communicate to us that most important part of the negotiations which referred to the propositions made by them. Sir, everybody on both sides of the House knows quite well that before we can expect the Government of the United States to enter into any negotiations with us for the purpose of framing a reciprocity treaty, we must in the first instance convince the people and the Government of the United States of the sincere and earnest desire on the part of Canada and our negotiators to secure such a treaty. This has been from the first wholly lacking on the part of these hon. gentlemen. They have had no desire to secure reciprocity, and for the best of all possible reasons they know perfectly well, and we know perfectly well, that a large class of their supporters on whom they rely for the means whereby they maintain themselves in power, have been from first to last steadily and continuously opposed to the negotiations with the United States which the great bulk of their countrymen desire to see carried to a completion ; and I have no doubt whatever that the reason why the Government refuse to give us the full information on this question which reason and

constitutional precedents warrant us in demanding, is that they are reluctant to allow other persons to know to what extent they were willing to go or how far they went in the way of offering any terms whatever to the United States. That, Sir, and nothing else, is, I think, the real reason why these hon. gentlemen are so extremely loath to give us the information which we have a right to demand at their hands. Sir, I can hardly understand how any business man can come before this House or before the country and say that in a matter of the very gravest importance like this, he deems it enough to give us a mere verbal statement of what he recollects to have taken place a number of days ago. At the time I called the attention of the House to the extreme inconvenience that would result from such a practice, I specially enquired whether the statements made in negotiation had been recorded at all, or whether those statements had been submitted to the commissioners of the United States; because I told the hon. Minister of Finance then, and I now repeat, that unless those statements had been reduced to writing and submitted to representatives of the United States and agreed to by them, there was the very gravest danger of discrepancies arising between the recollection of himself—without necessarily imputing any blame to him—and the recollection of the United States authorities. Now, Sir, it is so clear, so plain, so obvious, that that as a mere matter of business precaution that should have been done, that I could hardly bring myself at the moment to believe that it was neglected; and now I think it will appear that this was done, and that the fact was kept back from us for the reason that it was not convenient to the hon. gentlemen to allow the people of Canada and the members of this House to understand the precise mode in which they approached the American Government, to know the exact nature of the propositions they made to them, to know how far they were willing to sacrifice their beloved friends of the Red Parlour. I do not exactly know what the hon. gentleman meant by the statement which he made. That he proposes, as I see he states he proposes, a reciprocity treaty or certain modifications and extensions such as the changed conditions of the country might render necessary. Now, we ought to know, we should have been informed then, it ought to have been made a portion of these same protocols and records, what particular changes and modifications the hon. gentleman suggested as a basis for negotiation. We ought to know how far he was willing to go in extending that same Treaty of 1854 which referred to natural products only. He was told that if he desired really and honestly to obtain an offer from the United States his own offer must be made clearly and definitely. It does not appear from the statement here that such a thing was done, but I should suppose that the hon. gentleman must have made some more or less definite proposition in order to obtain any answer from the United States at all, because he states that immediately on this being done he was informed by Mr. Blaine that they must go a great deal further, that they must go wider than natural products, and include a general reciprocity in manufactured articles as well. And then he apparently proceeded to enquire of Mr. Blaine whether such a treaty of reciprocity involved discrimination against Great Britain. Well, I have not the slightest hesitation in repeating what I have said here often before. All treaties of reciprocity, particularly all treaties to be made on as broad a basis as we propose to make this, must, and will, of necessity, involve discrimination in favour of the country which grants reciprocity. We never denied that. It would be perfectly absurd for us to expect that we could obtain full and perfect reciprocity with the United States unless we are prepared to give them some reasonable advantages in return, and most assuredly it was a very unnecessary question for the hon. gentlemen to bring up and discuss with Mr. Blaine. If they had gone down with any honest intention of negotiating a reciprocity treaty, it was perfectly clear that they should have been prepared to make certain definite and distinct propositions; and the reason more than almost any other which leads me to believe and to say that they went down with no such object in their minds is this: that neither in their public statements nor in the despatch they sent the British Government, do they appear to have submitted any reasonable proposition such as they had the slightest ground for believing the United States would entertain.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CHARLTON. After the charges made against the Government to-night, I am surprised that we have heard from only one of the Ministers of the Crown with reference to the resolution placed in your hand, Sir, by the leader of the Opposition. Since 1878 there has always been manifested a spirit of subserviency to the Ministers, a disposition to follow them blindly without enquiring into motives, without enquiring into their conduct, without holding them to their responsibility, that argues ill for the independence of this House and for the good government of this country. It certainly should be demanded by this House that the Ministers of the Crown, who are not the masters of this Assembly but the servants of the people, should give a full account of their actions to the representatives of the people, should withhold nothing from us, but at all times and places should put us in a position to judge fully and independently, with all the facts before us, as to their conduct in the management of public affairs of every character. This has not been done in the instance under discussion to-night. It has not been the custom of the Government to do so. The Ministry has never hesitated to trifle with Parliament. They have never hesitated to withhold from Parliament what it might suit their purpose to withhold; and it is time now, as it has been at any time for the last twelve years, for Parliament to assert its rights and for this House to demand that the Ministers shall not trifle with it but shall place in our hands all the information which they are now withholding. It may be argued by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice or by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that the verbal statement of the doings of the Ministers in negotiations is sufficient for this House. It might well be asserted that a verbal statement with regard to the expenditure of public moneys, or with regard to the tariff of the country, or regarding transactions of any kind of any department of this Government, would be

sufficient. We would not necessarily call into account the veracity of the Government by refusing to accept verbal statements in regard to the management of affairs in a public department, but we are entitled to have something more than verbal statements, and we do have in all these cases detailed statements that can be verified, and we are entitled in a matter of the kind under discussion, to all the papers and memoranda, to all the Government may have done, to every proposition they have made, and every counter proposition they may have received, in fact, to everything concerning their negotiations at Washington. We have not received that. I will use a word which I think will answer the purpose when I say that the insincerity of the Government in regard to these reciprocity negotiations, in regard to all that preceded the assumed or alleged reciprocity negotiations, begets suspicion now as to the conduct of the Government at Washington with reference to this matter. We have the reasons assigned by the Government for dissolution, reasons bearing upon this question of negotiations for reciprocity. It is proper to allude to this in this connection, because it leads up to the state of matters which we are discussing tonight, and the circumstances connected with the dissolution of the House warrant us in entertaining some suspicions as to whether the Government have dealt fairly and fully with the House in this matter, whether they have placed the House in full possession of information on this subject or have withheld something which is necessary to the full understanding of this question. You, Mr. Speaker, will recollect that the House was unexpectedly dissolved on 3rd February, 1891. The reasons assigned for that in the Government organ, which I supposed were inspired, and which have been endorsed, because they were never disavowed, were that :

"It is understood that the Dominion Government have through Her Majesty's Government made certain proposals to the United States for negotiations looking to an extension of our commerce with that country. These proposals have been submitted to the President for his consideration, and the Canadian Government is of the opinion that, if the negotiations are to result in a treaty, which must be ratified by the Parliament of Canada, it is expedient the Government should be able to deal with a Parliament fresh from the people, and not with a moribund House.

"It is understood that Canada will send a delegation to Washington after 4th March, the date on which the life of the present Congress expires, for the purpose of discussing informally the question of the extension and development of trade between the United States and Canada, and the settlement of all questions of difference between the two countries. This delegation will visit the United States capital, it is said, as the result of a friendly suggestion from Washington."

And we had placed before us a circular or despatch of the 13th December, 1890, from the Government of Canada to the Colonial Office in which it was proposed that commissioners should be appointed who should have authority to treat at Washington on the basis of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 with certain modifications, and it was asserted that there were negotiations on foot at that date for a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Upon that assumption and representation of the case, the Government dissolved the House and went to the people. Subsequent developments made it apparent that no negotiations were on foot with the Washington authorities at that time, that the Government of Canada had received no invitation, no overtures from the Government at Washington, and that the statement made was a statement destitute of foundation, and, when this state of affairs was brought to the attention of the American Secretary of State by a letter from Congressman Baker of Rochester, N.Y., Mr. Blaine in reply explicity stated :

"There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured that no such scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion, confined to natural products, will be entertained by this Government."

Then it appears that there was no friendly suggestion emanating from Washington, and that no negotiations for a reciprocity treaty were on foot, but, even if the statement were true that there were negotiations for a reciprocity treaty with Washington, the assertion that it was necessary to dissolve the House in order to have that treaty dealt with was untrue. A full year must elapse before a treaty could be submitted to the United States Senate for consideration. Even then it would be fair to assume that some months would elapse before that treaty would be considered by the Senate, so that the election could have been held a year afterwards, and the new Parliament would have been elected in ample time to consider this treaty, even supposing this statement made in the public organ was true, which it was not. I allude to this for the purpose of pointing out why we deem ourselves entitled to entertain some suspicions as to the character of the Government manœuvres at Washington, as to the character of their statements as to the Washington negotiations. Their first trip to Washington was evidently made without invitation, and merely to save appearances. The House was dissolved for other reasons than those which were assigned, and it was necessary to carry out this game of deception, as I will characterize it, for it was nothing else, to go to Washington, as my hon. friends the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance did, where they remained for a few hours. They were not met by Mr. Blaine, but they received a rebuff and were sent about their business and had to come home again. During all the campaign of 1891 it was perfectly apparent to any impartial observer that the Government, while professing to desire reciprocity, were not anxious for anything of the kind. At every meeting and in every speech by every Tory orator, abuse of the United States was indulged in, and, while hollow professions were made in favour of reciprocity, every opportunity was taken to show why the people of Canada would be better off without it. The insincerity of the Government was transparent, and was apparent to every candid and close observer, and now, when they have thrown off the mask and informed us that reciprocity is not attainable, and that it is useless to make any further efforts in that direction, the joy with which they occupy that position and abandon the game they have been playing and stand up in their true colours is sufficient to show what their feelings have been throughout that transaction. Then, we are forced to believe that the Conservatives of this country are actually and truely enemies to the arrangements of any reciprocal arrangements between this country and the United States. It is possible that they might accept the old Treaty of 1854, which admitted the natural products free of duty. But beyond that, I venture the assertion they are not prepared to go, and would not go. Dealing with this question upon the basis of any scheme of attainable reciprocity, I do not hesitate

to say, that the Government are the enemiesof any such arrangement, and are not prepared, and are not willing, and will not attempt, to secure reciprocity.

Now, that is not the case with the party upon this side of the House. We would be glad to get reciprocity in natural products, the kind of a treaty our friends opposite talked of getting when they went to Washington. But we know we cannot obtain it. We know that the uniform declaration of the American Government since 1866 is that they never would renew the treaty upon that basis, and that means that it is useless to talk about getting it. We know well that to talk to the people about securing a reciprocity treaty upon the basis of the Treaty of 1854, is merely amusing them with a false pretense. We would be glad to get reciprocity on the basis of a free admission into the United States of the natural products of this country, in return for the admission of a large list of American goods scheduled as free goods; we would be glad if a treaty could be got upon that basis. That is where we part company with our friends opposite, because they would not, in my opinion, accept a treaty upon any such basis as I have named. We are willing to go further, and if it is not possible to obtain reciprocity short of a treaty that is absolutely unrestricted in the free admission of the products of the labour of each country, we are willing to go that far, and that is another point where we differ from those hon. gentlemen. We are actually intent upon securing a reciprocity treaty, honest in our endeavours and wishes to secure it. The Government are not, and they have played with this question, they have used it as an electioneering dodge, they used in the general election of 1891, and they have made use of it in the bye-elections of 1892; they have used the issue with great skill as politicians, there is no doubt of that. But, Sir, they have all the time deceived the people of this country, and now they stand out unmasked in their true colours as the natural enemies of reciprocity, and as guilty, during all this time, of duplicity in their position before the people of this country.

Now, there is something in these negotiations that has been concealed, I am convinced of that. I am convinced that my hon. friends opposite have not dealt in sincerity and truthfully with the people of this country. I want to understand as a member of this House exactly what was done at Washington. I want to know whether the Government made any proposition whatever with regard to obtaining reciprocity. If they did make any proposition, then I want to know what it was. I want to know when they made that proposition—whatever it might be, if they made one—to Secretary Blaine, what his counter-proposition was, what answer he gave to that proposition. I want to know whether, after laying that proposition before the Secretary of State and receiving his reply, they made any modification of that proposition; I want to know, in short, if there were any negotiations at all. I want to know, if there were any negotiations, what the character of these negotiations was. We have not that in formation. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we are likely to get it. We are not likely to get it from the gentlemen who ought to take the House of Commons into their confidence before asking us to pass upon this question. I understand from the Americans papers that the State Department at Washington intend to issue their version of the affair, and from that statement we may possibly get at the truth. But we are entitled to that statement, we are entitled to a true statement of the negotiations, a true statement of what was done and what was not done in regard to this matter, from the Ministers themselves, and if they withhold that information from this House then they are trifling with the representatives of the people of this country, and they are worthy of the condemnation which the resolution of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition throws upon them in this matter, for not having taken the House into their confidence, and for not having placed before us the actual conditions of the negotiations, what they have actually done, and what they have not done.

We have heard a great deal said about loyalty. We had something said this afternoon about the sin of discriminating against England. It is very refreshing to see the care of a certain party in Canada with regard to England, to see this mighty country taking England under its wing. They are very careful about British interests, very loyal to those interests. In my opinion it is our business to look after our own interests. The British people do not ask us to look after their interests. They laugh at the assumption of power on our part to care for their interests. We are placed here, occupying nearly one-half of this continent, to look after the resources of this country. We have our own future to make, our own prosperity to secure, we have our own progress to care for, and, Sir, we must look after our own interests and move in the light of our own interests, and in that light exclusively, if we are to succeed in the race that is set before us. All this cry about loyalty is merely a herring drawn across the trail. The object is to divert the attention of the people from the true issue placed before them. I believe in Canada for the Canadians, I believe in promoting the interests of Canada first. England would not hesitate, and has not hesitated, to discriminate against us if her interests required it; and if it becomes necessary in order to promote our own interests, to secure our own progress, and add to our own prosperity—if it becomes necessary incidentally to discriminate against England, not because we do it as a matter of choice, but because it is to our interest to do it, I do not hesitate to say we should take that course, and make our own interest the primary consideration.

Now, very likely we will hear a word from the Ministers, and perhaps we will not. The peculiar condition of affairs of this House, and in all Houses that have sat in this Chamber for the last twelve years, renders it quite unnecessary for the Ministers to say anything unless they choose to do so. They have but to indicate their wishes; it is not necessary to defend them, they have merely to indicate their wishes to secure the applause of their followers. This is what I complain of in regard to parliamentary government in this country, the fact that there is a slavish subservient following that does not require from the Ministry a statement as to its motives, a statement as to its conduct, that does not hold the Ministry to accountability, that allows the Ministry to govern this country by Orders in Council, and allows Parliament to abdicate its functions and serve as a mare make-weight or tail to the kite of ministerial power. It is for that reason that I hold this motion is most opportune; it is for that

reason I hold that this House should resume its functions, should demand that the Ministry should place in its possession all the information that is necessary to guide this House in arriving at a just conclusion upon all public affairs. I believe that in this instance vital and important information has been withheld from this House, and that the motion of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is most opportune, most proper, and is urgently called for under the circumstances.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Godbout,
Armstrong,	Innes,
Bain (Wentworth),	Landerkin,
Béchard,	Langelier,
Beith,	Laurier,
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Legris,
Bowman,	Lister,
Brodeur,	Livingston,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Carroll,	McMullen,
Casey,	Mignault,
Charlton,	Mills (Bothwell),
Christie,	Monet,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perry,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Delisle,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	Rowand,
Featherston,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Scriver,
Forbes,	Somerville,
Gauthier,	Vaillancourt,
Geoffrion,	Watson,
Gibson,	Yeo.—57.
Gillmor,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Lippé,
Amyot,	Macdonald (King's),
Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Bernard,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bennett,	McAlister,
Bergeron,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bowell,	McDougald (Pictou),
Boyle,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Burns,	McKay,
Cameron,	McLean,
Cargill,	McLennan,
Carignan,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Carling,	McNeill,
Carpenter,	Madill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Mara,
Chapleau,	Marshall,
Coatsworth,	Masson,
Cockburn,	Mills (Annapolis),
Corbould,	Northrup,
Corby,	O'Brien,
Craig,	Ouimet,
Curran,	Patterson (Colchester),
Daly,	Pope,
Davis,	Prior,
Desaulniers,	Putman,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Reid,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Robillard,
Dewdney,	Roome,
Dugas,	Rosamond,
Dupont,	Ross (Dundas),
Earle,	Ross (Lisgar),
Fairbairn,	Ryckman,
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Savard,
Foster,	Simard,
Fréchette,	Skinner,
Gillies,	Smith (Ontario),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Stairs,
Hazen,	Stevenson,
Henderson,	Temple,
Hodgins,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hughes,	Tisdale,
Hutchins,	Turcotte,
Joncas,	Trywhitt,
Kaulbach,	Wallace,
Kenny,	Weldon,
Kirkpatrick,	White (Cardwell),
Langevin (Sir Hector),	White (Shelburne),
LaRivière,	Wilson,
Lépine,	Wood (Brockville).—93.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Baker,	Frémont,
Taylor,	Sutherland,
Dyer,	Rider,
Ferguson,	Carrole,
Hearn,	Choquette,
Cleveland,	Guay.

Mr. RIDER. Seeing that my name is down as having voted for the amendment in place of the name of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Sanborn), I beg to say that I did not vote. I was paired with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Dyer) or otherwise I would have voted yea.

Amendment negatived, motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee).

Immigration—Salaries, Agents, Europe. $5,900

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to know who are the agents in Europe, where they are located and what their salaries are?

Mr. CARLING. There are five agents in Europe, Mr. Dyke, of Liverpool, salary, $2,100; Mr. Grahame, of Glasgow, salary, $1,300; Mr. Connolly, of Dublin, salary, $1,000; Mr. Merrick, of Belfast, salary, $1,000, and Mr. Down, of Bristol, $486.66.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are the duties of immigration agents performed at the office of the High Commissioner in London or is there a separate officer there?

Mr. CARLING. Not that I am aware of. I am quite sure that there is no office outside of the High Commissioner's office in London, and the work is done at his office by Mr. Colmer and the officials connected with the office.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that Mr. Grahame, of Glasgow, has a salary of $1,300 a year and is allowed $4 a day besides; why are the amounts charged separately?

Mr. CARLING. This allowance has been given to the agents for the last 15 years. It was done by the Government of Mr. Mackenzie and it has been done by the Government since. However, it is not the proper way to do it, and it is not intended to continue them. It is intended to revise the salaries of the agents in the old country, so as to give them a fixed salary and allow them for actual travelling expenses. That is, I believe, the intention of the head of the Department of the Interior, who will have charge of this matter in the future.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can understand that during the Mackenzie Government it might be necessary to make this extra allowance in Glasgow and London because we did not have a High Commissioner there. We have now a High Commissioner in London with a full staff of officials, and I do not think it is necessary to pay an extra $4 a day to these agents. I am glad to hear the Minister announce that it is intended to readjust the salaries and the travelling expenses of the agents. Could

the Minister give us an idea as to what the changes are to be?

Mr. CARLING. It is intended to change the system in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. McMULLEN. When will that come into operation?

Mr. CARLING. I believe it is intended to commence the next financial year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Do these agents certify to their own travelling expenses, or will the High Commissioner have the supervision of the different offices?

Mr. CARLING. The agent in Great Britain makes his report to the High Commissioner and he has a general supervision over them. Vouchers will have to be given for the actual travelling expenses the same as is done in this country and the agents will have to certify to them.

Mr. GIBSON. It would appear as if Mr. Grahame, the agent at Glasgow, has been travelling 325 days in the year at $4 a day, and that he was also 15 Sundays away from home. Being a good Scotchman, I know that the Scotch people do not travel on Sunday; but this man seems to have been travelling 15 Sundays in addition to the 325 days, for which he is allowed $4 a day; and certainly he must have spent some of his time in Glasgow. I would like to know from the Minister if he is all the time on the road.

Mr. CARLING. He is not all the time on the road.

Mr. GIBSON. If the whole of this amount is not for travelling expenses, but part of it for salary, the exact amount paid for salary should be put under that heading.

Mr. McMULLEN. On page B-221 I find that the total expenses of the London office amount to $26,955.46. Among the expenses there is a charge of $50.37 for barley exhibit. Was that in connection with the shipment of barley from this country?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose it is the expenses in connection with the barley sent to the old country to be exhibited, at the request of the High Commisioner.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice also a charge of $321.20 for expenses of the Doncaster show. That appears to be a large amount for one show.

Mr. CARLING. The Doncaster Show is the chief exhibition in England every year, and at the request of the High Commissioner we sent cereals from the North-West and the various provinces to to be exhibited there. It is considered of very great importance that that should be done, and this charge represents the expenses connected with it.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a charge of $13,639.24 for printing 628,222 copies of the report of the delegate farmers. Was it printed here or in England?

Mr. CARLING. The reports were made to Sir Charles Tupper and were printed in England. It was very important that they should be issued as soon as possible, in time for the spring immigration, and the cost of printing was much less than it would have been in this country. It was done to save time and also to save money.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman say whether tenders were asked for, and whether the lowest tender was accepted?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that tenders were asked by the High Commissioner from the principal printers in London, and that he accepted the lowest tender, and he was authorized to have the reports printed at the price mentioned, about 2 cents each.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any report of the delegates furnished to the Government were suppressed. There was a rumour that two or three of these delegates who visited the Maritime Provinces and who afterwards visited Ontario and the North-West, presented a report of a character not entirely satisfactory to the Government. The report, it was rumoured, set forth the disadvantages under which the Canadian farmer laboured, dealt very strongly upon the necessity that existed for procuring for him free access to the American market, drew certain conclusions which were quite opposite to the position taken by my hon. friend and his colleagues, and expressed the opinion that there was no future for the Canadian farmer, except in the obtaining of continental free trade. If any report of that kind was submitted to my hon. friend and has not been published, it would be a matter of interest to this House and the country to know why the Government ventured to suppress the report of these delegates after they had examined the field.

Mr. CARLING. I have seen no such report and if any report of the kind mentioned has been made, it has been made to the High Commissioner. But I am satisfied that no such report has been made to the High Commissioner, because I had an interview with those delegates in Toronto, and they did not indicate to me that they were dissatisfied at all with the general policy of the Government or believed that it was so necessary to the Canadian farmer to obtain trade relations with the United States. These delegates were selected by the High Commissioner with the approval of the Government and their reports would be made to him in England, and they will be printed by him if he considers it necessary.

Mr. CHARLTON. If any report of that kind is in the hands of the High Commissioner, I hope my hon. friend will see that it is published, whatever may be the conclusions arrived at by these delegates, whether they may happen to tally with the policy of the Government or be different from that policy. The public are entitled to the opinion of these men, especially if these opinions are founded upon actual examination of the different sections of the Dominion and into the condition of the farmers. I have it on authority that such a report is in existence, and that the Government do not wish it published. If there is such a report it should not be suppressed.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say I have seen no such report and am quite sure the Government has not seen it.

Mr. CASEY. This question of these farmer delegates in their reports is rather an important one. They seem to have cost us a good deal of money, first to last, although the Public Accounts do not enable us to ascertain, without a vast

amount of labour, how much they actually cost. Has the hon. gentleman an account of the sum total expended on the visit of the tenant farmers?

Mr. CARLING. The total expense of bringing them out here and taking them back to the old country will be about $13,000.

Mr. CASEY. The figures I have been able to get out of the Auditor General's account show an expenditure of $8,000, yet the Minister says they cost $13,000, or $5,000 more than I have been able to find. I find that the charge for postage and distribution among the different agencies of England foot up altogether to over $6,000. Then the cost of printing in England is $13,639, all of which added together comes to about $28,000, and adding the $5,000 which the Minister gives over and above what I was able to find, that brings the total cost of the visit of these delegates and the distribution of their report to the end of last year to $33,000. This is a very large amount and I notice some very peculiar things in that connection. Look at the item of postage. I find under the head of London office a charge of $1,567 for postage on the reports of the delegate farmers from that office. I presume the postage would certainly not be more than a penny on each report. It is only a cent in Canada on each report, and I am sure the book post in England is no dearer, but supposing the postage on each report was a penny, this amount of $1,567 would pay for the postage of 783,500 reports, whereas there were only 628,000 printed altogether. The account reads: "Reports of the Farmers' Delegates, 628,622, $13,629," or somewhere approximating 2 cents apiece; so that while under 630,000 reports have been printed, we have enough charged for postage to mail over 780,000 at a penny a piece, and if, as I believe is the case, book post in England cost but half a cent apiece, that would make postage charged on considerably over 1,600,000 reports. We find here in the London office more than enough charged for postage to distribute the whole of these printed reports. But we also find other charges, $2,317 in one place, $937 in another, $121 in another for distributing these reports in England, so that we are charging for distribution three or four times over. We are charged $6,000 in all for postage and distribution of these reports which it only cost $13,600 to print. They were printed in England and under the supervision of the commissioner in the London office, and there is more than enough charged in that office for postage to distribute the whole lot. Yet, besides that, we have $4,500 charged in other places for distributing them. I do not understand how we can have those two classes of charges. If they were mailed to individuals from the London office, there should be no further charge for distributing. Evidently there is a job of some kind somewhere, and perhaps the Minister will explain.

Mr. CARLING. I am quite sure there is no job in the distribution. They were large reports, and I do not believe you could get one of those reports sent to parts of the Empire for a penny. The postage to Great Britain is charged by weight. We have the High Commissioner and his staff there, and I am sure the House has sufficient confidence in Sir Charles Tupper and his staff to believe that this work will be properly done. I am sure that the money has been properly expended.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the Minister is sure, but it is clear that his attention was never called before to the distribution of these pamphlets. Ha says, with his mild benevolent smile, with thet sweet and trustful expression which no doubt expresses his personal character, with the genial confidence he has in everybody's good conduct, that he is sure that it is all right, members must not expect him to know anything about it, but he is sure that it is all right, because we have a High Commissioner and a staff of clerks to look after it. I can only put against this confidence which he has in the absolute correctness of all the dealings of his agents in every neighbourhood, the fact that stares us in the face that it costs us half as much to distribute these pamphlets as to print them. We have a charge of $1,546 to mail them from London and we have another item of $2,317 to distribute them at Liverpool, whether by mail or by hand does not appear. I know the size of these pamphlets, and they do not weigh more than eight ounces. Even if they weighed twelve ounces, they would go for 1½d., and this amount would cover all that were printed, making the greatest allowance. The amount charged in London for postage would cover the distribution of the whole of them, and yet we have $4,500 charged at other points. I think the amount is too large to be allowed to slip. It is the business of the Minister to see that too much is not charged by the High Commissioner or anybody else. I have not been able to find the expenses of the Paris agency in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is there.

Mr. BOWELL. It is included in the miscellaneous items.

Mr. CASEY. Then Mr. Hector Fabre is not under the control of the Immigration Department.

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. PERRY. I have not seen any of these pamphlets in Prince Edward Island. It appears to me that not only is the report of these delegates mysterious, but there is something mysterious in the mission of the delegates themselves. I saw one of them and travelled with him on the cars. He said he liked the country very well, but he appeared to be frightened. The impression made upon me was that he had instructions from some members of the Government or some officer of the Government to hold his tongue and not to give expression to his own opinions. He appeared to be hampered and not to be willing to speak especially on one particular question. It would not be fair for me to mention that question here. When we have paid hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money it this direction, I think we have a right to know where it has gone and what the people have received in return for it. I would like to know from the Minister how many immigrants came from London, how many came from Liverpool, how many came from Glasgow, how many came from all the other ports of Europe. We have been told what immigrants we have received during the past ten years. Where have they gone? The Government are not even able to keep our natural population at home. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) told us that the emigration commenced in 1854, and was principally between 1854 and 1866, and he had the audacity to say that

it was nearly all from Prince Edward Island. I think when an hon. gentleman talks about something out of his own province, he should stick to the truth, but he was far from doing that. I have looked at the census returns from Prince Edward Island since 1848——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. We are on the question of salaries. We have already gone astray a good deal. When we reach the item of expenses, the hon. gentleman can say what he likes on that subject, but we will never get through if we do not stick to the item.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. I think, under salaries as well as under anything else, we are at liberty to discuss the number of immigrants we have obtained.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am very sorry to have to check the hon. gentleman, but we shall never get through unless we confine our attention to the item under discussion. He can make his remarks on the second item after this one, as long as he pleases.

Mr. PERRY. I do not know that we will gain much by splitting hairs in this way. It is very seldom I trouble the House. I want to know from the Minister whether the reports of these farmers' delegates were distributed in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. CARLING. The delegates' reports were distributed in the old country. Last session, by order of the House, 50,000 more of those reports were ordered to be printed for distribution in Canada. Whether they have been distributed, I do not know, because it was not done through my department. They were ordered to be printed for the use of members, by the Printing Committee. The others that were printed were distributed in the old country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What became of these 50,000 that were printed for circulation in Canada?

Mr. CARLING. They were not printed by the department, nor by the authority of the department. The Agriculture Committee recommended to the House that 50,000 copies be printed in English and in French.

Mr. PERRY. The Minister says he don't know, who is to know?

Mr. CARLING. You have just as much right to know as I have, because it was ordered by this House, and not the department.

Mr. BOWELL. I dare say the hon. gentleman could learn what he desires on enquiry from Mr. Botterell, of the Distribution Office. All parliamentary documents are distributed from that office under the instructions of the Printing Committee. The Minister of Agriculture had nothing whatever no do with this, any more than my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Perry).

Mr. PERRY. We have a right to get the information from the Minister himself. He ought to have a return showing how many of these reports were sent to each of the provinces. I got none, and I have not heard of a single person in Prince Edward Island who has received them.

Mr. CARLING. They may not have been printed yet, and therefore they may not have been circulated yet.

Mr. PERRY. The more the Minister says, the more inconsistent he appears. He says perhaps they are not printed yet. That is a strange proceeding. I am not the Minister of Agriculture, I wish I were, and I would try to give more satisfaction than the present Minister is willing to give. Perhaps he thinks Prince Edward Island is too small and too far away to receive any consideration from him. I can tell him that that little Island is a beautiful little Island; it is the best country in the whole Dominion of Canada. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture told this gentleman not to send any papers to Prince Edward Island for fear the people would get some information. I contend that as we have helped to pay the expenses of these farmers' delegates we should have some of their reports.

Mr. WATSON. I do not remember that the Agriculture Committee asked that 50,000 copies of the reports of the farmers' delegates be printed for circulation in Canada.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman will enquire he will find that the order was given by the Printing Committee and passed through this House.

Mr. WATSON. If so, I think there would have been a discussion on it, because it does not seem right that we should pay for the circulation of these farmers' delegates reports in our own country; they should be circulated in the old country. It is the people of the old country that we want to enlighten. What means was taken to have these circulated?

Mr. CARLING. You must enquire from Mr. Botterell, of the Distribution Department. It is not a matter that comes under my control at all. There were 250,000 copies of the reports of the agricultural farm printed and distributed last year, and these delegates' reports would be distributed in the same way.

Mr. WATSON. I agree that the farm reports ought to be printed and circulated in Canada, but the farmers' delegates reports should be circulated in the old country.

Mr. CARLING. All those that were printed by authority of the department were distributed in the old country. We have not distributed any in Canada, except a few copies that were sent out to members last session. They were so well thought of by the Committee on Agriculture that they desired 50,000 more to be reprinted and distributed in Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister said a short time ago that there were in England five agencies. In London alone we spent last year $40,364, and we have no immigration office there unless in connection with Sir Charles Tupper's office. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) has drawn attention to the enormous sum that was paid for postage on those various farmers' delegates pamphlets. I find in connection with emigration in London, including the item charged on the High Commissioner's account for postage, and the item in connection with general expenses under the head of immigration, that we paid altogether $9.50 a day for postage. I would like to learn from the Minister, in the recast he intends to make of the agencies, what reduction he expects to be able to make in the general expenses next year. We

would like to know how he expects to save money under the arrangement that he anticipates making. The reason I ask this is that the amount asked this year is the same as was asked last year and there is no provision made for a reduction.

Mr. CARLING. My hon. friend will see that the large expenditure in England by the High Commissioner's office includes printing the farm delegates' reports, the postage on these reports and the guide book of Canada that was sent to London, the distribution of chromos and posters, and advertising in the English press. Of course an important thing is to advertise the country and to let the people know all about our great North-West and the advantages of Canada as a field for immigrants. Every English paper in which we advertise has written about Canada in a most favourable way and the articles have been sent out to us. There are 27,000 post offices in Great Britain and the Postmaster General has been good enough to permit us to hang up one of our posters in each one of these offices free of charge. Then we distribute pamphlets with maps in all the market towns and every place where they will attract the attention of the people. The expenses of the farm delegates, I believe, were also paid in London through the High Commissioner, as well as all the other matters I have mentioned, and that is the cause of so much expense in his office.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite satisfied that a very vigorous effort has been made by the Minister and his staff to get immigrants into the country. However the question I put to the hon. gentleman was, what saving he expected to effect, as there is no provision for any reduction in the vote asked ?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know as there will be any great saving in Great Britain, and perhaps there will be more expended, but as I have pointed out, the change will be made in the system of paying the agents in England, and perhaps a reduction will be made in that line. As the hon. gentleman is aware the branch of immigration has been transferred to the Department of the Interior, which I think was very wise, because the Department of the Interior has a commissioner at Winnipeg, and it has land agents and land guides, and we think that a reduction in expenses can be made in that way.

Mr. McMULLEN. I earnestly hope that the change to the Department of the Interior will have a beneficial effect, because, while the hon. Minister of Agriculture has made a vigorous effort to bring immigrants here, it is a sad consideration for us to see that they are not here now. I hope the Department of the Interior will be better able to keep them in the country. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Perry) was anxious to know where the immigrants came from, but that is not a matter of such vital importance as to know where they went to. $40,000 per year is an enormous sum to expend in one office in London on immigration, and it appears to me that a very considerable reduction could be made in the item of $10 a day for postage.

Mr. CARLING. I think no money that has been expended has had a better result than the bringing out of the farmers' delegates. The people in the old country look with suspicion on any lecturers we send from Canada, as they think they have some object in view and they will not listen to them in the same way as they will listen to persons whom they selected themselves to come out to this country. I believe that the visit of the farmers' delegates and the circulation of their reports will be the means of bringing out a large number of the best class of immigrants this year and next year. We will not of course have that expenditure this year, but still it is necessary that the people should be supplied with literature with regard to the Dominion of Canada. The people of Great Britain want to know more about Canada and with a population of nearly 40,000,000, it takes a long time and a good deal of expenditure to have literature distributed. I am glad to say that the litterature has been so well distributed that we are receiving benefits from it now by having a good class of immigrants coming to Canada this year.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I think the Minister is in error in saying that it was on the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization that 50,000 copies of the report of the farmers' delegates were printed for Canadian distribution. I have the report of the committee before me, and it only recommends the issue of its own report; but it refers to the 13 farmers' delegates who visited Canada, and mentions that 800,000 copies of their report were printed for circulation in Great Britain and Ireland, and expresses the hope that Canada will reap a valuable influx of immigrants from that circulation. With respect to the copies which reached us in Canada, I may say that the only copy I saw was a single set of the English edition which was sent to me. I never saw a Canadian copy, and if a Canadian edition was issued it was never circulated that I am aware of in the western portion of Ontario. What I want to draw the attention of the Minister to is the actual position of our Scotch and Irish agencies. The Scotch agent at Glasgow presents his twentieth report, so we must presume that he is familiar with his duties from long experience. In that report he speaks of having visited many portions of the country and having circulated 40,000 copies of the report of the Scotch delegates. The actual returns from Scotland show a steady annual diminution, and it seems to me that it is only a question of a few years when that immigration will disappear altogether very much as our immigration from France has disappeared under the care of Mr. Fabre. The same remark applies in a greater degree to the immigration from Ireland. While our agent at Belfast makes a special reference to the competition he has to meet with from other countries offering better inducements, it seems to me that it would be worth while for the Department of the Interior which is now going to take charge of immigration to obtain a special report from those agents as to the nature of the competition they met with and as to the probability of their being able to continue to draw immigrants from those sources. If our agencies continue to draw immigrants at the steadily decreasing rate which we have seen them doing for the last ten years, it will only be five or six years before they will entirely cease to bring any immigrants from Ireland or Scotland. It seems to me that there is ground for stirring up those agents to present a distinct statement of the difficulties they have to contend with, so that we may understand whether we are getting value for

our money or whether it is desirable to continue those agencies in their present form.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think there is a good deal in what my hon. friend from North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) says, and, for my part, I think the time has come for the Minister of Agriculture to consider whether it would not be advisable to change some of these agents. They appear to have grown rusty and to be not as able to do their work as they used to be, while their charges are constantly increasing. I am glad to know that the visit of the farmers' delegates to Canada is likely to prove beneficial. At the same time I think there was altogether too much expense connected with that visit. Apparently there has not been a proper audit of the accounts, or some of the items would not have been allowed. For instance, Mr. G. H. Campbell, of Winnipeg, charges $10 a day for 110 days' services in accompanying the delegates, and other expenses besides. He is also paid at the rate of $5 a day as a general agent. I also find that Mr. C. Griffith, photographer, was paid $100, and Mr. Thomas Mills, another photographer, $165 for waiting on the farmers' delegates. There are a great many such charges, which I do not think should be allowed. I would like to know whether they have been audited, and, if so, by whom?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Campbell was selected as a good man to take charge of the delegates. There were twelve or thirteen of them altogether, and it was very important that we should send some one who knew the geography of the country well, to take them from one end of Canada to the other, and to accompany them from the time they arrived at Quebec, through the different parts of the great North-West and as far as Victoria, and until they left the country. During that time Mr. Campbell was not employed as an agent and he did not receive double pay. Since then, he has been employed in immigration work in the western States, and he has done good work there. Considering that Mr. Campbell was well adapted to the work, and that he gave good satisfaction, not only to the department, but to those he took charge of, I think that the expenditure is not excessive.

Mr. GIBSON. I quite agree with the Minister of Agriculture that the delegates sent out here will do far more effective service in the way of promoting immigration than the agencies which have been established for some years. I have no complaint to make of the expense connected with the visit of those delegates. I find that that there were thirteen of them, and that they cost $540 each, or in all $7,011.90. As I find it in the Auditor General's Report it is $7,011.90, but the Minister says it is $13,000. What I wish to call the attention of the Minister to is the fact that in addition to the large salary paid the Glasgow gentleman he charges $1,071 for distributing the pamphlets, and his salary and expenses in connection with the duties of his office amount to $3,038. This added to the expense of distributing these pamphlets makes his income $4,110. It seems to me that the whole expense in connection with the printing and distributing of these pamphlets is unwarrantable. The whole amount is $18,826 of which $13,000 is for printing and $5,200 for distributing. The cost of distributing seems out of all proportion to the cost of printing.

Mr. WATSON. While we must agree with the Minister that we should do all we can to bring out farmers' delegates from the old country, I am a little surprised at the statements he has made that the men we sent from here were of little or no service because the people would not listen to them. I remember the hon. gentleman stating before the Immigration and Colonization Committee that the experiment of sending home settlers from Manitoba and the North-West was one of the best means adopted by the Agriculture Department and the Canadian Pacific Railway of giving information to intending immigrants.

Mr. CARLING. Those were men who had come from particular parts of Scotland and who went back to visit their friends. The people would not believe those who went as lecturers and whom they did not know anything about, but they had faith in the statements of their own friends.

Mr. WATSON. I would not like to reflect on the hon. gentleman's department to the extent he has. I would not suppose that he would have sent men to the old country to whom the people would not listen. I think he would have selected representative men who would be listened to in the old country.

Mr. CARLING. So we did.

Mr. WATSON. Some of these men who went to the old country cost the Government little or nothing and cost the Canadian Pacific Railway little or nothing.

Mr. CARLING. Those were not lecturers.

Mr. WATSON. I know some who did lecture in different places and the result was a good many immigrants of the best class were got into Manitoba. Manitoba, for a very small expenditure has been doing good work in connection with immigration; and as the Government are about to transfer the immigration branch to another Minister, I hope when that change is made they may work in conjunction with the Manitoba Government and the North-West Council. The president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in an interview a few days ago, referred in the most favourable terms to the work now being done by the Manitoba Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it appears to me that the Dominion Government, who have the most money to spend on immigration, should work in harmony with the Local Government of Manitoba and the North-West Council. The hon. member for Assiniboia brought up a motion the other day which was commendable. The North-West Council requested that a portion of the money set aside for immigration should be relegated to them to be spent by them. That would be a good move. The people of Manitoba and the North-West are very much interested on obtaining settlers, and I believe would spend the money much more economically than would the department here. The system should have been adopted a couple of years ago. The system of sending delegates from the country to act as immigration agents, giving each man three or four months' trip to his native land, should be pursued in the future. If instead of sending men who are not at all acquainted with the country, the Government would send men who have settled in the country many years and could answer questions with regard to location, soil, &c., different results would be shown.

Mr. CARLING. As the hon. gentleman has stated that no order was given by the House to

print these phamplets, I would refer him to the report of the Printing Committee of 22nd June last, recommending that 250,000 copies of the report of 1890 by Professor Saunders on the experimental farms, and 100,000 copies of the report on dairying, and 50,000 copies of the delegates' report be printed and distributed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I remember the matter being up for discussion in the Printing Committee, but do not remember that the recommendation made by the Agriculture Committee was adopted. However, if that order was adopted, as no doubt it was, it has never been acted upon, because we have never been put in possession of those delegate farmers' reports.

Mr. CARLING. They are not printed yet.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the House had better set aside that order now, because I cannot see what benefit it will be for the people of the older provinces to have these pamphlets circulated. The hon. member for Marquette has said that this Government ought to act in concert with Manitoba and the North-West. I think if it were possible that an understanding could be come to by the Local Governments of the west and the Dominion Government on the subject of immigration, it would be a good thing for the country in general, because we find that the Government of Manitoba and the Government of the North-West send men down to Ontario to lecture about the North-West and Manitoba and to induce the settlers of Ontario, and no doubt of other provinces, to leave their native provinces and go out to the west. That is not going to benefit the country. It is only the transfer of a man from one province to another, and does not add to the wealth of the country. I think the immigration should come from the mother country and other countries, but this system is only an attempt to remove people from one province to another. That was the contention which was put forward by a number of the members of the Printing Committee when it was proposed to have 50,000 copies of these reports of the farmers' delegates printed, because we could not see that any benefit could result from inducing the farmers of the older provinces and their sons to sell out and go to the newer provinces. I think it would be well for the Government to come to some arrangement with the Provincial Governments in the west. I am glad to see that a new order of affairs has been instituted with reference to this immigration literature. It used to be the fashion to print and send out into Canada thousands of pamphlets, but I am glad to see that has been stopped. It is of no benefit to the older provinces, and we should circulate such literature in foreign countries and in the mother country. I should like to know if the system of granting bonuses to immigrants is to be continued. I see that last year $11,179 was paid in bonuses to adults and children coming into this country. Some years ago the Government pledged itself not to pay any more money in this way, but it still keeps on doing it. The matter was enquired into very carefully by a commission in the Province of Ontario two years ago, and the opinion which was given by most of the men competent to offer one was that it was not conducive to the interests of the country that the system of bringing pauper children into Canada should be continued. However, I see that large sums of money are still paid for that purpose. It is no benefit to Canada to have those pauper children come here. The young people of this country cannot find employment. The sons of our own people are driven out of the country, because they cannot find employment here, and they have to go to the States, because you are bringing in these pauper children to take away the bread and the occupation of the sons of Canadian parents, and they displace so many native-born Canadians who are thus driven across the border to the United States. I do not see that this is of any benefit to the country, and, as my hon. friend from Essex says, they are not as good stock. I see also that large sums of money have been paid for advertising in newspapers. On page B-219 of the Auditor General's Report, I see that $200 was paid for a descriptive article on the anniversary of the *Empire*. I suppose that is the Toronto *Empire*. I should like to know what good a descriptive article in the Toronto *Empire* would do in regard to immigration. How was it going to bring foreign immigrants to this country? The *Empire* does not circulate largely in Europe or in Great Britain, and why should the Government pay $200 to the Toronto *Empire* for a descriptive article? It does not even say whether the article was in reference to immigration or not. I think it is clear that this was simply a gift to the organ of the Government. Then there is the Brandon *Mail*, 24,000 copies, $700. What was done with that?

Mr. CARLING. Those were distributed in the western States. We had agents in Dakota, endeavouring to induce Canadians who had gone there to come back to Manitoba, and we had the post office address of the parties living in Dakota, and the Brandon *Mail* was sent to each of these parties by post during the summer of 1890.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I suppose the same was done with the *Scandinavian-Canadian*, 25,000 copies, $575. I suppose that could not have been sent to Dakota?

Mr. CARLING. No, that was sent to Scandinavia, and some were sent to Iceland.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I see that the *Western World* received $300 for advertising, and 60 copies were purchased. Where is that paper published?

Mr. CARLING. In Winnipeg.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Where was that circulated?

Mr. CARLING. In different agencies in Canada and in Great Britain. It is considered a very good paper, giving an illustrated description of the country, and it was thought well to distribute it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then we have the Winnipeg *Colonist* and 200 almanacs. Really the expenditure in that line seems to have been extravagant, and I do not think it results in any great benefit to immigration to advertise in that way.

Mr. CARLING. You must advertise.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes, but not in that way. I do not think that brings any direct benefit to the country at all. A question was asked about 2,000 copies of the *Dominion Illustrated* which were obtained for distribution for immigration purposes. The answer was that they were purchased at $2,000 and were circulated for the purpose of inducing immigration to this country. I would like the

Minister to explain in what way he expects a publication of this kind will help immigration. It is an illustrated newspaper published by a company that became bankrupt, and the stock fell into the hands of a gentleman in the city of Montreal. He had a large number of old copies of the *Dominion Illustrated* on hand, and got rid of them by selling to the Government. No doubt he exercised all the influence he had with the Government to induce them to buy these old copies of a newspaper that, perhaps, did not have ten lines in six months referring in any way to immigration. I want to know what induced the Minister to buy these illustrated newspapers, where they were circulated, and how does he know that they were circulated?

Mr. CARLING. The book was not an old one. I dare say the hon. gentleman has seen it. It was a volume of six months of the *Dominion Illustrated*, containg some 300 pages. It is a book that anyone would be glad to consult who wanted to ascertain the resources of Canada. The actual cost of the paper of the book when it was printed would be something like $2.75 or $3. We consulted with our agents in the old country and with the Canadian Pacific Railway people, and we bought the 2,000 books at $1 each, which was about one-third their original cost. They were to be distributed in all parts of the United Kingdom, in all public places or resorts, in reading rooms and hotels; the most important points were selected. I believe the circulation of that book will result in great good to the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is cheap enough, but the Minister will remember that that volume was made up of the weekly publications of an illustrated newspaper. When it was published there was no intention on the part of the publisher that it was to be used as immigration literature.

Mr. CARLING. When the book was purchased and bound they introduced a number of pages of introductory remarks, giving a description of Canada, and its advantages as a field for immigration. That was added to the book before it was taken over.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman furnish us with a sample?

Mr. CARLING. I shall be glad to lay one on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I cannot see that this expenditure can be justified, because, although the book is cheap at $1 a volume, still it had no reference to immigration matters, except the introduction the Minister speaks of, and that introduction was placed there for the purpose of selling this old stock that was of no good to anybody. It belonged to a bankrupt concern, and they appealed to the Dominion Government to help them in their distress, and the Government bought out the whole stock, a dead stock that could not have been sold for 10 cents each.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who was the party in Montreal?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I believe I am correct in stating that Mr. Richard White, of the Montreal *Gazette*, was the gentleman who secured the money.

Mr. CARLING. He may have been interested in it. It was from the lithographing company they were purchased.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understand Mr. White is largely interested.

Mr. CARLING. Very likely.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think there can be no justification of the expenditure.

Mr. WATSON. I have a copy of the report of the Immigration and Colonization Committee of 1891, and I fail to find where any recommendation was made by that committee to print any number of the farmers' delegates reports.

Mr. FOSTER. That was done by the Printing Committee.

Mr. WATSON. I think the Minister of Agriculture informs us that was recommended by the Immigration and Colonization Committee.

Mr. STEVENSON. No, the Printing Committee.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think the Printing Committee would undertake to publish any edition of an immigration pamphlet for circulation in the old country or Canada, without a recommendation of the Agriculture Committee. The only recommendation I find for printing any additional number of any report is the report I have in my hand, and it recommends the publishing of 7,000 extra copies. I find no recommendation for the publication by the Immigration and Colonization Committee of any of these farmers' delegates reports. I think if such a matter had been mentioned in that committee they would have objected to any such publication. In former years, in debating this distribution of literature, I have taken exception to the principle adopted by the Agriculture Committee of giving members of Parliament these documents by the thousand for circulation in Canada. They are needed for circulation in the old country, not in this. Pamphlets were got up describing different portions of Canada, but they were not for circulation in Canada at all. If immigration pamphlets are to be published, they should not be distributed in Canada but in the old country. If these pamphlets have been printed, but not yet distributed, I think they should be sent to the old country and distributed there.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that the Committee on Agriculture recommended that a Canadian edition of the report of the tenant farmers' delegates be printed, and then the Printing Committee reported to the House in favour of printing 50,000.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It is plain it was not consolidated in that report of the committee. It must have been done in some other form on some other occasion, because it forms no part of that report.

Mr. FOSTER. These are the two reports which were presented to the House, and which appear in the Votes and Proceedings, the report of the Department of Agriculture and the report of the Printing Committee.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not agree with my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) in his estimate of the value of the publication known as the *Dominion Illustrated*. He seems to think it is of no use as an immigrant agency. Now, I hold in my hand a copy of it, and any gentleman who will look through it will find it is admirably adapted to be an immigration pamphlet. First of all we have a cut—it is not a very bright one, but still it is highly creditable to a new country like Canada—it is call-

ed "The Fair Alsatian." You know it is said, Mr. Speaker, that a thing of beauty is a joy for ever, and if you give an immigrant something of that sort that he can look at after his hours of toil, it must be a great advantage to him. The next article is on what is called "Quakerism." You know we have an estimable section of people in western Canada, and I suppose in other parts of the Dominion, called Quakers or Friends, and this magazine gives them a good character, and so far it is correct. We have next an article on the Laurier Banquet. We heard a good deal about it the other day, that the leader of the Opposition was invited to a banquet in Boston and he committed the unpardonable offence of taking his mutton without the old flag flying over him. The worst of it is that hon. gentleman was born with a great deal of the instincts of a gentleman, and as his character and training has been such as to develop these traits of a gentleman, it seems he did what any gentleman would do when invited to take dinner with an honourable company, and instead of looking around into every corner of the dining room to see that all was correct, he sat down like a gentleman and took what was set before him. The Jingo idea is, that before a loyal Canadian takes his dinner, he ought to inspect every corner of the dining room to see that everything is in accordance with the ideas of jingoism. However, the magazine comes to the conclusion that this is a matter of opinion, and that on the whole, as it is a kind of hollow ceremony, that it is just as well honoured in the breach as in the observance, and so far we agree with it. Then we have a whole column of literary and personal notices, telling about the Hon. A. J. Balfour being elected Chancellor of Edinburgh University, and notices of several literary men, and two or three literary papers, all tending in the direction of encouraging immigration. Then, Sir, we have a woodcut of the "Brigade staff of Niagara Camp, Ontario, October, 1891." It must be encouraging to the people who come into this country to know that we have brave, handsome men to defend them. Then we have a little bragging about "Our engravings." It is well to have a good opinion of ourselves and the *Dominion Illustrated* has cultivated that good opinion of itself. Then, Sir, we have an article on fruit culture in Australia telling the sort of fruits that can be grown there to perfection, and next an article on "High-toned journalism." All these things are intended to set forth the advantages of Canada as a home for the immigrant. Then we have another article which makes out that American farmers are 50 years behind the times, and this is circulated in the old country as an inducement for these people to come out here and enlighten the poor Americans. Next we have a cut of "Chatauqua on the Lakes." What a splendid thing it must be for the immigrant when he goes to the backwoods or out on the prairie to know that when he wants to cultivate his intellectual faculties there is such a beautiful place as Chatauqua on the Lakes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is in the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Certainly. Then there is a little piece of a serial article entitled "Out West, No. 4." It is written by a Mr. John McLean, and I see that it tells principally of the hardships that the Indian women have to undergo. It is intended no doubt to encourage the wives and daughters of our immigrants who settle out in the west amidst these hardships, that they will always have the consolation of knowing that no matter how great their hardships are they are not quite equal to the sufferings of the Indian women. Then, we come to "The re-interment ceremony at Lundy's Lane on the 17th October, 1891."

Mr. FOSTER. That is patriotic.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Certainly it is, and it must be an immense inducement to immigrants to think that if they give their lives in the service of their adopted country, that a hundred years afterwards they will be decently re-interred. Then we have "Cricket written by an umpire who is well qualified to speak" and he gives a description of cricket as it is played in Great Britain and Ireland. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that it is a grand thing for the immigrant to know how to play cricket. The next is a cut of "St. James' Methodist Church, Montreal, rear view." We come to the serial story now, "The Romance of Crime." I do not want to read it to the House, but when it comes to the most interesting part, and when you want to hear more about it it says "to be continued." The next thing is something about our own country. It is "Niagara Canon Falls, 15 miles west of Victoria, B.C., in winter," and it has ice enough around it to last all summer. The next is "Part III, New Brunswick Literary Men." We are glad to know that we have a number of literary men in New Brunswick, and I do not know whether the Minister of Finance is amongst them or not, but if he is not he deserves to be. Then we have a group of gunners who have been out hunting and we have "The red and blue pencil" which are notes by the editor and no word about our new country at all. Then we have, most important of all, a history of the Schuyler family of Albany, New York, United States, for the last two or three hundred years, with portraits of these eminent men who lived a hundred years ago, and the very house they lived in is given, and then we have another chapter on sports and pastimes. It seems that on Thanksgiving Day last fall, there were two games of ball played in the city of Ottawa, and you can see here the very positions the men stood in.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Anything about fashions?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Nothing about fashions; they must have forgotten that. I have been reading this publication during the last year and every number of it contains a conversation between a reporter and an Indian chief called the Sagamore, and I will tell you what the Sagamore talked about. It seems that there had been an eclipse of the moon a few days before, and the reporter went to find out what the wise old Sagamore thought of it. The Sagamore thought awhile, and then he said that the moon was a long distance from the earth and that it took a long time for news to travel there, but that the revelations at Ottawa and Quebec had made the man in the moon so sick that it caused the eclipse. So far as the revelations at Quebec are concerned, I never paid much attention to them. I looked upon them as a domestic matter which the people of Quebec could settle for themselves, and in which any interference from other provinces would be a piece of gratuitous impertinence. But with regard to the revelations at Ottawa, I am very much of the same opinion as the Sagamore. So that, on the whole, I think my hon. friend from North Brant

(Mr. Somerville) should take back what he said and apologise, for I think after a careful survey of the situation he must come to the conclusion that though as a means of rewarding a hungry supporter it may be considered rather roundabout and clumsy, still as an immigration agency it is a howling success. I think the hon. gentleman should bear in mind that it is the first duty of the Government to feed their hungry supporters, and all this talk about using up the funds of the poor people of the country is nothing at all compared to that great and important object of the Government, supporting their hungry supporters, all of course for the honour and glory of the old flag.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has transgressed a law which is held to be very sacred and very dear on his side of the House: he has been quoting from a public document and has not laid it on the Table.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. After this exhibition of the merits of the publication in question, I think the Minister ought to give us some explanation of how he came to buy these books. I think this House and the country are entitled to know what pressure was brought to bear on the Government to invest this $2,000 in a publication of this character, which could have no influence whatever in inducing immigrants to come to this country.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. Minister is not going to answer the question put by the hon. member for North Brant, I have a question to ask with regard to Mr. Dyke, the agent at Liverpool. I notice that he is allowed $4 a day for 365 days for travelling expenses, and $1,400 or $1,500 a year for salary, and that he also charges $90 for travelling in Canada. Why was he paid for travelling in Canada?

Mr. CARLING. He travelled to the North-West and British Columbia in connection with immigration matters, and I think that the $4 a day was not expected to cover travelling in the North-West. That is an extra amount allowed for extra travelling.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he paid extra for travelling in Canada and did he draw the old country allowance at the same time?

Mr. CARLING. I believe he did. I believe he was requested by Sir Charles Tupper to come out to Canada and visit the North-West and British Columbia and to inform himself as to the country, so as to be in a better position to give information to those intending to come to Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very singular that he should be allowed travelling expenses in Canada in addition to the $4 a day. Was he with the farmer delegates or alone?

Mr. CARLING. He was not with the farmer delegates.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like the Minister of Agriculture to explain what inducements were held out to him to buy these illustrated journals. Did he examine the work before he bought it?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; I have a specimen book which I will be glad to lay on the Table.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understand this publication is no longer in existence and that the publishers became bankrupt. Were these old copies purchased after the newspaper became bankrupt?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not dead.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why was this work selected at all? What pressure was brought to bear on the Minister, and to whom were the copies given?

Mr. CARLING. I have already explained to the House that these copies were distributed to all the agencies and the reading rooms and public houses and other places of public resort by the Canadian Pacific Railway, who undertook to distribute them without any expense to the Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What did the Minister hope to accomplish by it?

Mr. CARLING. There is an introduction in this book with regard to Canada, giving a description of the country, and then we had illustrations of parts of Canada and the harvests in the North-West. There were also illustrations of scenes in British Columbia, Ontario and the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say this was a half-year's newspaper bound up in one volume.

Mr. CARLING. Each volume was six months and had some 420 pages.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that these volumes were all for the same half-year?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then they were the accumulated stock in the office from year to year which had not been sold.

Mr. CARLING. They were for two or three years, from 1889 to 1891.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They were simply the overplus of stock on hand at the time.

Mr. CARLING. They had a large number left, some 1,500, and I do not know what they have done with these.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have you secured the balance?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What portion of immigration matter was in the book?

Mr. CARLING. Four pages or twelve columns.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was this publication not bound when purchased?

Mr. CARLING. No, the arrangement was that the introduction should be bound up with the book. The Government had nothing to do but pay a dollar and they had a volume fully bound.

Immigration Expenses..... $150,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand this department has been transferred to the Interior, and I would ask the Minister of the Interior to explain this item.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I have not yet been able to give much consideration to the subject. The Immigration Department was only transferred to me a week or two ago and I have not been able to make myself sufficiently acquainted with its workings to express an opinion as to the changes I may make, and I do not think it will be proper to make that

announcement now. I may say, however, with regard to the agencies in the old country concerning which an hon. gentleman said that enquiry should be made, that I have given instructions, and an investigation is now being made into the amount of work done by those agencies and their general management. As soon as I receive the reports, I shall be able to conclude whether it will be advisable to make any changes in that respect or not. A certain amount of this expenditure of $150,000 has been paid for the farmers' delegates, and a certain sum I believe has been paid for bonuses given to settlers who came out from Europe and took up land in the North-West. It is proposed to utilize a part of that money, and it may be that a great deal will have to be used for that purpose in the future. It will depend upon the amount of immigration we get from the old country. Of course it is pretty well understood, I think, that the object of the transfer from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior is that, as the Department of the Interior has the control of the lands and almost the first thing a settler does is to go to the land office and enquire as to the lands, a saving might be effected in this way, and we might be saved the expense of some of our immigration agents in the west and might work this matter almost entirely from our land offices. I am sure we shall be able to do good service to the immigrants from those offices and will be able to send men from them to act as land guides and to do good service to these immigrants, better service than they have hitherto received. Of course this question of immigration is very large, but when there is only $150,000 to be spent in the work, it dwindles down to a very small affair. I think every means should be taken to make every dollar go as far as possible, and in the interest of immigration proper. There is a difference of opinion in regard to the value of literature, in regard to sending lecturers, and in regard even to sending returned men. I agree to a great extent with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) in what he said as to the returned men, if the proper men are selected. There may have been instances where men have been sent to the old country who have not brought about the results anticipated, but I know a great number who have gone there and have done a great amount of good. I think where good men are selected, who have been for some years in our country and have prospered, they can do good work by going among the men among whom they were brought up, and by inducing their friends to come out and join them in this country. I think also a great deal can be done in inducing our prosperous settlers to correspond with their friends at home. I think one letter from a thriving settler here to his friends in the old country will do more good than any lecturers or pamphlets or even returned men, because, when a letter of that kind gets into a small community, it becomes the talk of the village for days and weeks and even months. I think, speaking generally, the tide has turned to some extent in our direction. The colonies generally are now drawing in their horns in regard to immigration. In Queensland they stopped giving assisted passages in February last. In Western Australia the same thing was done except in regard to mechanics, and the assistance given to them is on a very small scale. They are reduced passages but not free. In Cape Colony and in Natal they have done the same thing. In Natal, they are only giving assisted passages to mechanics and female servants. In the States, we know they are enforcing very strict regulations in regard to immigration. The Argentine has been a failure, and I think people are returning from that country rather than going to it. So I think we should anticipate and shall have a much more extended immigration into this country in future than we have had in the past. The hon. gentleman asked me what I proposed to do with the $150,000. It will be expended virtually, I fancy, for the next year as it has been in the past. I agree with what the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) says as to joining hands with Manitoba and the North-West in regard to immigration, and I do not see why we should not join with all the provinces. I think in 1874 there was an arrangement made with all the provinces, and they agreed to take a share of all the burdens of immigration, but I am not sure whether that was carried out in its entirety or not. Manitoba has done her share in a certain class of work by sending delegates to the older provinces and inducing many to go to the North-West, but this is a kind of immigration which I do not think we as a Dominion should take part in. I think the money should be almost entirely spent in inducing immigration from foreign countries.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Does the Minister of Agriculture intend to continue to give these assisted passages? I see that last year $2,960 was expended on assisted passages, and $4,725 as bonuses to adults at $5 a head, or the large sum of $7,685, including the grant to the Women's Protective Society of Montreal of $1,000.

Mr. CARLING. There has been no assistance given to immigrants in the way of assisted passages since 1888. That amount was a disputed account with the Beaver Line, and was contracted prior to that time. A reduction was made of some $200 or $300, but no assisted passages have been given since 1888.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The item is put in the Auditor General's Report without any date, so I could not be aware to what it referred. Is the bonus to adults and children to be continued?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will excuse me giving him an answer in regard to that because, until he drew my attention to it, I was not aware whether that was given or not.

Mr. CARLING. The $5 is given to shipping agents on the continent. It has been done for some years. If an agent sends out an immigrant to Manitoba, he is allowed $5 on the certificate of the agent at Winnipeg that the immigrant arrived. It is the only way we have on the continent of advertising. We are not allowed to have an agent there, we are not allowed to advertise. We have the shipping agents and booking agents to whom we offer an inducement to send out immigrants, and on their arrival in the North-West we have paid them a bonus of $5.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is not that likely to induce an inferior class of immigrants? The shipping agents, as long as they ship a man and receive their $5 for him, do not care what class of a man he is.

Mr. CARLING. The class of people that come out are a good class of people. There may be occasionally an inferior man.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As to the bonuses paid for children brought into the country, do you intend to continue that system?

Mr. CARLING. I am not prepared to say whether we shall continue the system. Altogether it has been satisfactory. It has been said that these were pauper children which have been sent out by the Local Government boards. They really were not pauper children. Our agents visit the children every year in different parts of the Dominion: and their reports are very good. Not 5 per cent of the children turned out bad. We have been giving $2 per head for the children, of whom 1,300 arrived last year. The reports we have from our agents are very satisfactory as to the conduct of those children.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it advisable to continue this system when the fact is the young people now in our country cannot get employment? We are bringing these people in to take away the work from our own young people.

Mr. CARLING. We have reports from our agents in Ontario that the farmers cannot get men to work on their farms. We have applications from Toronto, London and Hamilton, saying how many people they can place on farms, and that they cannot get a sufficient number to do their work. The ages of the children range from five to eighteen.

Mr. GIBSON. I observe that $385 were paid to the steamship companies to induce immigrants to leave France and come out here. I want to know what Mr. Fabre is for, if he is not to induce immigrants to come out to this country.

Mr. CARLING. I have explained that the steamboat booking agents are distributed in every little village and town in France and the other countries of the continent. That is the only way we have of reaching people who desire to come out to this country. If the agent is against us and will advise people not to come to our country, it will be to our disadvantage. It has been strongly urged by the High Commissioner that that is the best way we can take to induce people to come to this country. We have allowed $5 to the booking agent for every man that he sends to Manitoba, on the certificate of the agent that he has arrived there.

Mr. GIBSON. Both these items were paid to the city of Paris, where Mr. Fabre lives. I would like to know what use he is to this country for the $4,000 we pay him.

Mr. CARLING. I suppose we do the same with him as with Sir Charles Tupper. The money is paid by Sir Charles Tupper to the steamboat agent, and all we do is to get a certificate from our agent that the party bringing with him a certificate of the booking agent has arrived, and then the money is paid.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand the department has adopted the policy of giving a bonus both to the agent and to the settler, $10 per head to every settler settling upon land west of Ontario, and $5 to every child over 12 years of age.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) was speaking about the $5 that is paid to immigrants who come from the continent. Last year the Government adopted the policy of allowing $5 to the booking agents in Great Britain in the same way that we have done on the continent, on condition that the immigrant, on arriving in the North-West, took up land. In addition to that, we paid $10 to the head of each family, and $5 to each member of the family over 12 years of age.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the Minister what principle guides him? I see in the report of Sir Charles Tupper that:

"Wide publicity was given to the bonuses which the Government, in conjunction with the transportation companies, offer to persons settling upon land, no matter to whom it belonged, in Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia."

Now, is that what is done? If an immigrant comes out, $5 is given to the agent who sends him here. If he goes up into the North-West and settles upon a farm, he gets $10, and each of his children over 12 years of age gets $5. If that is done in the Province of British Columbia, also, where they have their own lands, why is it not applied to the other provinces as well? Farms are being abandoned in Ontario; why should not these immigrants be allowed to settle upon them?

Mr. CARLING. There are no Crown lands in Ontario for immigrants.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They go out to British Columbia and settle upon lands "no matter to whom they belong." There is land in Ontario belonging to some one.

Mr. CARLING. It has not been given to parties who settled on 160 acres of land. It has been given to parties who took up homesteads and became actual settlers. So far they have not availed themselves of the offer to a large extent, but I expect this year that when the offer is better known in Great Britain, a very much larger number will avail themselves of the inducements we offer them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Sir Charles Tupper, in his report, says:

"It may be desirable to state, in this report, the measures taken by me, under your directions, for the encouragement of immigration to Canada during the last year. Wide publicity was given to the bonuses which the Government, in conjunction with the transportation companies, offered to persons settling upon land, no matter to whom it belonged, in Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia. Forms of application were supplied to all the steamship agents by whom they were to be issued: and the steamship companies, as well as their individual agents, advertised freely that the bonuses were available."

According to that interpretation, Sir Charles Tupper has published that it is the policy of the Government that any immigrants coming into Manitoba or the North-West or British Columbia and purchasing land no matter whether it belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway or whether it iss an improved farm, will get the bonus. The Canadian Pacific Railway have had large grants of land here, and at the time there was such extraordinary privileges given to them we were told by the leader of the House and his confrères that it would relieve us of a large amount of expenditure in connection with immigration, and that the company would become the great immigrant agents of the Dominion. If the bonus applies to immigrants taking up improved land, why should it not apply to Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario and Prince

Edward Island? I do not know what precaution is taken to ensure that the immigrants will remain when they get here. The report of the Minister of Agriculture says that the policy of granting a bonus to immigrants is continued on the certificate of the Dominions lands agent that the settler has taken up the land. According to that the Dominion lands agent is to certify before this money is paid. Will he certify with regard to lands that do not belong to the Dominion at all? Suppose an immigrant purchases a farm which has been cleared and improved, and wishes to remain on it, will the certificate of the Dominion lands agent entitle him to the money?

Mr. CARLING. It is understood that the land shall be wild land that has not been taken up before. Whether the land belongs to a railway company or to the Dominion, so long as it is wild land, a *bonâ fide* settler coming here with his family and remaining will get the bonus. The object is to get the people into the country and it does not matter what lands they settle on.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If an immigrant goes to British Columbia and buys an improved farm from another farmer, is he entitled to this bonus?

Mr. CARLING. I do not think so. It is understood that he must become a settler of unoccupied lands, but of course we have had no case of that kind.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is a matter that should be known, because Sir Charles Tupper has held out that inducement to the immigrants in his report.

Mr. CARLING. The object is to get immigrants into the country and we pay the bonus when they settle on any wild land whether it belongs to the Dominion or to the railway companies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I certainly think that the paragraph from Sir Charles Tupper's report, as read by the hon. member from Brant (Mr. Paterson), is capable of the interpretation he has put upon it. I may state that all these payments made to immigrants have been made through the land commissioner at Winnipeg, and I feel quite sure that if he had been asked to pay a bonus to a settler who had taken up an improved farm he would have refused to do it. My impression is that no bonus would be paid to any new settler until he has settled on wild land. Now that the matter has been brought to the attention of the Government it is well worthy of enquiry, and I shall make very early enquiries from the land commissioner in that regard.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it would be well to call attention to that, because, if Sir Charles Tupper has given publicity to the fact and has given people to understand that they would be entitled to a bonus no matter where they might settle, the Government might be liable to be charged with a breach of faith.

Mr. WATSON. What length of time is a settler supposed to occupy this land previous to receiving the bonus?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Six months, I think.

Mr. WATSON. What guarantee is furnished that the settler is going to remain in the country before the shipping agent receives his $5?

Mr. CARLING. We do not pay the shipping agent until the settler has actually taken up land. The shipping agents complain of that and think they ought to be paid the bonus the moment the immigrant arrives in Winnipeg, but we have refused to do so.

Mr. WATSON. I think that is a very wise provision, because one can very easily understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway in competition with the American roads might offer inducements for settlers for Dakota or Minnesota to go around by Winnipeg or St. Paul, and unless some precaution is taken a large number of the immigrants for the States might receive this bonus as being immigrants for Canada.

Mr. GIBSON. These continental steamboat agents are reported to have sent out 961 persons, and the Minister tells us that $15 foc the head of a family, and $7.50 for each adult member of a family, is paid to actual settlers. I find that only $567 was paid to actual settlers, and assuming that to have been paid to a family consisting of a man, his wife and two children, it means that 48 settlers were obtained in return for these bonuses. How does the hon. Minister explain the discrepancy between the 961 persons sent out and only 48 who became settlers?

Mr. CARLING. We do not exact from the steamboat agents on the continent the same conditions that we do from the steamboat agents in Great Britain. When our agent at Winnipeg certifies to the High Commissioner in England that an immigrant from the continent has arrived there, the shipping agent is paid the $5; but in the case of the agents in Great Britain we insist that the immigrants sent out by them shall become actual settlers before they are paid the bonus.

Mr. GIBSON. What is the use of encouraging these continental settlers to come out if they do not settle?

Mr. CARLING. When our agents certify that they have arrived in Manitoba, the amount is paid.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose British Columbia is treated the same as Manitoba?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Then it appears to me that this is only a bonus of $5 for a large number of people who come from the old country to travel by the Canadian Pacific Railway, because it is well known that a great many settlers go to British Columbia over the Canadian Pacific Railway on their way to Washington Territory.

Mr. CARLING. We have to run that risk. But the bonus is only paid to agents on the continent for advertising the country.

Mr. WATSON. I think there is a great risk run, because the census shows that the people have not remained in the country, though we have been charged with the cost of bringing them in. I had hoped to hear the Minister of the Interior say that he intended to revolutionize the whole immigration system, which, in the past, has been a failure. It appears that Mr. Dyke had actually to come out last year to see the country to which he has been advising the people to come for years past. I think that a man, knowing no more of our country than Mr. Dyke does, is not a suitable person to be an immigration agent, because he is not

able to give the information which intending immigrants require. We ought to have a man there well acquainted with the country, who would be able to give everybody enquiring good practical information, so that they would know what to expect when they come. The Manitoba Government has such an agent in the old country in the person of Mr. McMillan, and from what I learn from the officers of the Government as well as from the Canadian Pacific Railway officials, the work Mr. McMillan individually is doing amounts to more than that of any agent that either the Dominion Government or the Canadian Pacific Railway have in their employ.

Mr. CARLING. He gets the advantage of all that we have done.

Mr. WATSON. And he gets the advantage of all his own experience as a settler in Manitoba, and I believe that is the reason of his success. He has brought out a great many immigrants of the very best class. I hope that the Minister of the Interior will revolutionize the whole system, and that he will place agents in the old country who will be able to give people such information as will induce a class of settlers to come here who will remain in the country after they come. I do not object to the expenditure of money for bringing immigrants to our North-West. We have to get that country settled, and in order to do that we must spend money. But we must have the right kind of settlers, and they can only be selected by men who have a thorough knowledge of the country.

Mr. DALY. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in believing that Mr. Dyke is unacquainted with Manitoba and the North-West. Mr. Dyke knows more of it than the hon. gentleman does, because he was there before the hon. gentleman was and has travelled over every foot of it. The year before last, when he came out, he did so only to augment the information which he had before. I had the pleasure of meeting him on that occasion, and although I have lived in the country for eleven years, the information he gave me about it was simply surprising. He travelled over every foot of Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia, and it was to inform himself on particular portions of the North-West which he had not visited previously that he came out. In reference to Mr. McMillan, the hon. Minister of Agriculture is probably as well acquainted with that gentleman as the hon. member for Marquette. I recommended Mr. McMillan to him, and it was under the auspices of the hon. Minister that he first went to England in the interests of immigration. Mr. McMillan is a good man, he lived in Manitoba and farmed there, and he is acquainted with all the requirements necessary to bring out settlers, and he is doing good work. In reference to the general question, I am pleased to hear from the hon. Minister of the Interior that he desires to act in concert with the Government of Manitoba and the Government of the North-West Territories. As a Canadian I hope that he will not only co-operate with those Governments but that he will induce the Government of Ontario, the Government of Quebec and the Governments of the Maritime Provinces to co-operate with him in immigration. Although it is important to the whole of Canada that Manitoba and the North-West should be filled up with settlers, it seems, in view of the fact that every year many people are leaving the older provinces to settle in the North-West, that some effort should be made to fill their places. In Great Britain they would find many tenant farmers who would be delighted to come out to Ontario and the older provinces and take up the homes of those who have gone to the North-West, because the tenant, farmer, as any person who has studied the subject knows, in Great Britain, Scotland and Ireland, is a man of considerable means. He has not been doing well during past years, but has the remnant of a considerable fortune left in almost every instance, and he comes to the country with from £1,000 to, in some instances, £4,000. Such a man would be better pleased to settle in an old settled portion like Ontario and buy farms in that province for $45 to $60 an acre, and it seems extraordinary that the attention of the people of Ontario has not been drawn to the fact, and I hope it will be a matter of pleasure and duty to the Minister of the Interior to request the co-operation of the Government of Ontario in this matter. It seems to me there is a duty before the Minister which it would redound to his credit and that of the Government to perform, and that is to make considerable changes in the organization in Great Britain of to-day with reference to immigration. With all deference to the Minister, I must say that a considerable amount of dry rot exists in our agencies in Great Britain. Mr. Dyke is a capable man, but I cannot see for the life of me, judging by the reports of the agents in Glasgow and elsewhere, what these men have done for their money, and I think it will be the duty of the Minister to see that they do something in return for the expenditure. I do not know that any of the gentlemen at Dublin, Glasgow or the other places have that acquaintance with the country which Mr. Dyke has, but it may be that I am doing them an injustice, and that they have been hampered in their efforts through want of money. I know that Mr. Dyke felt considerably hampered in this respect. I know that some years ago, when the estimate was considerably more than at present, our agents were able to branch out in other ways, by advertising and in other lines, and meet the competition from the United States, the British Colonies and the Argentine Republic, but as year after year the estimate was cut down, the work they had done was dropped and might just as well not have been done at all. Immigration like any other business has to be built up from the beginning, and just as soon as you can get the thing in working order and induce people to believe that Canada is the country for the immigrant, you must see that the work is not allowed to slacken for lack of means. In Manitoba particularly, and the North-West, where we have the great inducement of free homesteads to the settler, which is found in no other country to-day, as soon as that channel is opened up and the stream of immigration started, instead of having $150,000 on the estimates we ought to have three times that amount in order to enable those gentlemen to carry on the work properly. If the work has not been what was expected, it is due in a great measure to the dilatory and niggardly policy the Government has pursued. My views were ventilated considerably on this subject some three years ago; and I think as the resulte, the vote on that occasion was considerably augmented. I am disap-

pointed that the Minister of Finance has not seen fit to place a larger amount in the estimates. I hope that the work done as the result of the extra amount voted which assisted to bring out the delegates will be shown by an increased immigration this year, and will satisfy the Minister of Finance that the expectations arising out of that expenditure have been realized, and that next year there will be a larger amount voted for immigration.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to break in upon this interesting discussion, but as we have now sat up three long nights, if there is any more information required concerning this item, it would be better that we should adjourn and resume the discussion another day.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to know if this bonus would apply to immigrants in the United States ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. No.

Mr. WATSON. It think it would be advisable to extend it to American settlers. It is well known that many of our Canadians are in the United States, and certainly they are much better settlers to bring to the North-West than the people who are not accustomed to the country.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 29th April, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION BILL.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) respecting Representation in the House of Commons. He said : I am sure that this Bill will be very cordially received by the House if I may judge by the anxiety which was evinced that I should introduce it, and I feel very great pleasure in meeting the wishes which have been evinced principally on the other side of the House that it should be brought down. I hope that it will not at all justify the observation that was made from the other side when the last Redistribution Bill was introduced—that the Bill came both too early and too late—too early in the sense that it ought never to have been introduced, and too late because the end of the session was then approaching.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then the hon. gentleman wants a long session.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure we shall have the gratification of seeing the pleasant countenance of the hon. gentleman and his associates for many weeks yet in this House, irrespective altogether of the provisions of this Bill. The hon. gentleman knows the regret with which we part company at the end of the session, and I am glad to know that the period when we shall separate is still so distant. There are still estimates to be brought down, and the reception which those that have been brought down have met at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, the pleasant discussions which take place night after night in this House on those estimates, make it a joy to the Government to bring down more. Therefore, I am happy to know that the time when we shall part company is very remote indeed, and that there will be ample opportunity to consider all the merits of the Bill, and there is nothing but merits in it. I looked to see the date at which the last Bill was introduced, and I find it was described in one of the speeches made on the second reading to have been either the tenth or the eleventh week of the session, I think the eleventh. This, therefore, comes down two or three weeks earlier than the last.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Quite a progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, and I hope, when my hon. friends opposite hear the contents of this Bill they will recognize that that is not the only improvement. Notwithstanding the fact to which I have referred, Parliament was prorogued about three weeks after the Bill was presented here, showing a haste which I hope may not be repeated this session, in order that we may remain together longer.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. We all expect that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not claim that this Bill will satisfy everybody. That is the only misgiving I have on this subject. I think that those who are disposed to criticise a measure of this character, apart from political considerations altogether, will say that those who are not pleased with it are very hard to please, but we must recognize the fact that, amongst friends as well as opponents, there are those who, from strong attachment to their constituencies, are exceedingly indisposed to make a change which will appear in any sense to weaken or lessen the strength of these constituencies, although the provisions of the law are imperative that a redistribution shall take place, and although we are bound to consider when the period of redistribution comes, as it has come, the changes of population which make it necessary to re-adjust the representation of constituencies which, otherwise, we would be very reluctant to touch. In making some preliminary remarks in which more interest may be taken than in the Bill itself, because the Bill is of so simple a character, I may say that we are proposing to introduce this measure in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act which require that, after the completion of each decennial census, the representation of the various constituencies in this House shall be re-adjusted on certain well-known and well-defined principles. We have felt that, while there might be no pressing necessity for our legislating on this subject during the present session, we should be more strictly within the lines of the constitution were we to do so, and we have to bear in mind the cardinal consideration that this House must always be prepared for the contingency of having a new representation called for by the exercise of the prerogative of dissolution, and it might be most inconvenient and detrimental to the free working of the constitution, if, by not bringing forward this measure, there should come into a new Parliament provinces more strongly represented than they are entitled to be, and others more weakly represented

than they are entitled to be. For that reason, it has seemed necessary that the Bill should be gone on with during this session. Now the census returns give the population of the provinces thus: Ontario, which in 1881 had 1,926,922, is returned with a population of 2,112,989. Quebec, which had then a population of 1,359,027, is now returned as having a population of 1,488,586. Nova Scotia had then 440,572, and now 450,523. New Brunswick then had 321,233, and now 321,294. Prince Edward Island had then 108,891, and now 109,088. Manitoba then had 62,260, and now 154,442. British Columbia had then 49,459, and now 92,767. The Territories then had 25,515, and now 67,554. Under the provisions of the British North America Act, the representation would stand thus: Ontario has now ninety-two members, she will have the same number. Quebec has sixty-five members, she will have the same number. Nova Scotia, by reason of the fact that the growth of her population has not been as large as that of other provinces, instead of twenty-one members, will hereafter have twenty. New Brunswick, instead of sixteen will have fourteen. Prince Edward Island which has now six will have five. Manitoba which now has five will be entitled to seven. The representation of the Territories is based on an arbitrary arrangement which it is not proposed to disturb. They have now four members, and it is proposed to leave that representation untouched. In British Columbia readjustment according to the terms of the census would give her four members, but under the terms of the Act of Union she came in with six members, and is entitled to remain with six until she shall become entitled to a larger proportion. Now, the question arises as to the readjustment which is necessary to meet these conditions. I will refer, beginning at the eastward, to the readjustment proposed for Prince Edward Island. As I have said, the Island now possesses six members, and with the readjustment will be entitled to only five. It will be necessary, therefore, to change the boundaries of the constituencies in the Island. The mode of division hitherto adopted has been very convenient, because it corresponds with the county lines. There were three counties in the Island, and they were each represented by two members. In order to make five constituencies, it will be necessary to depart from county lines, and the readjustment which I propose, and the plan of which I will lay on the Table of the House, is, I think, the fairest that can be suggested with regard to that province. We propose that there shall be five constituencies named West Prince County, East Prince County, West Queen's County, East Queen's County, and King's County, each having one member. The division is made according to the description of lots in that Island, which I think correspond to townships elsewhere, and no lot, according to the original division of the Island, is divided. The division by population will be thus: West Prince County will have just about 21,000 of a population; East Prince County will have 20,723, this includes the town of Summerside; West Queen's will have a population of 22,209, this includes the city of Charlottetown; East Queen's will have a population of 23,466; and King's, which includes Georgetown, will have a population of 21,684, so that under this plan the population of the Island will have been equalized as nearly, I think, as is practically consistent with adhering to the township lines I have mentioned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the division which the hon. gentleman has outlined ignore county lines altogether? For instance, does East Prince County embrace any portion of Queen's County, or does East Queen's embrace any portion of Queen's, or is King's County left intact?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The county lines are departed from in each case. Now, coming to the Province of New Brunswick, where, as I have said, the number of seats will have to be reduced by two, the changes which will have to be made are these——

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman state what the population of the counties of Prince Edward Island is, following the county boundaries?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Prince has a population, in 1891, of 36,470; Queen's has a population of 45,977; and King's a population of 26,633. Now, coming to the Province of New Brunswick, the first change occurs in the City and County of St. John. The representation of the whole province is as follows: Outside the City and County of St. John there are thirteen members, the City of St. John has one, and there are two for the city and county combined. The one member representing the city is elected, of course, by the votes of the citizens only, the two members representing the city and county are elected by the votes of the citizens and the residents of the county. It is proposed to take one member from the City and County of St. John, so that hereafter the representation will be one member for the city and one member for the city and county. It is then intended to join the Counties of Sunbury and Queen's. That will leave for the Province of New Brunswick the fourteen members which she is entitled to under the British North America Act. The City and County of St. John has a population of 49,574; the united Counties of Sunbury and Queen's will have a population of 17,935. No other changes are contemplated in New Brunswick.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the population of the city and county separately?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. St. John City has a population of 24,184 under the city as originally constituted, and the city of Portland, I think, contains about 20,000 persons. St. John's County, that is, including the city of Portland, includes 25,390.

Mr. COLTER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the city will be entitled to one representative and the county to one?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; the city is entitled to one and the city and county to one.

Mr. COLTER. Then a voter in the city can vote for the city representative and also for the county representative, and has two votes, while a voter in the county has only one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That remains as at present. The city has only one, and the city and county combined have one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That gives every voter in the city two votes, while every voter in the county has but one.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. Under the present law hon. gentlemen understand, I think, from my explanation, that the city voter has now three votes and the county voter has two. Coming now to the Province of Nova Scotia, the smallest constituency in that province is the County of Queen's, with a population of 10,610. The population of Shelburne, which is the adjoining county to the westward, is 14,954. The adjoining county to the eastward is Lunenburg with 31,076. We propose simply to unite the Counties of Shelburne and Queen's, and to make the district the electoral district of the Counties of Shelburne and Queen's, with a population of about 25,000. The unit of population of that province will be about 22,000, and the united counties will, therefore, somewhat exceed that unit, but not exceed it as much as several other counties in the province. There is this to be said in favour of that method: that the two counties besides lying side by side are united in interest and in many other points of similarity. I might mention as regards these counties in that province which will exceed the unit in the way I have described, that Colchester exceeds the unit having a population of 27,160, Cumberland has 34,529, Halifax city has 38,556, Halifax County 32,865. Hants County slightly exceeds it, Inverness has 25,779. King's slightly exceeds it, Lunenburg exceeds it, having 31,076, and Yarmouth exceeds it also, having 22,218.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There must be many counties very much below the unit.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There are several. Referring now to the Province of Quebec, I will mention first of all some leading features in connection with the population which seem to require immediate attention. There are great centres of population in that province which require larger representation than they now have in this House. The city of Montreal, possessing three members now, has a population of 182,695, Hochelaga has a population of 80,998; the two combined having a united population, therefore, of 263,693 with but four members. In our opinion it is only just that the representation of the city of Montreal should be increased to five members, and that Hochelaga should have two members, so that Hochelaga and Montreal will have seven members. In addition to that, and for the purpose of avoiding increasing unduly the representation of these large centres of population, the redistribution takes away from these two constituencies of Montreal and Hochelaga, parishes which will be added to Jacques Cartier and Laval. In addition to that the County of Ottawa calls for further representation on account of its population and very great extent. We propose to give an additional member to the county, therefore, and under the new arrangement which we propose the County of Ottawa will have two members with a constituency of 32,000 population each, and the constituencies of Hochelaga and Montreal will have a population of 35,000 each. It will be necessary, of course, to provide for these new constituencies by taking from other portions of the province where the population is not so large, and I will mention briefly the changes which are proposed to be made, and will then read from the Bill which will give particulars of the changes. I may state, however, at this point, that in the Province of Quebec the unit of population, I think, is about 22,800 as nearly as it can be made. The population of the County of Ottawa is now 64,000. Referring particularly to Montreal, with a population, as I have said, of nearly 200,000, it is to be divided into five constituencies. One, St. Mary's division, will have 38,000; St. James division 32,000, the St. Lawrence division 42,000, the St. Antoine division 44,000, and the present Centre division is left intact under the name of St. Anne's division, with a population of 28,000. The additional constituency taken for the County of Ottawa is supplied by joining the two constituencies of Three Rivers and St. Maurice, and the three other constituencies are taken from the southern counties, that is, these counties lying south of the St. Lawrence River from the western boundary of the Province of Quebec to the County of Nicolet. These counties, thirteen in number, are only entitled by their population to nine members, and three counties being taken out, it leaves them ten members, or one more than they are entitled to according to the unit of population which I have just described. Napierville is made to disappear and is divided between Chateauguay and Laprairie. St. John and Iberville are joined together, and Verchères is also made to disappear and is divided between Chambly, St. Hyacinthe and Richelieu which surround it. This arrangement gives to the region formed by the counties north of Ottawa and of the St. Lawrence, from Pontiac to Champlain inclusive, thirteen members with a population of 276,214. That is an average for each county of 22,000 as nearly as can be stated. The hon. gentleman asked me to state the portions of the constituencies of Montreal and Hochelaga which are given to the neighbouring constituencies of Laval and Jacques Cartier. There is a new constituency called the electoral district of West Hochelaga, which will consist of the town of Ste. Cunégonde and St. Henri, and of the parishes of St. Gabriel Ward (annexed to Montreal) and Côte St. Antoine. East Hochelaga will consist of the towns of Maisonneuve and Côte St. Louis, of the villages of Côte Visitation and Mile End, and of the parishes of Hochelaga Ward (annexed to Montreal) and St. Jean Baptiste Ward (annexed to Montreal). The electoral district of Jacques Cartier will hereafter consist of the town of Lachine, of the villages of Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Ste. Geneviève, St. Joachim de la Pointe Claire, St. Laurent, Côte des Neiges, Côte St. Paul, Notre Dame de Grâce, and Verdun, and of the parishes of Lachine (Ste. Anne du Bout de l'Isle), Ste. Geneviève, St. Joachim de la Pointe Claire, St. Laurent, St. Raphaël de l'Isle Bizard, Côte St. Paul, Notre Dame des Neiges Ouest, and Outremont. The electoral district of Laval consists of the village of Ste. Rose, and the parishes of Ste. Dorothée, St. François de Salles, St. Martin, Ste. Rose, St. Vincent de Paul, Sault au Recollet, St. Joseph Rivière des Prairies, St. Léonard de Port Maurice, Longue Pointe and Pointe aux Trembles.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the population in the County of Laval?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About 19,000. The County of Ottawa will be divided thus: There will be an electoral district of South Ottawa, consisting of the townships of Masham, Eardley, Wakefield, Hull (including the city of Hull and the town of Aylmer), Templeton, Portland, Derry, Buckingham, Mulgrave, Lochaber, Ripon and Petite Nation; and an electoral district of North Ottawa,

consisting of the townships of Lowe, Denham, Bowman, &c., &c., including all those townships forming the remaining part of Ottawa County as it was constituted (including unorganized territories) on the 31st of January, 1861, by section 1 of chapter 75 of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada.

Mr. LANGELIER. What will be the population of each division ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About 32,000.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not defined in what manner the Counties of St. John and Iberville are to be constructed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are to be united.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood that part of Napierville was going to Chateauguay.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The electoral district of St. John and Iberville will consist of the towns of St. John and Iberville, and of the parishes of St. Jean l'Evangéliste, St. Luc, Ste. Marguerite de Blairfindie (L'Acadie), St. Alexandre, Ste. Anne de Sabrevois, St. Athanase, Ste. Brigide, St. Georges de Henriville, St. Grégoire le Grand, St. Sébastien and St. Valentin. The electoral district of Chateauguay will consist of the villages of St. Rémi and Napierville, and of the parishes of St. Martin, St. Urbain Premier, Très St. Sacrement (de St. Jean Chrysostôme and Ste. Martine), St. Rémi, St. Patrice de Sherrington, St. Edouard, St. Cyprien, St. Antoine Abbé, Ste. Clotilde and St. Jean Chrysostôme.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understood that one part of Napierville was to be put in Chateauguay, and it seems that some parishes of Chateauguay are to be put in Laprairie.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The electoral district of Laprairie will be the villages of Laprairie and Sault St. Louis (Indian village of Caughnawaga), and of the parishes of Laprairie, St. Constant, St. Isidore, St. Jacques le Mineur, St. Philippe, St. Michel Archange, St. Joachim de Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a gerrymander with a vengeance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not apply that awkward name to any part of this Bill. There is nothing in it of that character.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us now what becomes of Verchères ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If I read the descriptions of Chambly, Richelieu and St. Hyacinthe, I think they will contain the remnants of Verchères.

Mr. LAURIER. What is left of Rouville ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The electoral district of Rouville shall consist of the village of St. Césaire and St. Dominique.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is Bagot.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman does not recognize his own province. It must be due to my bad pronunciation. The electoral district of Rouville will consist of the villages of St. Césaire, St. Dominique, St. Pie, St. Paul, L'Ange Gardien, Notre Dame de Bonsecours, St. Jean Baptiste, St. Hilaire, Belœil and Ste. Magdeleine de la Présentation, St. Charles and Notre Dame.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is there any change in Pontiac ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the hon. gentleman passes to Ontario, would he be kind enough to say if there are any other changes in the Province of Quebec ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think I mentioned all of them. In the Province of Ontario very few changes are proposed.

Mr. LAURIER. Happy province.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been well attended to before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Changes are not needed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there are some changes needed, more in the representation of the constituencies in this House than in the constituencies,——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON—but we have decided to leave that in the hands of the electors who are doing it so admirably. We do not propose to pass any statute on that subject.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But in the other provinces you propose to help the electors.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, we do not ; but the changes which have been made are more extensive in that province for the reasons I have mentioned, that it is necessary to give these very large centres of population, Montreal, Ottawa and Hochelaga, additional representation in this House, and that could not be done without altering a number of constituencies which have smaller populations. I was about to mention that the reasons which call for the change in the Province of Ontario are principally of the kind I have just mentioned with regard to population. There is the case of the city of Toronto which, on the same principle as that which has called for a change with regard to Montreal, requires additional representation. There is a necessity likewise for providing for an additional representative for the great district of Algoma, and likewise for a portion of the population for the County of Renfrew, which population is at present out of the limits and range of representation. The district I refer to is North Renfrew. We propose to give a member to the Nipissing district, and this will include a portion of Eastern Algoma, and we propose to give an additional member to the city of Toronto. In order to provide for this additional representation, Niagara district is restricted so as to bring the constituencies more nearly up to the average representative population. The only other changes in the Bill are the township of Clarence which is taken from the County of Russell and added to Prescott, thereby tending to equalize the population and place Clarence in a riding where the people will be more in harmony with the rest of the population of the riding. The Island of Scugog is taken from North Ontario and placed in South Ontario. The island properly belongs, as regards geographical proximity, to the constituency in which we propose to place it, and the population is not large, about 600. The village of North Elgin is taken from North Bruce and placed in West Bruce to which it belongs geographically. If I am not mistaken,

the village a considerable distance from the limits of the constituency in which it is placed now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The same distance as it was ten years ago.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, and no doubt the hon. gentleman will not be better satisfied now than he was ten years ago when it was put into the constituency from which it is now taken. The Counties of Lincoln and Welland are united.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you mean that Lincoln and Welland are one county and one member?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I will give the details. The electoral district of the County of Lincoln and Niagara will consist of the town of Niagara, the city of St. Catharines, the townships of Grantham, Clinton, Louth, Pelham, and Gainsborough, and the villages of Beamsville and Port Dalhousie. The electoral district of the County of Welland will consist of the townships of Bertie, Crowland, Humberstone, Stanford, Thorold and Willoughby, the villages of Chippawa, Fort Erie, Niagara Falls, Merritton, and Port Colborne, and the towns of Niagara Falls, Thorold and Welland. The electoral district of the Counties of Haldimand and Monck will consist of the townships of Oneida, Rainham, Seneca, North Cayuga and South Cayuga, Canborough, Dunn, Moulton, Sherbrooke, Wainfleet, and the villages of Caledonia, Cayuga, Hagersville and Dunnville.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are Haldimand and Monck made into one constituency?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not as they are now, but there will be one county described as I have stated. South Wentworth will consist of the townships of South Fleet, Binbrooke, Barton, Glanford, North and South Grimsby, Caister, East and West Flamborough, the town of Dundas, and the villages of Grimsby and Waterdown. The electoral district of North Wentworth and Brant will consist of the townships of Ancaster, Blenheim, East Brantford, South Dumfries and Beverley. The electoral district of the south riding of the County of Norfolk will consist of the townships of Houghton, Walsingham, Charlotteville, Woodhouse and Walpole, the town of Simcoe, and the villages of Port Dover and Port Rowan. I think I have mentioned the only changes made by the Bill in the Province of Ontario. It will be observed that the reconstruction which will take place is confined to the neighbourhood of Toronto and the group of districts about Lake Ontario, and every effort has been made to interfere as little as possible with the representation as it exists at present, and with the geographical lines.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister if the population in the Niagara district is not greater than the population east of Kingston?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot make the calculation while I am on my feet.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood the object was to equalize the constituencies and to bring them nearly up to the unit of comparison; but are not the districts east of Kingston populated much less than those west of Kingston?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We could not equalize all through Canada without making a most sweeping change. We think these changes are all necessary to give additional representation where it was called for, and can be justified on the ground of numerical population.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will you give us the population of Haldimand and Monck, and North Wentworth and Brant?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was about to give the population of these constituencies. I think the unit of population in Ontario is about 22,000 or 23,000, North Wentworth had a population of 14,591, North Brant 16,993, South Wentworth 16,770, Lincoln 21,806, Welland 25,131, Monck 15,315, Haldimand 16,318, South Norfolk 17,780. Under the proposed arrangement Haldimand and Monck will have a population of 21,474, South Norfolk 22,702, North Wentworth and Brant 21,629, South Wentworth 25,725, Lincoln and Niagara 25,230 and Welland 26,944. The population will be much more nearly equalized in these counties and will be brought nearer to the unit of the province. Now we will refer to the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before leaving the Province of Ontario, I would ask the hon. gentleman where does Manitoulin Island fall in the division of the Algoma district?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It remains in the western division where it is now with the other islands. The House, of course, has observed the extent of the increase of population in the Province of Manitoba, that population having increased from 62,260 to 154,442, requiring that her representation in this House should be raised from five to seven. I will call the attention of the House to the way in which that additional representation is provided for. A change has been made by calling the present constituency of Lisgar, Selkirk. The reason for this is that there are the towns of East Selkirk and West Selkirk in this constituency, and all of Lord Selkirk's old settlers live in that constituency. For those reasons we think Selkirk is a more appropriate name than Lisgar. Provencher remains as it was before. Old Selkirk is divided into two ridings. The reason for this division in the population is that Lisgar was well and thickly settled. Brandon, it is to be expected, will, in about four years, fill up and have more than the present population of Lisgar, and make them about equal. Marquette we have divided into two constituencies, Macdonald and Marquette. I need not say to the House that in selecting a name for the new constituency we have give the name of the statesman who was leader of the House for so many years, and has devoted so much of his life to the development of this country, and especially with matters connected with the development of the territories out of which the Province of Manitoba was created. For that reason it was deemed proper to give the name Macdonald to one of the new constituencies. The discrepancy in the population between Macdonald and Marquette, can be explained by the fact that the Dauphin country is in Marquette, and the territory in Marquette will fill up in a few years, in all probability, to equal, if not exceed, Macdonald. The unorganized territory in Provencher, it is expected, will fill up likewise and largely build up the population there. If the House desires it, I will read the descriptions of the lines, but I suppose it will only be tiresome to the House. I will

mention the population of the constituencies as they will exist. The city of Winnipeg has a population of 25,639; Lisgar has 29,287, that will be East Selkirk; Brandon has 22,403; Marquette, 12,509; Macdonald, 22,104; West Selkirk, 23,560; Provencher, 22,104. I mentioned to the House that it was not proposed to make any change for the present in the representation of the Territories. There is no change required in the number of members for the Province of British Columbia, but a change does seem called for by the peculiar distribution of property, to say nothing of territorial extent.

Mr. WATSON. Before the Minister leaves Manitoba, would he just give the divisions of north and south, east and west, for Marquette and Macdonald?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Marquette will comprise the rural municipalities of Odanah, Clan William, Harrison, Saskatchewan, Blanchard, Strathclair, Shoal Lake, Oak River, Miniota, Archie, Birtle, Ellice, Russell, Silver Creek, Rossburn, Shell River, Boulton, the town of Minnedosa, the town of Birtle, and the town of Rapid City; and also all the organized territory lying between the western boundary of the Province of Manitoba and the easternly limit of range 17, west of the 1st west principal meridian, north of township 18 in ranges 17 and 22 inclusive of west principal meridian, and also lying north of township 28 in ranges 23 to 29 inclusive of west principal meridian, for the northern boundary of the Province of Manitoba. The electoral district of Macdonald shall comprise the rural municipalities of South Cypress, South Norfolk, North Norfolk, North Cypress, Langford, Rosedale, Lansdowne, Westbourne, Portage la Prairie, and the town of Portage la Prairie, the town of Gladstone, the town of Neepawa, and the village of Carberry, together with the unorganized territory lying within and bounded by the following limits, that is to say: On the west by the eastern limit of range 17, west principal meridian, on the east by a line running through the middle of Lake Manitoba, on the south by the northern boundary of township 20, and the same produced east to the same line running to the middle of Lake Manitoba, and on the north by the northern boundary of the Province of Manitoba. I was going on to say, that in the Province of British Columbia, the only changes proposed are made necessary by the changes which the influx of population have created. That will be apparent when I mention the population, and when it is compared with the extent of the territorial divisions as now constituted. There are three electoral districts outside the Island of Vancouver. These are at present, New Westminster, Caribou and Yale. We propose that the new electoral district of New Westminster shall consist of New Westminster district and the Coast district, as defined in the public notice issued from the Lands and Works Office in said colony, on the 15th December, 1869, purporting to be in accordance with the provision of the 39th clause of the Mineral Ordinance of 1869, and to give to that New Westminster district two members. We propose that the electoral district of Yale and Caribou shall be joined, and that the new district shall consist of Caribou, Lillooet, Yale and Kootenay districts, as specified in the same public notice. That will, of course, have one member. The new district of Yale and Caribou will have a population of about 20,500; New Westminster will have 42,226, with two members; Vancouver electoral district will have 18,229; and Victoria, with two members, 18,538, as it is now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman retain the double constituencies of Pictou, Halifax and Ottawa?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, and Cape Breton. I was going to say, in mentioning the changes in Ontario, that I did not refer to the change in the city of Ottawa, because it is a very slight one. It was merely made in view of the municipal change which has brought Stewarton into the city of Ottawa, and which occurred after the last distribution was passed. For municipal purposes, and I believe for provincial purposes also, Stewarton was comprised in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Is it proposed to divide Hamilton and Halifax?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If it were proposed to do that I would have mentioned it long before this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not state how Toronto is to be divided?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. West Toronto will be given two members, and the other two divisions will remain as they are.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How many districts in Canada will have a double representation?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot tell on the spur of the moment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is West Toronto to be divided into two districts or to be given two members?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. West Toronto, as it is now, will have two members.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible at this stage to discuss at all the measure which has just been introduced, because whatever good or whatever bad there may be in the measure itself consists in the details of the apportionment which has been made, and at first glance it is not possible to say whether the apportionment is fair or unfair, but I must say at once that as far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, in so far as I can see it at first sight, the apportionment seems to me to have been the most arbitrary that could have been designed. I am sorry, Sir, that those who were in charge of that measure from the Province of Quebec did not choose to follow the principle which was laid down as far as the Province of New Brunswick is concerned; that is to say, of making the changes in the line of existing divisions. In the Province of New Brunswick, two counties are united together, and in so far as I can see, whenever changes are to take place, if the changes are made on this line, it is the least objectionable of all. Likewise in the Province of Quebec, the city of Three Rivers and the district of St. Maurice are united, and at first blush without looking at the details of the Bill I can see no very serious objection to that. Likewise the County of Ottawa, which has a very large extent in territory and a population exceeding 60,000, is divided into two counties, and if the division is made on at all a

fair basis, which I cannot say at this moment, the principle seems to be one which cannot seriously be objected to. But when we come to the counties south of the St. Lawrence River in the Province of Quebec, where the strength of the Liberal party has always been for twenty years or more, we find gerrymander on such a scale that it will be impossible to recognize the counties now in existence. No attention has been paid to existing limits, parishes which have been united together for very many years are now divided and are jumbled over into five or six different counties. The County of Verchères, an old county which was represented in the old Parliament of Canada by Sir George Cartier, for, I believe, more than 15 years, now disappears and is distributed into three different counties, Richelieu, St. Hyacinthe and Chambly. Then the County of Chambly receives a portion of the County of Rouville, and the County of Rouville receives a portion of St. Hyacinthe, if I remember aright, and a portion of Bagot also. What reason or what justification can there be for that? As far as the city of Montreal and the County of Hochelaga are concerned, I cannot speak with very great accuracy because the limits have been given in only a very imperfect manner, but so far as I can see enough has been given to enable me to congratulate the Minister of Public Works, who had in the County of Laval a very soft bed before, and who will have in the new County of Laval a still softer one now.

Mr. OUIMET. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the leader of the Opposition, in his closing remarks, said that the Minister of Public Works had a soft bed before in the County of Laval. I confess that indeed I had, but I won it after a hard fight and I kept it, and nobody can blame me for that. If I had attended to any selfish motives, if I had listened to the appeals made to me from my friends in my county, who have so faithfully fought for me and for the party, the old county of Laval would not have been disturbed, and there are very good geographical reasons why it should not be disturbed. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has mentioned that the County of Verchères should not have been disturbed on account of its historic name, but I may remind him that the County of Laval bears a name which is certainly the equal of Verchères, and besides, geographically speaking, my county was intended to stand alone, as it is an island. If I took some parishes from Hochelaga in order to decrease the already too large population of that county, I think I should have received credit for having done so. I may say to the hon. leader of the Opposition, besides, that the parishes which are now added to my county were in the last election largely Liberal, and perhaps after 19 years of battle to remain in this Parliament, it might have been reasonable for me as an old stager to expect to be left alone. But I added these parishes to my county, and I did it from no selfish purpose, but in order that I might not be open to the attacks which the hon. gentleman has now made against me. Now that my personal case has been settled, I will try to explain how I thought the divisions that I assisted in making in the Province of Quebec, are fair. I may say that we have divided the province into three large groups for the purpose of redistribution. The first group consisting of the counties which we call the "Quebec Counties" according to political divisions, are twenty in number. They extend from Champlain, Portneuf inclusive, to Chicoutimi and Saguenay; and on the other side of the river from Gaspé up to Nicolet. These twenty counties have a population of 443,900, which divided by twenty gives a population of 22,195 for each. Thus, although the average population of each of the twenty counties does not reach the unit of population fixed by law, that is, 22,800 it comes pretty near to that; and it was thought fair, in order to avoid any friction or complaint—though it was a great sacrifice on the part of our friends from the district of Quebec—not to have any changes made in those counties. I think we ought to be credited for that. Now, the counties of the Eastern Townships are ten in number, representing an aggregate population of 225,216, or an average of 22,540. In these there were inequalities in the representation to be remedied, but we thought it would be more satisfactory to the public, and also to the Opposition, that no change should be made there, since the average was as near as possible to that fixed by law. Then, we come to what I call the political district or region of Montreal, which is formed of three great groups, that is, the thirteen counties lying north of the Ottawa River and the St. Lawrence, from Pontiac to Champlain, which have common interests and are pretty similarly situated. These thirteen counties have an aggregate population of 276,214, giving an average for each county of 21,297. We felt obliged to give an additional representation to Ottawa County, for which the hon. leader of the Opposition might give us credit, for he knows that Ottawa County is a Liberal county. If he consults the returns from the last elections he will see that in each of the divisions as made, the Liberal candidate had a majority. So that from a political point of view—though we did not and ought not to consider that—we have practically given the Opposition one more member there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That escaped your attention.

Mr. OUIMET. It did not escape our attention. We shall look after it at the next election. Now, Three Rivers and St. Maurice have not the average population, and although they were two Conservative counties, and although both are represented by two very valuable and, I may say, most prominent members, we thought we could not avoid—though we did so very reluctantly—uniting these counties.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the name of the new county?

Mr. OUIMET. It will be known by the name of Three Rivers and St. Maurice. Their boundaries are not disturbed. Coming to the group which I call the central group, extending between the Ottawa River on the one side and the St. Lawrence River on the other, formed by the Counties of Soulanges, Vaudreuil, Jacques Cartier, Hochelaga, Laval, Montreal West, Montreal Centre and Montreal East, these eight counties contain a total population of 307,312, an average for each of 38,416. According to the unit this group is entitled to thirteen representatives; but in order not to be too harsh upon the other groups, we only give eleven representatives to this central group, dividing it as rationally as can be done under the circumstances. Laval and Jacques

Cartier are what we might call rural counties. Hochelaga was composed before partly of what I call suburban population, and partly of rural population. We thought it would be fair to divide between Laval on one side, and Jacques Cartier on the other, the rural part of Hochelaga, and to divide in two that part of Hochelaga composed of suburban population.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil are not united?

Mr. OUIMET. They are not, and I will give the reasons. These two counties form part of the central group, and if any one has a right to complain of under representation, it is the population composing that central group, and not the population of the other counties which have more than their share of representation. Besides, I think a very good additional reason is that, in future, the increase of population will likely take place in that central group; and it is more than likely that ten years hence, when a new distribution is made, this central group will be entitled to an increased representation, and it will take it from itself. Then will be the time to unite the Counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges. Now, the southern group, lying south of the St. Lawrence, is composed of thirteen counties, having a total population of 224,900, which entitles them only to nine members. At the present moment they have thirteen representatives, and we thought it only fair to take from that group, Liberal or not, the three seats that we wanted out of the four which they had in excess of their rightful number, and so we have done; but we have done it with no intention of injuring our opponents politically. We have done it in a way to interfere as little as possible with the geographical boundries, and with a due regard to population. First, we have done what my hon. friend advised us to do in every case. That is, we have attached together two counties which are lying contiguous, the Counties of St. John and Iberville.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are separated by a river.

Mr. OUIMET. My county was separated by two rivers. That will be another river for the hon. member to cross. Now, we had to take a county from the three adjoining counties, Chateauguay, Napierville and Laprairie. Laprairie had not the requisite population, and in order to complete the number we had to add to it part of Chateauguay, not because it was Conservative, for I think the majority in the last election was Liberal in the parishes of Chateauguay and Ste. Philomène.

Mr. BRODEUR. Why not add Ste. Martine?

Mr. OUIMET. We might have very well added Ste. Martine to Laprairie and have added to the Conservative majority of Laprairie, but we did not do so because we thought it would be an apparent injustice, and did not want to be open to the charge of having made the division from a purely political point of view and in order to bring about direct advantages. I am very sorry, on account of my hon. friend from Napierville, that the name of his county should disappear, but, as in the case of St. John and Iberville, we could not do otherwise, because Napierville had to be divided in two, and it was impossible to add it to the next county. Now I come to what appears to be a sore point, and I am very sorry for our old friend from Verchères, and I hope this will not be the means of securing his disappearance from our midst after the long years he has served his country so well, but it had to be done and we did it in order to make the divisions of that territory as equal as possible. The County of Chambly was the lowest in population, and in order not to spoil its geographical appearance, we just took from the County of Verchères the two parishes of Laprairie, Varennes and Ste. Julie, and going in that direction we had to cross the river and take two or three parishes from Rouville. My hon. friend will not be sorry as these parishes were not too overwhelmingly in his favour during the last election, and it will only improve, at all events, his own position. *Le malheur de l'un fait le bonheur de l'autre* applies in this as in most occasions of life. The remainder of Verchères has been attached to Richelieu. Richelieu until last year was a Conservative county, and whether this change will make it a Liberal county I do not know. If it were a question as to whether the name of Richelieu would be less dear to the heart of my hon. friend than the name of Verchères, it would be very easy to make the change and call the two counties Verchères instead of Richelieu.

Mr. LAURIER. What is there in a name?

Mr. OUIMET. It is the electors the hon. gentleman wants and not the name. If we had left the remainder of Verchères with Richelieu, it would have made too much, and we thought it would be very useful to temper the very pronounced Liberal colour of St. Hyacinthe by adding to St. Hyacinthe the two parishes of St. Marc and St. Antoine. As to the County of Rouville, I suppose I need not justify the valuable additions we have made in favour of our friend the present representative. As to Bagot, we had to take from Richelieu the parish which was next to it and which properly belongs to it, and my hon. friend, the member for Bagot, was so sensitive that he was afraid of being open to the charge of having taken away too many of his opponents in the parishes of St. Pie and St. Dominique, and he took the Liberal parishes from Drummond and Arthabaska, which have already too much population. These two Liberal parishes he expects to manage so that in the future they will be good Conservatives. Those are St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure. After these explanations, I am sure that my hon. friend will withdraw his expression of opinion that the changes we were obliged to make were most arbitrarily made. I think our friends have more reason to complain than our opponents, and if I had been left to myself, if we had not wished to avoid giving the slightest ground for the charge of unfairness, I would rather than have seen any change, for reasons that will be obvious to the hon. member for Verchères, have preferred to keep my county as it is, just as he would like to preserve his own. But the inequality of representation was so glaring that we had to do justice to the city of Montreal and the suburbs of Montreal and Ottawa County, and it had to be adjusted in some way. Some one must suffer, and I hope our friends will not complain that our opponents should have really won a county in Ottawa and one in St. Maurice, which is really two out of four. I think that on the whole the present redistribution is fair to all parties and our opponents in the Province of

Quebec at all events, will not have reason to complain of any gerrymandering.

Mr. BARNARD. I presume the proper time to discuss this measure will be at the second reading. So far as the redistribution in British Columbia is concerned, I do not think it is the best that could be devised, nor do I think it is one which will be satisfactory to the people of the mainland. I hope, before this Bill receives its second reading, the Government will see their way to divide the mainland into three constituencies, each with one member, which is quite possible, and which would be certainly a fair and proper division. I will reserve any further remarks for the second reading.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of the details of the measure the hon. gentleman has submitted. Like the hon. gentleman who has immediately preceded me, I think the proper time to point out what I regard as the mischievous and the unjust character of this measure will be when we come to consider it on the second reading, and when we have the measure printed before us and will be able to compare the Bill itself with the actual population of the various districts. I will say this much at the outset. I may say that, under the British North America Act, there is provision for the distribution of representation according to population among the provinces, but there is no provision nor was it intended that there should be equal population in the various districts, that the rule of three should be applied in the division of each province into electoral districts. The objections which apply to a measure of that sort were well stated a long time ago by Mr. Burke, and there may be an opportunity for pointing out these reasons, and to some extent they were stated by the late Premier in 1871. However, I am not going into a discussion of that matter on the present occasion. In 1882 we were told, when the measure was submitted to Parliament for the redistribution of seats, that care was had to pay due regard to the sacred principle of representation by population. I am about to call the attention of the House to one feature of the measure which the hon. geetleman has submitted to us, so far as it affects the Province of Ontario. It is only necessary to look at the census to see that the portion of the Province of Ontario which lies west of Toronto is under-represented at the present time, and the portion which lies to the east, between the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence Rivers and the eastern portion of Lake Ontario, is over-represented, but the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have taken away two members from the district which is already under-represented and have left that section of the province which is at the present time and has been all along over-represented, having in this House a representation out of proportion to the numbers which its population would warrant, just as it is. Why that is done is perfectly obvious to every member of this House and will be perfectly obvious to every citizen in the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman has in the western portion of the province made but one change. The city of London had its boundaries extended a few years ago. I think it is nearly ten years since what was called the town of East London containing a population of about 6,000 was embraced within the limits of the city, and two years ago the district of South London was also included in the city of London. Now the hon. gentleman includes neither of these in the city, but he takes from the constituency to which those two portions of the city now belong another municipal division, the village of London West, and adds that to the city of London. Why did he not add a portion of the city itself? Why did he go outside of the city and take from the riding of East Middlesex a portion of that riding and add it to the city of London? The reason is perfectly obvious. London South has a majority of 100 against the Administration. London East has also, I believe, a majority against the Administration, but the village of London West gave a considerable majority to the Conservative candidate at the last election, and so, with the view of strengthening a member of the Administration, it is proposed to take London West and add it to the city and leave out two wards of the city as portions of the riding of East and of South Middlesex to which at present they belong. Every one will understand the character of that division. I wish also to bring under the attention of the House, and under the attention of the country, the fact that at this moment the Government have in this House, I think, two-thirds of the representatives from the Province of Ontario. Giving the Government the credit for their success at the bye-elections, there were recorded against the Administration in the elections for the members sitting at this moment in this Parliament a majority of the electors of the Province of Ontario. There are some thousands of the electors who voted against the Administration over those who voted for them, and yet under this distribution the hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House have two-thirds of the members from that province. That is according to the statement made by Mr. Johnson, which is an inaccurate statement as against us.

Mr. BOWELL. Was not that statement made before the bye-elections?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking after giving credit to the Government for the bye-elections, and they will not do away with that majority of 7,000 against the Government or with one-third of it, as the hon. gentleman knows, so that you have two-thirds of the members elected by a minority of the voters. Does the Government propose to correct that injustice? What do the Government do, in order to give to the minority in this House and to the majority of the electors outside a fair representation in Parliament? Nothing. They undertake to still further pack the representation in Parliament. They take away from a district already under-represented two of its members, and they leave the sections of the province which is already over-represented all the representatives they have. Hon. gentlemen may think that that is perfectly fair, they may think that the principles of ethics do not apply to public matters. I have a different opinion, I believe the people of this country will have a different opinion, and it is the duty of hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House to bring under the attention of Parliament and of the whole country the character of the measure the hon. gentleman has submitted to this House. Let me take the case of the County of Middlesex. You have four representatives in this House from that county, one Reformer and three Conservatives. What is the vote in that county?

There is more than 500 of a Reform majority in the County of Middlesex. In the Niagara district, the hon. gentleman proposes, although the vote as it stood the last time gave a majority in favour of the Opposition, to give the Opposition one member that is, to give the majority one member, and to give three to the minority. That is the arrangement made by the hon. gentleman in this Bill. Do these hon. gentlemen think they can sustain an injustice of that sort, that an injustice of that sort will be tolerated by the people of this country? Sir, I remember in 1882, when my constituency was gerrymandered and its boundaries were altered, when, according to the vote that had been recorded before, I was put in a minority of 300; I appealed to the sense of justice and fairness of my constituency, and I say it to the honour of the Conservatives there, that a large number of them supported me and have continued to support me ever since, because they would not wink at misconduct so gross, at a system of political warfare that was in its character so cowardly. Nothing the hon. gentlemen can do, can be more discreditable to them than to undertake to secure themselves in possession by altering the boundaries of constituencies in such a way as to enable a minority of the electors of this country to elect a majority in Parliament. I say it is an outrage that ought not to be tolerated, that it is a principle as foreign to every man of proper British feeling as anything well can be. I can understand how a policy of that sort may be tolerated in a country like Mexico or Peru, where the people have no regard for principles of fairness as applied to public matters and public life; but I say that it is an improper, it is an immoral and a cowardly course, for any party to pursue: and when hon. gentlemen propose to take from a section of country that is not adequately represented at the present moment, two of its representatives and give them to a section of country that is regarded as Conservative, leaving the sections that are over-represented because they are Conservative unchanged, they have adopted a course which the people of this country will not sustain, and I trust there is a sense of manliness, a sense of fair-play sufficiently strong on that side of the House to discountenance such a course, and that hon. gentlemen opposite will assist hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in making this a fair measure, instead of being an unfair measure as it is laid upon the Table of the House, and as it has been explained by the Minister of Justice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the leader of the House that in bringing this measure down a second time, it would be convenient if a schedule were attached, giving the population of the proposed counties. He can easily do that from the information he has in his hand, and it will save a good deal of trouble.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the hon. Minister whether it is intended to have copies of the maps made for distribution among the members?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That cannot be done without very considerable delay. It would take a long time to draw the plans.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that no map of Quebec is to be found among those brought down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is one prepared.

Mr. BOWELL. These maps only represent the old constituencies and not the proposed ones.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But if the House were in possession of small copies of these, we could easily mark ourselves the proposed changes. It would be a matter of great convenience.

Mr. BOWELL. So far as Ontario is concerned, the changes are so small that they can be easily laid upon the Table, as suggested by the member for South Oxford.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HARBOUR OF THREE RIVERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider resolution (April 28th) to authorize the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers to raise a sum to be applied to the purchase of wharves or beach property.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before doing so the hon. gentleman had better state exactly what is to be done and how far we are to be made liable for this $218,000.

Mr. FOSTER. In 1882 I find that Parliament authorized the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers to issue debentures to the amount of $300,000, bearing 6 per cent interest. In the interim between 1882 and 1885 they had issued debentures to the amount of $63,600, and in 1885 the Governor in Council was authorized to advance this $63,600 already issued, and the sum of $18,400 necessary to complete the works which at that time had been undertaken, making altogether $82,000. Power to issue the remainder of the bonds was taken away from the Harbour Commissioners, and the Government was given the bonds for this $82,000 bearing 4 per cent interest, with a sinking fund of one-half per cent. It is now proposed to give the commissioners authority to issue debentures for the balance between the $82,000 issued and advanced by the Government, and for which the Government hold bonds, and the $300,000 which was originally proposed; that is, to give them power to issue debentures for $218,000, bearing 6 per cent interest, or 5 per cent interest, and 1 per cent for sinking fund, and to give these debentures $218,000 priority over the $82,000 of bonds that the Government hold at 4 per cent. I may say that for a number of years no interest has been paid. The works have been unproductive, they have not been finished, no interest has been paid, and it is a condition precedent to any debentures being issued under authority of this act, that the arrears of interest up to the date of the Act being assented to, shall be paid to the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the commissioners to negotiate these themselves, or is the Government going to advance the money?

Mr. FOSTER. The commissioners negotiate these bonds, and the Government have no reponsibility themselves.

Mr. LAURIER. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman taking the present stage, but I presume that before he takes a further stage he will be prepared to lay on the Table of the House the correspondence that has taken place.

Mr. FOSTER. All the papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, what the Minister proposes is to give these priority over the existing debt of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that that should not be done without a more satisfactory explanation than we have had. To give $218,000 priority over $80,000 may amount, and very often does amount, to absolutely wiping out the second mortgage, and most people would regard it as a very unsatisfactory security. Before we go further with this, we ought to know what revenue the corporation possesses, and what are the annual expenses of maintaining the harbour, or maintaining the works from which this is going to be levied.

Mr. FOSTER. I will endeavour to have an estimate, so far as it can be made, as to what the expected revenue of the works when completed will be. The trouble is at the present time that, as it stands, although it is an asset, it is really a dead asset. The works are not even half completed, they are only about one-quarter done, and consequently the amount of revenue derived is very small indeed. They contemplated, at first, works to the amount of $300,000; under the present legislation, if approved, they will be authorized to make an expenditure to what they at first desired to make, that is, up to $300,000. That, it is thought, will place the harbour in a complete state so that revenues may be obtained from it. As it is at the present time our interest has fallen in arrears, simply because the revenues from the incomplete work have not been sufficient, after paying the small expense of administration, to yield any considerable amount. Something has been paid, but a large part of the interest is in arrears. By this legislation we do two things. In the first place, we get our arrears of interest up to date, and in the second place, by having the harbour put into a complete state, we shall make the whole a live asset, so that probably if the business at all fills the anticipations of it, our security, though it is a second lien, will certainly not be less valuable than it is to-day, and it stands a chance of being an available asset. As it is at the present time, I must confess that it is a dead asset.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Looking at it as a purely business transaction, I would suggest to the Minister that it would be more to our interest, if we are to make any considerable reduction of our debt, to let them borrow $250,000 or $300,000 and pay us off. That would be a neat transaction, it would avoid the inconvenience of having two mortgages, and I for one would be willing, if the other members of the House are of the same opinion, to treat Three Rivers liberally and make a handsome reduction. I would throw off the interest and throw off a little bit of the principal in order to get the balance.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we will do better than that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think we will. The result of this will be practically that we might as well wipe out the $80,000 altogether. That is usually the result of putting large sums ahead of our claims. I have no means of knowing, and the hon. gentleman has not as yet the data in his hands, what amount of trade or commerce is likely to be developed there, but looking at the population of Three Rivers and looking at the general situation, it appears to me that the chance of paying the interest on $218,000 and of maintaining the works, and afterwards paying us back, is very slim indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. It cannot be more slim than the prospect of paying the interest now.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman that we postponed the priority that we now possess, in favour of the loan which he authorizes the commissioners to acquire?

Mr. FOSTER. The authorized issue becomes a preferable lien; ours is put afterwards.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not catch the hon. gentleman's reason as to why he thought that by putting ourselves second we would improve our security.

Mr. FOSTER. The reasons I have given were these: The works are at present incomplete, and in consequence they produce no adequate revenue. Representations have been made, and I think, with a good deal of probability, that it is impossible that the trade can be carried on there until the harbour is put in a complete state. At the present time, although we have nominally a first lien it pays us no interest, but if the harbour is put in a state in which it will draw the trade, the revenues will be increased, and the prospects will certainly be no less that we shall get something from it. We do gain by this arrangement the arrearage of interest which will be paid, and the commissioners will be put in a position to make their harbour profitable, if it is possible to do so, by the trade which will be drawn there consequent upon the completion of the facilities to accommodate it.

Mr. LAURIER. What are the works to be completed?

Mr. FOSTER. Some property there is to be acquired, but the main expenditure is for the building of new wharves.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I look with the greatest possible suspicion upon legislation of this kind, and I think that anybody who has followed the legislation of the last twelve years in respect to advances we permitted the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to make for alleged improvements, will join in my feelings that in so far as we postpone the indebtedness now due to us, we lose it altogether very probably, and in the not far distant future we will be called upon to assume this liability. The hon. gentleman knows that has been the experience with reference to the Quebec harbour works, and that will be the experience with respect to this work. I submit that it is reasonable and fair that, before we authorize the borrowing of this sum of money by the Three Rivers commissioners and authorize the postponement of our present claim in favour of the new loan, this House ought to be more fully informed as to the character of the works. I think that the Government, before introducing this resolution, should have been prepared with the report

of the engineers and the estimates of the work, so as to enable us to see the probability of interest being paid upon this expenditure. As it is now, the House is absolutely in the dark. Reasoning by anology and judging of probable results in this case from what has been the actual results in similar cases, I think I am not going too far when I assert that we will not only probably lose the $80,000 which we have already advanced, but that a very strong effort will be made to induce us to assume the responsibility for this loan which these commissioners are authorized to make.

Mr. FOSTER. It is always in our own hands.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is, and this is always the preliminary step towards asking the Dominion to assume the whole debt in order to recover the loan which is made. I press upon the hon. gentleman that it is not fair on his part to ask Parliament to vote this resolution without putting us in possession of information, which I assume he himself must have, as to the precise character of these works, and such information which would enable an ordinary member of the House to judge whether there is a reasonable probability of this money earning interest. The hon. gentleman has not given the House the information. If there are reports from engineers we should have them.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying the House ought to have information, but, as the hon. the leader of the Opposition has said, this being only the initiatory stage, it was not necessary that it should be submitted. On the introduction of the Bill I shall be glad to give the fullest information I can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I submit that the initiatory stage should not be taken without this information. We are taking a preliminary step, but a necessary step to the introduction of the Bill, and I contend that the information to justify us in taking that step should be before us. Parliament will afterwards be more or less committed, and I enter my protest because I have seen, in times gone by, that when Parliament legislates in this direction it is not long before we are asked to assume the entire debt. I have no faith in this proposition, and I certainly think the House ought to have the information that has justified the hon. gentleman in asking us to vote the resolution. That he has not given, although he must have had it.

Committee rose and reported resolution.

SUPPLY—WEST INDIAN TRADE.

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

Mr. BORDEN. Before the motion is carried, I desire to make a very few observations in reference to a matter to which I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance a day or two ago by a private note. It relates to the present position of trade relations between this country and the Spanish West Indies. I desire to get some information as to what result, if any, has come, or is likely to come from the negotiations now going on between the representatives of this Government and the British Government and the Spanish Government. About a month ago I put the following question :—

"Whether any and what steps have been taken to secure for Canada the continuation of the present arrangement, ending on the 30th of June next, with Spain, by which Canadian products, notably potatoes, fish and lumber, are admitted to the Spanish West Indies on the same terms as the products of the United States."

I received the following answer from the Minister of Finance :—

"The matter has been represented to the British Government, and Sir Charles Tupper has been given full plenipotentiary powers with Sir Drummond Wolff to enter into negotiations with the Spanish Government in regard to this matter."

Now, it seems that negotiations are going on, and it is with a view if possible to get some statement as to the present position and the prospects with regard to those negotiations, that I bring this matter up now. I may explain to the House, in justification of this course, if any justification is necessary, that the constituency which I have the honour to represent is specially interested in this matter. The export of potatoes from that county, as well as from many other counties from the Province of Nova Scotia, will be seriously affected by the loss of the Spanish West Indian market. At the present moment the Havana market is the only market, with the exception of a very trifling one in the British West Indies, that we have for our potatoes ; and as the Finance Minister very well knows, the product of potatoes in the western part of Nova Scotia is a very large and important one. A year ago, probably 60,000 barrels were shipped from my constituency alone. At any rate, from one port in that county 40,000 barrels were shipped direct to Havana, and there were no shipments to any other part of the world, because the markets of the rest of the world are absolutely closed to us. The volume of the export trade from Nova Scotia to the Spanish West Indies during the year ending the 30th June last is shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns to have been over $1,250,000. Our exports to the Spanish West Indies in fish, lumber and potatoes were nearly equal to our exports to the whole of the British West Indies. Therefore it will be seen that this trade is one of very great consequence to the people of the Province of Nova Scotia. Now, I have been urged by my constituents to obtain if possible an answer to the question I am at present asking, because the season for planting potatoes is again approaching, and if we are not to continue to have that market on the same terms as we had it last year, it will be useless for the people engaged in that branch of agriculture to put in their crops with any hope of exporting the product. A year ago, the question was under discussion in this House whether our products would have, during the season that is just past, entrance to the Havana market on the same terms as similar products from the United States. At that time I took the view, which was supported by many members of this House, including the hon. Minister of Finance, that under the treaty between England and Spain, then existing and still existing, under the most-favoured-nation clause of that treaty, Canadian products must be admitted on the same terms as the products of the United States under the treaty recently negotiated between the United States and Spain. It turned out that that view was correct. Now we have approached a much more important aspect of this matter. We are face to face with the fact that Spain has denounced the treaty under the most-favoured-nation clause of which the products of Nova Scotia were admitted free to the Havana market last year, and that treaty will come to an

end on the 30th of June next. Consequently, we are face to face with this state of things, that after the 30th of June next United States products will have free entry to the markets of the Spanish West Indies while the products of Nova Scotia and this Dominion generally will have to meet a serious tax. In the article of potatoes the duty is $1 per barrel. American potatoes will be admitted free. Canadian potatoes will have to meet a hostile tariff of $1 in Spanish gold per barrel, and you can say that is a prohibitory duty. It will be absolutely impossible for us to send our potatoes to Havana if that condition of things happens. I can illustrate that to the House by something which happened during the month of September last. A shipment of potatoes was made of a steamer load of 5,000 barrels from Kingsport in my county to Havana. The cargo reached Havana before the Spanish officer there had received instructions from his Government not to collect the duty. The duty was imposed by the Spanish officer, and the net product of that cargo of 5,000 barrels, which was returned to the shipper in Kingsport, amounted to the magnificent sum of $53. After instructions had been received by that officer, the duties were remitted, and a cheque was sent to the shippers for some $4,500, which represents the cost and profit, if there were any, upon the shipment. Now, it is plain from that illustration that if we had not succeeded under the favoured-nation clause last year, in getting our products into Havana upon the same terms as those of the United States, it would have amounted to simply giving away the potatoes after they had been exported, and it would have been absolutely impossible to send a single barrel of potatoes to that market; and that is what will happen this year unless the Government is able to secure a continuation of that treaty. The people desire to know whether or not there is a reasonable prospect of obtaining a continuation of that treaty. I shall not enter at any length into the discussion of the probability or otherwise of our being able to do that, but I will mention this fact: I observe that in the treaty which has been made between the United States and Spain, under a provision of the McKinley Bill which gives power to the Executive to make special reciprocity treaties, the Spanish Minister says, in a communication to Mr. Blaine, that "his Government has decided to respond as promptly and as fully as its national interests and international engagements permit, to the legislation of the Congress of the United States as set forth in the note of 3rd January." I observe that there were really two treaties made with the United States. One was but a provisional measure which should terminate on the 30th of June next, and I find that at that very moment, or shortly afterwards, the Government of Spain gave notice to the British Government of its intention to terminate the treaty existing between Great Britain and Spain on the 30th of June next; and I observe that a further arrangement was made between Spain and the United States, which is called a definitive arrangement, to come into force after the 30th of June next. Consequently it would seem as if there was a deliberate intention to terminate international engagements referred to by the Spanish Ministry existing between Spain and other countries, in order to enable the Spanish Government to make this definitive treaty with the United States. If that view of the case be the correct one, then it would look as if we could scarcely hope to procure an extension of the existing treaty, because Spain would scarcely have denounced that treaty, and framed its policy with the view of making a special arrangement with the United States, and then within a few months or before the very day when notice was given to terminate the treaty, agree to an extension of it. However, I should be very glad to hear that there is a prospect of an extension of the treaty; but if not it is open, of course, to the Government to make a new treaty, and it is with reference to these matters and for the reasons I have attempted to give that I desire the fullest information should be given, either now or at the earliest possible moment, with reference to this most important question, a question particularly affecting the trade of Nova Scotia in the articles of lumber, fish and potatoes.

Mr. BOWERS. I have had several letters from my constituents pressing this matter on me and asking me to obtain if possible information from the Government. I mentioned the matter to the Finance Minister but did not get much satisfaction, but perhaps the hon. gentleman had not much information to give. I received a letter a short time ago from one of my constituents in Bear River, a member of the firm of Clark Bros., who carry on a large lumber business there. He says:

"I have just received a letter from our agent at New York in regard to the effect the termination of the present treaty between England and her colonies and Spain will have on our shipments to Spanish West Indies. At present Cuba draws her supply of spruce lumber almost if not entirely from Nova Scotia. After 1st of July, all lumber from Nova Scotia going into Cuba will pay at the rate of $9 (nine dollars) per M. duty while American lumber will go in free. The duty you will observe is so great as to make it impossible to send lumber to Cuba, in fact it is practically prohibitory. This will entail a very heavy loss on lumbermen all over Nova Scotia, but particularly on western Nova Scotia, as our shipments for some years past to Cuba from Annapolis, Bear River, Plymouth and Yarmouth have covered more than half the entire quantity cut. Can you ascertain from the Government if there is a probability of the treaty being renewed or what the outlook is?"

I would also call the attention of the Government to the large amount of dry fish and farming produce sent from Digby County to the Spanish West Indies and which form a very large part of the exports from that county. The several ports of Bear River, Digby, Weymouth, and all along the shores of St. Mary's Bay, will deeply feel the loss of those important markets, and I sincerely trust that the Government will soon be able to assure the country that such treaty will be renewed.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not possible for me to give the hon. gentleman who has asked this question any definite information. The hon. gentleman has stated the case very correctly, I think, and the answer which I gave on previous occasions have shown him and the House that negotiations are on foot.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Has Sir Charles Tupper gone to Madrid on this matter, or is he still in London?

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the House the information before I have finished. Representations were at once made by this Government to the British Government in the way of negotiating for a continuation of the same terms we now enjoy or for other terms which would be favourable to our products, but the Spanish Government refused absolutely to make any advance towards negotia-

tions until they saw the result of the legislation in the French Chambers, because the legislation at that time under way in the French Chambers promised to bear very heavily on Spanish products, and in the end did bear heavily upon Spanish products; and, while that was in progress, the Spanish Government refused to enter into any negotiations at all. After that legislation became an accomplished fact late in the autumn, the Spanish Government had an additional motive for delay in studying the legislation which was accomplished and its effect upon Spain herself. Shortly after the beginning of the year, however, circumstances seemed to be more favourable, and, after the change of ambassadors, Sir Drummond Wolff was put in charge on the part of Great Britain, which was also anxious to undertake negotiations for a treaty on her own account with Spain, and shortly after that again Sir Charles Tupper was appointed, as I have stated, co-plenipotentiary with the English ambassador at Madrid. The English ambassador went to Madrid and from that time to this has been approaching the subject, dependent of course on the amount of co-operation lent to him by the Spanish Government, which up to a late period has not been very marked. Sir Charles Tupper has not yet left London for Madrid, but is in daily expectation of being called there. He will be called there as soon as negotiations have progressed so far that his services will be actually necessary; there is no use in his being at Madrid until the Spanish Government are willing to undertake the *pourparlers*. The latest information we have on the subject is contained in a telegram just received from Sir Charles Tupper in which he states that he expects to start for Madrid at probably a few days' notice. As negotiations are in that state, my hon. friend will see it is impossible for me to give him any definite information. The only thing we can do is to hope that the relations of Spain with Great Britain which, on account of the termination of treaties, have placed prospectively in a different position the two countries, and one less favourable to their mutual interest than before, may make it a point of interest to both nations to make new arrangements to take the place of those that will come to a termination on the 1st July, and we may also, I think, from the treatment we have offered to Spanish products by our tariff, which is much more favourable to them than that of the United States on the whole, be hopeful that there will be a favourable outcome to the negotiations which are in progress.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what respect is our tariff more favourable to them than the tariff of the United States?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that it is more favourable, taken as a whole. The articles which are the basis of the treaty of the United States with Spain are coffee, hides, sugar and molasses. Now the chief exports from the Spanish Antilles are sugar and molasses. It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that, while these negotiations were proceeding between the United States and Spain, Spain tried hard to get her tobaccos into the United States on more favourable rates. She did not succeed. She pays the full tariff, which is very high in the United States, on her unmanufactured tobacco which goes into that country, and, whilst in the article of molasses, which is not a very large export, the United States tariff gives an advantage over ours, and while on sugar over No. 14 she gives an advantage under the tariff, though I am told that the sugar over No. 14 forms a very small percentage of the total export, we give free entry to all her sugars up to and including No. 14, and we give her tobaccos free access to our market in the unmanufactured state, so that, taken on the whole, our tariff conditions are more favourable to Spain than those of the United States. More detailed information it is impossible to give except that this Government and the British Government are pursuing the negotiations and pushing them as rapidly as possible, but of course there are two parties to these negotiations and one cannot proceed more rapidly than the other will consent to.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 75) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Carl Auer Von Welsbach and others.—(Mr. Stairs.)

SUPPLY—WEST INDIAN TRADE.

Mr. FLINT. When you left the Chair the Minister of Finance had just made a brief but very discouraging statement to the representatives of the Maritime Provinces. In common with all the representatives, particularly from Nova Scotia, I heard the statement of the Finance Minister with a great deal of regret; nor do I propose, in the few remarks which I shall make on this important subject, to lay any blame at the door of the Government for any of these unfortunate results or failures in connection with the negotiations for the continuance of the present satisfactory terms on which our products are received in the Spanish Antilles. In order that the House may perceive the great importance of this subject to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and particularly to those of Nova Scotia, I will ask the liberty of again calling attention to some of the more salient items of our export and import trade with the Spanish West Indies. Almost the whole of the export trade of the Dominion of Canada with the Spanish West Indies is from the Province of Nova Scotia. From the Province of Quebec the item is so small as not to merit a quotation, and the same may be said with regard to the Province of Ontario. The small Province of Prince Edward Island exports to the Spanish West Indies scarcely anything of importance; but when we come to the Province of Nova Scotia we find that ninety-nine-hundredths, I may say, of all our exports to the Spanish West Indies go from that province, the total amount being, of products of the Dominion, $1,191,917. To show the magnitude of this item, as compared with our other exports, I need only say that our exports to Great Britain are $2,263,594; our exports to the United States are $3,318,504. Thus it will be seen that the exports from Nova Scotia to the Spanish West Indies are about half those to the United States; and a very large percentage in proportion to those that go to Great Britain. The largest item in connection with these exports is that of the

produce of the fisheries, amounting to $941,633. The next largest item is exports, the products of the forest, $98,572; of agricultural products, $137,533. Now, if, as has been said by the hon. member for King's, and as must be quite apparent from the few remarks that he made in illustration, the probable, and I might almost say, inevitable, effect of the rescission of the present advantageous terms under which our products are received in the Spanish West Indies, will be, I think it is quite apparent, that this trade will almost come to a standstill; and I cannot but express my regret that this comes at a time when, owing to complications with our fellow colonists in Newfoundland, it seems that a large portion of our trade with that colony was also about to be intercepted. I must say that I do not think that the Ministry, whether the fault is entirely theirs or partially theirs, or whether it be altogether the fault of circumstances, can congratulate itself upon its success in negotiations for reciprocal trade arrangements particularly during the past few years. They have failed, miserably failed, wretchedly failed, in their efforts to secure any amelioration of the trade restrictions with the United States of America. We have also failed, notwithstanding, I believe, the very serious efforts made on behalf of the Government by the Finance Minister, to secure any alleviation of our trade condition with the British West Indies. Then we have this last blow coming upon the people, particularly of the Province of Nova Scotia, and I must say that, taken in connection with the excessive tariff upon imports into that province, and the large exodus which is going on week by week and month by month, from that province, the outlook is discouraging indeed. If there were any words of hope in the few observations addressed to us by the Minister of Finance to-day, they would have been received by the representatives of that province in this House, and by the people of Nova Scotia, with a degree of satisfaction which can probably be imagined from the broad statement of the figures which have been laid before the House in connection with our trade relations with those islands. We have, however, the promise that the High Commissioner of Canada in England is expecting to be called upon very shortly again to renew negotiations on this important subject at the Court of Spain. This, under some circumstances, might give us a great deal of encouragement, knowing, as we do, the energy and the capability of that hon. gentleman; but, even this is very much dimmed when we recall the fact that for the last eight or nine years we have had promises made which have not been fulfilled, some of them in very strong terms indeed, and expectations held out of a very favourable character, as to what was being accomplished, or was likely to be accomplished, by the efforts of the High Commissioner with the people of Spain. I trust most sincerely that some result may flow therefrom, and that the Ministry and the Government may be in a position, within a very short time, to announce to this House, or in some other way to the people of this country, that a more favourable outlook is promised in regard to our trade with the Spanish West Indies. We have a large import trade from those islands, larger, perhaps, than many hon. members are aware, certainly larger than a great many people throughout the country have an idea of. The Province of Ontario imports about $37,000, paying a duty of $27,344, from those islands; the Province of Quebec last year returned imports of $1,470,677, paying an import duty of $829,623; the Province of Nova Scotia imported $318,536, upon which they paid a duty, in round numbers, of $161,000. New Brunswick imported $133,454, upon which they paid a duty of $81,312. I think that this large volume of imports from the Spanish West Indies, paying into our treasury so large an amount of revenue, certainly is a great reason for making favourable negotiations with the Governments of those islands. I think that in considering any reduction of our tariff, the Government might take into consideration the circumstances of this country, and the large volume of imports from the Spanish West Indies which pay duty into the Dominion treasury, to see if they cannot make use of this fact as an assistance to their negotiations in connection with their efforts to obtain the favourable terms they have alluded to. I presume, and I think I am right in assuming, that none of these features have been neglected, and from a personal knowledge of the unrest which is felt in commercial circles, particularly in the fishery business circles of Nova Scotia, I can only reiterate to the members of the House and to the Government, that in all their efforts—if they are making serious efforts—through their High Commissioner to ameliorate our trade relations with the Spanish West Indies, particularly in anticipation of the 30th day of June next, that they will have the warm and earnest sympathy and co-operation of members on both sides of this House. This at the present time is a matter of almost vital importance to the people of Nova Scotia, and unless some arrangement is made by which our goods, particularly the produce of our fisheries, can be sent to the Spanish West Indies upon as favourable terms as those of the United States, very great loss and very great commercial depression will be felt throughout almost every portion of the Province of Nova Scotia. I presume that it would be too much to expect that this session we should receive any important news in connection with this matter, but I trust that long before the House meets again we will be able to hear from the Government the announcement of a definite settlement of this important question.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Finance Minister whether these negotiations at Madrid, between England and Spain, are being transacted on behalf of the British Empire and Spain, as a whole, or whether, through the Colonial Secretary and Home Government, on behalf of the Dominion of Canada Government specially. I would like to know whether the negotiations have reference to the trade of the Dominion particularly or to the trade of the whole Empire. The matter is probably of no more vital importance to any part of the Empire than it is to the Province of Nova Scotia. I would also like to ask the Finance Minister if he can tell us why it is, and for what reason, the old treaty was abrogated at the instance of Spain. Was it because of anything that Canada or Great Britain had refused to do for Spain or the Spanish West Indies, or was it that requisition had been made to the Imperial or Dominion Governments for concessions to the Spanish West Indies and to

Spain, which could not be conceded? Why was it, and wherein did the obstacles exist to our having a continuance of the old treaty, or the establishment of a new one on possibly better relations? Prominence has been given to the great importance of the trade of the Spanish West Indies with the Dominion of Canada, and I wish particularly to draw the attention of the Finance Minister—I have no doubt that he is well aware of it already himself—to the fact that almost our entire trade with the Spanish West Indies is from the Province of Nova Scotia. The total export trade from the Dominion to the Spanish West Indies amounting last year to $1,280,212, and of that $1,249,530 is from the Province of Nova Scotia: the great bulk of it consisting of the two great matters of export from that province, namely, products of the fisheries and the forest. Of products of the fisheries we export $999,000, and of the products of the forest $98,275. From Quebec we only export to the Spanish West Indies, $5,950, from New Brunswick $1,026, from British Columbia $250, and from Ontario $23,300. Possibly it might be wise for us to make certain concessions to the Spanish West Indies which I have no doubt would readily be granted by the other provinces of the Dominion inasmuch as the great part of the trade is with the Province of Nova Scotia, and she in her turn would be willing to make equal concessions to the other provinces in some other line whereby more extended trade relations might be established with the Spanish West Indies. It is of great importance to the life of the trade of the Province of Nova Scotia that some better trade relations should be established between the Dominion and the Spanish West Indies. It is almost certain that we will lose the Spanish West Indies trade, and after 30th June we are in danger of losing the British West Indian trade, as it is well known to be a rule of trade that where a country sells her surplus products there also will she buy what is required. Consequently, when the treaty between the British West Indies and the United States comes into operation, it is likely that they will buy their supplies from the United States and thus we will lose that avenue of trade. I do not doubt that this matter has been already brought to the attention of the Finance Minister and that he is doing his utmost to bring about a better state of things, but it is absolutely necessary that every part of the Dominion should be made aware of the vast importance of this question to the Province of Nova Scotia. I trust that if anything can be done by any representatives of the other provinces of the Dominion in the Cabinet, that they will give way wherever it may be necessary to sustain the trade which we have now left to us, and to promote more extended relations with these foreign markets. Probably the Minister of Finance will not express an opinion as to the difficulties that lie in the way of this treaty being had, but that is a matter for him to say. The merchants along the south shore of Nova Scotia are anxious to know whether the difficulty comes from Spain or her colonies, or whether it comes from Great Britain and her colonies. The reply of the Minister of Finance to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden) leaves us exactly in the position we were in twelve months ago, and it leaves us with the prospect of no better future after the 1st of July next than we have to-day. This is a matter of serious moment to the Maritime Provinces, and I trust that a fair solution of the matter will be arrived at, and one that will be profitable to the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the subject which has been brought before the attention of the House is well worthy of serious consideration. Our trade with the Spanish Antilles is of very great importance to the people of the Province of Ontario as well as to the province down by the sea. It is well known that a great many of the articles which we manufacture in the Province of Ontario, notably flour, have had their markets largely circumscribed of late. We found a profitable market in Newfoundland for a large quantity of our flour, and from the beginning of the fiscal year in July, to November, when the Newfoundland Government imposed discriminatory duties against Canada, we sent to that colony 100,000 barrels of flour. That afforded a very profitable outlet to the millers of the Province of Ontario for the flour that they manufacture, but owing to the obstruction thrown in the way by the Dominion Government in imposing a duty on their fish, they retaliated by imposing a duty on our flour, and consequently that market has been lost to us. The Cuban and Porto Rico markets are very large consumers of flour, and it is of the utmost importance that they should be open to the Canadian millers as well as to Americans. I find an article in the Boston *Journal of Commerce* which shows the great importance of that market, and how the American people appreciate it. It says:

"We have shown how under the reciprocity treaty our exports of flour to Cuba have multiplied nine-fold since last year—the figures being 118,421 barrels, valued at $532,949, for the months of January and February last against 14,386 barrels, valued at $77,310, for the corresponding months of 1891, before reciprocity went into operation. In sixty days after the new treaty in its application to flour went into effect, we sent nearly as much flour to Cuba as we had done in the 365 days of the year preceding."

That shows the great importance of those markets, and how highly they appreciate them. Then, further on, the article says:

"And the effects of reciprocity are being only partially felt as yet. For competing Canadian agricultural products are now being admitted into Cuba and Porto Rico under the same conditions as our products. But Spain has 'denounced' the commercial treaty with the British Government, by which the Canadians claims this 'most-favoured-nation' privilege. The treaty expires on 1st July next. Thereafter, Canadian products will have to pay full duty in Cuba and Porto Rico, and we shall enjoy a practical monopoly of the colonial markets."

In view of that statement, I think it is of very great importance that every possible step should be taken to prevent the abrogation of that treaty by which we are able now to obtain access to the markets of those two countries on the same terms as the American people. I understood from the Finance Minister, to-day, that our High Commissioner was waiting for a summons from Spain to negotiate a treaty. We were told, last year, that he was waiting for the same summons, so it seems that he has been waiting for twelve months and no summons has come yet, and I think it likely that he will have to wait a long while before it will come. Now, the manufacturers of the Province of Ontario, owing to the failure of the negotiations for reciprocity with the United States, and the blundering of the Dominion Government in shutting up the Newfoundland market, find it very hard, indeed, to obtain outlets for their goods; and now, seeing that these new obstructions are likely

to be set up on the 1st of July next, and that time is rapidly approaching, it is of the utmost importance that the Government should take every means in their power to prevent any discrimination against Canada in entering the markets of the Spanish Antilles. We can only hope that the Government will make every effort to prevent the abrogation of the privileges we now enjoy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think that some of my hon. friends here must have forgotten the propositions embraced in the Address of the Government to the Imperial Parliament, or at all events to the Colonial Secretary, last year. It is assumed that the Minister of Finance and his colleagues would deprecate the termination by Spain by this treaty containing the most-favoured-nation clause. Well, Sir, I am rather astonished at that expression of opinion, because the Spanish Government has only done what the Minister of Finance and his colleagues asked the Imperial Government last year by a formal Address to do; and I suppose that as long as the result has been accomplished, as long as the treaty has been denounced, the practical consequence of its denunciation will be exactly the same, whether that came from the Government of Spain or from the Government of the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman, at the close of last session, after nearly every member on both sides of the House had gone home, asked the quorum that remained to present a formal Address, which the hon. gentleman did not think it worth while to bring down at an earlier period of the session, to the Imperial Parliament, not only advising the Ministers of the Crown in the United Kingdom what they ought to do in the interest of Canada, but what ought to be done in the interest of the whole Empire. The hon. gentleman followed the example of the tailors of Tooley Street: he proposed to speak, not only of the country which he represented, but for every other portion of the British dominions which he did not represent. Now, let me call the attention of the House to the concluding paragraph of the Address which the Minister of Finance asked this House to send to our Most Gracious Sovereign. That Address concludes as follows:—

"The Senate and House of Commons therefore humbly request Your Majesty to take such steps as may be necessary to denounce and terminate the effect of the provisions referred to as well in the treaties with the German Zollverein and with the Kingdom of Belgium, as with any other nation in respect of which such provisions are now in force."

Surely it could not be supposed that the hon. Minister of Finance, when imploring our Gracious Sovereign to denounce all the treaties containing the most-favoured-nation clause, could be carrying on a correspondence to prevent the denunciation of this one particular treaty? I think it is a pretty well recognized principle of logic that what is said of the whole must be said of each of the parts, and when the hon. gentleman asked for the denunciation of all the treaties containing this clause, he included in that universal category the treaty between Spain and the United Kingdom under which those advantages were enjoyed which are now about to be terminated. Well, Sir, it is quite clear from this Address what the views of the hon. gentleman were as to important questions of public policy. The hon. gentleman knew right well that there was not, at all events in his lifetime, the slightest hope or expectation that the fiscal policy of the mother country would be changed in the direction pointed to in that Address—that the Imperial Government would legislate to the detriment of the trade of £500,000,000 with foreign states, in order to confer a special benefit upon the dependencies of the Empire, the trade with which was not one-fourth of that amount. So the hon. gentleman knew that there was not the slightest probability or chance of the adoption of the policy which was suggested in that Address; but he was looking, in this as in other matters, not to the general well-being of the community, but to the political advantages which the Government might enjoy by undertaking to persuade the somewhat sensitive loyal population of Canada that this was in the interest of the Empire—that it would be of very great advantage to adopt between the present day and the day of judgment the policy marked out in this Address. And so the hon. gentleman was prepared to sacrifice any day that advantage that Canada might enjoy under the arrangements now existing in order to secure those political advantages which an appeal to the loyal sentiment of the country might confer upon the Administration. And so we find the hon. gentleman and his colleagues asking the Imperial Government to denounce this treaty. Well, the Imperial Government exercised a better and a more disinterested judgment on behalf, not only of the people of the United Kingdom, but of the dependencies of the Empire, and they declined to pursue any such course. They declined to take the line which the hon. gentleman suggested in this Address at the fag end of the session. But Spain did for the hon. gentleman what the mother country refused, and so we find the Government in the present position, that one of the most important markets open to the people of the Maritime Provinces for the special products of these provinces has been closed in consequence of the action of the Spanish Government, and closed, so far as we know, in consequence of the action of hon. gentlemen at the last days of the session last year. I think that the Administration owes something to the House. Let those hon. gentlemen get up in their places and tell the people of this country how they came to move the Address which they sent to the Imperial Government, in the absence of a large majority of those who sit on this side of the House, in the absence of a large majority of those who sit on that side, after the members had left, after the opportunity for full discussion had gone by. When they proposed this Address they must have foreseen what the consequences of such a proposition would be. Did the hon. gentleman want this treaty between Great Britain and Spain, under which those advantages were sustained, denounced? If he did not, why did he ask for this general denunciation by the Address last year? The people will hold the hon. gentleman responsible for that Address, and they will hold him responsible for the disastrous consequences which are likely to flow from that Address by the denunciation of this treaty by Spain. How could the Imperial Government press upon Spain the propriety of the continuation of this treaty when the very parties who were most concerned in its maintenance, through those who, it must be assumed, represented their opinion, called upon the Imperial Government for its denunciation? That responsibility the Imperial Government were not ready to take. That responsibility, therefore, was one they left to the hon. gentleman opposite and

left to the Government of Spain. But the result, however disastrous it may be, will lie at the door of the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches. This address is clear and specific in its terms, and from those terms it will be seen that the hon. gentleman wanted not only this treaty denounced but every other treaty which secured any advantage to the people of Canada or the people of any other portion of the British Empire. They did in this address call upon the Imperial Government, not only to denounce these treaties, so far as they affected Canada, but they undertook to speak for Australia and Cape Colony and every other possession of the British Empire as well as for the British Islands; and if the people of the Maritime Provinces find a market which is well nigh essential to their existence, closed to them, they have their representatives who sit on the Treasury benches, and who are responsible for the administration of the affairs of this country, alone to blame for what has actually transpired.

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

(In the Committee.)

Immigration Expenses..... $150,000

Mr. FLINT. In connection with this item, I wish to call the attention of the committee to an occurrence which took place last summer while the House was in session, in connection with the visit of the farmers' delegates to this country, and I wish to ask the Minister if it is contemplated that there shall be any more attempts made to have visits from representative farmers of the mother country?

Mr. CARLING. There is no intention so far as I am aware. I do not know what the Minister of the Interior may do, but so far as I know there is no intention.

Mr. FLINT. In connection with that, I wish to express a certain degree of regret that at this stage we have not the report of the delegates who visited the Lower Provinces during the latter part of last summer, because it would be interesting to find what their views and ideas are as regards the state of agriculture there and the prospects for carrying out an immigration policy in those portions of the Dominion. In connection with that subject, I desire to call the attention of the committee to a complaint which was made about the middle of September last with regard to certain official courtesies which were attempted to be extended to the farmers' delegates by the Provincial Government, but which, owing to what I shall at present call an unfortunate misunderstanding, were not extended. As I recollect the circumstances, the High Commissioner in London sent a communication to the Premier of the Province of Nova Scotia asking him to extend the courtesies of the Provincial Government to these delegates and generally to use his position as Premier in influencing the Local Government to make their visit a success. The Premier, being about to visit England, left word with his colleagues and particularly with the acting Premier, and through him with the head of the Agricultural Bureau of Nova Scotia, to see that these delegates were properly looked after. The superintendent of the agricultural branch made arrangements to receive the delegates on their arrival, to look after their hotel accommodation, and to give them such a reception, and such a view of the country, and such an opportunity to meet leading agriculturists as would display in the best possible light the resources and facilities of the province generally. Up to almost the eve of the arrival of the delegates, it was understood that the province would do its share to show the resources of the province to them, and to show proper courtesy to them, but it transpired upon the arrival of these gentlemen that a private gentleman in the city of Halifax who was prominently connected with the Conservative party had authority from the Department of Agriculture, or from some of the Cabinet Ministers at Ottawa, to undertake this duty himself on behalf of the Dominion Government, and that one of the deputies or subordinates of the Minister of Agriculture was detailed from Ottawa to meet the delegates, take charge of them, see after their comfort, and assist them in the discharge of their duties. This created a very painful and disagreeable feeling not only in political circles in Nova Scotia but among the people at large, particularly among the large number of the people of the province who supported the Provincial Administration. It was felt that here a great opportunity was lost in the first place to remove from the visit of these delegates all appearance of political bias or feeling whatever, and in the second place there was lost, owing to this error of judgment, this misunderstanding which I think arose from the great obliquity which was shown on the part of these who acted in this way in the city of Halifax in regard to what social duties demanded, an opportunity for favourably impressing these delegates with the resources of the province. I do not desire to take up the time by reading from the long correspondence which took place at that time, but I will sum it up and will ask a full and complete explanation from the Minister in regard to it. The correspondence amounted to this: that owing to the request of the High Commissioner to the Premier of the province, expectations were held out, and the Local Government were prepared to receive those delegates on behalf of the province, to throw the whole of the resources of the province open to them, to accompany them to various parts of the province, but that private citizens, prominently connected with the party in power at Ottawa, and particularly in opposition to the Local Government, including no less a one than the leader of the Opposition in the Provincial Legislature, took charge of them in order to show them through the country. Friction was created, unpleasant social relations existed, and, I think, the expectations of the public in the Province of Nova Scotia were, to a great degree, frustated, owing to this, as it appears to me, very great social and diplomatic blunder on the part of somebody. I think it was unfortunate that the Local Government was not taken cheerfully into the confidence of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, and that the most friendly relations were not sustained between the two Governments. Then the visit of these delegates would have been as great a success as it should have been. Of course, I am speaking subject to the disadvantage of not seeing the report of the delegates. We may have that before us at a later period. I am also under the disadvantage of not knowing what has taken place between the high parties concerned

since the correspondence was published in the press, but it seems to me a little unfortunate that, when delegates are visiting us from the mother country in regard to the publication of whose views a great deal of interest is manifested, the spirit of which we were speaking last evening should not be displayed. I trust that, in all matters connected with immigration, there will be an active interest taken by the Dominion and the executive bodies of the various provinces to work together harmoniously. This has been too much neglected in the past, and, if we can cultivate a unanimity of action in the expenditure of money in all matters connected with immigration, I believe the department will have much greater success than it has had in the past. In some particulars, I think the interests of the provinces, and particularly the interests of the Maritime Provinces, have been overlooked and damaged by the over-eargerness and zeal and anxiety of the Dominion Government to introduce immigrants into the North-West. There has been a tendency to overlook the needs, the resources and the requirements of the Maritime Provinces. On this subject, I shall look with interest for the remarks of the Minister.

Mr. TUPPER. Perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words on this subject, as the hon. gentleman was good enough to tell me in advance that he proposed to allude to this matter. No doubt he gave me that information because my name was connected with the correspondence which appeared in the press of Nova Scotia last fall, and, though I have not refreshed my memory by perusing that correspondence for the small part I took in it, in reply to a telegram sent to me by Dr. Lawson, I think I remember enough to be able to say that it was nothing more or less than a misunderstanding on the part of some members of the Local Government of Nova Scotia, and at the same time a request to the Department of Agriculture that that department would see that some one was at Halifax on the arrival of these delegates to meet them and practically to guide them or arrange for guides for them in their progress through the province. I was consulted on the subject, and I named a gentleman to whom I think the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) referred, Mr. Cahan, who represents one of the counties of Nova Scotia in the Local Legislature, and he undertook to act for the Department of Agriculture in that connection. It appears that after that the secretary of the department also went to Halifax, and I received from Dr. Lawson, who is the secretary of the Board of Agriculture, a telegram in which he repeated word for word, apparently, the letter of introduction which the High Commissioner had sent to the Premier of Nova Scotia by these farm delegates; there was no other word in the telegram, merely a repetition of that letter. Without the slightest desire to be discourteous, on the contrary, simply to state the fact, my recollection is that I answered Dr. Lawson's telegram. Though no question was asked, I mentioned the fact that Mr. Cahan had been asked by the Department of Agriculture to look after these gentlemen. Now, I did not read, I do not read now, the letter of the High Commissioner in any other sense than, apparently, the sense in which it was framed. He was not asking the Local Government to incur any expense, nor to appoint any particular officer to take charge of them, but he was asking, just as the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) understands the letter, that the Local Government should extend to them all courtesies in their power, so as to make the visit of the delegates to the Province of Nova Scotia as pleasant and profitable as possible. The hon. gentleman, I am glad to say, is wrong if he thinks that the misunderstanding lasted long, and that those courtesies were not extended, because the secretary of the Department of Agriculture is my authority for stating that these difficulties were overcome, and that the delegates were courteously received and entertained by the Local Government, who, so far as they could, facilitated their movements throughout the province. For instance, I recollect that they requested and obtained passes over the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, if I am not mistaken, and the Local Government assisted in that respect the secretary of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the commission. The unpleasant feeling that arose was happily dispelled before these gentlemen left the province. So far as I recollect, I was not requested, nor do I believe any member of the Government was requested, to explain the part that was taken; but from the papers it occurs to me that Dr. Lawson misunderstood the request as contained in the letter which was sent by the High Commissioner to the Premier of Nova Scotia. That there was a misunderstanding is clear; that there was any intention to offend the members of the Local Government of Nova Scotia, I most stoutly and positively deny. That intention never existed from first to last, and the request, so far as the department was concerned, for some gentleman to devote his time to the company and act practically as agent for these delegates, was most naturally made to Mr. Cahan, who was in every sense qualified; the hon. gentleman will not deny that he was well qualified to act in a case of that kind, being familiar with the province and its resources. He was in every sense well able, and did very successfully inform these delegates what portions of the province to visit, and the means of getting there, and so on. The secretary of the department, as I am informed, received from the Local Government considerable assistance. The delegates received the courtesy Sir Charles Tupper anticipated would be shown them by the Local Government. I speak now without having had recent reference to any correspondence that occurred, and my recollection is that the only correspondence was contained in the telegrams which I have mentioned.

Mr. FLINT. Do I understand from the Minister that all further friction between the department and the Local Government has ceased? Has there been any *rapprochement* between the two Governments by way of explanation to remove this apparent difficulty? I think it is to be regretted that something of this kind was not done, because we know that in the Province of Nova Scotia local politics run pretty high. I desire to say here that I am speaking entirely on my own authority without having had the slightest consultation or word, direct or indirect, with the Local Government of Nova Scotia. I am speaking solely from impressions made upon my mind by conversation with parties outside the Government of Nova Scotia.

Mr. TUPPER. And Dr. Lawson's letter.

Mr. FLINT. Yes, I mean to say that I think there was an error of judgment, at the very least, in detailing the leader of the Local Opposition prominently to take charge of the farmers' delegates in the Province of Nova Scotia, particularly in face of the fact that the visit of those delegates took place after a conversation between the High Commissioner and the Premier of the province. It seems that the Premier of the province was in England, and I presume he had a friendly conversation with the High Commissioner as to what would be the most favourable season of the year for the delegates to visit the province, and he cabled his acting Premier with the result of the conversation. So the arrival of the delegates at the time they did arrive, was the result of the conversation between the Premier of the province and the High Commissioner, and it was very unfortunate, to say the least, I think it was an error of judgment, in asking the leader of the Opposition to take a too prominent part in the public reception and the public travels of the agents through the province, particularly in face of this misunderstanding. I am glad to know that the breach has not been any more extensive, and I sincerely trust that on future occasions of visits of delegations to the province, there will be a determined effort on the part of the Government not merely to avoid occasion for any feeling of this kind, but that there will be an active desire to draw the Local Administration into the reception, and into the journeyings of the delegates, in order that they may feel that they are participating and sharing with the Dominion, perhaps in the expense, at any rate in the pleasure, and the responsibility, of making these visits agreeable and successful.

Mr. FORBES. Do I understand the Minister to say that the gentleman whom he retained on behalf of the Dominion Government, was the leader of the local Opposition, Mr. Cahan, and that he has been paid therefor?

Mr. TUPPER. I do not say what he was paid. I say that Mr. Cahan acted in that capacity, but I had nothing to do with his pay.

Mr. FORBES. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could say whether he has been paid for his services, and how much?

Mr. CARLING. I think Mr. Cahan was paid for his services, for the time he gave to conducting the delegates around the provinces.

Mr. FORBES. Can the Minister tell how much?

Mr. CARLING. His travelling expenses only.

Mr. FORBES. Will it be possible to get the exact figures?

Mr. CARLING. I think so.

Mr. FORBES. Can the Minister give them now?

Mr. CARLING. I think it is $180.

Mr. BORDEN. I am very glad to hear from the Minister of Marine that there was no affront intended by this Government to the Government of Nova Scotia. But I think that the Minister must agree, that at the moment, at any rate, that this matter occurred, the Government of Nova Scotia had a right to think that an affront was intended. There was the fact that the High Commissioner had sent these delegates with a letter to the leader of the Government of Nova Scotia.

Mr. TUPPER. The existence of that letter was not known at the time.

Mr. BORDEN. I did not understand the Minister to say that, but the fact that the existence of the letter was not known puts an entirely different construction upon the affair, I admit at once. It was very unfortunate, however, that the High Commissioner did not communicate the existence of that letter to this Government. It seems to me that it was the most natural and the most proper thing in the world for the High Commissioner to send these gentlemen to those who had charge of public affairs in the Province of Nova Scotia. It showed that the High Commissioner at any rate recognized the fact, that so far as questions of this kind are concerned by which the country is to be benefited irrespective of party politics, that it was better to utilize the powers that happened to be in charge of the Government in that province entirely outside of political considerations. I am very glad indeed to know that the High Commissioner took that position, and I say that it is unfortunate that the Administration here did not know of the letter, or did not take the same view. What particular status had the leader of the Opposition in Nova Scotia that he should be placed in charge of these gentlemen? Why not have asked Dr. Lawson to look after them, if there was an objection to the Government of Nova Scotia, which happened to be Liberal. They might have been entrusted to Dr. Lawson who is a very able man and a gentleman known to be a Conservative in politics, although he occupies a high official position under a Liberal Administration. It would have been better, in the interests of all concerned, had the Government not chosen to place these men in charge of Mr. Cahan. I have no objection personally to Mr. Cahan, but while there was a perfectly obvious reason for putting the delegates in charge of the Government, there could have been no reason whatever why they should be placed in charge of the leader of the Opposition. Now, with regard to the manner in which these gentlemen were taken about in the Province of Nova Scotia, I can say with reference to my own county that these delegates were sent to two or three points along the line of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, that they were received by two or three prominent Conservatives, and that as the matter seemed to be kept a secret, no one outside of these gentlemen knew that the delegates were to come there at all. I do not believe that they got anything like an adequate idea of the western part of Nova Scotia through which they passed. I am very anxious, Mr. Chairman, to see the report of these delegates, and I think I understood the Minister to say they would be soon forthcoming? Does he know whether it has been printed?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know.

Mr. BORDEN. This visit took place in September last and I fancy the delegates concluded their visit in the Maritime Provinces some time in October. Surely the Government ought to know by this time whether the report has been printed or not. I have heard remarks that that report was not of a nature particularly gratifying to the fiscal views of gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches. I have heard it remarked, I cannot

speak from personal knowledge of course, that these gentlemen stated on more than one occasion, and I believe on one occasion publicly, that they found Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces blessed with a good soil, and a good climate and well adapted for farming, but they could not conscientiously recommend their fellow-countrymen to come out here. I have heard it stated that a speech was made by one of those delegates, I think at Amherst, in which he expressed himself somewhat in that line, and I have heard it also that very promptly instructions came from Ottawa cautioning that gentleman that he was getting on dangerous ground, and that he must be very careful to abstain from any allusion to politics of any kind whatever. When after that the Island of Prince Edward was visited and when my hon. friend from Prince undertook to draw the delegate out and could get no satisfaction from him whatever, he had probably got his caution. I think that the Minister ought to give us some satisfactory assurance as to whether these reports had been printed, or ever will be printed, and if so when they will be distributed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Perhaps I ought to say a word, as questions have been asked about communications between the Provincial Government of Nova Scotia and members of the Government here. As my colleague, the Minister of Marine, has stated, on learning that the delegates were coming, the first important matter to be considered seemed to be the necessity of putting some person in charge of arrangements for showing them the different parts of the province, and Mr. Cahan was asked to attend to that. I am sure that no person could be better qualified for that purpose, irrespective altogether of political considerations, and I am sure that nobody could take the slightest objection to Dr. Lawson, an officer of the Provincial Government, who is, in every respect, a very well qualified gentleman, in whom any one would have implicit trust for business of that kind. After we had recommended Mr. Cahan, and when an officer of the department here went down to help to receive the delegates and show them the country, and while Mr. Cahan was actually attending to that business, I received a telegram from the Attorney General stating that the delegates had brought a letter of introduction to Mr. Fielding. Mr. Fielding was then absent, and the Attorney General, I presume, was acting in his place. I can only quote the substance of the telegram from memory, because I did not know that the subject would be mentioned and I did not refresh my memory. I immediately telegraphed to the Attorney General stating that Mr. Cahan had been requested by the Department of Agriculture here, to give any assistance he could to the delegates, and that I was sure he would be very glad to co-operate with the Local Government, and that we hoped they would co-operate with him. I received afterwards a reply from the Attorney General, stating that that was not at all acceptable to his Government, and that they could not co-operate. I have heard, as has the hon. member for Queen's, the rumour that these gentlemen had expressed strong views about various matters which they were not sent out to report upon, and upon which I would not have the slightest respect for their opinion, because, I think the people of our province are quite as well able to judge of their own affairs as these gentlemen were. Neither by natural advantages nor by education were they better qualified to decide those questions than our own people. But I was afterwards told that when they were asked whether such was the case, they repudiated the assertion that they had interfered in any way in matters beyond their cognizance or control.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think it is well understood that those delegates did not venture to express any opinion on what is known as party politics pure and simple. When they came to the Maritime Provinces they were consigned, if that is the proper expression, to the care of gentlemen in political sympathy with the Government, and were kept under their control as much as possible. But they were men of more than ordinary intelligence, and the leader of the House will see at once that being sent here to advise their fellow-tenants at home as to whether this was a country to which they could properly recommend them to emigrate, their duty was to report not only on the soil and climate, but on those combined circumstances which go to make a country a desirable home for immigrants. The fiscal policy of the country, the cost of living, the cost of producing different products that we export from the Maritime Provinces were some of the main elements in determining whether they should recommend this country or not. For instance, if the markets of the United States are closed to our products, and we are compelled to send them to the old country, the question arises whether the products are such as can be sent to the mother country. Then comes the question of the cost of production, and that depends upon the fiscal policy we adopt. These delegates came to the conclusion that our fiscal policy precluded them from advising their co-tenants in the old country to come to this country. They were delighted with the soil and the people, they were delighted to find that we had so many of the elements of civilization here; and they would have been delighted to have advised their people to come to the country; but they said that while the present fiscal policy of the Government was continued they were not prepared to recommend them to do so. Hon. gentlemen opposite may not like that, but it is the fact; and the reports, not being satisfactory to the Government, are not printed. The hon. Minister of Agriculture does not say that they are printed. He tells us, as he has so often told us, that he does not know. Is the hon. gentleman serious in that? Is he wilfully abstaining from enquiring about them? The hon. gentleman knows that the reports of these tenant delegates were such as he dare not publish, because they would be the condemnation of the fiscal policy of which he is a mouthpiece. As the people of this country have paid a large amount for the expenses of these delegates, they have a right to their report; and if it is a fact that the fiscal policy of the Government is preventing immigration from coming to Canada, the sooner we know that and alter the fiscal policy the better.

Mr. CARLING. I think I owe an explanation to the House. I was asked last night if the delegates who were sent to the Maritime Provinces had made a report. I may say that I found on enquiry at my office to-day that a report of one of the delegates had been sent out here in the begin-

ning of March last. It was sent up to me at London when I was ill and confined to my bed, and I requested that it should be returned to Sir Charles Tupper, which was done. I never read the report, no member of the Government ever saw it, and I do not know what was in it. It was sent back to Sir Charles Tupper and was dealt with, I understand, in the same way as the reports of the previous delegates who came out to Canada. They were selected by Sir Charles Tupper, and the reports were made to Sir Charles Tupper and printed by Sir Charles Tupper. Only one report was sent to me, that was the report of Mr. McQueen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Printed?

Mr. CARLING. No, written; and I instructed that it should be sent back to Sir Charles Tupper to be dealt with by him in the same way as the reports of the delegates of the previous year. I have no knowledge of what was in that report, and if it has been printed it is without my knowledge. With regard to the statements made about Mr. McQueen and the other gentlemen having made speeches on the trade policy of the Government, I spoke to them about that when I saw them in Toronto, and they told me that it was not the case. They said that they had been at a meeting and that some people had tried to draw them into a trap to express opinions, and that they had been misrepresented in the press and had not made the statements attributed to them. I had not much opportunity of talking to the gentlemen, but I found them very intelligent men. I saw them both before and after their visit to the North-West, and altogether they seemed to be very much pleased with this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Who accompanied them through the Province of Ontario and the North-West?

Mr. CARLING. We had not charge of them after they came to Ottawa. They had letters of introduction to our agents and other people in the North-West, and I think I gave them letters of introduction to Mr. Donaldson, in Toronto, and to some of the Ministers of the Local Government. But they were not paid when travelling in the North-West or in Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Were they paid while travelling in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. CARLING. Their expenses were paid.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). How is it that a different rule was adopted there from that adopted in Ontario and the North-West?

Mr. CARLING. Because the delegates who came out the previous year came out to visit Canada, while the two delegates who came last autumn came specially to visit the Maritime Provinces. The delegates of the previous year were detained so long in the western part of the Dominion that they had not time to visit the Maritime Provinces after their return, it being too late in the season, and Sir Charles Tupper, when in Canada in the following winter, requested that I should allow him to select two gentlemen specially to visit the Maritime Provinces.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many delegates were there?

Mr. CARLING. Two, one from England and one from Scotland, Mr. Davy and Mr. McQueen.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The representations made with regard to these delegates were that they were put by the Government here under the control of a political friend when they came into the Maritime Provinces, and that if they had been suspected of some offence they could not have been more closely shadowed. Care was taken to keep them from coming into contact with any one who held views at variance with those of the Administration.

Mr. CARLING. No such thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And I understand that when they came to Ottawa, very serious attempts were made to convert them into the Government way of thinking.

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understand that the Government failed in that enterprise, and abandoned these men as hopeless reprobates, leaving them to the condemnation and the hardness of heart which accompanies depravity of so sweeping a character.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think they were so bad as the hon. gentleman represents them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am describing the view the hon. gentleman took of them. He has a peculiar standard of uprightness.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I never saw them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Government speaks as a unit. It is the hon. gentleman who sits opposite me who has the brains of the Administration, the reflective faculty for this particular purpose. My hon. friend who leads the House thinks for the Administration on other matters, but on this particular matter the exponent of the views of the Administration is the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that these delegates tried to persuade the Minister of Agriculture that they had not been taken possession of by the enemies of the Administration and been made to believe that the Government were all wrong in their fiscal policy, and pursuing a course detrimental to the best interests of the country. I understand that those opinions which they expressed, they undertook to convince the Minister of Agriculture were their own views, formed from their own observations, and from such information as the friends of the Administration had placed within their reach. I understand that, so far as the Opposition was concerned, there was no opportunity whatever for any member of the Opposition to come in contact with them. We might just as well expect an accused party to hold an intercourse with some co-conspirator in the presence of a vigilant policeman as to suppose it were possible for either of these delegates to have acquired any information whatever on public matters, except what was picked up from the newspapers holding views at variance with the Administration. I understand that they visited various portions of the Dominion, and came to the conclusion that the policy of the Government was such as not to justify them in recommending tenant farmers to leave the United Kingdom and settle in the country.

Mr. CARLING. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We shall see when their report comes down. If the hon. gentleman has not seen the report how can he tell?

Mr. CARLING. I had the pleasure of meeting the gentlemen in the Queen's Hotel after they had

visited the Maritime Provinces and the North-West and were on their way home, and had a conversation with them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And the hon. gentleman no doubt supposed he had persuaded them that the perfection of wisdom existed on the Treasury benches of Canada. But it seems he did not succeed to the extent he may have supposed, and when we get the reports of those two delegates we will be able to see what opinions they formed under the guidance and instruction of the hon. gentleman in the east. When they got as far as Ottawa, they were trusted to make further progress on their own account. If, this report should have the effect of convincing hon. gentlemen that the fiscal policy they have pursued during the past fourteen years is a mistake, even though it should for a year or two prevent immigration to Canada, it will in the end confer a very great benefit on this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would remind the Minister of Agriculture that he promised to produce a sample of that investment of $2,000 in old newspapers.

Mr. CARLING. I could not put my hand on a copy to-day, but I have sent for one and will bring it down Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand the item we are now discussing is to be placed under the control of the Minister of the Interior. I want to know from him if he can inform me of the amount of land at the disposal of the Government in Manitoba, and what amount is available for free grants in that portion of Assiniboia south of the boundary and before you come to the inferior lands?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I fancy the quantity in Southern Manitoba is very little.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In Manitoba generally.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a very large amount, particularly in the northern portions north of the Canadian Pacific Railway. South of the Canadian Pacific Railway there are very few homesteads now available. In the northern portion, the majority of the homestead lands are still open. The settlement in the north is principally about the main route to Lake Dauphin, and in the southern portions of Manitoba about Lake Winnipegosis. North of that there is very little settlement indeed. In the southern portion of Assiniboia, west of the boundary of Manitoba, the greater part of the land is still open for homestead entry. Within the last few months a very large quantity in the eastern section has been settled on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you tell me generally how much of it is available for settlement south of the boundary in that part of Assiniboia?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The country most valuable for settlement will be about 70 or 80 miles west of the boundary of Manitoba. It averages about 100 miles from the railway down to the boundary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Three-fourths of that is vacant to-day. Practically speaking, if I follow the hon. gentleman aright, he has a block of about 30 miles by 100 miles west of the Province of Manitoba which is available for settlement. That is, I suppose, one-half is in the hands of the Government, and the other half in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway or other railways?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a great portion of that which has not been granted to any company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has any correspondence at all been had with the Imperial Government as to the question of their joining hands with ourselves, or the Local Governments, for the purpose of making any considerable colonization in that quarter? A good many rumours have been flying through the newspapers at various times, and many suggestions have been made from time to time in the Imperial Parliament as well as in the English press. Has anything crystallized from these discussions or propositions? I know that one or two attempts at colonization were made in which people from Scotland and possibly from one or two other portions of the British Islands were assisted by their landlords to settle, but I desire to know if any negotiation or correspondence is going on with the British Government with a view to their assisting people to settle in Canada.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is no correspondence that I know of except that in regard to the crofters, the last of whom came out two years ago. That is the only correspondence we have had with the Imperial Government in regard to colonization.

Mr. LISTER. I think the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has got off on a side track. We have not yet finished with the tenant farmers. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if any agreement was made, or any understanding come to, between the Government or the High Commissioner and these tenant farmers, as to the payment of their expenses while in Canada, or for any portion of the time they were in Canada?

Mr. CARLING. The arrangement was that they should visit only the Maritime Provinces, and when they came out here they thought well to visit on their own account the North-West, and we paid them for their expenses from the time they left the old country till they came to Ottawa and from Ottawa back to the old country. The understanding was that we should pay them on the same basis as we paid the previous delegates, but their visit was confined to the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. LISTER, What was the arrangement as to their *per diem* allowance, because I suppose they were paid the same as the previous tenant farmers' delegates?

Mr. CARLING. They were paid $5 a day and any expenses they might be put to in carriage-hire and so on.

Mr. LISTER. Any railway fare.

Mr. CARLING. I think they had passes provided for them by the railway companies.

Mr. LISTER. The other delegates had not passes. I find in the Auditor General's Report the railway expenses are charged: Brown, $93, Edwards, $96, and all the delegates charged in the same way their railway expenses, besides their *per diem* allowance. How much did those delegates cost the country?

Mr. CARLING. I stated last night that the total expenses of the delegates, 13 in number, were about $13,000.

Mr. LISTER. That is not in reference to the last two delegates of last year?

Mr. CARLING. No; I am told the expenses of the last two delegates amounted to about $500 each.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman told us he had a conversation with these delegates in Toronto. Did he have an interview with them in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. CARLING. Yes: I had one here and one in Toronto. I met them in Toronto when they were on their way home.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the intention of the Government to bring out any other delegates?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know what the intention of the Minister of the Interior is, but as far as I am concerned, as I have already stated, it is not the intention.

Mr. LISTER. Who sent the report to the hon. gentleman which was sent to Sir Charles Tupper?

Mr. CARLING. I believe it was sent by Sir Charles Tupper to me, and it reached me while I was unwell in London, and I requested my secretary to return it to Sir Charles Tupper for him to deal with in the same way as he had dealt with the report of the other delegates the previous year. The delegates were all selected by him, and the reports were made to him, and he looked after the printing and the proofs, and attended to them altogether.

Mr. LISTER. Is it the custom of Sir Charles Tupper, on receiving a report in manuscript, to forward it to the department for approval before publishing it?

Mr. CARLING. I am not quite sure whether he sent any of the reports of the previous delegates or not. I know that he was very anxious that the report of the delegates who came out the previous year should be circulated as soon as possible to influence immigration for the following year. I do not think he sent the reports of the previous year before printing, as it was desired to print them as soon as possible.

Mr. LISTER. Am I correct in inferring that this report was sent to the Minister for approval, or can he suggest any reason why the report was sent to him?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot, except that it was a matter of courtesy, and, as I had had nothing to do with the selection of the gentlemen, and had nothing to do with the previous reports, I told my secretary to return that sent to me to Sir Charles Tupper to deal with as before.

Mr. LISTER. Was the report read by the secretary?

Mr. CARLING. Not that I know of.

Mr. LISTER. It was sent without reading?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, so far as I know.

Mr. LISTER. Was any letter sent with it?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say. I do not remember. I was unwell in bed when the report came to London.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would ask the Minister to explain the item on page 225-B of the Auditor General's Report: H. Hurteau, repatriation agent, salary one year, $1,200; fares, $29.25; cabs, $5; living, 17 days at $2. It appears that this man was paid a year's salary and only worked some 17 days. Where is this gentleman located?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Hurteau was a member of this House some years ago, and he has been attached to the agency in Montreal for the last few years as an assistant of the immigration branch there, and has visited the eastern States on two or three occasions to induce his countrymen to come back to Canada. He has been paid for his work, and has been located at Montreal.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If he was employed as repatriation agent, he ought to have been over in the States a longer period than 17 days in one year, if he expected to get any of the Canadians to come back to the Province of Quebec.

Mr. CARLING. He was not expected to give all his time on the other side.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It appears to me there is an extraordinary zeal displayed by the officers of this department to see that Government money is expended. The grant is a very large one, $150,000, besides salaries and other contingencies. We have to be careful to see that the money voted by this House is judiciously expended, and we must judge of the methods of expenditure by what we have discovered of the Government's methods of expenditure in the past. Now, I have in my possession an extraordinary document which I will give to this committee with regard to an expenditure in 1886-87. It appears in that year, the Government was in the habit of giving out contracts for the publication of immigration pamphlets. The members of the House who were in former Parliaments will remember the discussions that took place with regard to the extraordinary price paid for work of this kind to newspapers all over the country. Now, it appears that in 1886, a Mr. J. Y. Shantz, who is a resident of Berlin, engaged in the button manufacture, paid a visit to Manitoba and took an interest in the settlement of immigrants there. He wrote a German pamphlet: that was afterwards entrusted to a man named Casper Hett, a printer in the town of Berlin, to be printed. The Government ordered 50,000 copies of it. After the work was performed a bill was rendered by Mr. Casper Hett, who also, I believe, published the Berlin *Gospel Banner*, and the amount he demanded for his work was $750.60. The account was placed in the hands of the Queen's Printer to be audited. The Queen's Printer audited the account and concluded that even at the extraordinary prices which were allowed by the Government for this work by outside printers, he was only entitled to $434.74. But Mr. Hett was not satisfied with the payment, and he entered into communication with the department over which the Minister of Agriculture presides, asking that they reconsider this matter. I have in my possession the letter which was written in reply to Mr. Hett regarding this matter by Mr. John Lowe, who was then the secretary of the department, and who now, I believe, is Deputy Minister. I have a copy of this letter which I will read:

"DEAR SIR—The amount of your account as audited by the Queen's Printer, was $434.74, of which amount $400 has been paid to you—the balance being retained for 2,200 pamphlets respecting which you wrote on the 20th ultimo that the covers had been spoiled, and we do not seem to have received them since. With respect to the paper for the covers, I may say that if this was spoiled while in

actual use, we would not hold you responsible for it, but would send you other paper."

Now here is the extraordinary part of the letter:

"As respects the copyright, and referring to your letter which I received to-day, I do not see that it is necessary to make an actual registration of the copyright, but you might still assume it to be your property, and we purchase it from you. You mention also that you would sell us the electrotypes of the entire German pamphlet. Would you kindly inform me at what price you value these. I ask this question because the amount of your account was originally $750.60 while the audit of the Queen's Printer did not allow you more than $434.74, making a difference of $316.86, which is the amount I wish to pay you. Perhaps the electrotypes and the copyright might be included in this amount. $316,86 would be a little high for the copyright alone of that pamphlet. Please write me by return of post, and I will endeavour to have the matter settled with you as soon as possible.

(Signed) "JOHN LOWE."

Well, in referring to the Auditor General's Report for that year, I find for the year ending 30th June, 1887, an account which I presume is the account I speak of, because the figures are exactly alike, from the Berlin *Gospel Banner* for 50,000 German pamphlets, and I find that the copyright and the electrotypes were paid for at the price which was mentioned in this letter, and the total amount of $750.60, the original account rendered by Casper Hett, was paid in full. Now, the committee will perceive that the Queen's Printer is an officer entrusted with the auditing of all these accounts, and that no account which is not audited by the Queen's Printer is afterwards to be paid by the Government. He is the authorized officer to do this work. But when the now Deputy Minister, then the secretary of the department, discovered that Mr. Casper Hett was not going to get the full amount of his account, he displayed this extraordinary zeal, and instigated Mr. Casper Hett, and inspired him with the idea that he could get paid if he would just follow his instructions; and he wilfully and deliberately took this account—assuming that he was the owner of the copyright of this pamphlet when he knew that he was not the owner of it—and instructed Mr. Hett not to register the copyright, but he might assume, he says, that it was his property, and the Government would buy it from him. Then he goes on to tell him that he might sell the electrotypes of this pamphlet, which I suppose would be of no use whatever, worth about 8 or 9 cents a pound for old type-metal, because then the pamphlet had already been worked off, and these pamphlets I do not suppose were ever duplicated. Here we have an official of the Government, who is now Deputy Minister of that department, and a man who was then secretary of the department, instructing this man how he could get round this audit which was made by the Queen's Printer of this account, and he deliberately tells him that if he will follow out his instructions he will be able to cheat the Government out of $316.86. He says: That is the amount, and I want to pay you, notwithstanding the fact that the Queen's Printer had audited the account and insisted that $434.74 was the total amount which this man was entitled to get for his work. Now, I think that this was a deliberate fraud, not only on the part of Casper Hett, but on the part of the secretary of the department, when he instructed that man how he was to perpetrate this fraud, how he was to circumvent the Queen's Printer and to secure the payment of $316 which he was not entitled to by following out instructions. I do not know whether the Minister or the department was conversant with these facts, I do not know whether we are to hold him responsible for the acts of his Deputy Minister, but I think the country will hold him responsible for such acts, and if he was not fully informed with regard to these transactions he ought to be fully informed and he ought to have held the hand of his secretary when he was penning this letter to Mr. Casper Hett telling this gentleman how he could defraud the Government out of $316. It is not a large amount, but it is a fair sample of the way in which the money voted by this Parliament for immigration purposes has been expended. This matter is a serious one and it is one which requires investigation on the part of the department. If it is proven conclusively, as I believe it can be, that this is a genuine document—I have every reason to believe that it is a genuine document—and if it is so established by investigation on the part of the department, then I say that this man, John Lowe, who is now Deputy Minister, is no longer worthy the confidence of the Government, and that he ought to be discharged from the position which he holds. A man who in his capacity as an important officer of this Government wilfully and deliberately writes to a man who is performing work for the Government and whose account had been audited and fixed at $434.74; and who wilfully writes to that man, and points out to him the way in which he might cheat the Government, is not worthy to be continued as an officer in any department of the Government. I have referred to this matter because I thought it well to show that the closest supervision should be had over this expenditure. We are voting large sums of money every session to secure immigrants for this country, and if the money which we vote is wasted in this way, and in the way which was pointed out last night by giving to a newspaper proprietor in Montreal $2,000 for a lot of old newspapers, it is time that we should look to what we are doing. These old newspapers were printed and left over as every newspaper man knows week after week, and after they had accumulated for three years they were sold to the Government and bound and sent home as immigration literature. This case now before us is another example of the way in which this money is wasted, and I ask the Minister to explain how it comes that he allowed his secretary to thus instruct this man how to perpetrate a fraud upon the department over which he presides.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Chairman, I think it is hardly fair for the hon. gentleman to bring up a matter that is now six years old.

Mr. LISTER. It does not make any difference.

Mr. CARLING. It makes this difference, that I do not think that he can expect, or that the committee can expect, that I can give him an explanation of a matter that happened six years ago. The hon. gentleman will let me have the letter, and I certainly will enquire into the matter and see whether it really did take place or not. I would like him to hand me the letter—I am entitled to have it as he has read it to the House—but it is not fair to the Deputy Minister that this statement should be made without Mr. Lowe having an opportunity of explaining, as he can no doubt explain, what was done on that occasion. It is unfair to expect, and I do not think the House

does expect that I, as head of the department, can explain an account that was paid so long ago as the date mentioned.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I hardly expected that the Minister would be able to explain it. He says it was unfair for me to bring the matter up here, but I would like to point out to the committee that this is the only place where this matter can be investigated. If I had moved in the Public Accounts Committee to have this account of Casper Hett submitted, the probability is that the committee or the House would have refused to allow me to have the matter investigated, because it was an old affair. Here, when we are discussing the expenditure for immigration purposes, I think I was perfectly in order in bringing this matter up, and I think if Mr. Lowe has any defence he will have an ample opportunity of putting it before the Government. I do not think it can be charged that I have taken any undue advantage. This is a public matter and if we are not to discuss public matters affecting the expenditure of the country from any delicate feeling of offending some gentleman who may have a situation in one of the departments, then we might as well quit discussing these appropriations altogether. We are here for the purpose of discussing this kind of expenditure, and I cannot see that I could resort to any other course than the one I have now taken.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) is bound to hand over to the Minister of Agriculture a copy of the letter which he has read to the department this afternoon. The Minister of Agriculture must remember that the letter purports to come from an officer of his department, and under the rules and regulations of that department, if it is carried on in a business-like way, as I suppose it is, a press copy of the letter must be in the department, and all that the Minister can ask for from the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) is that he should give the name and date of the letter. If the letter is not to be found in the records of his department then it bears the appearance of impropriety on the face of it. If it was a proper transaction on the part of the Minister's present deputy, and his then secretary, that letter ought to appear in the letter books of the office. If it does not appear there, then I repeat it is incontestable evidence almost that at the time he penned that letter he knew he was guilty of an impropriety. One can hardly imagine an officer of the Government occupying a high and important position, next in importance almost to that of the Minister himself, lending himself to a wretched little piece of fraud, because it bears no other name, like that which my hon. friend has presented to this House. This country and England and Ireland have been flooded with the most worthless pamphlets that it is possible for a Government or individual to issue.

Mr. CARLING. That is your opinion only.

Mr. LISTER. That is my opinion, and I have seen them, and I venture to say it is the opinion of any impartial man who reads them.

Mr. CARLING. No, it is not.

Mr. LISTER. They are in the majority of cases simply ridiculous. The whole country is flooded with pamphlets, not for the purpose of attracting immigration to Canada, but for the purpose of providing pap for the greedy and hungry supporters of the Government throughout this country.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman knows that the pamphlets are all printed by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. LISTER. This one was not.

Mr. CARLING. That was six years ago. The hon. gentleman must know that the rule adopted now is that all printing shall be done by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. LISTER. I understood from the hon. gentleman's statement that the farmers' delegates pamphlet was to be printed in England. That is one pamphlet which has not been printed at the printing establishment in this country, and I know not at how late a date the hon. gentleman changed the rule of giving the printing of these pamphlets to the obscure little sheets throughout the country which could not get a decent living if they were not enabled to charge exorbitant rates for the printing of this literature. One can scarcely conceive of a more miserable device than that pointed out by my hon. friend for the purpose of getting out of the treasury of this country the paltry sum of $316. Why should the secretary suggest to this individual the plan of selling something that he did not possess, the copyright of that little pamphlet, which was of no value to any one except to the Government, and not even to the Government, because I think it is perfectly apparent that the Government never issued a second series of the pamphlet. In addition, for fear that the matter might not look exactly right, this worthy secretary suggests that they should put in the electrotype, worth, as my hon. friend says, about 8 cents a pound; and strange to say the price put upon this precious article was exactly the balance of this individual's account originally put in for the printing of these papers. Now, if this little matter is found out, it is not a violent presumption to suppose that there has been a good deal more of this kind of business going on in that precious department; and if this kind of thing is going on there, it is about time the Government changed the department, at all events so far as immigration is concerned, and that the routine work of that department—I do not pretend to say that the Minister himself had any knowledge of this—were placed in other and I hope better, hands than it has been in the past. I agree with my hon. friend in saying that it is the bounden duty of the Minister to investigate this matter, and if it turns out to be true that this gentleman has suggested to this needy publisher the way in which he could get his little account paid, then I say that officer is not a proper person to be in the employ of this Government. It is his duty to economize the funds of the people of this country, and to look after them with more care than he would his own. He may spend his own funds with any prodigality he thinks proper; but the country expects him to deal with the public moneys entrusted to him with economy and with honesty.

Mr. CARLING. I think it is to be regretted that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has made the statement he has to this House. The pamphlets that are being printed by the Government and distributed in Great Britain, and on the continent, and the pamphlets and re-

ports which we have distributed, are worthy of any country, giving as they do a description of the country and its resources, and the hon. member stands up and says that they are worthless trash.

Mr. LISTER. I say so now.

Mr. CARLING. I do not think the hon. gentleman has read the pamphlets.

Mr. LISTER. I have glanced over them, but I would not take the trouble to read them.

Mr. CARLING. Although the hon. gentleman has not read them, he says they are trash. I think that is unworthy of an hon. member of this House.

Mr. LISTER. In answer to the hon. gentleman's hot remarks, I would say that I have not read all the pamphlets. I glanced over a good many of them, but it would require more patience than I possess to read them through. I have said, and I repeat—not in any unkindly spirit to the hon. gentleman—that I do not think all of these so-called immigration pamphlets that I saw, with the exception of one relating to Manitoba, are worthless; and I think this is the proper place for me to express my opinion on the subject, if I have an opinion, so that this sort of thing may be stopped. Many thousands of dollars have been wasted in the publication of these useless pamphlets; and I am sorry to say that thousands of dollars have been expended for the purpose of bringing people to this country, while the census shows that we have not kept the immigrants that we have brought here; we have lost them all, and a good many besides. We are paying shipping companies and shipping agents for the purpose of bringing immigrants to Canada.

Mr. CARLING. Are we paying shipping companies.

Mr. LISTER. You are paying a *per capita* allowance to heads of families and to members of families who come to this country. You have taken no precaution before the payment of that money to see that these people would become permanent settlers.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware that we are paying shipping companies to bring out immigrants.

Mr. LISTER. You are paying your agents, and I suppose they are paying the shipping companies. At all events you are paying the heads of families and every member of a family for the purpose of bringing them to Canada, and then they only stay here a few days. The census shows that you have utterly wasted $100,000 to bring immigrants into Canada who have not remained here. Your statements from time to time show that you brought 800,000 immigrants into the country, and the census shows that you have lost them all and a large portion of the natural increase besides. What, then, is the use of wasting more money? You cannot point me out a rural section in Ontario where an immigrant from England, Ireland or Scotland has bought a farm in the last five years. Farms are being sold there every day, people are leaving there and going to Manitoba or Dakota or other parts of the United States, and I can safely say, speaking of my own county, that there has not been an English, Scotch or Irish immigrant in that county for the last five years who has bought farm property there. Why not stop this terrible waste of money or else adopt some other system? The blue-books show that the agents stationed in England, Ireland and Scotland, and in Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and the Maritime Provinces are all drawing large pay, living like fighting cocks upon the Government, and doing absolutely nothing. Their reports do not show that they have done anything worth keeping them there. We have expensive offices in every quarter of the country and expensive officers. Do the United States keep up these immigration offices all through their country? Are they keeping up expensive establishments in foreign countries? No. They do not depend upon such means to get immigrants. We are bringing them out by excellent immigration agents, no doubt, but we are immigration agents for the United States. There is where the money is going, there is where the people are going, and the sooner we stop the system the better for the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. This letter which has just been discovered by the hon. member for North Brant is certainly a matter of importance. The Minister, of course, has seen the letter.

Mr. CARLING. I have not seen it.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman's colleagues have seen the letter, and it is of great moment that we should have very distinct and explicit explanation with regard to how it was that the person in charge of that department should have ventured to issue such a letter to a person seeking to extract from the Dominion treasury money that he was not entitled to. That, along with many other facts revealed in connection with investigations which took place before this committee as well as before the Public Accounts Committee, go to prove that under the head of immigration enormous amounts are squandered, both in advertising and otherwise. The Minister made some reference to the pamphlets being printed by the Queen's Printer. I understood him to say last night that the department had given a very large number of these reports to be printed in London, and that they had been circulated in very large quantities throughout England, Scotland and Ireland.

Mr. CARLING. Yes, I said so.

Mr. McMULLEN. With regard to the report of the other two delegates who came out here last summer and returned last fall, it is high time that their report should be laid on the Table. We are here investigating the expenditure of money in connection with the visit of these delegates and yet that report is not before us. It was sent out to the hon. gentleman, it was laid on his desk, and notwithstanding the fact that this was in March last when we were about to assemble, he deliberately returned it to Sir Charles Tupper, and the hon. gentleman is not now able to communicate its contents. He cannot say whether in reality it was a report that highly commended Canada as a field of immigration or what else it said. It has already been hinted by some members of the committee that it contains reflections upon the policy of the Government with regard to this country. We ought to have that report and there has been ample time to have had it printed and laid on the Table. Here are two men who came out and who with no selfish interest

or desire to serve, deliberately report upon this country, and that report is not laid before us.

Mr. CARLING. Do you think we have the report?

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman say that it is not the case?

Mr. CARLING. I have said that I have not seen the report, that no member of the Government has seen it, and the report is in the hands of the High Commissioner. Not a single member of the Government saw the report. I did not lay it on my desk. It was brought to me, and I was not in a condition to look over it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, we have some reason to believe that such statements were in the report. The hon. gentleman says he is not in a position to say whether they are or not, but we have good reason to believe they are. Notwithstanding the fact that it has cost a great deal of money to bring these delegates out, the hon. gentleman is not able to tell us what the report contained. Has the hon. gentleman had a report from Sir Charles Tupper on the contents of that report, or is it to be printed in England as the other report was for circulation?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose so.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the Minister able to say definitely?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. What were the hon. gentleman's instructions to Sir Charles Tupper in regard to that report?

Mr. CARLING. As I have stated again and again, I gave instructions to return that report to Sir Charles Tupper to deal with as he had dealt with the previous report.

Mr. McMULLEN. That report was printed and circulated. Were the hon. gentleman's instructions to Sir Charles Tupper to print and circulate this report?

Mr. CARLING. My instructions were that he was to take the same course with the report of the farmers' delegates to the Maritime Provinces as he took with regard to the farmers' delegates to the North-West.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it not rather peculiar that the Minister of Agriculture has neglected to examine, or even to direct one of his subordinates to examine, that report, but has returned it to Sir Charles Tupper without knowing whether its contents are such as he would recommend to be printed or not?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It would appear to me that it is about time there was a change in the head of the department. According to the statement of the Minister to-night, it appears that the practical head of this business is not in this department, but in the High Commissioner. I have a good deal of respect for the abilities of our High Commissioner, but, if the administration of this part of Canada's affairs is to be transferred to a London office, it is about time we had some new head to the management in Canada. If a man who is on the spot with a staff of officials to help him has got to transfer this business to the London office, we should know it. Whatever may be the administration of the Department of the Interior, this business cannot get into a much worse tangle in that department than it is now in. I rose, however, not to refer to this matter, but to protest against the tone of the Minister's address on the subject of the remarks of the member for South Brant (Mr. Somerville). We are tired of hearing that, the moment we criticise the action of a Minister or of his department, we are doing something detrimental to the interests of Canada. If the members of this House are to get up only when they are ordered by the Minister of Agriculture, and are to sit down when he tells them to sit down, and are to do just as he tells us, the sooner we go home and cease to exercise our functions here the better. If we are not to have the right of a free and independent criticism of the doings of this department, and of the expenditure of the public money of the people of this country, the sooner we know it the better. It seems to have come to this, that the Government think they own this Canada, that they have supreme and absolute control of the public funds, and those funds are only to be expended according to their direction, and the moment you interfere with that smooth and pleasant current, you are injuring your country, you are traitors to your country, and then comes the waving of the old flag and the cry of disloyalty? If hon. gentlemen will turn back to the period up to 1878, and a number of us were in the House at that time, they will find that just as strong language was placed on record in the *Hansard* with reference to the administration of public affairs when it was in the hands of gentlemen who are now in Opposition as has been indulged in by members on this side of the House to-night. The question which has been brought up by my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) to-night, is a question which on the face of it deserves the careful consideration of the Minister and of his department. I do not pretend to say, and my hon. friend from Brant did not pretend to say, that the Minister should be in a position to give an explanation off-hand; but, if Parliament is not to have an opportunity of investigating and ventilating these matters, and if the Minister cannot bring his officers to book in regard to them, the sooner the public realizes that we are getting to be under an autocracy in the management of the affairs of this country, the better for all concerned. We should realize that the Opposition are here in the interests of the community, and, whether the Government like it or not, they will have to submit to criticism of those affairs.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is no doubt that the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) are in point. I think it is a duty we owe to the country to point out where the money has been misspent or not spent to the best advantage. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) was quite right in bringing a matter of that importance to the attention of the committee. Such conduct as that, supposing the statements be true, is certainly very reprehensible and should receive the severe censure not only of the Department of Agriculture but also of the whole House. There is no member of this House, if the conduct of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture is what has been stated, but would say that that man ought to be severely censured, and the Minister of Agriculture instead of objecting to the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) having brought this mat-

ter forward, should, if he desired to conduct his department as it should be conducted, be thankful to any hon. gentleman bringing to his notice such misconduct as that. There is no doubt that such a state of affairs existing in any department is dangerous not only to the country but to the Government, and the member for North Brant deserves credit for ferreting out and bringing to the notice of the House such conduct as he has mentioned. I cannot help thinking, considering the enormous amounts which have been spent for promoting immigration to this country, with the facts staring us in the face that every dollar of that money has been pratically thrown away, that we must come to the conclusion that there are a thousand more cases as bad as the one mentioned by the member for North Brant. I was astonished to find that the Minister of Agriculture has never read the report of the farmers' delegates. Is it possible that a pamphlet of such importance which has been circulated throughout the old country has never been read by the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. CARLING. I never said that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thought the hon. gentleman said he had sent it back without reading it.

Mr. CARLING. I explained that that report was sent back to Sir Charles Tupper and dealt with in the same way that he had dealt with previous reports. I said I had not read it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It seems to me most astonishing that the responsible head, and the gentleman who is responsible to this House for the large amounts that are spent under that head, should be so negligent of his duty as that a report that was intended to be circulated all over the old country, should never have been read by him. How does he know what that report contained? How does he know that it would induce immigration to this country? His first duty was carefully to read that report, or have some person read it for him. We find that over 600,000 copies, at an expenditure of $13,000, have been circulated, of a pamphlet that he never read at all. Then I find that in circulating these pamphlets in the old country we paid $4,520.74, and we paid for postage, $3,371,22. Now, I would like to know if the hon. gentleman considers it a wise and business-like transaction for this country to make a large expenditure, not only in printing pamphlets but in distributing them over Europe, when the responsible head of the department has never read them at all.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). There is one other item, and that is the returns that we are in the habit of making in connection with what is known as settlers' effects, that is, settlers coming into Canada, and their effects passing through the customs house. For a number of years past the Americans have abandoned the system of counting people going into the United States across the frontier amongst their immigrant returns, believing that, placed as they were with a long Canadian frontier, with a population going and coming all the time, these returns were utterly unreliable. Now, if you will turn to the returns of those who were counted in as immigrants added to Canada for the last three or four years, it will appear to all of us how absurd it is to continue to count that class of people as immigrants coming into Canada to settle. Take, for example, the Quebec returns. In 1888 we had 18,466; in 1889, 19,663; in 1890, 19,654; in 1891, we had 20,852 returns of settlers crossing into the Province of Quebec from the United States with settlers' goods, and classified as immigrants coming into Canada. Now, in turning to the summary of the reports that are made by our repatriation agents who have been working in the eastern States—because you can only consult a summary of those reports for these years—in looking at the original reports for the past year, I find that the labours of these men are devoted not to bringing parties back to the older provinces, but to bringing Canadians from the United States to our North-West country. Now, it seems to me that after all, these thousands that go to swell this list are merely men who go over into the New England States for a few months, taking their effects with them and returning at the end of the season, and I think the probabilities are that the same individuals have been passing the frontier for a series of years, each year being counted in to swell the number of settlers who came back into Canada with a view of settling here with their goods. It is worthy of consideration, when the operations of this department are being revised, whether it would not be better to drop that system of noting parties who come into this country and counting them as immigrant settlers. I am aware that the returns give us the number coming into Canada from foreign countries separate from those returns of parties who pass the customs with settlers' goods, but in the official returns you will find that they are almost invariably classified unitedly as the gross results of the operations of our immigration policy. In nine cases out of ten, these figures are combined together as the results of that year's expenditure for immigration purposes. Our agents in British Columbia, in former years, referred to the difficulties in separating the ordinary class of parties repassing back and forth from the class that were going into that province to settle, and there appeared to be a process by which they sifted out about one-fourth of their whole passengers and took the balance as what might be considered immigrants coming to settle in that country. I think there is a strong reason why we should adopt the American system and drop these altogether from our returns as parties coming into Canada to settle. If there is any process by which we can retain a check upon those that are coming into our North-West Territories from Dakota and other portions of the United States we shall be glad to have some information that is correct and reliable on those heads.

Mr. BOWELL. The remarks made by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) in reference to customs returns, may be, to a certain extent, correct, but there is no system that can be devised that will accomplish the object that he has indicated, or the results which he thinks should follow from the keeping of a full return of those who come into the country. He is quite in error in supposing that the same system prevails in Canada that prevails in the United States in reference to the noting of persons crossing the border as immigrants into their country. It will be remembered that a few years ago when this question was under discussion, affidavits were produced from parties living at Port Huron, and also at Point Edward, that the system that prevailed in the United

States, and which was afterwards abandoned as being utterly unreliable, was to count every passenger that crossed from Canada into the United States and add them to the list of immigrants going to that country. On the contrary, there has been no system prevailing in Canada other than this: That a man alone, or with a family, entering Canada with settlers' goods, has to make an affidavit that he is coming into Canada to reside with the goods which he is bringing with him, thus bringing within the clause in the Customs Act which permits the importation into this country of settlers' goods free of duty. These are the only persons who have been returned to the Customs Department and reported to the Agriculture Department as parties who came into the country as settlers. The hon. gentleman, however, is quite correct in saying that in many cases Canadians have left Canada and gone to the United States, and remained there for a certain length of time, and then on returning claimed the privilege of free admission for whatever effects they might bring back. In some cases it is found that these effects have been purchased within the limits which prevents the free importation of goods. There are other cases in which they have returned to Canada before the expiration of one year, and their effects are admitted free, so that to a limited extent the remarks made by the member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) may be considered correct. I agree with what the hon. gentleman says that it is highly desirable that we should have as correct returns as possible, but I venture to assert that there is no system that can be adopted better than has been in force here, or that greater precautions could be taken than have been taken by the Customs Department since I have known anything of its working, in order to have the correct returns made in the manner I have indicated. There are other settlers from Northern Dakota or Minnesota, who originally left Manitoba, settled in these states and remained there for six months and sometimes for two years and sometimes longer, and then returned to Manitoba, and they claimed the same rights as settlers. They certainly were immigrants in that sense of the word on returning here, although they had previously gone to a foreign country. The only possible means to carry out the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman would be to ascertain where these people were born, where they formerly lived, and to eliminate from the list of immigrants who come into this country those who had previously lived in Canada. That is really the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, but he will see from the explanation that I have made that the system which prevailed in the United States was altogether different from that which prevailed in Canada, because we know that the system of the United States in reference to the statistics on this subject was to set down as an immigrant almost every traveller who crossed the border. I know no better system that could be adapted so far as Canada is concerned, than that which has prevailed in the past. I may say that I listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks a few moments ago with some little degree of astonishment and surprise when he stated to the House that unless they, the Opposition, could discuss matters thoroughly they had better go home, as the Government seemed to own the country and that they objected to any criticisms. I certainly have not heard any objection on this side, to fair, legitimate and even improper criticism of the items. If a stranger were to read the remarks made by the member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) on this subject, he certainly would come to the conclusion that there was such an immense and powerful majority in this House, not only numerically, but every other way, that it prevented a free discussion of every item which comes before Parliament. I am under the impression that so far as this particular item of immigration is concerned, we have had three days discussion on it already. One day no item was passed at all, and the next day two items were passed. We have been for two days and two nights up to the present time discussing this question, and yet the hon. gentleman states that gentlemen opposite are prevented from discussing this question as they ought to discuss it. I confess I do not know how much more liberty men can possibly have in any part of the world than we enjoy here, and particularly in the discussion of estimates. I am sure that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) must have misunderstood the Minister of Agriculture, when he said that the pamphlets referred to had been circulated already, and that the Minister had never read them. I heard the Minister of Agriculture say that he did not read the reports to which the attention of the House had been called. I confess I never read them, and I do not know anything about them, but I do say that if they were of the character indicated by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) I would, if I were Minister of Agriculture, suppress them at once. I would not allow reports to be published which were derogatory to the country, or which reflected upon its institutions, or upon any policy which might be adopted by the majority of the people. I do not hesitate to say above board that I would suppress them without a moment's thought. These delegates were brought to the country, not for the purpose of criticising our institutions nor to find fault with the policy of the majority of the people, or to say whether we should have a system of incidental protection or free trade. That is a matter on which they had a right to have their own private opinions. They came here and their expenses were paid for the purpose of visiting this country to ascertain whether it was a country, in which the overplus of population of the old country could settle with advantage to themselves. If they made a report that it was not a country fit for settlement, owing to its fiscal policy or for any other reason, and if such report were sent to me as head of the department, I would at once act on the principle that I have indicated to this House, and not publish it. I would not permit these delegates who had been brought here at the expense of the country to make any report and circulate it at our expense if it were intended to injure the country. The contrary principle to this may be the one on which my hon. friend thinks this country should be governed, but it is certainly one for which I would not hold myself responsible, nor would I be a party to it if I knew it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would you pay their expenses?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly, just as all other delegates were paid, but that is no reason, if they made a report which would injure the country,

that we should put an additional expense on the country in enabling them to print and circulate it. I am quite sure that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) would not do so either, because I think he is too much of a patriot and likes his country too dearly to do anything of the kind. If he had the misfortune as a responsible Minister of this country to bring delegates to it, and if they should make a report to him and he should read it, and he thought it was of a character that was going to injure the country, I question very much if he would publish it to the world in order that it might do that mischief.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did they make such a report ?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know. I did not say so. I never heard of such a report.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was it not submitted to the Minister of Agriculture ?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know. I am telling the House distinctly what I as a member of the Government would do individually if it came before me.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You would not send it back without reading it ?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know what I might do. I am very much inclined to think that if the hon. gentleman wrote me a report I might do as the member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) did. I might not have the time, or not think it worth reading. Referring to Mr. Lowe's letter, which I have not seen before, I fully agree with the remarks made in reference to it. It is an improper letter for any deputy-head to write, and I am satisfied that the Minister of Agriculture and the Government of which he forms a part, will see that the deputies do not write letters of that kind, or if they do that they will receive what they ought to receive after it has become known. If the Government paid for the writing of that pamphlet, then the copyright belonged to the Government, and I do not hesitate to say that this letter having been made public—how my hon. friend obtained it I do not know—I think I can safely say to this committee and to the public that steps will be taken to ascertain why a deputy head of a department wrote a letter of the kind in order to extract moneys from the coffers of the country which should never have been paid.

Mr. FLINT. We have heard from the hon. Minister of War in regard to the principles that would actuate him in case a report was sent to him of which he disapproved. He has stated as Minister of the Crown that he would not have published a document of the kind he has alluded to ; but he has not stated that he would not read it.

Mr. BOWELL. No. I did not say that. Of course I would read it, otherwise I would not know that it should be suppressed.

Mr. FLINT. And I presume that a large number of the members of this House will agree that if the report of the delegates was hostile to the interests of the country and to immigration which the department desires to promote, it would not be advisable to publish it as an immigration document. But I take this ground, that the Government having invited these delegates—men of high standing and exceptional intelligence and ability—

to report on matters of this kind, it was the duty of the Government to have had that report in their archives in a position to be laid before this House, in order that the members representing the constituences of the country should be able to see the views expressed to the Government by men temporarily in their service. I think the complaint which the representatives of the Maritime Provinces particularly have a right to make before this committee is this : These delegates, who were peculiarly qualified to report on the capabilities and prospects of the Maritime Provinces, were invited to do so, their expenses were paid throughout the Maritime Provinces, they made a report, and their report is somewhere in the archives of the Government either in Canada or in London : and we contend that the representatives of the people should have an opportunity of examining that report and seeing what the views of the delegates were. If they referred to the fiscal policy of the Government, if they showed that those provinces were not desirable fields for immigration, then I think it would be only reasonable that the Government should say, we will not send documents of this kind abroad, because they may tend to check immigration ; but I think it is a breach of faith towards the representatives of the people in this House, particularly to the representatives of the Maritime Provinces, that we should not have an opportunity of seeing what the views of those gentlemen were. I hope that the impressions made on the minds of those delegates were not as strong as they have been represented to be ; but we have reason to believe that they reported to the Government that the conditions of life in the Maritime Provinces were too severe to permit them to recommend those portions of the Dominion at any rate for immigration. If they have made this statement, it agrees with the opinion of a large number of the people of the Maritime Provinces and their representatives in this House. The conditions of life in consequence of what has been termed by a prominent member of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia this iniquitous tariff, and in consequence of the enormous extravagance of the Government, the difficulties placed in the way by the failures of the Government to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, have created such a depression in the Maritime Provinces, that not only is it unlikely that immigrants can settle there with any prospect of improving their circumstances, but the residents of the country are fleeing away as fast as they can, and the reasons I have given are the true reasons for this exodus. We have in the Maritime Provinces, so far as nature is concerned, as great advantages as any other part of the Dominion. I defy any hon. gentleman to point out any territory with greater resources, a more agreeable climate, a more industrious population than the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia ; and yet in that fair valley, with all its resources, and its advantages of society, of education and of culture, we find the people leaving as rapidly as they can. Some of the finest counties in Nova Scotia have actually decreased in population in the last ten years. We have enormous fishing, mineral, forest and agricultural resources of a very superior character, and the climate of the country is unequalled. We have the benefit of those equal laws which are the proud boasts of British subjects everywhere. There is no possible complaint that can be made of

any feature of life in any portion of the Maritime Provinces except those features connected with the opportunity of the people to make a living and to prosper. These are the causes why immigrants do not come there; and I contend that the best immigration policy that this Government could have, and the best advertisement they could give the Maritime Provinces throughout the world, would be to reduce the tariff and to make an earnest endeavour to bring about reciprocal trade with our neighbours in the United States. Then we should have no reason to squander enormous sums to induce immigrants to come from abroad, because the circumstances of the people would be so easy and the conditions of life surrounding them so cheerful and happy that immigrants would seek our shores without this enormous expenditure of money. Coming to the report of the farmers' delegates, I think the committee has had before it enough information to justify it in bringing the Ministers before the bar of public opinion for not publishing this report. We do not ask them to publish the report if it is against the interests of the country, but we do claim that it should be laid before the House for the information of the members, so that we should have an opportunity of seeing it and judging whether it should be published or not. We have had placed before the House, notably the last time it was in committee, some reasons from the Government side why the immigrants from abroad had not remained in the country, why intending immigrants in the old world had declined to come to Canada, and why a large proportion of our people had from time to time left the country and are now leaving the country to go to the United States. I think of all the absurd reasons ever given to a legislature, the most absurd was that given by the Minister of Agriculture the other night, that it was in consequence of the speeches made by the Opposition. Arguments of that kind may do very well as jocularity in a bar-room, or a hotel corridor, or at an excited public meeting where people are only too ready to grasp at anything for the sake of turning an argument; but as a serious argument in Parliament, it is not worth a moment's consideration. It seems to me puerile, in the face of the difficulties people have to overcome, in face of the conditions surrounding them, owing to the failure of the Government to extend our trade, to say that the exodus is due to speeches of public men. I defy any hon. gentleman to point to one address of any leading man in Canada, in which either the resources of the country, its capabilities, climate or the opportunities it affords for advancement, have been decried or in any way made light of. Wild charges are made that public men have run down the Dominion, but let us have some quotations from their speeches in proof of such charges. If any such speech did exist or any such statement, hon. gentlemen opposite would be only too glad to place it in the most glaring light possible before the people on every opportunity. But no such statement can be found. I will tell hon. gentlemen, however, what does exist, and that is free criticism of the policy of the Government, free and full discussion of the effects of their policy. It is the duty of members of the Opposition to see how the moneys have been expended, to see where the promises of the Government have been unfulfilled. We know that these gentlemen made magnificent election promises that when placed in power prosperity would be the rule, and the exodus would be stopped. These claims, made by them at a time of great depression, were accepted by the people who believed that the Government could, in some mysterious way, by the policy they propounded, bring about a new era. But now we know by hard experience that the exodus is greater than it ever was at any time during the Mackenzie regime, and that the taxation of the people has been enormously increased. We know now that our expenditure has increased threefold, while our population has scarcely increased at all; we know that the old and the weak remain at home and bear the burden of taxation, while the young and enterprising leave the country as if it were stricken with a pestilence. With regard to immigration, while we see no signs of it in the estimates before the House, there are indications in various quarters, from sources supposed to be inspired, that there will be a tremendous pressure in the next twelve months to induce some more formidable expenditure in connection with it. I warn the Government, however, that unless they revise the system, unless their agents are made more responsible, unless they can show clearly that some material benefit will accrue from the expenditure of a larger sum, there will arise, particularly throughout the older provinces, such a hostility to the whole scheme that it will have to be abandoned. It is incredible that the fair provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the wealthy old Province of Ontario, have no attractions for immigrants from the old world. It is incredible that they should have no attractions for men with £1,000 or £2,000 sterling, who could find in the fine Province of Ontario a most excellent climate, splendid soil and situation, and other attractions social and otherwise which would be appreciated by the best class of immigrants. Some other reason exists than the stale one that the Opposition speeches were driving the people out of the country. Let the Government make the conditions of life easier, let them cut down expenses, let them show that the public departments are not honeycombed with corruption, let them show that the great powers given Government and the legislature were not given them to crush political freedom and enable them to give the minority the representation which should be had by the majority. Then immigration will come in, our own population will be kept at home, and will enjoy the prosperity long promised us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Minister of Agriculture intend to make enquiry into the authority of this letter signed by his deputy, and inform us whether that letter is in the archives of his department?

Mr. CARLING. Certainly, I shall make the enquiry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is a matter which should be dealt with promptly. I desire also to know whether we are to understand that the hon. gentleman will obtain from England and lay before us the reports of these two delegates? Before entering on a discussion of this kind, we should have had these reports. I want to know what the hon. gentleman's decision is on that point?

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that the reports made in 1891 were all submitted to the High Commissioner before they were printed, and as he selected these delegates in 1891, I referred the

report to him to be dealt with and examined, as the High Commissioner for Canada. That was one particular reason why I did not go over the report and hold it, as I might have otherwise done. There was no other member of the Government who had an opportunity of seeing or reading it, or, I think, who knew anything of it until they heard about it in this House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We are now aware that there is such a report. Will you lay it before us?

Mr. CARLING. I should be very happy to do so, but I have no doubt it is now in the hands of the printers in England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A cablegram will bring it in a few days.

Mr. CARLING. But it is probably in the printers' hands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A copy can be sent.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) has challenged any hon. member on this side of the House to show any grounds why I should have stated that the speeches of hon. members opposite would have any influence on parties who emigrated from this country or on those who have been absent in preventing them from returning to Canada. It is not necessary to go into ancient history to show that their speeches would have that effect. When this question was under discussion a few nights ago, my hon. friend from North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) said :

"These gentlemen tell us, with the calm assurance which characterizes my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron), that the reason why people leave this country is that gentlemen on this side of the House decry this country. I deny the statement emphatically, and I defy them to show any statement to prove their assertion."

This was his defiant demand for any evidence that my representations were founded on fact, but, before he concluded, he himself said :

"I say that the sooner we set about endeavouring to find a remedy for this condition of things, the better it will be for the people of Canada, for I can come to no other conclusion than that if we keep on at the present rate we will see our population gradually melting away and leaving our shores for a country where the conditions are more favourable for their personal advancement."

This is the same strain with the speech of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) who has just concluded. On the same evening my hon. friend the senior member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Perry) said:

"The hon. member for Inverness must know that we have now in the United States over 2,000,000 Canadians, a labouring class of people, who are developing the resources of that country, when we should have them here assisting to build up this country. When did these go there? Did they go in 1854? I do not know of one emigrant from Prince Edward Island who went to the United States from 1854 to 1866, but I know that many Americans in that period came and settled in the Island. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that emigration from Nova Scotia is far greater now than it was from 1854 to 1866."

And he went on to show that the conditions on the other side were of such a character as to induce our people to go across the line, and that has been the tenor of all the speeches I have listened to for a period of years whenever this question of immigration has been before this House. I stated before, and I think I can prove, that the emigration that left the Dominion of Canada, or the Maritime Provinces particularly, was greater during the existence of reciprocity between 1854 and 1866 than the emigration which left this country at any other period of its existence. When this question was under the attention of Parliament in 1880, it did not occupy much of its attention. At that time, it was pointed out that the census was not of a reliable character, that the entries in the customs were not reliable, but it was agreed on all hands that it could not be remedied. No one felt compelled to change from the *de jure* to the *de facto* system. However, in 1890, when this question was under the consideration of the House, it was pointed out by the hon. members opposite, and particularly by the hon. member for Quebec, the senior member for Queen's, P.E.I., and other hon. gentlemen on that side, that it was necessary to change the system, to abandon the *de jure* and come as near to the *de facto* system as possible. I felt at the time that, if an approach were made to the *de facto* system, the result would be disappointing to the people of this Dominion, but the Minister of Agriculture consented to adopt the system which was suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that was concurred in by all those who were then in attendance. The Minister of Agriculture said :

"There was no fixed time in the Order in Council, but instructions were given each enumerator to consider those who were absent on employment during the summer as temporarily absent, and to include them as belonging to the house. The enumerators are sworn, and receive instructions as to how the census shall be taken. There may be mistakes, but I am sure every precaution was taken and will be taken that none shall be entered on the lists but those that are in the house at the time and those who are considered temporarily absent for a month or two during the summer."

My hon. friends opposite have taken advantage of the apparent decrease in the increase—if that term may be allowed—of the population of this Dominion, but there is one reliable source of information, which I believe hon. gentlemen opposite will not refuse to accept, and that is the census taken upon the other side of the line. I do not think that any gentleman opposite will maintain that the census of the United States, as far as it represents the foreign birth of residents on the other side, is not a reasonably fair representation of the emigration from Canada to the United States. The census of the United States will prove that the emigration from Canada into that country, during reciprocity between 1854 and 1866, was greater than the emigration from Canada at any period before or since. In 1830 the number of people in the United States of British North American origin was only 2,277 ; and in 1840 the number was 31,627 ; in 1850 it was 147,711. Up to this time there was no National Policy to affect emigration from Canada into the United States. In 1860, which decade included the first six years of reciprocity, the number of British North Americans in the United States was 249,970. The increase during the first six years of reciprocity was not less than 101,259. In 1870 the number of Canadians in the United States amounted to 493,463, and this decade included the second six years of reciprocity, showing an increase 243,493. I say that in no twelve years since Canada was organized, did so many people emigrate as during that period. On a former occasion I gave reasons to show that it was not due to the National Policy, but to the free trade relations that existed between Canada and the United States in the products of the sea, the soil, the mines and the forest, that so large a num-

ber of people emigrated to the United States, when not less then 351,229 during 20 years, in 12 years of which we had reciprocity with the United States, left this country to cross the border. In 1871 the number I gave included 33,208 Nova Scotians ; that was over one-tenth of the population. From New Brunswick there were 26,364, which embraced more than one-tenth of the population of that province. From Prince Edward Island there were only 1,357 : and any person who knows that that is the garden of the Dominion can easily see why, at that time, it was not necessary for them to go abroad to seek their fortunes, because the market which reciprocity in the products of the soil had given, afforded them employment at home, and enabled them to live and to make money, as the senior member for Prince County (Mr. Perry) said when this question was under discussion a few nights ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was the increase in Canada during these years ?

Mr. CAMERON. That has no bearing whatever on the question. In 1881, there were 717,153 souls of British North American origin, residents of the United States, and I would remind my hon. friends opposite that that decade included the five years they were in power.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. During which period the agricultural population of Ontario increased seven times as fast as it did during the last ten years.

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend gets his information from sources which he has declared to be utterly unreliable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows nothing of what he is talking about.

Mr. CAMERON. I have never been characterized in my earlier days as a mixer and muddler of figures. In 1880 we had 610,090 Canadians of old Canada in the United States. We had in that year 51,160 Nova Scotians, 41,788 from New Brunswick, and 7,537 from Prince Edward Island. The most of them left during the blue-ruin reign of the Grit party in this Dominion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would you repeat those figures again ? I did not catch them.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not think my hon. friend is able to catch anything just now. The figures, then, prove that the emigration from Canada to the United States was greater, if the census of the United States is reliable, during reciprocity than it was at any other period of the history of Canada. They also prove that the emigration from this country was greater during the regime of the Grit party than at any other time. I venture the assertion on the basis of common sense that there was a less emigration during the last ten years into the United States, than during any other period in the existence of Canada, and that emigration decreased on account of the National Policy during the last decade. There is another point to which I wish to call attention. An exodus is not always a sign of blue-ruin. Emigration from the rural districts of this Dominion into the United States, is not a sign of ruin and decay. If my hon. friends opposite would only have a little patience and await the census returns of the industries of this Dominion, which are forthcoming, they will find that the population in the rural districts are in better circumstances now than they ever have been before in the history of this Dominion ; they will find that although a few young men are leaving the rural districts for the States, they are going there to better their own condition and better the condition of those whom they leave behind them. If a farmer has two or three or four sons on his farm, and it only requires the labour of half the number to operate the farm, is it not to the advantage of those at home that some of them should leave the farm to better their condition in the cities, or go to the other side of the line as our hon. friends opposite suggest that they should do. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to contradict the figures which are given from the United States statistics.

Mr. LISTER. They are not correct.

Mr. CAMERON. They are not correct in some respects, but they cannot be incorrect when they give the population of the United States by the births. I have not the slightest doubt that the number which are taken of foreign births in the United States or Canada are as correct as any portion of the census can possibly be. I venture to make another prediction which is not always very palatable to my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are these predictions ?

Mr. CAMERON. Not palatable to my philosophic friend opposite.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood my hon. friend to say that he was stating facts, but he now states that they were predictions and he is going to give us another one.

Mr. CAMERON. I said that I made some predictions which had been verified and that I would make another one now. I predicted some years ago that so long as the Grit party pursued the policy of obstruction and howling blue-ruin, that they would not obtain power, and that has been verified. I also made the prediction that they never would attain power while they were encouraging our people to emigrate, by the speeches they were making in the country and in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). My hon. friend says they are leaving the country for their own advantage.

Mr. CAMERON. I hope my hon. friend will keep calm.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a good job for the country that they are all Grits that are leaving.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, I proved that too. I believe that the census of the United States will show conclusively in the enumeration by origin of the people there, that fewer people left Canada during the last decade than left it at any other period. There is not a sensible person on the other side of the House who will not agree with me that as far as the enumeration by birth of the people of the United States is concerned, that the census of that country is reasonably correct, and that in that respect it is a better test for us to go by than our own census. We know that as a matter of fact my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) and my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Langelier) and in fact every leading gentleman opposite, proved conclusively that in the census of 1881, there were hundreds of thousands of our people on

the other side of the line at that time. I firmly believe that if the census of 1891 were taken as they were taken in 1881 and in the previous census, there would not be such a great disappointment at the results.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would my hon. friend be kind enough to say what he considers the difference in the way in which the census was taken by the Canadian Government in 1881 and in 1891?

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) and other hon. gentlemen opposite stated positively in 1890, that there were hundreds of thousands of Canadians on the other side of the line that were enumerated in the census of 1881. I agreed with him at that time and I believe that he was right. I believe that hundreds of thousands of our people living in the United States were enumerated in the census since 1881. Up to last year it would not be fair to take the census under the *de facto* system because the few who were on the other side of the line previous to that time were only temporarily absent, and when the census was taken here it was like what my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) said, that if a father were asked if a son who was twenty years away was expected to return, he would naturally say "yes." The Government of the day with that parental desire to see the children of this Dominion return held on, without a change in mode of taking the census, up to the last census, hoping that they would return.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did they do that with people who were absent for twenty years?

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) said that in 1890.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What do you say?

Mr. CAMERON. I believe that my hon. friend from Queen's was correct, and that there were hundreds of thousands enumerated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That were away 20 years?

Mr. CAMERON. He said that some who were away 20 years were taken in the census in Prince Edward Island, and I believe from my experience that he was correct. We cannot hope for an absolutely correct census in this Dominion or in the United States or in any other country where the people are floating from one side to the other, and there is no one knows that better than my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Did the census takers receive instructions from the Government to that effect? I would like to know if the Government instructed the census takers in 1881 to count people as residents of Canada who had been absent for 20 years?

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said so, and Mr. Blake said so, and hon. gentlemen opposite agreed with them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What do you say?

Mr. CAMERON. I believe they were correct. However, on the suggestion of these gentlemen, the mode of taking the census was changed, and if it had not been changed as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knows, the showing of the census would have been far different. I say that the census of 1901, which will be taken I have not the shadow of a doubt by the Liberal-Conservative party, will show that the increase during the transpiring decade will be larger than the increase during any decade since Confederation or before that time. I do not mean to say that the increase of population would be very material; but owing to the change, according to the evidence of my hon. friend the senior member for Queen's, P.E.I., the evidence of the leader of the Opposition of the day, Mr. Blake, the evidence of my hon. friend from Quebec and other leading gentlemen opposite, there were no less than 400,000 people on the other side of the line who were enumerated in the census of 1881. It is owing to the mode in which the recent census was taken that that was changed, and not in order to gratify hon. gentlemen opposite; but surely the change has given them ample excuse for trying to induce the people of this country to believe that because our people have been going across the line, the country is going to the dogs. Why, no less than 350,000 people went to the United States between 1854 and 1871, during a part of which time we had reciprocity; and yet no one would pretend to say that at that time the country was going to the dogs. It is not going to the dogs now. I have no doubt that when the report showing the industries of the Dominion will be presented to this House, it will show that the country is more prosperous now than it has been either before Confederation or since.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to refer to a few of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He took a great deal of trouble to show that we on this side are continually decrying our country. Now, I do not think that one line can be produced to show that the members of the Liberal party have decried their country. True, we have said that our country was not as prosperous as we wished to see it. We have said that a large number of our people were leaving us, not because of any natural causes, but principally on account of the policy inaugurated twelve years ago by the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches. I do not think that stating the facts in reference to the condition of the country is decrying the country at all. If I were called in to see the Minister of Militia, and I found him sick and I told him he was sick, I would not in any way be decrying his character. Now, the constitution of the country is good, and its advantages are very great, but it is sick, it is not as prosperous as it should be, and if the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat thinks that this is decrying the country, I would recommend him to read some of the speeches delivered by his late leader, Sir John Macdonald, in 1877 and 1878. If he would read the speech delivered at Sherbrooke on one occasion, he would find that Sir John Macdonald pointed out that thousands and tens of thousands of the very best people of this country—for he stated the young men and young girls—were leaving Lower Canada and going to the manufacturing centres of the United States, there to add to the wealth and prosperity of a foreign nation. If it was patriotic on his part to make such statements then, how can it be unpatriotic on our part? Then he will do well to read the speech delivered by Sir John Macdonald

in Montreal, in which he stated that we had no workmen nowadays, because there was no work in Canada for them.

Mr. CAMERON. That was the time of the soup kitchens.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And they were compelled to leave this country on account of the insane policy of the Liberal party then in power. He will do well also to read the speeches delivered by Sir David Macpherson when that gentleman travelled up and down the length and breadth of this country, stating that this country was in a desperate condition and that our people were leaving and going to the United States to find employment. He stated that there were insolvencies in the country the like of which were never known in the country before. He will do well to read the speeches of Sir Leonard Tilley delivered in 1877 and 1878, in which he will find the statement that we could not borrow money in England, because, the credit of the country was gone under the insane policy of the Liberal party. If he will read those speeches he will find paragraph after paragraph in which it is said that the people were leaving our country because it was in a bad condition under the regime of the Liberal party. This was untrue to a very large extent, and I am going to prove it to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman stated that 400,000 people went to the United States from 1854 to 1871, or in about 20 years, or about 20,000 a year. Will he follow a few figures which I will give in regard to the exodus under the National Policy? The hon. gentleman will not doubt the accuracy of the statement made in the report of the Minister of Agriculture that 886,000 immigrants came into this country who stated their intention of becoming citizens of Canada during the last 10 years. Now, taking the natural increase of our population at the same rate as that of the United States during the last decade, that is 14 per cent, it would amount to an increase of 600,000, which, added to the 886,000 immigrants, would make 1,486,000 people which should have been the increase in our population. Now, we had an increase of just 504,000, which leaves about 1,000,000 to be accounted for. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to account for them? I will sit down for five minutes if he will undertake to do so. Where have they gone? If they did not come to the country we were led astray by the statements that we supposed to be true; if they did come, the question naturally arises where have they gone? Echo answers "where?" They are not in this country. They must be in some other country. It is not likely that they went back to England, and so we conclude that they have gone to the United States. Divide that 1,000,000 people by 10, and the result is that 100,000 people went away each year under the National Policy, assuming that the figures presented us were true.

Mr. CAMERON. Will my hon. friend just have patience until the census of the United States will show the birthplaces of those who reside in the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the hon. gentleman take the figures before his eyes at present, prepared by his own Government, and will he say that those figures are untrue. What is the use of going to the United States when we have public documents prepared by ourselves. Is the hon. gentleman not willing to accept them? And will he ask us to wait until some time when he will receive from some other source a contradiction of these documents. The hon. gentleman says that the movement of the population can be accounted for largely by the number who have gone from the rural sections into the city. Now, I have taken ten cities of Ontario, the most prosperous we have, and I have taken up ten similarly sized cities in Ohio, Michigan and Indiana, the three states adjoining our own country, and I find that while our cities increased about 36 per cent, theirs increased about 63 per cent.

Mr. CAMERON. A good place to go to.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). So a good many of our people think, and the reason is they think they can do better there than at home. The hon. gentleman knows very well that it has been estimated that no less than 40,000 Nova Scotians are in the city of Boston, irrespective of the large number in Providence, Rhode Island, and other places in the adjoining states. The hon. gentleman has tried to account for the smallness of the population by saying that the system used when taking the census in 1881 was not the same as that used in 1891. He must know that the two systems are exactly the same with the exception of limiting the time of the absentee. Does he not know that Mr. Johnson, the statistician, has stated that even if the two methods were identically the same, it would not make any appreciable difference, that the result, instead of having 11·6 he would only have 12·6; and that is a small increase compared with 25 per cent on the other side of the line. Another point the hon. gentleman brought up was that Mr. Davies, P. E. I., stated some years ago that there were 100,000 in the United States who were not in Canada in the census of 1881, and the hon. gentleman says he believes Mr. Davies before he believes the Government, because, if he believes Mr. Davies was right, he must believe that the Government had not a proper system with regard to the method of taking the census. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the Government has so little understood their duty as to be unable to count our people without counting large numbers in the United States, he believes they are wrong.

Mr. CAMERON. What Mr. Johnson did say is this:

"To prevent the indiscriminate counting of absentees a time limit was introduced for the first time in the recent census. The application of this limit restricted the enumerators to taking only those persons whose ence from the Dominion or the province was really temporary. The absence of the time limit in 1881 led to considerable laxity and persons were included in the population who had been out of the country for years."

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Read the bulletin of Mr. Johnson and you will find that the difference in his opinion would not exceed one per cent.

Mr. CARLING. Five per cent.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I saw it one per cent in one of the books. There is a great difference in the immigration we get into the country and the exodus from the country. Those who leave are Canadians born and bred, whom we have educated at great cost, and who, as soon as they have received the full equipment to prepare them for the serious work of life, leave us. It is the healthy, the robust, the intelligent, the vigorous and enterprising people who leave us, and whom do

they leave behind? They leave the older people, and we have to bring in large numbers from foreign countries to supplement that loss. No one will say that one immigrant from the old country is equal to a Canadian, because even though he be physically strong and energetic he must be a few years here before he can become habituated to the work of the country, and therefore he is not as good a citizen as the average Canadian. Again we are in the habit of bringing out to this country a number of children, boys and girls, every year, and I would ask the Minister of Agriculture: Who has the inspection of those children before they come here? Are they selected by the poor-house boards or by the parties who bring them out and receive $2 a head for them? Who are the parties appointed to inspect these children as to disease and hereditary taint? Are they doctors? And by whom are they appointed, and by whom paid? Are they responsible, directly or indirectly, to the Government of Canada for their inspection and reports? I maintain that a large proportion of those children are tainted with hereditary and scrofulous diseases, and when they grow up and marry they sow the seeds of disease and immorality in our population. There is not a gentleman on either side of the House who, if he looked over the character of the children coming out, would not come to the conclusion that quite a proportion are unfit to be brought into this country. I knew just nine in our neighbourhood who were brought from the homes and adopted by people there, and every one of the nine has been a failure. Some of the girls have lost their character, and some of the boys had to be returned. They become so profligate and so dissolute that they are different from other parties, and it stands to reason that there is no person in this country who would not take greater care as to the purification of the stock in his barnyard than we are taking in the purification of the people of this country, because we import these people from the slums, yea, some of them from the reformatories to which they have been sent for crimes they have committed, and they are brought out here from those dens of infamy to mingle with our people. Any one can tell you that these children, born of dissolute, immoral and scrofulous parents, inherit to a certain extent, and although the diseases may not show in that generation, they will in a future generation, so that it is very dangerous unless there is some inspection by a Government officer, responsible to the Government for the duty he performs. This is a question of importance which I bring before the Minister, and I hope he will answer it. Of course, if they were examined by an officer of the Government, paid by the Government and compelled to report to the Government, they would have taken all the care they could, but I understand there is only an inspection made after they land in this country in many cases. It is said that any person who is found tainted is returned, but I have not heard of any case where they have been returned, and it would be a sorry thing to return a few boys or girls after they had come to our shores, and were found to be tainted with disease. It would be better to have the inspection made there by persons who would see the thing properly done and who would only send out people who were pure. It is the duty of the Government to prevent our population from being made impure by the introduction of impure blood from abroad. In reference to the letter which was read by the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), I was sorry that the necessity arose for reading it, but I compliment the Minister of Militia for the emphatic way in which he condemned any officer of the Crown who would write such a letter, and I thank him for doing it, and it adds to his reputation as being one of the most honourable men in the Conservative party.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No, I want an answer to the question I have put to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BOWELL. That question has been discussed in this House repeatedly. I think there is a good deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has said, but the subject has been repeatedly brought under the notice of the Government.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I brought it up in the Committee on Immigration and Colonization, but I should like to have an answer to the question. By whom are these children selected?

Mr. CARLING. To what children does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Those who are brought out by Dr. Barnardo and Mrs. Burt and others. There are 3,400 children brought out by these societies for whom the Government pay $2 a head, which amounts to $6,800. By whom and how are they selected, and how are they inspected?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that the children brought out by those philanthropic persons are not inspected at all. It is the pauper children brought out, that we do not pay for at all, who are inspected by the Imperial Government, and that is seen to by the High Commissioner, and our agents in Canada inspect them each year and report to the Imperial Government as to their condition and how they are getting along. The reports are very satisfactory, and there are not more than 5 per cent that have not turned out to be good boys and girls.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). With all due respect to the Minister, I think this is a very poor way of doing business in regard to this important question. He says he hardly knows who inspects them. He says that those for whom the Government pay $2 a head are not inspected at all.

Mr. CARLING. Those are all healthy children. There has never been any charge that they are not healthy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Minister says there is no inspection of the children brought out by Miss Rye, Dr. Barnardo and others. It is shown by his own report that a number of these children are taken from the reformatories of England. This year's report gives a statement of the reformatories from which they are brought. No person can impose upon the intelligence of the House by saying that children who have been guilty of some crime and have been sent to the reformatory as a punishment and then brought to this country, are the children who should come, and there should be some inspection to guarantee a certain class of children being brought to this country. Again, how can the inspectors of this country do any good by inspecting children who have arrived and remained in this country? Can we pick them up from

amongst the other children and send them back? Is it not reasonable that the inspection should take place on the ground where they are, and that the children fit to be sent out to this country should be selected, and that we should have a doctor responsible to this Government and paid by this Government so that he would give the benefit of the doubt to the Government and so that these children should be examined as to scrofulous, venereal and other diseases with which many of them are affected, if not by their own action, by the action of their parents. If the children are found pure after their inspection, they could be sent out.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware that they are inspected at all. The children that are brought out by these ladies and gentlemen are healthy children, and they are pronounced healthy when they arrive here by our agents.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Minister has not had the same experience in examining these children that I have had. I must assure him that a large proportion of them are affected with scrofulous and skin diseases, or secondary venereal diseases. I know this for a fact, because I have examined children coming from these homes; and it is no use telling the intelligent people of Canada that children gathered up in England from the slums of large cities, are coming out here without bringing with them a certain quantity of that disease from which Canadian children, born under different conditions, are free. I think if the Government have no system of inspection in England, it is their duty to establish one, so that the children coming out here, for which we pay two dollars a head, should not be taken from the reformatories of English paupers and brought over here to become criminals in our country, and to infect our population with their diseases. It is our duty to protect the innocence of our own people. Remember, also, that from the statements of police magistrates in this country this very class of children figure very largely among the criminal classes. Now, it is no use shutting our eyes to these facts. I think it is impolicy on the part of the Government not to decide at once that these children must be properly inspected, and to allow none to come in to pollute the stream of living humanity in our country by diseases of that character. I am glad I have put these questions, because it has brought out the fact that there is no inspection. I would strongly urge upon the Minister the need of looking into this matter with a view of taking some steps to see that a proper investigation and inspection is made into the physical condition of the children brought over here by public funds.

Mr. WATSON. I hope that the debate that has taken place, and the evidence that has been produced before the House, notably the letter from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture which has been condemned by the Minister of Militia, will have some good effect, and that the arguments that this side of the House have made will, at least, receive the consideration of the Immigration Department. I certainly think that the Deputy Minister, who has been attacked by members on this side of the House on different occasions, should be a responsible gentleman. It was stated last night by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) that, with all deference to the Minister, a considerable amount of dry rot exists in the agencies in Great Britain: the only exception he made was that of Mr. Dyke. I would not go so far as that hon. gentleman went last night, even if I knew Mr. Dyke as well as he pretends to know him. I would not admit, after living in Manitoba 8 or 9 years as he has, that Mr. Dyke or any one else coming from the old country, could give me information as to the wants of the people of the North-West. The hon. member for Selkirk admitted that Mr. Dyke was able to inform him of the needs of the people of Manitoba during his visit there last year. I was surprised to hear an hon. gentleman representing a constituency, who had lived 9 years in that country, admitting that a gentleman, casually visiting the province from the old country, could inform him as to the needs of the province in which he lived. Now, that hon. gentleman stated that dry rot existed among all our agents in the old country, except Mr. Dyke. As I understand it, Mr. Dyke is a supervisor, to some extent, of all the other agents in the old country. I can almost even excuse Mr. Dyke when we know that the gentleman who has practically control of the Immigration Department is the present Deputy Minister of Agriculture. I have thought for years, and I think this House must have thought for years, from the evidence given by that gentleman year after year, before the Immigration and Colonization Committee, that dry rot had set in in that gentleman long ago. It has appeared to me, and to all the other representatives of Manitoba and the North-West, that a change should be made in the deputy head. I have been attacked in the committee by that gentleman for speaking my mind in the House, when every statement that I made with regard to the immigration returns was proved by the census. Notwithstanding that we have had that gentleman year after year telling us the number of immigrants that were coming to our country, the census clearly showed that they had not come, or if they had, they were not in the country now. Then we had hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House getting up and decrying our country in apologizing for the fact of these people not being in the country. One went so far as to say that it was on account of the early frost in the North-West. Now, I do not think that language has ever been used by any of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that was calculated to do so much injury to the North-West as that. We give reasons why the people have left the country: we believe it is the fiscal policy of the Government, and that being the case, I certainly think, if they are going to retain that policy, that their whole immigration policy should be reorganized. So I think that this reorganization should not only include these agents in the old country and Mr. Dyke, but that it should also include the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. So far as the head of that department is concerned, we are going to have a change, and I hope the change will be for the better. It must be admitted that the immigration schemes of this Government in the past have been a failure; for all the money that has been spent for that purpose the results are very meagre. According to the statement made to-night by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) the people who leave our country, leave it for the country's good.

Mr. CAMERON. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman said that when these people left Canada those whom they left behind them were better off. Then why should this House vote money to bring people here to take the place of those who have left.

Mr. CAMERON. Because there are new territories to people.

Mr. WATSON. If there are new territories to people, those who have left our country ought to be kept here to occupy those territories. Then we are told that people leave the east and go to the west.

Mr. CAMERON. You discourage them from going there.

Mr. WATSON. When we take the census we find that people have left our country, young men of energy and enterprise, who, as he says, have left the country to benefit their condition. I believe they have left the country to benefit their condition, and because they are young and enterprising, and have gone to a foreign country, we must regret it, and we ought to try and keep them at home. I do not believe that all the money you spend on immigration will increase the population of Canada as it should be increased, and the people that you bring in here at a great expense to the public treasury will not replace the men who have left the country. We claim that our young Canadians of enterprise and energy are the very class of men we ought to keep here, and so far as we are concerned in Manitoba and the North-West, we know that one good Canadian is worth two or three settlers that you can bring from any country in the world. Now, in regard to these farmers' delegates, we know, from the evidence given to-night, that they had some reason for making a report against the fiscal policy of the Government, as they could not advise their friends and relatives to come to this country on account of that policy. Now, while I would like to see a large amount of money voted to bring immigrants to this country —because we must do the best we can, we have got to try something to counteract the bad influence of the fiscal policy—we should see to it that the right class of people are brought here. We have a glorious heritage in our Canadian North-West: it is the backbone of Canada, so far as her credit is concerned. But the fiscal policy of the Government is against that country, and tends to discourage immigrants from coming here from other parts of the world. I do hope that the evidence that has been offered here to-night, especially that letter signed by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture which was intended to show a man who had published a pamphlet the means whereby he could defraud the Government, will be taken cognizance of. If that Deputy Minister has been guilty of such an act, it certainly ought to be an excuse for getting rid of him. I do not know what particular ties exist between that gentleman and the Government, but I am satisfied that we cannot expect to have a proper system of immigration to Canada while we have such a man controlling the department. I have expressed myself on this matter before the Committee on Immigration and Colonization and in this House. I think that the members of this House who are members of that committee and have heard the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, who takes longer to say less than any man I ever heard speak, make his annual statements, will come to the conclusion that he is not a proper person to direct the immigration department of this country, and have under his control the expenditure of a large sum of money, after the evidence we have had here to-night over his own signature, that he showed a man how to defraud the treasury. I trust that when this immigration department is transferred to another department of the Government, that the men who made such a miserable failure of our immigration policy for the last ten years will be supplanted by abler and more active and more energetic men.

Mr. McMULLEN. I earnestly hope that the discussion to-night will have a beneficial effect. I am sure that the Minister in charge of the department will appreciate the discussion and will bring about a better condition of things during the next ten years than in the past. We are willing to spend money to bring people here if we can keep them here when they come, but it is a sad fact that the census shows that all we have brought here have left us. The Minister of War said to-night, that if the report by the delegates reflected on the general condition of Canada, he would have no hesitation in suppressing it at once. I agree with that to a certain extent, but if these men in their wisdom felt it their duty to draw the attention of the people in the old country to the fact that the policy of protection militated against the prosperity of the people here, these delegates would not have discharged their duty if they had not made known fully any objections they had to the fiscal policy of Canada. They felt it their duty to do that, and the Minister of Agriculture appears to have thought it his duty to prevent that report being laid before Parliament, and here turned it to the High Commissioner. The Auditor General's Report shows, in the amounts paid to men for trying to bring immigrants here, and for trying to locate them and repatriating those who have gone to the United States, that a great deal of this money has been wasted. You find that one W. A. Webster whom you can meet in every constituency in this country where there is a bye-election, and who is nothing but an electioneering agent, has drawn $1,928 last year as immigration agent. It is undoubtedly a misappropriation of public money to keep a man of that stamp in such a position and to charge his expenses on the country as an alleged immigration agent. The letter which has been referred to to-night, and which from the evidence on its face has undoubtedly been written by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, is a reflection upon that gentleman and upon the head of the department. A man drawing a salary of $3,200 who is supposed to guard the best interests of the people, who would lend himself to the writing of such a document showing a person how he could extort money out of the people of this country is not fit to hold his office. All these things go to show the recklessness with which our immigration system has been conducted within the past ten years. Hon. gentlemen remember the case of Têtu, the immigration agent at Emerson, which came before the committee last year. That man has now passed away, but after all we should be permitted to draw the attention of the House to the irregularities which took place under his management. I may mention that I notice by the Auditor General's Report that he drew his pay up

to the 30th June last. It is proved clearly by sworn testimony before the Public Accounts Committee that the Minister had been informed that this man was extracting money out of the public treasury improperly, and that he was charging for his own brother-in-law, a man named Fournier, $50 a month for 11 months as caretaker of the office, while Fournier was away in the States, and that this man had pocketed the money by endorsing the cheques as drawn by Fournier. That witness stated that he told the Minister of Agriculture in his own office of these irregularities, but notwithstanding they were allowed to continue for 11 months, and until they came out in the Public Accounts Committee. All these things show that the management of the whole immigration system has been reckless and extravagant, and without any returns. If on this side of the House we have pointedly criticised this expenditure, it is because we feel it to be our duty to do so in the face of the revelations of the census. It is in the interest of the country that we criticise these items, and we earnestly hope that in no future Parliament will the Opposition feel called upon to bring before the House the evidence of the want of care and proper management which have been exposed to-night as well as at other times in this House. Now, I wish to draw the Minister's attention to the payment of $1,675.40 last year as salary to J. H. Metcalfe, besides $2.50 a day for living allowance for 112 days. I would like to know who Mr. Metcalfe is? Is he the man who is a member of this House? has he been in the service of the Government as an immigration agent; where did he perform the service, and what did he do?

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman knows Mr. Metcalfe as well as I do.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know him at all

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman discussed him last year very fully and freely. Mr. Metcalfe is now the member for Kingston, and he was employed frequently in the North-West, in Dakota and in Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). While he was a member?

Mr. CARLING. No, not while a member; and he did good service in inducing immigration to the North-West. I think we succeeded last year in bringing two or three thousand people from Dakota; and the seed having been sown, we expect still better results this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman state what particular qualities Mr. Metcalfe possesses to fit him to be an immigration agent? Does he speak French or German?

Mr. CARLING. It is not necessary that he should speak French or German. He is a man like Mr. Webster, whom I think the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, there is not a bye-election held at which Mr. Webster is not present working for the Government.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Webster has done good service for the country. I do not know any man who has done more in Dakota than he has in turning the eyes of the people of that state, especially Canadians, to the advantages of our own North-West. Mr. Metcalfe has been equally energetic in inducing people from the western States to come to Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. All I have to say is that I consider it an injustice to keep a man like Mr. Webster to go around to the bye-elections. I am satisfied that he has not rendered service to this country for the money he has taken as an immigration agent. The appearance and address of the man, and everything about him, are not such as to reflect credit on this country, and I would not take him to be a man who would make a very active immigration agent. He is capable of talking a good deal in his own way, but I do not believe he is at all a success as an immigration agent. With regard to Mr. Metcalfe, he has been a member of the Legislature of Ontario in opposition to Mr. Mowat, and when he has not been there, this Government has employed him and sent him to Dakota. Is that because he has no other way of living? Now, if the hon. Minister wants to prevent lengthened discussions of items of this kind, let him bring evidences that the money we vote is properly expended; and if without that he thinks we are going to allow items of this kind to go uncriticised he is very much mistaken.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I made a statement with reference to the sources from which the children I referred to were taken. I stated that a number of them were taken from the reformatories of England. I have here the report of the Minister of Agriculture for 1888, and on page 27 I find a table under this heading: "The folllowing statement shows the number of immigrants, chiefly children, brought to Canada under the auspices of charitable societies and individuals during the last six years:—Kingswood Reformatory, Bristol: Dr. Barnardo, London; Redhill Reformatory, Falthham Reformatory, Bedfordshire Reformatory, Suffolk Reformatory, Oxford Reformatory, Ruxton Reformatory." From these were taken, in 1888, 59 children who were brought to this country and on whom we paid $2 each. Fifty-nine juvenile criminals taken from England.

An hon. MEMBER. Not at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No person is put into the reformatory unless for some simple crime. Therefore these children may not be very deeply dyed criminals, still they have the elements of criminality in them, and they will sow the seeds of criminality in the country. I do not think they are a class which ought to be brought out, and I draw the attention of the Minister to it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would vote this item readily if the results were not so disappointing. It is very disappointing that we should have gone for years expending such large sums and then when we take the nation's stock and count our assets find that we are short and have done an unprofitable business. It is a matter of regret to me that we should have to expend money to secure settlers for Manitoba and the North-West, while at the same time we are losing so many of the older settlers of Canada. If there is any way by which we could induce those who feel impelled by circumstances to leave the province in which they live, to go to portions of the Dominion where they would have opportunities for bettering their circumstances more favourable than the States, it seems to me

we ought to endeavour to do so. It seems to me that pamphlets distributed among the farmers of Ontario and the other provinces, drawing the attention of the great possibilities in Manitoba and the North-West and the many openings for investment and enterprise in British Columbia, that would tend to the welfare and benefit of the people and prevent Canadians from going into the United States. It is to be regretted that while we are trying, on the one hand, to induce people to come from the older countries and settle here, on the other hand, the best of our people are crossing over to the United States from some cause or another. I was only too glad to hear the Minister state that 2,000 Canadians had been brought from Dakota during last year. If that be an actual fact, I do not begrudge the money spent in bringing them over, but it would be money better spent had it been used in the first instance to direct their attention to their own country. If we could impress on the minds of our people the fact that there are many opportunities for benefiting their condition in Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia, much greater than the reare on the other side, and thus turn their steps in that direction, we would be doing a good work. I do not desire the Government to unsettle the ideas of people located in the older provinces, but if those who feel impelled to remove by circumstances had their attention turned in that direction it would be to the benefit of the whole country. Mr. Dyke says that in the United States the fact there have been so many settlers from the old country who have sent back money to their friends to bring them out, gives the United States a great advantage over us, and besides there is a large proportion of foreign population in the United States that we have not in Canada, and he suggested that a plan should be devised by which parties located in Manitoba and the North-West could be granted a sum of money to defray the expenses of some of their particular friends they wanted to bring out from the old country. It is worthy of consideration, but I do not endorse it, not having sufficiently thought the matter over. It would be better perhaps than instead of letting agents be the means of bringing out immigrants. As those brought out in this way we could rely on remaining here, which we cannot do in the case of those who receive the $10 per head or $5 per head on arriving at Winnipeg which they can use and pass on to British Columbia or Washington Territory. This item no doubt will be agreed to by the committee and I hope the Government will be more successful than they have been in the past. It is most desirable some way should be devised by which we could induce those living in the older provinces to remain within our borders where there is plenty of land and good prospects. I trust we may be favoured in that country with a large crop this year again, and I trust that the rich mineral wealth of British Columbia will be developed more and more and that there will be an increase in the population there, as I believe there has been. I know that many have turned their steps in that direction lately. I trust that employment will be found for them there, that the country will be opened up, and that we may obtain better results in the future. It has been most discouraging, not speaking at all from a party point of view, to find, whatever the cause may be, that, when we have expended so much money for immigration purposes, our increase of population has been so small. The figures of the Agriculture Department may be wrong, but certainly there have been some immigrants who have come into the country during the last ten years. Even if not one had come, and our own natural increase had stayed with us, we would have had a larger increase to our population than the census returns tell us we have. It is I think in view of these discouraging facts that this discussion has arisen, and I think it is the duty of the Canadian Parliament to find out what the cause is for the depopulating of the country. There must be some cause for it, and, if it is in our power to remedy it, it is our bounden duty to do so, no matter on which side of the House we may sit.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister of Agriculture how the agent was employed in North Dakota. I can understand how an agent may be employed in Liverpool or in the rural districts of England, going about addressing public meetings and so on, in order to encourage people to emigrate to this country, but in what way could the agent be employed in Dakota? Did he go to the various farm houses where people were just settling to induce them not to settle, or to people who had just purchased lands to induce them to abandon the lands and go to Manitoba? In what way did he perform duties as an agent to induce immigration from Dakota into Manitoba and the North-West? I confess that I see a very great deal of difficulty as to how it would be possible for that party to go into a new country which was just being settled up and to act as an immigration agent to bring the people of that country to Canada. The Government must have a policy in this respect, and I should like to know if this party was sent there in good faith to promote emigration from that territory into Canada?

Mr. O'BRIEN. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read the statement given by Mr. Webster to the Committee on Immigration and Colonization, I think he would have come to the same conclusion as I did, and other hon. gentlemen from this side of the House also did, that that gentleman showed a great amount of ability and shrewdness, and that his methods were eminently successful. Of course his manner and style did not happen to suit the refined taste of the hon. member for Wellington. We can understand that a man must be very perfect in these particulars in order to come up to the refined standard which that gentleman would apply to all the servants of the Crown. As to Mr. Webster being given to talking, perhaps that is a fault with which the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) might sympathize to a certain extent. Never having seen him before, I came to the conclusion that the methods he employed were suited to the work he has to do, and that he was just suited for the work he undertook. I do not think any money has been spent by the Department of Agriculture which was more successful, and attended with better results than that spent on Mr. Webster.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member may have been satisfied. I have not been.

Mr. O'BRIEN. You have not read his report.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The report of Mr. Webster is not the report of Mr. Henry Smyth or of Mr. Metcalfe, and I have put a question to the Minister of Agriculture as to the general policy of the Administration, what instructions were given and what methods were adopted to obtain immigration to Manitoba from Dakota?

Mr. CARLING. Perhaps my hon. friend is aware that there are some 20 or 30 agents from the United States travelling in Ontario and different parts of Canada now, all the time trying to induce our people to go to the United States.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They are agents of railway companies and not of the Government.

Mr. CARLING. We are aware of agents who are sent here with literature to do anything they possibly can to persuade our people to leave Canada and go to the United States. We found that there were a great number of people in the western States, and especially in Dakota, who were not satisfied with the country they were in, and most of them were Canadians and people who had come from the old country. We sent Mr. Webster there to visit that country, and he travelled hundreds of miles. He stopped at farm houses, at agricultural fairs, and at places of public resort. He met the people and found they were discontented and dissatisfied, and he pointed out the advantages we had to offer to them in the North-West, and took some of them with him—quite a number of prominent men who lived in the State and in whom the people had confidence—to Manitoba and the territories, and showed them what kind of land we had there and what inducements we had to offer, and I am glad to say that mostly all of those who were taken there, went back and reported favourably of our country. We have by that means induced last year between 2,000 and 3,000 to go into Manitoba, and, as I said a short time ago, we expect a much larger number from the western States next year. That is the kind of work that Mr. Metcalfe was employed to do, and Mr. Webster has been aiding him, and we have now 10 or 12 parties who have been in the western States during the last three or four months, who are reporting in the most encouraging way as to the movement in the western States towards Canada. I do not think, if the hon. gentleman were at the head of the department, he could do anything better than we are doing in showing the people who are dissatisfied that we have a country much better than their own, and that they can do much better in that country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The parties to whom the hon. gentleman refers, are agents of railway companies in the western States who are operating in Canada. These parties go to Toronto and other centres of population where they meet large numbers of farmers coming to market on market days, and they seek an opportunity of discussing these matters with them.

Mr. DALY. Just what Mr. Webster does.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But, at the time the Minister sent Mr. Webster, and Mr. Smith, and Mr. Metcalfe into Dakota, Dakota had no such large centres of population, and affords no such opportunities of meeting with the people from rural districts as that which is afforded in the cities and towns of an old settled province like Ontario. I could understand how an immigration agent at St. Paul, or Chicago, or Milwaukee, might meet large numbers of the agricultural population.

Mr. DALY. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that if he wanted to see the agriculturists of the County of Middlesex, he could choose any place as favourable as the city of London? The larger the city is, the larger the number of the rural population to come in from the surrounding districts. He has an opportunity of meeting in a day a larger number than he would meet in a month if he went into the country where the population was sparse. So if the western States are to be made a field in which immigration operations are to be carried on, then it is of great consequence that the House should not simply be told that there are agents in Dakota, or in Minnesota, or out in the Deadwood country, but that the House should be informed where these localities are in which these persons ary carrying on their operations. It does seem to me that if you undertake to send agents into a new country where the population is sparse, you are sending agents into a district where there will be the largest amount of labour with the least possible results.

Mr. DALY. A pamphlet has been published for circulation in Dakota, Minnesota, Michigan and other States, signed by G. H. Campbell, General Immigration Agent of the Government, and in that pamphlet are contained a number of reports made by the delegates that were taken over from South Dakota to Manitoba and the North-West by Mr. Webster and the other agents. Here is a report from the delegates from Dakota who visited the Canadian North-West in company with W. A. Webster, during May and June, 1891. The report says:

"We, the undersigned, farmers of South Dakota, owing to the repeated (and almost total) failure of crops, have made up our minds that we must emigrate somewhere, and after hearing the description of the agricultural resources of Manitoba and the Canadian North-West by W. A. Webster, Dominion Immigration Agent, and A. F. Holmes, colonization agent, decided to visit and personally inspect these provinces, not only in our own interests, but also in the interest of very many of our neighbours. Accompanied by Agent Webster, we left Aberdeen, South Dakota, May 14th, reached Winnipeg May 15th, spent a day examining that fine substantial city of 28,000 inhabitants. We visited Brandon, which is the centre of a grand wheat-growing region. Visited the Government Experimental Farm, saw here samples of grain, grasses, trees, shrubs, and saw their system of farming, which seems to be most complete. We visited the well-known farm of William Sandison, who raised last year 60,000 bushels of grain; his wheat averaged 30 and oats 90 bushels per acre; his teams and outfits being the best we ever saw. After driving over this district and meeting some old friends who have made wealth farming here, we went west to Moosomin, drove over this district, which is a splendid section for mixed farming; visited the farms of J. R. Neff & Thomas Boubier, who have been farming here for the last nine years, growing from 25 to 30 bushels per acre, oats 60 bushels, and potatoes, 300. From here we went to Moose Jaw; drove over this district: splendid soil, good grass, stock living out all the year. Visited several fine farms and prosperous farmers in this district. From here we went to Calgary, a fine town of 4,000 inhabitants; with many costly buildings of freestone quarried on the spot. From here we had a grand view of the Rocky Mountains, 75 miles distant. Going north from here to the famous Red Deer District, we examined it pretty thoroughly: it is a grand stock country, probably no better known; plenty of timber, water, hay and good soil easily tilled. We found very many North Dakota farmers settled in this district. There is plenty

of free homestead land here. Turning east we stopped off at Regina, the capital of the Territories. We examined this district thoroughly: no richer soil than here. North and south of here are fine stock stations, stock living out almost the entire year: we hear nothing of hard times here. From here we went north 250 miles over a first-class railroad to Prince Albert in the Saskatchewan Valley. We examined this district very carefully: we find here plenty of timber for all purposes: water in abundance—rivers, lakes and well water of first quality, at depths of ten to fifteen feet. Rich, mellow soil, producing a luxurious growth of grasses of a most nutritious kind—in short, a first-class country for mixed farming, having good railway facilities, and where good prices are had for stock and all kinds of farm products. There is plenty of free homestead land here."

And they say at the end:

"In the interest of our friends and neighbours in South Dakota, we desire that this, our report, be printed, and circulated in the Dakotas, and we say most emphatically that the statements made by Agents Holmes and Webster to us in regard to the agricultural resources of Manitoba and the Canadian North-West, are true in every particular, as we found everything better than they represented them to us, and we wish here to tell the farmers of South Dakota that they can place confidence in their statements."

Then follow the names of the gentlemen who compose the delegation. There are numerous other reports from other delegations that went over under Mr. Webster and the other agents. Now, in regard to the methods adopted by Mr. Webster and his assistants, they merely go to the centres of population in the different counties in South Dakota: they do not go to St. Paul and Minneapolis, because those cities are not surrounded by as large farming districts as are a number of small centres of population in South Dakota. They went to Aberdeen and to other county seats in different counties of South Dakota, and saw the farmers there, and no doubt the methods adopted by Mr. Webster were the same as those adopted by the American immigration agents here. I know that he has done a great deal to direct immigration into Manitoba from Dakota. He was the pioneer agent there, and, with the others who have acted with him, has been able, as the Minister says, to bring two or three thousand people into our country. I think the methods he has adopted will bear an inspection in every particular. Every one of the delegates that have come over to Manitoba and the North-West reported most satisfactorily of our country, and have stated that the representations made by Mr. Webster were true in every particular. Now, in reference to another subject which was discussed by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) I may say in reference to the matter suggested by Mr. Dyke in the report of the High Commissioner about families sending over money to their friends in the old country to bring out immigrants, that method has been adopted in the United States for a number of years, and no doubt the greater number of the people from the United Kingdom who have gone in there, have been brought out through means sent home by their friends. Only a short time ago my colleagues and myself met the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of the Interior, and we laid before them our views upon the very subject the hon. gentleman was discussing, namely, that we thought it a matter worthy of consideration on the part of the Government whether they should not afford the assistance that the hon. gentleman has spoken of, namely, to enable the people who are located in Manitoba and the North-West Territories to send aid to their friends to bring them out here. If these people desire aid to bring their friends from the old country, it is evident they are satisfied with their lot here, and the fact of their being successful and known to be men of respectable character which it will be necessary for the Government to first ascertain, it is evident that their friends will be as good settlers as they are. I hope sincerely that the representations which are made to the Government in this particular will bear weight, and that next year we will ascertain from the Minister when this matter is under discussion again, that the Government have adopted that plan. Now with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Watson) as to what I said last night about Mr. Dyke. I simply said then, and I repeat it now, that from my knowledge of Mr. Dyke, and from the knowledge that a great many other gentlemen in this House have of him, that he is a man well fitted for the position which he holds. He is a gentleman who as a linguist has very few equals, being a master of five languages which he can speak, read and write. He has immense experience in immigration, and I repeat what I said about that gentleman being able to instruct me in reference to the North-West and British Columbia and Manitoba. Although I had been living in that country 9 years, when I first saw that gentleman and conversed with him, he was able to tell me a great many things about that country that I did not know. But of course I cannot place myself in the same category as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) who will never, at all events apparently, learn anything. I wish to tell that hon. gentleman that he can be taught a great many things he does not know about that country by people who have been in Manitoba only one year. I am prepared and willing to learn at all times. Of course I have not the advantage of the hon. gentleman opposite, and some of his friends who address this House in such grammatical language so frequently. I have a little boy of 7 or 8 years of age who can teach them a great deal. I want to inform them that there is a great deal for any man to learn about this great Canada of ours, and there is a great deal for gentlemen on the opposite side to learn. I have been living in the country (Manitoba) for 11 years and I have a great deal to learn about it, and there are a great many gentlemen on the other side of the House who have lived there a great deal longer than I have apparently and I do not think they know they live in one of the grandest countries in the world. They always try to deride our country, and to run it down, and to make us believe that if we have not the population in this country that we should have it is on account of our fiscal policy. They say that those people who are alleged to have left Canada with a tariff of 27 per cent taking it all round, have, forsooth, gone to a country with a tariff 45 per cent and 50 per cent. Could anything be more absurd? It is not our fiscal policy that has given our country away. If hon. gentlemen opposite were in power to-morrow there would be the same influx of people into the United States from Canada. We have people coming from the States here and so it will continue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not what your friends said in 1878.

Mr. DALY. No, because they had reason then to say the country was in ruin. Have we seen a soup kitchen in the country for the last fourteen years?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Lots of them.

Mr. DALY. You and your friends have been in the soup ever since and no doubt you feel the effects of it.

Mr. LISTER. You are very impertinent, Mr. Daly. Whenever you get on your feet you do not know what you say.

Mr. DALY. I beg your pardon, Sir.

Mr. LISTER. You are impertinent.

Mr. DALY. I do not wish to cross swords with the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Lister) but if there is one gentleman in this House who can be impertinent, and who has been impertinent, it is that hon. gentleman. I know him of old, and I know no gentleman in this House who can be as impertinent as he is.

Mr. LISTER. No one can surpass you, Mr. Daly, in that respect.

Mr. DALY. You take the cake, you are above me in that. Now, to come back to the subject. I do not believe that our fiscal policy has anything to do with our people going to the other side of the line. Hon. gentlemen opposite said the same thing in 1888, 1889 and 1890, and in 1891 the people answered them, and during the last bye-elections the people have answered them again by returning the Government by an immense majority. If they are not satisfied with this expression on the part of the people they cannot understand anything. They give us to understand that if they were on this side of the House *presto* change, everything would be lovely and we would have the population flowing in from Great Britain and the old country, and they would remain here. I would like to know what was the extent of the exodus between 1874 and 1878 when they were in power.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). 23,000 a year, one-fifth of what it is now.

Mr. DALY. No amount of talk from hon. gentlemen opposite will convince any reasonable minded man in Canada that the fiscal policy of this Government has had anything to do with the people going to the States.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to let the House know what that report which the hon. gentleman has read to the House has cost the country. A. F. Holmes, served for 10 months and drew $3,000 for getting up that report and securing the signatures of these men. G. H. Campbell served half a year and he drew for his services $2,050 for drawing up that little pamphlet.

Mr. DALY. He earned his money.

Mr. McMULLEN. The pamphlet which my hon. friend has read to the House cost the country $5,065. These are the two men that he trots out to-night as evidence of the emigration that is going from Dakota to Manitoba. It is simply because they are paid large sums, and they have to show the Minister of Agriculture they did something, so they come back with glowing accounts of what they accomplished and the Minister of Agriculture pays them out $5,000 of the people's money.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). I have heard a great deal about this Mr. Webster, I never met him before I met him at the Agriculture Committee and the first year he appeared there he gave us some very plausible reports. The second year he made statements that a large number of people were leaving Dakota and coming to Manitoba, and when he was cornered and asked to give the names of any he knew, he gave the names of two men who were going to leave, and that was all he could give. If you examine the reports of the Agriculture Committee you will find that that statement is correct. These are not the reports of these gentlemen themselves, but the reports that were made by the agents and signed by these individuals. Let me make a statement now with respect to what I know to be the case in respect to the Province of Ontario, and that is, that before you spend large sums of money to bring immigrants into that province you must make the country a cheap country to live in. I state fearlessly that the fiscal policy of the Government has made Canada a country in which people cannot produce cheaply. Two years ago I had a visitor from Glasgow, a gentleman at the head of the sanitary arrangements of that city. He remained some six or eight weeks in Canada, and also visited the United States. After he went home I had a letter from him, in which he told me that if he could be the means of preventing any person coming to Canada he would do it, because he said the fiscal policy of the Government was keeping the farmers in actual bondage, and they were not getting more than two-thirds the value of their labour, as it was taken from them by the policy of the Government and put into the pockets of combines and rings, a small portion going into the treasury. I have a friend who comes to this country every year to do business and who in the old country is a strong Conservative, and the last time he was here he said to me that as long as the policy of the Government was such as it was we need never expect immigrants from the old country to come to Canada. A large number of young men in the old country have come into the Province of Ontario, and have remained there one or two years, and then their friends in the United States writing to them have induced them to leave Canada and join them. I say that the fiscal policy of the Government is the sole cause. I agree with the hon. member for Selkirk that we have in Ontario one of the finest countries under the sun, but the reason immigrants do not come there is because it is a dear country to live in and produce in, and labouring people do not get the full reward of their labour. The High Commissioner in his report even strikes in a distinct manner at some of the causes why Canada is not settled. He mentions the exodus to the United States, and though he states that it is too much spoken of, he admits that it has some effect. He also says that the immigrants from the old country are very easily led. The class of immigrants we want to obtain in Canada is a class who examine everything closely before they leave, and the statements that have been sent abroad, that this country is ruled by rings and combines, that large sums of money are taken from the people that do not go into the treasury, and that many are leaving and going to the United States, are the causes why they do not come. There is another cause mentioned by the High Commissioner, who says:

"I need hardly say that the returns of the census of Canada were received here with a certain amount of disappointment, as it was expected that the population would exceed 5,000,000."

The people from other countries would naturally enquire, what is the case of such a small increase in the population in Canada? If the Government will not adopt a policy of making this a cheaper country to live in and to produce in, they need never expect that all the money they may spend for immigration purposes will bring large numbers of settlers to this country.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Selkirk say that there was a prospect of many Canadians from Dakota going into Manitoba, and I hope that the good work will go on. In ten or fifteen days Manitoba is to receive another car load of immigrants who are coming from the far east, and after I have stated to what class they belong, I do not think the hon. gentleman will say that they are very desirable settlers. I wish to corroborate the statement I made as to the children, by reading an opinion expressed in London, England, in a cablegram which came to one of the leading papers a day or two ago. It is as follows :—

"LONDON, April 28.—Fifty stalwart lads, whose ages range from thirteen to seventeen years, have just started for Canada under the auspices of the Children's Aid Society, which defrays the cost of clothing and passage, amounting to about £13 for each boy. The majority of the youths will go direct to Winnipeg, whence they will be distributed, it is understood, throughout the North-West provinces. Cynics predict, however, that the most of them will speedily find their way to the large cities of Canada and the United States, where they will be likely to resume the kind of life that has indirectly led to their expatriation. Nearly all the boys have been inmates of industrial schools, as a consequence either of crime or parental neglect. Critics of this sort of assisted immigration insist that Canada is entitled to have a better class of persons sent out from the mother country. They also complain that nobody thinks of helping lads of stainless character to get homes in the new world, the efforts of the charitable in this respect being almost exclusively lavished on persons from whom it is unreasonable to expect good results."

Mr. WATSON. I just wish to say a word and give the Government credit, where credit is due. No doubt a large number of immigrants have been induced to come from Dakota to the North-West during the past year. I hope that good work will continue. I have always claimed that we have better advantages to offer intending settlers from the old country, better natural advantages than they can find in Dakota. Unfortunately the Government policy was such that a great number of people from eastern Canada went to the western States and settled there, and they now find by the delegates who came from the United States to Manitoba, and viewed our land, that we have better advantages in Manitoba than they have in Dakota, and quite a number of people are coming from Dakota to Manitoba. As there is a large number of Canadians in Dakota, I would suggest that the same encouragement should be offered young Canadians who have gone to Dakota to come to Manitoba that are offered English settlers. They are a more desirable class of people, and I think that this gift to European emigrants of $10 apiece to actual settlers in Manitoba, to fathers of families, and $5 a head for the children, should be given Canadians who return from Dakota. There is no doubt a great many of the European emigrants assisted in this way find their way into the United States, and the money paid them will be an entire loss. I would suggest, as I did last year, that the Government should work in harmony with the Government of Manitoba, as the latter could do more, being close at hand, and could put to practical use any grant under the supervision of the Local and Dominion Government. Much better work could be done that way by sending our Government agents out to that section. It is well known there is a number of immigration agents from the United States operating in Canada. I do not believe the United States Government pay any agents to operate in Canada, but the railway companies do. A few days ago I saw a gentleman who used to be very energetic in bringing the people from the old country to our Canadian North-West, Mr. Whilhelms, who brought a large colony to the county I have the honour to represent, in the vicinity of Rapid City. But for some reasons best known to himself he has gone to Dakota and is now immigration agent, taking people from eastern Canada to the western States. He told me that since the first of March he had taken some fifteen hundred people, adults and children, from eastern Canada to the western States.

Mr. DALY. What part?

Mr. WATSON. From the vicinity of Ottawa, the Eastern Townships; some from the vicinity of Toronto, and all through Ontario, taking them over the Northern Railway. The hon. member from Selkirk said he thought I could be informed by Mr. Dyke on the requirements and necessities of Manitoba. I am not prepared to admit that I could be informed by Mr. Dyke on that subject, but I am not surprised at that hon. gentleman saying so, because any man coming from Manitoba and supporting the fiscal policy of the Government cannot be considered as very enlightened—

Mr. DALY. I had a majority of 455.

Mr. WATSON —and could be enlightened by information from a gentleman who visited our country for a few weeks. Our people did leave this country for the United States during the Mackenzie regime at the rate of 23,000 a year, but during the present Administration they have left at the rate of 100,000 a year. People will move about, of course, but there is an immense loss, as the census shows, over what we suffered during the Mackenzie regime. After the census, taken in 1885, when it was clearly shown that the number of immigrants reported by the Agriculture Committee to have gone into Manitoba and the North-West were not there, the hon. member for Selkirk gave as an excuse that the people had left our country on account of the frost.

Mr. DALY. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. WATSON. I expected contradiction and I have the *Hansard*. On page 742, 2nd June, 1887, it will be found that when he made that statement, I called the attention of the House to the fact that frosts had not been the means of driving the people from Manitoba, and he said: We had frosts for two years and the hon. gentleman cannot deny it.

Mr. DALY. That does not say that frosts drove the people out. What the hon. gentleman says was that I had declared it was on account of the frosts that people were driven out of the country.

Mr. WATSON. The debate was on immigration and the Opposition challenged the Government for not having the people in the North-West. We pointed out that in five years 175,000 people were

reported to have gone into the country and were not there, when we took the census, and this was the reason the hon. gentleman gave why the people were not there.

Mr. DALY. I never gave the reason. Read the words.

Mr. WATSON. I have read them. The hon. gentleman gave other reasons, such as that the enumerators who had counted the people, had counted in navvies, railway employés and people who had gone to the coast, to British Columbia or Washington Territory, and among other reasons he stated that we had had frosts. That was not a patriotic reason to give, and I was sorry he made that statement. We have one of the greatest agricultural countries in the world. We believe we have a much better country than the Dakotas. We know that the people who have gone to Dakota are now coming back to Manitoba, and we have had a large number of people who have come in there last year, whether through the influence of Mr. Webster or any one else. We want those people to be brought into Manitoba, and I do not object to the money being spent by the Government for that purpose. We are doing a charitable thing in bringing these people to Manitoba, because they have failed to get crops in Dakota, and we are free from those cyclones that trouble them there. We grow the largest number of bushels of wheat to the acre grown in the world, and the finest wheat in the world, and having all these natural advantages, there must be something, even outside of the immigration, work which prevents the people settling in that province. I hope the Government will work in harmony with the Manitoba Government, who could bring these people back to the province and see that they get proper locations when they come back. I believe that, by working in harmony with the North-West Council and the Manitoba Government, our moneys can be much better spent than by placing them in the hands of the agents of this Government. I hope this discussion will be of benefit, and that we may have better results in the future, so that, when we take the next census, it will be shown that the population is increasing not only in Manitoba but in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister state the names of the 12 or 14 people who he told us were operating in Minnesota and Dakota with a view to the repatriation of the people ?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot now.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will he give the names and the allowances at a future stage ?

Mr. CARLING. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will recollect a little experience he had with Mr. Henry Smyth in Dakota, where $1,800 was paid for him to induce immigrants to come to the North-West, and it was shown that not one farthing's worth of benefit had accrued to the country, but in fact that, while Mr. Smyth was sending glowing reports from the west, he was actually in the western part of Ontario. If we are to believe the statements which have been made for a number of years by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), we would come to the conclusion that the whole North-West is filled up with people and Dakota was depopulated, whereas we find we have only a bare 54,000 people in the whole of Manitoba.

Mr. DALY. 154,000. Try and be correct for once.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Minister of Justice said 54,000 to-day. He must have been wrong, but we find that Dakota is increasing its population three or four times as fast as the North-West, and yet there are so many people said to be going to the North-West from Dakota. I believe a number of these reports are pure nonsense, and without foundation, and I think the accounts of Mr. Webster and others should be carefully audited, and it should be seen that the work is done which is alleged to have been done.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 2.05 a. m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 2nd May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 77) to revive and amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Canadian American Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

DUTY ON CRUDE PETROLEUM.

Mr. INNES asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to lower the duty on crude petroleum or gas oil used in the manufacture of gas ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is not yet in a position to indicate its intention on that subject.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES RANCHING COMPANIES.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, Whether any arrangement has been come to with the ranching companies of the North-West Territories, whereby lands fit for cultivation may be entered on and occupied for farming purposes ? Will the persons ejected by the Waldron Ranch Company be permitted to re-enter and occupy their lands ? Will lands fit for cultivation in the Waldron Ranch Company's leased territory be henceforth open to settlement for farming purposes ?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Negotiations between the Government and the ranching companies in the North-West Territories are now in progress. I am not aware that any person has been ejected by the Waldron Ranch Company. The negotiations above referred to include the Waldron Ranch Company, and as they are not yet concluded it would not be possible to answer this question more definitely at present.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if he has made the enquiry which he promised as to the letter of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture which was brought down by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), and if he is prepared to make any statement in regard to that matter to-day?

Mr. CARLING. I am not prepared to do that to-day, because I thought it would come up when the House went again into Committee of Supply, which will be to-morrow.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for:

Statement of all applications or complaints made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council respecting the matters or things referred to in sub-sections (*k*), (*l*), (*m*), (*n*) and (*p*) of clause eleven of the Railway Act.

2. By or against whom such complaints were made.

3. The manner in which the same were dealt with or disposed of.

He said: The clauses of the Railway Act to which reference is made in the notice are as follows:—

"The Railway Committee shall have power to enquire into, hear and determine any application, complaint or dispute respecting tolls and rates for the transportation of passengers and freight, the adjustment of such tolls and rates between companies, running powers or haulage, traffic arrangements, unjust preferences, discrimination or extortion."

I desire to see whether any such applications have been made since the Act was passed in the year 1888, and, if such applications were made, I desire to know how they were disposed of. It will be in the recollection of the House that some years ago a Royal Commission was appointed after an agitation had been carried on for some years with a view to appointing a permanent Commission. That Royal Commission made a report contained in the Sessional Papers of 1888 and formed a basis for the amendment made in the Bill passed during that year. The Commission reported, with a good deal of hesitation and doubt, as follows:—

"That the powers of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council be enlarged so far as to enable them to administer the proposed law, providing—

"1. That the committee shall itself hear and determine all disputes arising between railway companies, with power to appoint proper officers to take evidence locally.

"2. That the committee shall itself decide all questions of classification of freight, tariff and uniform railway returns.

"3. That the committee shall have power to appoint officers in each province to hear and determine all complaints against railway companies, subject to power of reference by such officer of any point to the committee, and also subject to the right of appeal to the committee itself."

The last provision was not embodied in the Act of Parliament, and no step has been taken in regard to that since the report was made, but I would call attention also to the language of the report. The Commission, having dealt with the evils to which they refer, made the following statement:—

"The Commission desire to provide by immediate legislation for admitted evils, with the least possible disturbance to existing methods, only accepting such conclusions as have been tested and proved to be beneficial. They wish to avoid the hasty creation of any system of which experience in the United States, England and Canada may soon require serious modification. They think it better to test the working of the proposed law by temporary provision for the execution, and after full experience of the results of the Interstate Railway Commission and of our own legislation to consider whether such system should be made permanent."

Now, for my part, I do not accept the conclusion except in that temporary sense at which this Commission arrived. I was not convinced then, and I am not convinced now, that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is by any means the best tribunal for determining matters of this kind. I desire to draw the attention of the House to it, so that if that is the opinion entertained, either in the House or in the country, some change may be made by the Government, not in this, but in another session of Parliament. When we look at the enormous powers of the Railway Committee, and when those who have had something to do with it see how those powers are carried out, judicial powers, deciding matters between individuals and railway companies of the greatest magnitude, I think we must all see that it is not in accordance with the general view which we entertain, that where judicial powers are exercised it should be by a body wholly free from political influence. Then there are matters of detail, and I think the Minister of Railways will probably agree that his office is sufficiently burdensome, as it is, with its ordinary functions, without his being called upon to interfere with matters of this character. I do not know, and therefore I move for returns, whether any objections have been made respecting traffic, against charges, unjust preferences and discrimination, or what is called in the Bill, extortion. If no such charges have been made, it may, perhaps, be reasonably contended that there is no complaint; on the other hand, it may be that charges are not made because those which are interested do not believe that they would receive the justice, perhaps, which their merits demand. There may be, of course, opposite views taken with regard to that, but so far as my information goes the public are not any more satisfied now with the management of railways and the charges which they make, tariffs and so on, than they were several years ago, when there was a good deal of agitation on the subject. In that, however, my information may not, of course, be accurate, but that is the information I have. My main object in moving this and the following resolution which stands in my name, is that we may have the returns and the information, and that if it be, as I think it will be found, that the Railway Committee does not and cannot do justice between parties which the people have a right to expect, the Government perhaps will find a more simple and convenient means where these cases may be settled by a tribunal more in accordance with our judicial system. The one matter which I have observed, which I dare say other gentlemen have observed, is this: Where, for instance, the committee is composed of a certain number of Ministers, as the present law provides:

"It shall consist of the Minister of Railways, who shall be chairman thereof, of the Minister of Justice, and of two or more of the other members of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada, to be from time to time appointed by the Governor in Council, three of whom shall form a quorum; and such committee shall have the powers and perform the duties assigned to it by the Act."

Now, I have known cases in which four or five hon. gentlemen are sitting to hear a matter of complaint between railway companies, or between a municipality and a railway company. The case stands

adjourned, and the next time the committee meet, perhaps half of the original members may not be present, and others may have taken their places; finally, a third meeting will take place composed partly of still other gentlemen, on each case there being a quorum, but not by any means a quorum of the same gentlemen who heard the complaint in the first instance. That does appear to be a shocking state of things, that in the end this matter has to be determined by those members of the committee who happen to sit on the last occasion, although they may not have heard any of the facts of the case, and only know of it from reading the notes of the shorthand writer of the evidence that was offered in the earlier part of the enquiry. For this reason, I beg to move the resolution which stands in my name.

Mr. HAGGART. There can be no possible objection to the motion moved by my hon. friend. In reference to the cases which he mentions under sections (*k*), (*l*), (*m*), (*n*) and (*p*), that is, concerning traffic arrangements between different companies, there have been only a couple of cases appealed to the Railway Committee, which was for the purpose, partially, of determining the rate of freight that one railway has to pay to another, and the traffic arrangements between them; these two cases have been satisfactorily disposed of. The other cases which come before the committee are not judicial cases at all, they are mostly cases in reference to the crossing of railways, public highways, construction of branches. As the hon. gentleman says, there have been a number of cases before the courts, I suppose about 60 each year in all, and I think we have managed to dispose of them very satisfactorily. There can be no possible objection to bringing down the returns and giving the information the hon. gentleman mentions. The class of cases which may be brought before the Railway Committee are entirely different from those brought before the Commission in England. The Commission in England is composed of one member for England, one for Scotland, one for Ireland, and one of the judges of the Superior Court is the chairman of the Commission. The class of cases which come up before that Commision are mostly legal and judicial questions, whereas questions of that nature very seldom come up before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council here. They are, as I said, mostly cases relating to tariffs, as to the manner in which one railway shall cross another, the manner in which a bridge should be built, and the crossing of a street over a line of railway, &c. All these cases, I think, have been satisfactorily and quickly dealt with by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as at present constituted. Very few cases have come before that committee of the class which the hon. gentleman mentions in the latter part of his resolution, as to the traffic arrangements, as to whether a particular locality is discriminated against, as to whether individuals have been discriminated against, or as to what traffic arrangements should be made between different railways; in fact, only two or three cases of this kind have come up, and these were merely for the purpose of making traffic arrangements between two companies. I had full information upon the subject a day or two ago, but I have not got the papers here at present.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a very important subject, and I gather from the words just uttered by the Minister of Railways, that he sees no reason to alter the law, and apparently the Government is satisfied with the system which now exists. For my part, I have always thought there was a good deal to be said in favour of the opinion which, if I remember rightly, was expressed a few years ago by the hon. member for Simcoe, to the effect that the present system was not satisfactory, and that the whole subject had better be referred to an independent tribunal. However, I do not express any opinion to-day upon it, but when the papers have been brought down, perhaps the subject may be gone into again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for:

Return stating for the last year (1891):—1. The number of applications which were made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for an adjudication, order, or direction, respecting any of the matters or things which, under the provisions of the Railway Act, the Railway Committee had power or authority to deal with; 2. Showing in general terms the nature of the application; 3. The names of the members of the Honourable the Privy Council who (*a.*) Heard each of the applications; (*b.*) Who were present at any one or more adjourned hearings thereof, and at the final adjudication thereof; (*c.*) In cases in which adjournments took place, the dates of hearing, and subsequent adjournment or adjournments of final adjudication. 4. Statement showing how each of said applications was disposed of, viz.:—Granted or refused or partially granted.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish to say a few words as regards one of the branches of the enquiry referred to in these resolutions, and which was commented upon by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that is, with respect to members of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council joining in decisions of cases which they have not fully heard. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, or rather that his information is erroneous which leads him to the conclusion that this has been in any sense the practice. I think I might almost say that I am confident such a case never occurred. I would not trouble the House even with this explanation at this moment if the return brought down would remove that impression from the mind of the hon. gentleman; but it would not do so. At nearly every meeting of the Railway Committee—and I have attended every meeting since I took office except two—there are cases adjourned, and very likely it will appear that some members were not present when adjourned cases were decided. But they are not cases partially heard and decided at subsequent meetings; they are cases in which the parties were found not to be ready, and at the very opening of the case it was adjourned to a more convenient day for the parties or one of them. But in every case where the matter had been entered upon, the enquiry was recommenced in order that the members present might hear the case in full, and I think it will be found that no cases have been decided by members who have not heard the evidence from the beginning to the end.

Motion agreed to.

A CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. McCARTHY moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the vast commercial interests existing between the United States of America and Canada, and of the political questions from time to time requiring adjustment between the Dominion and the neighbouring Republic, it would tend to the ad-

vancement of those interests and the promotion of a better understanding between the two countries were a representative appointed by the Government of the Dominion, subject to the approval of Her Majesty's Imperial Advisers, and attached to the staff of Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, specially charged to watch, guard and represent the interests of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the notice of the House a matter which appears to me to be of some very considerable practical importance. The House this session has already considered the question which was mooted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with respect to the power of making treaties, and a very interesting discussion—I had not the good fortune to be present, but I have read the debate since—took place on that occasion, in which the views entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite and those entertained by hon. members supporting the Government were very fully and prominently brought forward. I do not in the least desire to quarrel with the conclusion at which the House then arrived. I think, looking at the history of this country for the last few years, we ought to be well satisfied, and I for my part feel that we have had substantial justice done to us in the way in which treaties which have interested Canada or have been of moment to this Dominion have been dealt with by the Imperial authorities. We have had a very great enlargement of our powers during those years. There was a time, no doubt, when the making of the old treaties with respect to this country was not participated in by any person who represented the Dominion, or rather the then old Province of Canada; but of recent years the policy of the home Government has been in the opposite direction, and we have not only been invited to take part in such negotiations, but on one occasion the leading Minister of the Crown here was appointed one of the Commissioners to negotiate the treaty which became known as the Washington Treaty. Although I realize the practical impossibility of the country making treaties irrespective of the Imperial power and of the Imperial authority, I do not see why we should not have a representative, not in any sense independent of, but acting in conjunction with, the representative of the Crown at Washington, who would be specially charged to watch over and guard Canadian interests. That appears to me as a practical step, a matter which should meet the concurrence, and I hope will meet with the concurrence of members on both sides of the House. We have enormous interests at Washington. We have larger interests with the United States than with any other power except the Imperial authorities in London. Whether we look upon it from a commercial point of view, when we find that nearly one-half of our whole trade is done with the United States, or whether we look at it from the point of view of international rights and privileges, we find difficulties are arising constantly between us and the Government of the United States. We are more or less affected by the Treaty of 1818, our interests are involved in the Washington Treaty, our rights are constantly being invaded and brought into question on both sides of the Dominion, and in addition questions are constantly arising in regard to our trading and bonding privileges and interests affecting our railways, and in point of fact it is difficult to enumerate the various matters which from time to time are brought in question between this country and the great republic to the south of us. When we look back a few years we shall find that our powers in connection with treaty-making and matters of that kind with respect to foreign states have been very much enlarged. Commencing as far back as 1865, I find that at that time Sir Frederick Bruce, then Minister at Washington, was instructed to place himself in communication with the Canadian Government and directed to act in connection with matters more especially affecting Canada under the instructions of His Excellency the Governor General. That was the first time in which, so far as I know, there was any recognition of the peculiar position and interests of Canada as between us and the Imperial power. In 1869, however, upon our delegates going from Canada to England they made representations that no steps should be taken in regard to the renewal of the reciprocity treaty without previous communication being had with the Canadian Government; and our views in that respect also were acceded to. In 1871 the late Sir John Macdonald was appointed a member of the Joint High Commission, and although he was, of course, acting in that capacity as a representative of Her Majesty the Queen and under the direction of the Ministers of Great Britain, nevertheless he was there to point out, and I have no doubt he did point out, how the interests of Canada were affected, and he did what he could to have those interests protected and safeguarded. Then, in 1874, a still stronger statement was made by our Government, which was not objected to by the Imperial authorities, and appears to have been acquiesced in. A claim was then made, that it was impossible for a British Minister to understand questions involving the negotiations of a treaty, and upon that representation the Hon. George Brown was appointed as Imperial Commissioner on behalf of the Canadian Government. In 1879, Sir Alexander Galt was commissioned to act on behalf of the Canadian Government in connection with the English Minister in both France and Spain, and in that same year, I think it was, a very important statement was made by our Government. It will be found in the correspondence that led up to the appointment of our High Commissioner at London, and there I find this statement made:

"It is further submitted (by Canada) that the very large and rapidly augmenting commerce of Canada and increasing extent of her trade with foreign nations, is proving the absolute need of direct negotiations with them for the proper protection of her interests. In most of the treaties of commerce entered into by England, reference has only been had to their effect on the United Kingdom; and the colonies are excluded from their operation, a fact which has been attended with most unfortunate results to Canada as relates to France. * * * The Canadian Government, therefore, submit that when needs occasion such negotiations to be undertaken, Her Majesty's Government should advise Her Majesty specially to accredit the representative of Canada to the foreign Court, by association, for the special object, with the resident Minister or other Imperial negotiator."

There it will be seen that the principle of my resolution was contended for so long ago as 1879, and that upon that representation the Canadian Government did appoint a Canadian to represent the Queen of course, but still as a special Minister or delegate or representative from Canada. Now, looking at the interests involved between this Dominion and the United States, looking at the difficulties which are continually arising, looking at the misunderstandings that will from time to time crop up between countries having the rival

interests which these countries have in various matters, it does appear to me to be a reasonable and highly proper thing that a gentleman coming from Canada acting with, and under the direction, of course, of the British Minister, but still to be in direct communication with this Government, would be an appointment of a most beneficial character, and tend in every way to prevent misunderstandings and to promote goodwill and peace between us and our neighbours. It is certainly in the interests of all parties that there should be that good-will and good understanding between the people of the United States and the people of this country. It may be said—I dare say it will be said, if any gentlemen think proper to take part in the discussion,—that my argument goes further than simply the appointment of a resident agent, and that if pushed to its legitimate and logical conclusion as far perhaps as my hon friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) desired the House to go when he moved in favour of a treaty-making power,—I am not going to discuss that, because it seems to me to be foreign to the present question, but I think it will be seen that if there is no practical difficulty, if there is no insuperable difficulty in a gentleman appointed by Canada acting with the British Minister at Washington, that all parties in this country would be glad to see such an official representing us there. If that be so, Sir, I trust that if the House approves of the resolution, the Government will see its way to endeavour to give effect to it. I do not mean to say that the Government will not meet with difficulties, I do not mean to say that they will not meet with some objections from the Foreign Office; I dare say the staff of the Foreign Office will put forward many reasons why a novelty of this kind should not be introduced; but, nevertheless, that has not been the spirit with which our applications for advanced charge of our own affairs has been met with in recent years, and I have no doubt that the Government of Great Britain will yield to anything that is practical and will yield to any representation that is made from this side, more especially if it is backed up by the concurrent opinion of the great body of the members of this House. After the lengthy discussions that have taken place on the trade question this session, I do not propose to do more now than to make these few observations. I bring it to the notice of the House, and more especially to the notice of gentlemen responsible for the conduct of the affairs of the House and of the country, that it would certainly be in the interests of Canada, and a proper representation of this country, and a proper advancement in our political rights if we could so look upon it, to have a representative in Washington, in the same way that we now have a High Commissioner at London. I, therefore, beg to move this motion, seconded by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I was waiting to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman who was mentioned as the seconder of this motion, before making any remarks upon the question itself. I may say at the outset, that after the long and somewhat thorough discussion the question with reference to commercial treaties has received at the hands of this House, it does not appear to be necessary to take up much time in referring to this matter at very great length. I sympathize altogether with my hon. friend who has moved this resolution, in so far as it evinces a desire to carry on, so far as it can be legitimately and properly done, the extension of Canada's powers in regard to the management of her own affairs; her powers and influence in regard to the direction of her affairs outside of this country as well as in it. The hon. gentleman has very truly remarked in his brief but accurate history of the gradual development of Canadian powers in this direction, that the Government of Great Britain have met our demands in a kindly and friendly spirit; and a review of ten or fifteen years history of this country will show a very great advance indeed in the powers that Canada, a colony of Great Britain, has obtained in reference to the full and thorough representation of her interests as they are dealt with in foreign countries, by the Government of Great Britain. The contrast between this recent period and twenty years ago is very marked indeed in that respect, and as I took occasion to affirm in the course of the debate which happened here not many days ago, Canada has to-day about all the powers in that respect that she can ask for consistent with the relations which exist between her, as a colony, and the mother country as an integreal part of the Empire. The resolution which my hon. friend has moved contemplates more than a commercial agency, it seems to me, and somewhat less than the status of an independent power. It asks that owing to questions which arise for adjustment between the Dominion and the United States:

> "It would tend to the advancement of those interests and the promotion of a better understanding between the two countries were a representative appointed by the Government of the Dominion, subject to the approval of Her Majesty's Imperial Advisers, and attached to the staff of Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, specially charged to watch, guard and represent the interests of Canada."

So that I think my analysis of the resolution is correct, that it contemplates less than the status of an independent power and something more than a commercial agency. Now, so far as commercial agencies are concerned, I think that the Canadian Government, as it has been doing, may still further press its lines out in that direction, aiming ultimately at having at every important trade centre in countries with which we have large business relations, some one to represent this country in a commercial trade way, much the same as in the consular system which is in vogue in all commercial countries; and any proposition looking in that direction has not only the cordial sympathy of the Government, but its cordial co-operation. I may say that the Government has already made a commencement in the direction of establishing such a system of commercial agencies. The High Commisioner in London, outside of all other duties which he has to undertake, and which he performs so well, has the duty of guarding and looking after the commercial interests of Canada in relation to those of the mother country, and of reporting his observations continuously and clearly to the Dominion Government. Sir Charles Tupper's duties have largely turned in that direction, and he has made numerous and very important reports to this Government, which have been very helpful and which in the future I hope may be turned to still more practical account. We have also in Paris to-day an agent, Mr. Hector Fabre, who outside of a

general supervision of immigration matters in France, has been charged, not specially heretofore, but within the last year and specially by my own department, with looking after the commercial interests of Canada in so far as they are related to or affected by legislation or the trend of business in France. In the West India Islands there have been within the last six months a half dozen or so of commercial agents appointed at the principal centres, whose duty will be carefully to observe the current of trade, the legislation, and whatever else may take place which would in any way affect Canadian commercial interests, and to report fully and carefully on those matters to the Dominion Government, to the end that their observations and information may be known not only to the Canadian Government, but, by means which shall be adopted, may become known to the commercial bodies of this country as well, so that benefit may accrue to the general trade and business of the country. With the United States of America, as my hon. friend has remarked, our commerce is very large and our commercial interests correspondingly important. There is, however, this difference with regard to the United States system of Government and that of most other countries, that in almost every other country the tariffs, which affect so largely the business relations of different countries with each other, have their origin with the Government; and representations made to the Government and negotiations carried on with the Government in purely fiscal matters, have their influence, and if favourably looked upon by the Government involved, may be directly carried out in tariff regulations made under the direction of the Government and be presented to the legislature; whereas in the United States the Cabinet is altogether outside of Congress. There the Cabinet as a Cabinet has nothing to do with the initiation or the carrying through of tariff and fiscal regulations. These matters are in the hands of a committee of the House and are solely within the powers of the House itself. So that the difficulties in the way of influencing tariff legislation through the Government are greater in the United States than they are in most other countries with which we have commercial relations. Now, when we contemplate what is proposed here, the question arises as to what greater power a representative from Canada would have as an *attaché* to the staff of the British ambassador in Washington, in the sense of guarding the commercial interests of Canada and keeping the Dominion Government thoroughly informed as to the trend of sentiment, and as to the initiation of measures which may have an effect upon the trade and commerce of Canada, than he would have as a simple commercial agent whose duty it would be to keep himself *en rapport* with the tendencies in these respects in the United States, and to keep the Government of Canada fully informed in relation thereto. If he is given a position as an *attaché* of the British ambassador at Washington, then the practical difficulties arise of which my hon. friend spoke, and which we must all acknowledge. What shall be his powers? He will, of course, have to be subordinate to the British Minister. It would not be possible that he should act of his own motion in matters relating to general Imperial policy. He must act under the instructions of the British ambassador; and the difficulty arises as to what would be the practical nature of his position, and as to whether an advantage would be gained by having a Canadian attached in that subordinate way to the staff of the British ambassador at Washington above such advantages as we have at present. Any one who has followed the course of events knows that a major part of the work of the British ambassador at the court of the United States has to do in one way or another with Canadian interests, as is the case with no other country in the world, and, perforce, the British ambassador at Washington has to make himself acquainted, and does make himself acquainted with Canadian affairs. He has the interest of Canadian affairs at heart, and it is his duty, as it has been his practice, to keep the Governor General and the Government of this country thoroughly informed with reference to any transactions which affect Canada in any of her interests. So that with this peculiar position of the English ambassador at Washington, having to do so much with Canadian affairs, and with the quick means of communication we have with Washington, it is a fact that at present nothing goes on in which Canadian interests are involved, and with reference to which information ought to be given to the Canadian Government, in which such information is not given, and the clearest observations, so far as these things affect Canada, brought to the notice, and that speedily, of the Dominion Government. Among the difficulties in the way of having an *attaché* of our own at Westminster in connection with the embassy, is the practical difficulty as to what powers he would have and what greater advantages would be gained in that respect than are gained at present, and over and above what might be gained by having an intelligent agent at Washington, and if the idea is that we should have such an agent there, that is a policy which would demand carrying out, not only with reference to Washington, but all important countries with which we have trade relations. So far as the question stands at present, without going any further into it, I see the practical difficulties which surround the question, and whilst I sympathize with the spirit and endeavour of my hon. friend to have the powers of Canada, which have been so extensively developed within the last 15 years, still further developed and extended, in so far as that extension can be useful to Canada and practically carried out, I yet see many practical difficulties in the way, which it would be necessary to very carefully consider before we take a decisive step. The hon. gentleman has brought his resolution before the House, and it will no doubt be discussed by the House, and the Government will listen attentively to the discussion and carefully note the observations made on either side, with the view of profiting by these observations and this discussion towards extending as far as it can be consistently and properly done, in conjunction with the home Government, the powers which Canada already possesses in a large degree, and which it is the object of my hon. friend to still further extend and develop.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We are still in the clouds.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very sorry, for my part, that the very clear and forcible, though concise, argument of the hon. member for Simcoe has failed to convince the hon. gentleman who has just

spoken. That hon. gentleman has pointed out the advantages and the disadvantages arising out of the proposed policy, and I have not been able to gather from anything he has said that, between the advantage on the one side and the disadvantage on the other side, he was able to form an opinion for himself. He has not shown us whether he is fish or flesh. He may be both, but he has not shown us that he is either. For my part, I hail with great pleasure the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe. It seems to me that his proposition, though it does not go so far as I would wish, would still be of great advantage to the people of Canada at large, and a great improvement on the present state of things. It is manifest, and it must become more and more obvious, that the interests of Canada and the interests of Great Britain are of necessity on account of their respective positions, distinct and separate upon many things. Their commercial policies differ. One is free trade and the other protection; and the very fact that Canada, and the Conservative party especially has chosen deliberately to adopt the policy of protection, while by instinct and by tradition, it seems to me, we should have favoured the other policy, is most conclusive evidence that the interests of both countries cannot be served equally by the same policy. I hope the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) will take a note of this motion of the hon. member for Simcoe. That hon. gentleman rather lectured me the other day for having repeated the opinion I had expressed on a former occasion, that the interests of Canada and Great Britain could not be served by the same economic policy. I could not have prevailed upon him, I am sure, to go back ever so little on the opinions he expressed; but I hope the cobwebs which obscured his judgment, usually clear in other matters, will be brushed away by the arguments of the hon. member for North Simcoe. As I have said, the proposition of the hon. gentleman is not perhaps as broad as I would desire, but I recognize the great difficulty which stands in the way. We are a colony of Great Britain, and it is impossible for us to have anything better than what is proposed. The Minister of Finance would prefer a commercial agent at Washington. I do not say that a commercial agent at Washington would not be of great advantage on many occasions; but obviously the power of a commercial agent, in so far especially as international relations are concerned, must be very limited, and there would be, even if we had a commercial agent at Washington, numerous questions upon which from the very limited nature of his functions, his powers would scarcely be of any benefit at all to Canada. I would prefer if possible to have a diplomatic rather than a commercial agent at Washington, but how are you to have a diplomatic agent at Washington? What is the suggested remedy? The hon. gentleman suggests that there should be a Canadian *attaché* to the British embassy. The experiment is worth trying. I do not know how far it will work, but for my part I say that a good many of the difficulties which marked our relations in the past with the United States would be obviously overcome if we had such an agent. Let us go back to the evil days of 1888 when commercial war was in sight between Canada and the United States, when we were threatened not only with commercial war but with all the evils of war itself, because if we had come to this unfortunate state when possibly commercial intercourse would cease between Canada and the United States, the door being thus opened, the results must have been very serious and there is no saying where it would have ended. The hon. gentleman said that the British ambassador always took a practical interest in the affairs of Canada. I do not altogether agree with him. On the contrary, I charge British diplomacy with having been on all occasions indifferent to Canadian interests and with having sacrificed Canadian interests wherever the interests of Canada came in contact with British interests. In those very days of 1888, when commercial war was within sight, I frankly avow that the British ambassador at Washington was taking some interest in what was going on before his eyes, but from the very necessity of the case, from the fact that he had to report directly to London and that from London his communications had to come to Canada, war might have been declared, non-intercourse proclaimed, before the results of his efforts had become at all available. Under such circumstances it was lucky for Canada—and in so saying I have the words of Sir Charles Tupper—that a Canadian gentleman who resides in the United States, Mr. Wiman, constituted himself the ambassador of Canada at Washington, interviewed Mr. Bayard, then Secretary of State, and procured an interview between him and Sir Charles Tupper, an interview which at once brought up negotiations which afterwards brought on the Treaty of Washington, a treaty which I am sorry to say was abortive, but which at all events removed the clouds which threatened the amicable relations between the two countries. Perhaps it is not out of place here, after giving the authority of Sir Charles Tupper as to what Canada owes to the action of Mr. Wiman, to quote the language of Mr. Bayard, in a letter which he addressed to Sir Charles Tupper as follows:—

"WASHINGTON, D. C., May 31, 1888.

"MY DEAR SIR CHARLES,—The delay in writing you has been unavoidable. In the very short interview afforded by your visit I referred to the embarrassment arising out of the gradual practical emancipation of Canada from the control of the mother country, and the consequent assumption by that community of attributes of autonomous and separate sovereignty, not, however, distinct from the Empire of Great Britain. The awkwardness of this imperfectly developed sovereignty is felt most strongly by the United States, which cannot have formal relations with Canada except directly and as a colonial dependency of the British Crown, and nothing could better illustrate the embarrassment arising from this amorphous condition of things than by the volume of correspondence published severally this year relating to the fisheries by the United States, Great Britain, and the Government of the Dominion. The time lost in this circumlocution, although often most regrettable, was the least part of the difficulty, and the indirectness of appeal and reply was the most serious feature, ending, as it did, very unsatisfactorily."

I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the ending of this letter:

"The time lost in the circumlocution was the least part of the difficulty, and the indirectness of appeal and reply was the most serious feature, ending, as it did, very unsatisfactorily."

Now, let us suppose that at that time the plan proposed by the hon. gentleman had been in operation and that we had a Canadian *attaché* at the legation in Washington, I would believe that he would have to report concurrently to both Imperial and Canadian Governments.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. He should communicate, through the ambassador, to the Government of England and to the Government of Canada, and if that were done through the British embassy, the indirectness of the reply would be avoided.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Partially

Mr. LAURIER. No, not only partially but completely, because all matters would have to be communicated simultaneously to the British and Canadian Governments, and the Canadian Government would then act at once, and the very difficulties which on that occasion occurred would have been in a larger measure obviated. It seems to me that the language used by Mr. Bayard gives one of the best reasons for the motion of the hon. gentleman. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the question is one of very great difficulty. I am sure that this arrangement would not work as satisfactorily as I would wish it possible for it to work, but, as long as Canada continues to be a dependency of the British Crown, I can think of no better method than that which is suggested here of Canada conducting her affairs in regard to our relations with the American people. Situated as we are, the remedy the hon. gentleman proposes will certainly have my support, and I think my friends on this side are prepared to give it their cordial support.

Mr. WELDON. Seeing that the leader of the Opposition has come to such a sound conclusion, we can scarcely object to the statement he made when he commenced his speech, that the interests of Canada and the interests of England were separate and distinct. The hon. gentleman's speech proves that he is not a perfect Bourbon, but that he can learn something. In 1888, he spoke in a most disparaging way of the Washington Treaty, and he has to-day expressed himself as being sorry that the Fisheries Treaty of 1888 was abortive. I think his remarks show that the position of a British ambassador in Washington is not adequate to meet the needs of Canada. He illustrated his remarks by referring to the representations which Sir Charles Tupper made in 1888 when he returned from Washington, which showed that there was, in fishery matters, an intense degree of irritation in the United States. The Minister of Finance expressed his opinion more in favour of a commercial agency at Washington, and the leader of the Opposition says that, while that would be good, a diplomatic agency would be better. He has expressed my view in that regard. He has stated that British diplomacy has sometimes endangered the interests of Canada, and I think that is true. If we were to go over the treaties of many years since the commencement of this century, we would find the truth of that, commencing with the Ashbourne Treaty and going through the others, the principal reason for which was that the British plenipotentiaries were imperfectly informed as to the facts, and as to the effect those treaties would have on the interests of Canada. The motion which has been made by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is to the effect that we desire to have the plenipotentiaries better informed as to the facts in regard to Canadian interests. I need not multiply instances in support of this motion. Some of them were given by the Minister of Finance, and it appears that, to-day, England has laid down the rule that, where the interests of Canada are to be affected by British diplomacy, no conclusion shall be arrived at unless Canada has been consulted in regard to the state of affairs. In a speech quoted this session, which gave some pleasure to hon. gentlemen on the other side and some pain to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) and others on this side, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach made a distinct declaration on the part of the Imperial Government in this regard. I have not the words in my memory, but from my reading of the speech I believe he said this in effect: Nowhere will you find a more distinct statement of the rule that England would take the colonies into her confidence, and would not treat for them so as to bind them without their concurrence. The case in favour of this has been so clearly and so well stated by the mover and by the leader of the Opposition, that I may not dwell upon it. I very heartily support the motion; I think it is capable of doing much good; I think that it is very likely to bring about a better understanding between our own people and the American people. As was said by Mr. Bayard, in the negotiations four years ago, "God made us neighbours, and common sense should make us friends." He is an unwise public man, either in the counsels of that nation to the south of us, or in this Chamber, who uses words of acerbity or bitterness.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member who has just sat down dissents from the view of my leader that the interests of Canada and those of Great Britain are distinct. He has failed to show any reason for that dissent. I must call his attention to the fact that the statement that those interests are distinct, does not always mean that they are antagonistic; it may mean that, and it may not. The fact that Great Britain is not directly interested in most of the questions that occur between the United States and ourselves, shows that those interests are distinct; it does not follow, of course, that they are antagonistic, but it may easily follow from the circumstances arising out of a particular case. Let me quote the fishery question in the east and the question of the seal fisheries, as instances in which they might easily become antagonistic. England has no concern in the prosperity of our fishermen in the Maritime Provinces, England has no concern with the question of who kills the fur seals in the North Pacific ocean; but it does matter to Canada who shall fish in our eastern waters; it does matter to Canada very much whether she has a right to kill seals on the high seas. I would instance this last particularly, as a case where the interests appear to be antagonistic to a certain extent. Although Canada has been consulted in this matter, and our interests have been ably represented, England has dictated the policy that the question of killing seals on the high seas shall be an open question; she has agreed to go to arbitration on the question as to whether seals should be killed on the high seas. Now, it would be to the interest of Canada in this matter to have maintained the proposition that since the United States have admittedly no jurisdiction over those open waters, the question should not be open at all of putting restrictions upon the killing of seals in those seas. Now, another proposition of my hon. friend was that England had admitted the principle that Canada should always be consulted, and that she should enter into no treaties or no legislation bind-

ing upon the colonies without such consultation. The hon. gentleman has put that much too broadly. In the treaties between the United States and Great Britain affecting Canada, Canada had representation, but we were made rather rudely aware the other day of the fact that other British treaties did affect the colonies, and that Great Britain was unwilling, as stated by Lord Knutsford in his despatch which has been laid before the House, to make any changes in the existing treaties whatever at the request of Canada or any other colony. It was laid down very distinctly by the Colonial Secretary that the interests of the colonies were not to be taken into consideration in regard to those treaties, that we would just have to put up with whatever effect those treaties might have on our commerce. I am not discussing whether that should be so or not, but I am pointing out to the hon. gentleman that such is the case, that in regard to treaties England does not undertake to consider the interest of the colonies except where the treaty is one specially referring to the particular colony in question. Now, as to the usefulness of this agent at Washington, there is no doubt he would be much more useful if we had the power of making our own commercial treaties. I am satisfied that if this House had the courage, and had the knowledge of its own interests to induce it to ask for that power, there would be very little difficulty in obtaining it. I do not see why England should not be willing to give us power to make our own treaties with foreign countries, just as she has given us power to make our own tariffs, levying taxes upon imported goods, English as well as foreign. Now, it is the Government and their supporters who have seen fit not to ask for this power. They have refused the suggestion made from this side of the House that we should ask for the power to make our own commercial treaties, a request which, I believe, would have been granted. It is naturally, therefore, awkward for them, specially for the Minister of Finance, to give any countenance to a proposition which, if it has any tendency, will certainly tend in the direction of more independent governmental action of Canada towards the United States, in regard to treaties. It is awkward to the Minister to sanction any such proposition, and he, therefore, proposes the substitution of a commercial agent. He failed to point out what commercial agents could do for us in regard to a diplomatic matter. He has equally failed to see how a diplomatic agent attached to the Imperial consulate could be of any use to us. I do not agree with him there; I think a Canadian *attaché* would be of some use to us. But I would point out further that this agent would have no powers of negotiation in himself, he would have to do everything concerning actual negotiations through the consulate, and with the authority of the Imperial Government. But this much he could do, so far as treating with the United States is concerned: he could conduct preliminary proceedings, could arrive at such conditions as the United States and Canada were mutually willing to agree to, and at that point only need the assistance of the Imperial Government be invoked. Everything could be settled between the United States and Canadian representatives before the advice of Great Britain was asked in the matter. I think in that way he might be extremely useful. But it remains to be asked whether our agent need be attached at all to the Imperial staff at Washington. His duties would be necessarily the duties of an adviser merely; he could fulfil those duties equally well if he were not attached, if he were merely a diplomatic agent of Canada at Washington for the purpose of advising with the British representatives on all necessary occasions, but not a member of his staff, and not necessarily under his direct control. He could send us information of what is passing at Washington, he could sound the leaders of Congress as to what could possibly be arranged in the way of treaty, and he could give this information to this Government and to the British Government equally well whether he were attached to the staff or not. On the other hand, his attachment to the staff might in many ways hamper his action. I think all our experience has gone to show that a representative of Canada directly, has better facilities for negotiation with the American officials, than a representative of Great Britain. It has always been the case when we send delegates there directly from this country, that they have got along better in negotiations with the United States, the United States have spoken a little more freely than they would to the direct representative of Britain alone. I think this agent not attached to the Imperial staff would be more useful than if he were attached, and on other grounds I think there would be a greater field of usefulness open to him. However, taking the motion as it is, although there would be difficulties in the way of such a representative, I feel with my leader that the experiment is one well worth trying, that no harm could result and some good might be accomplished by appointing an agent even with such limited powers and under the supervision of the mother country, as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) asks to have appointed. For that reason, if no better proposition is submitted on the other side of the House, I am inclined to support the motion.

Mr. COCKBURN. As one of the representatives of the city of Toronto, whose imports and exports during last year exceeded $23,000,000, a large portion of whose trade is with the United States, I naturally feel an interest in the question which has been brought before the House by the hon. gentleman for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). At the same time I must say that I was somewhat astonished at the remarks of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) when he told the House that Canada and England were antagonistic in their views, that England had manifested no concern whatever in the fisheries question, and that she had no interest in it. Surely it must be within the recollection of the hon. gentleman that only a few years ago, owing to the deep interest which she took in our fishery question, Canada was awarded over $5,000,000; and surely he must recollect the despatch, not more than a month old, of the present Premier of England, in which he gave the United States clearly to understand that if Canadian rights in our seal fisheries were infringed, they would be protected by the whole force and power of the Empire. I think it was absurd, therefore, on the part of the hon. gentleman to use the tone he did use in speaking of the negotiations of treaties, when he knows that every leading English statesman for several years past has given the colonies to understand, and has particularly given Canada to understand, that no treaty will be consummated with any power affecting the interests of

Canada without the voice of Canada having been first heard and duly weighed. The question which has been brought up, as to whether we should have a resident agent in Washington to protect our interests, is indeed a vital question. We have already established Canadian agents, inasmuch as we have in London Sir Charles Tupper; and I think the experience we have had of the manner in which those duties have been performed, and the profit which has accrued to this country from the performance of those duties should strongly encourage us to establish a similar office in the city of Washington.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKBURN. Hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear." They are always ready to make an outcry when dollars and cents are concerned; but let me call to their remembrance the simple fact that only a few years ago Sir Charles Tupper, being in London as our representative, was able by the immediate action he took to prevent our Canadian cattle being scheduled, and to save millions of dollars to our farmers, enough money to defray the expenses of the office for a quarter of a century.

An hon. MEMBER. That is old.

Mr. COCKBURN. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not like old truths to be brought to their remembrance. I trust this office will be established at Washington, and that due power will be given to the Canadian representative to protect our interests there. We have in Paris an agent whose duty it is to protect our interests, and who, if he has not had the same opportunity to distinguish himself as Sir Charles Tupper has possessed, has been, no doubt, of great service to this country. I myself in my experience in Toronto have again and again had occasion to observe the complications which are apt to arise between the United States and ourselves on commercial matters; and again and again, as I know, merchants of that city are obliged to go to Washington or elsewhere to have mistakes and misunderstandings rectified. It is not simply the immediate results of the establishment of such an office to which we are looking, but the very presence of a Canadian agent would prevent many misunderstandings arising and many acts culminating which could not be recalled. If we had such an agent there many difficulties would be avoided and many misunderstandings prevented. The question as to whether he should be a commercial agent, a mere consul, so to speak, or whether he should be attached to the diplomatic service, is another question. From my own experience, and from the time I spent in Washington, I am led to the conclusion, by the general tenor of conversation, that the interests of Canada were not looked after as carefully as they would have been had we possessed there a gentleman qualified on every occasion to represent the views of Canada to the Government of the day. It is true they have not at Washington a Cabinet as we have here, and therefore there is not the same direct mode of influencing the opinion of the Government, but, at the same time, Mr. Blaine, and other members of the Cabinet, although they have no seats in the House of Representatives, possess great influence, and are consulted by leading members of the House, and, therefore, if we had a commercial agent there, or some gentleman attached to the British Minister, he would be able, in the course of the year, to serve Canada infinitely better than this country can be served without some such representative. I trust, therefore, the proposal made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will receive due consideration from the Government, and that they may see their way to establish some officer there who would carefully guard the interests of Canada and be in full accord with the Dominion Government here.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is pretty clear that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches have made some progress since they discussed the motion relating to commercial treaties a few weeks ago. The Minister of Finance with respect to that motion was of the opinion that it would necessarily lead to the separation of Canada from the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman, in speaking for the Administration, did not tell us the Government were prepared to support this motion, but he did tells us that the Government might go so far as to do for Canada as regards the United States what they have done six times over with respect to the West Indian Islands. Our commerce with the West Indies is of the value of $2,000,000 a year and the Government have six commercial agents there, and so where our commerce is something more than twenty times that of the West Indies, the hon. gentleman does not, although he sees very great difficulty in the way, think but that the Government might, in the interests of the commerce of Canada with the United States, establish a commercial agent at Washington. Well, Sir, I may say this with respect to the hon. gentleman's proposition, that I do not think a commercial agent at Washington would mean very much in the interest of Canada. The people of Canada might perhaps to some extent be better served by having commercial agents in the United States, but no more at Washington than at other points and certainly not so much at Washington as at Boston or New York. Sir, it is the political duties which would largely devolve upon a representative of Canada at Washington that would make the appointment of an *attaché* at Washington important, and the appointment of a commercial agent would be the appointment of a person who would have none of those important functions which it is necessary that an agent of Canada should have who has to deal with the relations of this country and the neighbouring Republic. I was somewhat amazed at the observations addressed to the House by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn). The hon. gentleman did not inform us, any more than the Finance Minister did, whether he favoured a commercial agent or a diplomatic agent. The hon. gentleman was in the clouds during his remarks and he never came down from the clouds. His opinions were as vague, and the House was left in doubt as to what they were at the conclusion of his speech as it was at the beginning. The hon. gentleman complained of the observation made from this side of the House, that our interests were not always identical, or felt to be identical, with the interests of the United Kingdom, and that, therefore, the interests of Canada were not always sufficiently regarded in the negotiations that took place between the neighbouring Republic and the Foreign Office. The hon. gentleman repudiated that, and yet before he had done he informed the House that the interests of Canada were not closely looked after by the embassy at Washington.

Mr. COCKBURN. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I understood these to be the words used by the hon. member.

Mr. COCKBURN. I said they were not so closely and zealously looked after as they might be if we had an agent there acting with the British ambassador.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will accept the hon. gentleman's qualification of the words I have attributed to him. I said that the hon. gentleman had stated that our interests were not closely looked after, and the hon. gentleman says that I left out the conjunction, and that the words he used were "not so closely" looked after. I accept his qualification, and to the extent which it minimizes the statement accordingly. But, Sir, after all the hon. gentleman admits that our interests are so far distinct from those of the United Kingdom that the Government of England sends a representative who does not so closely regard, and does not extend to our interests that watchful care that a representative of Canada would do. When the hon. gentleman makes that admission, I think he makes all the admission necessary to uphold and support the proposition of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Now, Sir, whatever may be the views of political economists who think that in the highest and most accurate sense the interests of nations are never antagonistic to each other on questions of trade and commerce, that is not the view taken by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn), or, so far as I know, by any hon. gentleman on that side of the House; and whatever views may be entertained on the subject of trade and commerce, there are certain other relations affecting the territory and the sovereignty of this country, in which the feelings of the people of Canada are not adequately represented by any one from the other side of the Atlantic. We know that it does not matter very much to the Government of the United Kingdom whether our rights in the Atlantic fisheries are maintained according to our contention, or whether they are surrendered to the extent of the American contention. It matters very little to the Government of the United Kingdom whether the seals in Behring Sea are regarded as American property strayed away from home, or whether they are regarded as the property of mankind generally. There are other interests represented by the English Foreign Office which attract the attention of British statesmen and which are considered paramount, and so in regard to all these matters which are of vital concern to us, and which are necessary to the building up of a nationality in this part of the North American continent which have very little interest for any Government in the United Kingdom. It is true that the Foreign Office does take some interest in our affairs. So long as it has charge of these affairs, the Foreign Office must feel that it is necessary not to disgracefully abandon the just claims of Canada; but in so far as they can pursuade us to abandon them for the sake of a peaceful settlement they feel that they may in the interests of the Empire properly do so. The Imperial Government is much more concerned with the maintenance of their sovereignty in India, and with the holding of Russian ambition in check in Central Asia, than it is in holding in check American aggression on the North American continent, and so I say that the sovereign interests of the Empire which specially affect Canada on this continent are much more likely to be properly cared for, and much more likely to be adequately guarded by a person responsible to the Parliament and to the Government here, than by one responsible to the Parliament and Government at Westminster. I do not think that there can be any doubt on this, because everything that has transpired proves it. I need not refer to anything more than the Fenian raids to show this. What was there in the claim of the United States with regard to the Alabama, that was not equally strong against the United States and in favour of Canada on the subject of the Fenian raids? Is there any hon. gentleman on that side of the House who will for one moment pretend that the Government of the United States were to be excused for permitting men to arm and to drill and fit themselves out in a warlike manner and to enter upon Canadian territory with a view of committing hostilities? Was not the Government of the United States more responsible for what transpired in reference to these raids, than was the Government of the United Kingdom responsible for the raids committed by the *Alabama* and the *Shenandoah* and the *Florida* and other vessels sailing from England to commit depredations upon the commerce of the American Republic? Sir, with regard to these matters our interests were subordinated to what the Imperial Government felt to be the interests of the Empire. The Government of Great Britain was seeking to hold Russia in check, was anxious to avoid quarrels with the United States and was ready to make sacrifices for the purpose of reconciliation in reference to the United States that were perhaps in the interests of the United Kingdom but certainly were not in the interests of Canada. I could mention other illustrations, but that one of the Fenian raids is sufficient to show that the interests of Canada and the interests of mother country in our diplomatic relations with the neighbouring Republic are not always identical. Therefore the interests of Canada, if they are to be adequately cared for and properly protected, must be under the control and jurisdiction of Canada. I do not know, but it does not seem to be that there are the difficulties in the way of working out this question that have been suggested by some hon. gentlemen in the discussion that took place earlier in the session. I have pointed out before that the tendency at the present time, the evolution, if I may be allowed the expression, of our constitutional system, shows that the exercise of executive authority with reference to external relations cannot always be continued in the hands of those who reside at Westminster; and when the interests of any important colony are paramount, when it is the colony which is chiefly concerned, then it is the responsible Government of the colony, and not that of the United Kingdom, which should control the negotiations for the settlement of the question. Now, it is because that is the case with Canada that I favour the proposition of the hon. gentleman. I do not say that as worded it is in all respects such as would occur to my mind; but I accept it generally as a first step necessary for the establishment of our control for the securing of a substantial voice in the management of our external affairs. I do not ask that this shall be done in all matters; but I say that in those cases in which we are the parties chiefly affected, we,

and not the Government at Westminster, should decide how the question should be settled. That being so, I think it is important that the proposition embraced in the resolution of the hon. member for North Simcoe should receive the sanction of the House. It was said fifty years ago that responsible government for domestic purposes was incompatible with the maintenance of our connection with the mother country. It is said now that the granting of this proposition is incompatible with the maintenance of those relations. Experience has shown that the first contention was altogether erroneous. I believe experience will show that the contention with regard to this proposition is equally erroneous; and that it is possible to establish this relation, and to work out this policy of giving to the important colonies a voice in the management of their external relations, without in any way weakening the connection between the colonies and the mother country. On the contrary, in my opinion, it would rather tend to strengthen that connection, because it would give us the position of equals and not the position of subordinates which we have up to this moment occupied, in reference to external affairs in which we are deeply interested.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask my hon. friend which proposition he adheres to—the proposition that in matters mainly affecting one of the colonies of the Empire, the colony should have the control of the negotiations, or the other proposition, which he stated immediately afterwards, that the colonies should have a substantial voice in the negotiations, because the two propositions are very different from each other.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I suppose that the colony would have a substantial voice if it exercised a controlling influence.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, I would like to know which proposition the hon. gentleman wishes to adhere to. I do not think that was really a very candid reply on the part of an hon. gentleman of my hon. friend's standing in the House. He knows very well that he has not answered the question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the question the hon. gentleman has put to me. I am prepared to do so whenever a proper motion for the discussion of that question is before the House. I did discuss it a few days ago. I think that the extent to which any dependency should have a voice in the management of the interests which concern itself will depend altogether on the extent to which that interest is exclusive, or paramount, or co-ordinate.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sure that the House is very much enlightened as to the views of the hon. gentleman in the reply he has made. My hon. friend is not in the clouds, at all events. However, I am glad to find that my hon. friend, although he has given us a treatise on this subject, does not himself feel that it is one so very easily dealt with as one would have supposed at one time from his remarks. The truth of the matter is that when he comes down to a definition my hon. friend is as vague as any one can very well be. He lays down the proposition that the colonies under certain circumstances should have the control of the negotiations, and in the next breath he modifies that proposition by the statement that they should have a substantial voice in the negotiations. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House further than just to say that from my point of view I am heartily in accord with the resolution which my hon. friend has presented to the House. It does seem to me that it would be of very great advantage, both to Canada and to the representative of the mother country at Washington, if we had there some one thoroughly familiar with affairs in Canada, who from his intimate knowledge of our affairs, would be able to inform the representative of of Her Majesty as to the best course to follow in the interest of the Dominion. For my own part, I do not see—it may be simply because I do not take a sufficiently accurate view of the case—why we should anticipate any more friction in that case than we have experienced from the establishment of the Parliament which we have in Canada. If it be possible to establish a Parliament such as exists in Canada, and to give to our people the rights that they possess to-day, and if that can be done without friction, and worked harmoniously as it has been, and as it is being from year to year more harmoniously worked, I do not see why any danger should be anticipated from the appointment by us of a gentleman to be placed as an *attaché* on the staff of the representation of Her Majesty at Washington. I do not see why we need anticipate any friction. If the gentleman were not so attached, if he were sent there to negotiate treaties for Canada irrespective of the mother country altogether, I do think that we should very soon find that there would be friction, and friction of a very serious description too. I cannot imagine, for my part, anything better calculated to force this Empire asunder, or to set the various members of this Empire at each other's throats, than to give them power to negotiate treaties irrespective of one another or of the central authority. This, however, appears to me to be a very different proposition, and one which in no way threatens the danger which would accompany the arrangement proposed a short time ago by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). That hon. gentleman has to-day, however, made a remark in which I do coincide—sometimes my hon. friend and myself do coincide in our views, but not as often as I should wish—when he said that the Imperial authorities had not treated Canada in reference to the Fenian raid claims as Canada ought to have been treated. I agree with my hon. friend. I am very far from saying that the Imperial authorities have always acted towards either England, Ireland, or Scotland or Canada just as they ought to have acted, and I think they did not act in reference to Canada on that occasion as they ought to have acted.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They paid her to be quiet.

Mr. McNEILL. But when my hon. friend says that at that time the Government of Great Britain were acting towards Canada as they did, because their minds were centred on India, and because they were watching Russia and were anxious to check Russian ambition there, I think my hon. friend is very, very wide of the mark. I think my hon. friend is just as far wide of the mark as he can very well be. The truth of the matter is it was not any such spirit that actuated the British Government of that day at that time. The truth of the matter is that the spirit which actuated the British Gov-

ernment in that day was the spirit which had confined England and English politics to the silver streak. The truth of the matter is that the spirit which actuated the British Government of that day was the spirit which actuates the gentleman who is a disgrace to this country, and who is, from his residence in Toronto, penning letters in American magazines to injure this country—I mean Mr. Goldwin Smith. The spirit which actuated the mother country, or rather the Government of the mother country at that time was the spirit of the Manchester school. My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) shakes his head, but it is the fact. That was the spirit which actuated those who held power in the mother country at that time, and I can assure my hon. friend there were a great many people in the mother country who would agree with his remark in reference to that matter, who were very much ashamed of the position in which England was placed, as regards the enforcement of the rights of the colonies, simply because of the pressure of those who dominated to a large extent the press of England at that time—I mean the Manchester school. When my hon. friend says that the Government of England are more concerned with questions connected with English politics than they are with the fishery question on the Atlantic or the seal troubles on the Pacific, I suppose that to some extent my hon. friend is correct. I presume a local Government is generally more concerned with local affairs in one sense. I presume that local affairs are more present to the minds of an English local Government than more distant affairs, but I think it was a little ungenerous of my hon. friend to refer to the British Government as not having acted towards Canada with respect to our fishery claims on the Atlantic as they should have done. I think my hon. friend should recollect that the British Government made our claims their claims with regard to the fishery treaty: that they sent over here an agent whose sole desire was to find out the wishes of the representatives of Canada in Washington at the time and give effect to those wishes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Did the Treaty of 1888 give effect to our wishes with regard to land-locked bays on our coasts, and was the same rule adopted as the Americans hold with regard to land-locked bays on their coasts?

Mr. McNEILL. That is not a question affecting in any degree what I have been saying.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, it affects it altogether.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he thinks that every treaty which is arranged is to be arranged just according to the views of one side concerned in the treaty. I would like to ask him whether he does not expect that when we enter into negotiations with the United States, either with regard to fishery treaties or anything else, a certain amount of compromise on the one side or the other will probably be wise? I think, at all events, that the treaty which was then negotiated, had it been carried into effect, would have been a good treaty for Canada. As my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says, hon. gentlemen opposite considered it a good treaty; at all events they supported it. As I was about to say, I think the course my hon. friend took was most ungenerous with regard to the fishery treaty, and I think it was especially ungenerous when he referred to the Behring Sea trouble. He knows perfectly well that had it not been for the interest the mother country took in the Canadian rights and privileges in the Behring Sea, we would have been unable to maintain our position there at all. He knows perfectly well that if the British Government had gone the length of forcing war between the Empire and the United States, Canada would have been the main sufferer in any such trouble. He knows perfectly well that is the case. I must say I am very sorry my hon. friend should have treated the House to such remarks as he has treated us to with reference to this matter. I do not think it lies very well in the mouth of any member of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition to cast aspersions on the Imperial Government concerning matters as to whether they have been doing their utmost to further our interests, as they have been, both with regard to the fisheries and the Behring Sea question.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why are you supporting this resolution if that is the case?

Mr. McNEILL. I am very glad my hon. friend has put that question. It is perfectly fair, and I am prepared to answer it. I support this resolution because I believe it will assist the Imperial Government very much in the knowledge that is necessary to enable them properly to defend and uphold our interests. I say that in most cases, in almost every case which can be pointed out, except perhaps the the case of the Fenian raids, where our interests were not guarded as they ought to have been by the Imperial Government, it is because the Imperial Government has been deficient in information. This is true both with regard to the boundaries and almost every other question we can refer to. And I say that the proposal of my hon. friend will have the effect of informing the British Government or representatives in a way in which they would otherwise not be informed. I do not wish to take up the time of the House further, but am glad to say that I think the resolution of my hon. friend is one worthy of the support of the House, and, further, from my point of view, and I should imagine, from the point of view also of those who agree with me as to the future of the Empire, it has I think this advantage, that it will tend to the benefit not only of Canada but of the Empire as a whole.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The very great importance of this question is indicated by the range of the debate, because members who have discussed it, without indeed, I must admit, departing very much from the principle of the resolution, have discussed all the relations of Canada to the Empire. We have had a little debate about the policy of Great Britain in so far as Canada is concerned: we have had allusions to the history of British diplomacy in so far as it affected Canada, and especially as administered at Washington. I admit, as I have said before, that these subjects are somewhat touched upon by this resolution. I refer to the extent of the interests which it does touch, for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the necessity of the greatest care before pronouncing a definite opinion upon this question, I mean as to the details of the resolution it may adopt. Now, in all the argument that has taken place upon the subject this afternoon, it seems to me that the reasoning has not had a tendency to support the resolution itself. In the reasoning we have had from illustrations

taken from British history in regard to her action as to Canada and her diplomacy as to Canada, and especially the illustrations of recent date in which it did seem that her policy somewhat disregarded the interests of Canada, we have had arguments in favour of our having an agent at Washington either of a commercial or of a diplomatic character, but the terms of the resolution are distinct and look not so much to the appointment of an agent at Washington as of an officer attached to the staff of the British Minister there, who, in my humble judgment, would be of a different position altogether, from that contemplated by the hon. gentlemen who have supported the resolution. Let us see whether the argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite are not open to the answer of the Minister of Finance, though the Opposition may be just in their criticism in regard to the term "commercial agent" as used by him. What was the argument of the leader of the Opposition himself? It was that an officer of this kind would be useful to both Governments, and that he ought to report to both Governments. The hon. gentleman, in that argument, distinctly put the officer in the position of an agent of this country appointed with the assent of Her Majesty's Government and having obligations both to the British Government and to the Canadian Government, because he must report to both. There is a great deal to be said in favour of that view, and I suppose that is the light in which the Minister of Finance framed his statements. There is a great deal to be said in favour of the appointment at Washington of an agent—let us drop the term "commercial agent," and say simply "agent"—who would have the duty that a consul has in foreign countries, and would have the powers of such an official where there is not a full diplomatic agent. The importance of that may be seen in the instances which were adduced this afternoon. While I am not able to agree with all the leader of the Opposition said as to what took place in 1888, what has taken place since has shown that personal intercourse with a Government with which we have international relations, such as we have with the United States, is of great importance with a view to removing uncertainty and misunderstanding on various matters. That was the principal value of the negotiations of 1888, though they did not result in a treaty, they did result in a better understanding between the two Governments, and our experience in regard to commercial and other affairs shows that, as to Governments as well as to individuals, personal communications are better than any which have to go through the long circuit through which the ordinary official communications between Canada and Washington have to go. Therefore, a great deal is to be said in favour of the establishment of an agency of that kind. I agree with my hon. friends on this side who deny the desire of Canada to have an agent there with full diplomatic relations. I agree that the practice of arranging that some person recommended by the Government of Canada should act with the plenipotentiary on behalf of Her Majesty has been satisfactory in the negotiation of treaties of late years. For many reasons which it would be unnecessary for me to discuss this evening, I think that the criticism on the part of our friends on this side is wise, and that we ought to rest satisfied with the arguments in favour of an agency established there, as in other parts of the United States, such as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) indicated in his remarks. But whether we shall obtain the same advantage from an officer attached to the staff of the British Minister is another question. I think there is a wide distinction there. In my judgment, not only would it not be the duty of the officer to report to both Governments, but it would not be his right or his duty to report to either. He would be simply the servant, and the confidential servant of the British Minister himself. I admit that there would be some value in having such an officer there because he could afford information to the Minister on Canadian affairs, which would be more correct than the ambassador could get from other sources, but he would be powerless to communicate with us. What would come under his observation from time to time would be within the confidence of his master, and he would not be at liberty to report to us any circumstances whatever without the permission of his master. As far as that is concerned, we would have no advantage at all, because now, when the British Minister thinks circumstances have arisen which the Canadian Government should be made aware of, it is his duty and his instruction to communicate them directly to us. Therefore, what the *attaché* would do in communicating with us is done now. We can conceive of many cases in which it would be most important that we should know what is proceeding between the two Governments, and the *attaché* might know of that and still be powerless to communicate with us upon it. For these reasons, I think it is undesirable that we should commit ourselves to a proposition in favour of appointing an officer who would simply be attached to the British Minister's staff. I think the time is approaching when it may be desirable for us to have an agent at Washington as well as at other points in the United States, an agent appointed with the consent of the British Government, not clothed with plenipotentiary powers, but with such powers as a commercial agent is clothed with, and that, with the sanction of the British Ministry, he should be at liberty to communicate to us any difficulties he may apprehend, any emergencies he may foresee, which an *attaché* of the British Minister could not do under the seal of secrecy which would be attached to the position he would hold on that staff. The subject is of such importance that I think the House should be very careful in committing itself even to the terms of the resolution. I think, if any agent should be appointed there, he should not be more subordinate to the British Minister than any consular agent would be. For the purpose of seeing whether I have correctly understood that the arguments advanced in favour of the scheme point rather to the appointment of an agent than to the appointment of an officer attached to the staff, let us apply some of the illustrations we have had this afternoon; let us ask ourselves in regard to one of the questions in relation to which it is said that Great Britain has not conserved the rights and interests of Canada, how much better these would have been treated if there had been a Canadian attached to the staff of the British Minister at Washington. Would we have had any more favourable consideration of our claims arising out of the Fenian raids from the mere fact

of our having an *attaché* there? That question was dealt with, I suppose, by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs himself, as a part of the policy of the British Government. If we take up any other of the illustrations we have had this afternoon, we find in not one of these cases could our position have been improved by an officer surrounded by the embarrassments which a mere confidential servant of the British Minister would be in. I urge upon the House again that if we are to take the very important step of having a representative there, or in any other foreign country, we ought to insist that so far as confidence is concerned he should be independent of the British Minister having a right to approach him daily and to receive communications from him, and the Minister should be charged with the duty of giving him such information as can be properly given in the interest of Canada; but that we should not have him in such close relations that he must obtain the assent of the Minister himself before he can make any communication to this Government. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that that would be a matter of arrangement. He will see at once, I think, that any arrangements which would make an *attaché* independent of the Minister would be utterly incompatible with such a position. From the fact of his close association with the Minister, from the fact of his being attached to his staff, he must learn many things which only a person in the confidence of a Minister can learn, but he is not at liberty to communicate them under any arrangement which can be made without obtaining the approval of that Minister himself; and even if he shall have procured information elsewhere than in the Minister's office, as to events which he may have heard of from other sources, he is not at liberty to communicate them to us without acting inconsistently with the terms which exist between an *attaché* and the Minister. For these reasons, I repeat that I think the House, in dealing with interests of such great importance, should deliberate very carefully upon the kind of policy which we wish adopted, or which we wish to recommend; and for that reason I move that the debate upon this resolution be now adjourned.

Mr. WELDON. I would like to add a word before this debate is closed, and that is a remark that escaped my memory when I was on my feet before, with reference to the omission of the Fenian raid claim which was submitted, as my hon. friend from Bothwell said a few moments ago, to the Joint High Commission at Washington. I think that circumstance affords the strongest proof in the whole discussion in favour of the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe. I think that my recollection of that matter is correct, that when the negotiations had been running in the autumn of 1870 during the month of November and early in December, a preliminary agreement was come to by the British Minister and by the American Secretary of State, setting forth a memorandum of the subjects on which the two nations were to arbitrate, these being, first, the damages wrought by the *Alabama* and other Confederate cruisers; second, the bonding privileges; third, the Oregon boundary; fourth, freedom of the St. Lawrence; and sixth, the Atlantic fisheries, and one or two minor matters. I have no doubt whatever, from my recollection, that the question of the Fenian raids at that early stage in the month of November, was omitted from that order of reference for the simple reason that the British embassy was not sufficiently in touch with Canadian feeling, and did not know the magnitude of this question from the Canadian point of view. I have no doubt they meant to press the Canadian claims, but when it was discovered, some months later, that the order of reference had been by this preliminary arrangement fixed, and when it came to the knowledge of Canada that the Fenian raid question was not incorporated, and when our people pressed for a consideration of their claims, the answer was: It is too late. My point is that if, in the early months of those negotiations, if in the months of October or November, 1870, there had been a Canadian *attaché* at Washington, in touch with Canadian feeling, reading the Canadian newspapers, and knowing how strongly Canadians felt in this regard, that matter would have been put in a much better position.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I followed the argument of the leader of the House carefully, and was sorry to observe the conclusion at which he arrived. We frankly admit that if the statements he made are to be accepted as the only conditions under which this official could be appointed, his appointment would be of very little use. He has correctly stated that the relations existing between Canada and the States are so intricate, and the interests involved are so great, that all leading men acknowledge that the present fashion of making communication between the two countries is exceedingly cumbersome; we all admit that. We all remember when the Washington Treaty of 1888 was discussed, and when the correspondence which led up to that treaty was laid before the House; and the circumlocution that existed in exchanging despatches between the Government of Canada and the Government at Washington, and in getting a reply, was sufficient to convince everybody who studied the question that some escape from the existing difficulty must be found. We found on that occasion, for instance, that a despatch on a vital question at which the two Governments were at variance, and in which there existed the possibility, to say nothing more, of war, that it took nearly seven months for a despatch sent from the Canadian Government to the Washington Government and to have a reply. There was, perhaps, some excusable delay; I do not know where the fault occurred, perhaps both sides were to blame; but nobody could justify the existence of a system which permitted seven months to elapse between a despatch going from Canada and receiving a reply from the Government at Washington. Now, we all saw that if practical common sense had been applied to the negotiations, a despatch might have been forwarded and a reply received within six weeks, giving both parties time to consider the issues involved. The hon. gentleman suggests that we can escape from the difficulty by appointing what he calls an agent, what is practically a consul. I can see no good reason why the appointment of a consul cannot coincide with the appointment of a diplomatic agent. Their duties are altogether different. I should suppose if you did appoint a consul, or a gentleman who fills the duties which a consul usually does, that Washington is about the last place to which he should be sent. New York, being the great emporium of the

United States, or Boston, the city with which we do the largest business, or Chicago, would be the centres to which you would send such a gentleman as the leader of the House suggests. It does not appear to me that he would fill the bill at all. The difficulty is to have the special views of the Canadian Government upon questions especially affecting Canadian interests, pressed upon the Administration at Washington. The difficulty is to have somebody there fully cognizant with Canadian interests, and capable of dealing with Canadian interests in the Washington Congress and reporting on them to the Government here. Now, that cannot be met by the appointment of a consular agent. The hon. gentleman begins with this statement, that if you do appoint such a diplomatic agent he will not be permitted to report, as he necessarily ought to do, and necessarily must do, jointly to this Government and to the Imperial Government. Why not? The hon. gentleman sees we are suggesting a condition of things for which there is no parallel. We are evolving out of the old colonial status into something a little higher, for which there has been no precedent. He will see that the old hard and fast rules, which governed the diplomatic service of Great Britain in its dealings with foreign powers, cannot be applied to the new condition of affairs where one of her colonies is permitted to appoint a special *attaché* to the embassy, charged with care over Canadian interests. It necessarily must follow that that special *attaché* so appointed and so charged, must make a report to those who charged him. If he is to go there simply as a Canadian, not having any further communication with us, not receiving instructions from us, and no more in contact with the people of Canada after he goes there, than an *attaché* from England, what benefit would he be? None whatever. He must be in touch with the Canadian people, and he must receive communications and advice from the Canadian Government; he must report to them from time to time jointly with such a report as he may make to the Imperial Government. But it is not for us to lay down the conditions and limitations that should attach to this appointment. The experience of the Foreign Office will no doubt do that successfully and well. What we have to bear in mind is the great point we have in view: the difficulties that exist, and the means of meeting them. The suggestion which the hon. gentleman makes, not as a final solution but as a tentative measure which would at all events remove existing difficulties, is an experiment which might be tried, and we might ascertain how it would work. I have every confidence that the Home Office, recognizing the principle underlying this resolution, recognizing the fact that we have special interests which require a Canadian appointee to guard, will be prepared to go as far as is necessary in order to make this officer when appointed an effective one. It will not do for me or for the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to attempt to lay down those limitations which it might be necessary to set out in respect to this appointment, but I have no doubt it will be a step in the right direction and that very great good will result from it. If the appointee were simply a commercial agent, he would have nothing to do with diplomatic matters. He would have no right to communicate either with the British Minister or with Mr. Blaine.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not speak of a commercial agent only; I spoke of something between a commercial agent and a diplomatic agent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) A kind of hybrid, so far as is known to the diplomatic service at the present time. In order to be effective, he must be attached to the British embassy, because all communications are made between Great Britain and the United States through the embassy, and all Canadian representations are communicated to the United States through the embassy after going through the Foreign Office. He must, therefore, necessarily be attached to the embassy and work in unison with the embassy. Although I see difficulties in the way, I see no insuperable difficulties, and the exercise of a little common sense would remove them, and as I see no objection to the proposal of my hon. friend from East Simcoe, I am prepared to support his motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has moved the adjournment of the debate. I would see no objection to this course being taken under different circumstances, but, in view of the remarks made by the two Ministers, I cannot but regard the proposed adjournment with feelings of diffidence. The two hon. members on the Treasury benches who have spoken on the question to-day have not spoken in a manner favouring the resolution. On the contrary, both hon. gentlemen who addressed the House showed conclusively that they did not favour the resolution of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but that they would favour something else. Now, what is this something else which those hon. gentlemen favour instead of the proposal of the hon. member for Simcoe? They do not propose a commercial agent, but they propose an agent of some kind, and so far as I understood the Minister of Justice, what he would propose would be an agent at Washington who would report confidentially to the Government. Well, this seems to be very objectionable to my mind. First, as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has stated, we have to face a new state of affairs in this country. We are now a colony of 5,000,000 people, in many respects a semi-independent people; we are already a nation, and we claim to be a nation; yet so long as we are a dependency of the British Crown, it is impossible we can have any accredited representative to a foreign country. With our neighbours, with whom we share the continent, it is inevitable that we must have, I will not say difficulties, but international relations. The best way to meet them would be, according to the tenets of international law, through our own embassy at Washington. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has suggested the very best plan under the circumstances; that we should have, so far as we are able to acquire it under present circumstances, an embassy of our own at Washington in the manner he has suggested, an *attaché* to the British embassy, reporting not only to the British Government, but to the Canadian Government as well. But what does the Minister of Justice propose? He proposes that Canada should have an agent at Washington. Of course, he would not be an accredited agent who could be recognized by the American Government. They could not treat with him; he could not approach the Secretary of State and have official relations with him. Of course, he could have confidential relations; he

could communicate confidentially with the Secretary of State, if the Secretary of State chose to see him. He could report confidentially to this Government; but certainly that would be the most objectionable of all forms of diplomatic relations. It would be practically the introduction here of a secret service which has too often been the bane of European diplomacy. For my part, the proposal of the hon. Minister is most objectionable for all purposes, because there would be nothing open, but everything would be secret and confidential. This Parliament could not ask for the information which had been received, because, it being confidential, the Government could keep it to themselves. Hon. members should not favour a proposal of that kind. We have recognition of this fact that after all we have distinct interests from the British Government and the British people, that those interests are to be served in some way, and so long as we have nothing better suggested than this proposition of the hon. member for Simcoe, I, for my part, will abide by it. Hon. gentlemen opposite propose the adjournment of the debate. What does that mean at this stage of the session? It means simply that this question is to be shelved and is to have no solution during the present session. This is too important a question to be treated in this manner, and for my part I shall oppose the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think on the whole I have no reason to be discouraged at the reception which my motion has met with on both sides of the House. There seems to be, at all events, a feeling, if not from the most conservative point of view, that we should have some kind of representative to the great country to the south of us. I have felt for many years, and the longer I am in public life the more strongly do I feel, that it is impossible for this great country to thwart the natural development and the process of evolution which is going on. We must remember that we are a great nation; we are recognized in that capacity, although we have not yet the full powers of nationality. I am not at all one of those who think that our interests are diverse from those of the British Government and that they must inevitably lead to separation between the Dominion of Canada and the Empire. In that I know I differ from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to hear that expression of dissent; I thought that was the view taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe the interests of this country and the interests of the great Empire, of which we form no insignficant part, are not antagonistic. I cannot, for my part, believe the people of this country will be satisfied unless we are leading on, unless the development of a great country like this advances; and I believe further, that we have only to ask, in any reasonable way, the mother country to receive at the hands of the great statesmen who guide her destinies, that recognition of the growing power of the Dominion of Canada to which we are entitled. It is one of the glories of the British constitution, it is one of the things that distinguishes it from all other systems of government—the power of expansion, the power from time to time to meet the growing wants, whether those of the growing democracy on the native soil, or the developments, in other ways, of the dependencies which belong to the empire of Great Britain; and I feel satisfied that when attention is drawn to this subject, when the close intercourse and intimate trade relations which exist between Canada and the United States are recognized, the reasonable proposition that we should be at liberty to have our own representative at Washington, will not be denied to us. I do not understand the leader of the House to dissent altogether from that view. The Minister of Finance rather favoured the appointment of a commercial agent. But that does not meet the point I desire to present, while at the same time I do not mean to say that that is not important. I have long recognized the unfortunate position the commercial people of this country labour under in having no agent to report to us the special wants of the country, wants which we possibly would be able to fill. But we have other interests, interests which are more or less embroiling us with the people on the other side of the line; greater, far greater than the interests—except in a commercial point of view, —that the mother country has with the people of the United States. I am not wedded to any former words of my own or pinned down to any particular course or to any particular policy, but I want to know, consistent with our position as a dependency of the British Government, how can we have that representation in international matters except in the way that I suggest? My hon. friend who has just spoken has pointed out that we could not appoint an agent there. As we are not an independent power our agent would not be received at Washington except under the authority of Her Majesty's Minister. Well, surely my proposition is more reasonable than that Her Majesty should delegate a British Minister to represent England, and a Canadian Minister to represent specially Canadian interests, the one independent of the other. It does appear to me that the reasonable way of carrying out this proposal is that we should ask that we should have the liberty of appointing a gentleman responsible to the Foreign Office at home, a gentleman who would be under the control of the British Minister at Washington, but a gentleman who would be authorized to report to our Government. If that could be arranged, and it is a subject of arrangement, the difficulty which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice seems to find would at once disappear. Granted now that no *attache* of the British Government could report except on the authority of the British Minister, granted that everything he knows and acquires he is bound to hold under the seal of secrecy, of course that leaves matters as they are to-day. But if this proposition which I venture to present to the House is acceded to, a way and a means must be found by which the Minister will permit, not in a hostile spirit, but will permit communications between the Governor General here, who is the head of our Executive, and the representative we send to Washington. Now, I do not know where this may lead, but I have the greatest confidence that it will not lead in any way which will be injurious to the interest which binds us now so happily to the mother land. I have the greatest confidence that the recognition of our great might and power will be all in favour of union, and all in favour of the permanency of existing arrangements, but it is impossible for me to doubt that the great interest of this country has with the people of the United States ought not to be

permitted to receive direct representation at Washington. I forbear, Sir, to go into any controversial matter which has been raised in the course of this discussion. I am not going to take up any of the illustrations and point them as tending to one conclusion or the other. I desire that this should not assume a party aspect or be treated as a party question. It seems to me it is a question which is common to the interests under which for once at least we may sink our differences on party questions, and join together. Therefore it is that I am glad it has on the whole been so temperately and fairly discussed. With regard to the motion for adjournment, I would ask my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition not to press the House to a division against the opinion of the Government in that respect. I do not at all fear that the matter will not be raised again, and I think it would be perhaps best for the interests we all have at heart if the Government were permitted a fitting opportunity to reconsider, or to come down with some definite proposition, if they have a definite proposition to make. At present, I do not quite understand I must confess, the views that they entertain. If I had to vote on this question, as proposing it, I should certainly do so, and if I have to vote against the adjournment in the belief that the adjournment would shelve the question I would vote against the adjournment; but I do not quite understand that the adjournment of this debate will shelve this question for the session. It will go on Public Bills and Orders and would be reached on Wednesday week as I understand it. With that expression of opinion, in which of course my hon. friend on the opposite side is as well competent to deal as I am, I think on the whole that the Government not having given this matter full consideration, the House should understand exactly what alternative they propose and then we would be in a position to say that we either accept the alternative proposition of the Government or adopt the one which I have ventured to suggest. I can only say in conclusion, that the only means I can see of our having a representative is in the manner suggested by my resolution. At the same time, the members of the Government are much more familiar with the actual practical working of Government matters than I can pretend to be, and I shall listen with very great attention and care to any proposal or counter proposal that may be made. But I certainly would not be willing to accept as adequate by any means a proposition that would substitute a mere consular agent for the wider and larger scope which I think our agent should hold at Washington.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has more confidence as a rule in the Government than I have and in the hope that deliberation will produce a change for the better in their ideas as expressed to-day; we will agree to accept the adjournment.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN.

On the Order being called for the motion of Mr. Fauvel, with reference to commerce between Canada and Great Britain;

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the Minister of Justice to allow this motion to stand.

Mr. McCARTHY.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no objection as regards the absence of the hon. gentleman whose name it appears in; but I would like the hon. gentleman to consider, whether the motion could be moved or not? It seems to me to be the same question that was disposed of the other night.

Mr. LAURIER. That may be, but I ask this favour especially because Mr. Fauvel on one or two occasions was ready to proceed and could not. There is some force in what the hon. gentleman says. The hon. member is absent, however, and I would not like that any step be taken in his absence.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Very well, we will allow it to stand.

COCKBURN ISLAND—LOCATION TICKETS.

Mr. LISTER moved for:

Copy of location ticket granted to John Alexander McLellan, of Cockburn Island, for lot 15 in the 5th concession, Cockburn Island. Also, copy of all affidavits or declarations, letters and other papers from any person or persons to the department, or any officer of the department, in any way relating to said lot or the cancellation of the said ticket. Also, copy of any order made for the cancellation of said ticket.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. Minister of the Interior that I brought the subject-matter of this motion to his attention last session, and I now bring it before the House in the shape of a motion for the purpose of getting the information which he then refused to give. If the facts in my possession are correct, the department has acted in a most extraordinary manner in refusing to give Mr. McLellan the information which he has sought, not only in the House, but by letters to the department. Mr. McLellan was the locatee on lot 15 in the 5th concession of Cockburn Island. He had received his location ticket, and that location ticket was cancelled by the department without, so far as he has been able to learn, any reason whatever. Mr. McLellan applied to Mr. Ross, who is the agent of the department on Cockburn Island, and he was told by Mr. Ross that his location had been cancelled and that his right to the property had been taken away from him. Mr. Ross refused to give any information as to why the location ticket had been cancelled; he simply told Mr. McLellan that declarations had been filed with the Department of the Interior, and upon these declarations this land, to which he claimed he had a legal right, had been taken away. The agent at Cockburn Island refused to give him copies of the affidavits, refused to give him the name of the person or persons who made them, refused to give him the grounds upon which the department had based its judgment that he should be deprived of his land, refused to give him any information about the matter at all. During the last session of Parliament I asked the Minister the reasons for the cancellation of this location ticket, and he said that the matter was a private and confidential one and could not be made public. Now, Sir, it is astounding that in this country and in this age a man who has properly acquired the right to a parcel of land, and who is to all intents and purposes the owner of that land, subject only to the performance of the settlement duties, should be deprived of his land and his rights in it, and that the Government of the country should refuse to tell him for what reason he has been deprived of his property. Now, I present this motion to the House for the pur-

pose of seeing once more if it is not possible to extort from the Minister the reason why this land has been taken away from the settler. As we all know, Cockburn Island was opened for settlement, and it was the right of any individual to go there and locate land for settlement. This man located his land, and received a location ticket from the proper authority; he was as much entitled to that land as any gentleman in this House is entitled to his land, until he made default in the performance of his settlement duties. He says that he did not make default, but that he was informed by the agent on the island that the land was taken away from him, and that the Government had decided that he should not get the patent for it; and it was taken away and given to other people. Now, I ask the Minister to lay on the Table all affidavits presented to the department on which the department has acted in cancelling this location ticket. It is incredible that a man should be deprived of the property to which he is justly entitled without being informed of the reasons, the pretensions or the claims which were made against him as to the ownership of the land, and that he should not be allowed an opportunity of presenting reasons why his rights should not be taken away from him. Yet this man says, and I believe his statement, that he has been deprived of his rights, that he is ignorant of what evidence was produced before the department, and that he had no opportunity of controverting any statements made against him to the department; and if his statement is true, it is an arbitrary and tyrannical act, disgraceful to the department.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Before you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was about making a few remarks on the motion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister). I should not have made any remark had it not been for a few words which fell from the hon. member indicating that he had asked for papers last year and that they had been refused. My recollection was different from that, and since recess I have endeavoured to find out the true facts of the case. Looking at *Hansard*, I find that the hon. gentleman last session asked a question somewhat similar to what appears to-day in his motion, and I replied to the question, but no papers were asked for. If, up to the time the hon. gentleman made his motion this afternoon, there was any objection to giving this information I am not aware of it. I will add for the information of the hon. gentleman what I had given me with regard to this matter which occurred before I took charge of the department:

"Lot 15, con. 5, Cockburn Island, was sold to Mr. John Alexander McLellan on the 12th of December, 1887. Evidence was furnished the department by Agent Ross showing that this lot was taken up for the purpose of stripping it of its timber. The conditions of sale of the lot were not fulfilled, and the sale was accordingly cancelled on the 3rd of July, 1888. The lot is still unsold and is covered, as it was when sold to McLellan, by the timber license of Hitchcock & Foster."

That is the position I believe of this lot, about which the hon. gentleman requested information. With reference to the subsequent motion with regard to another lot, lot 16, in the 4th concession, Cockburn Island, which appears to have been sold to Thomas Smith and by him assigned to Peter McLellan, upon evidence being furnished that he was taking the timber off the lot covered by a timber license to another party, the sale was cancelled. That is all the information I have on the subject, and there is no reason why these papers should not be laid on the Table.

Mr. LISTER. So far as the statement of the hon. gentleman is concerned as to what took place last year, I find, on referring to *Hansard*, that he correctly stated the position of the matter then. All that I did last session was to put a question upon the paper. I asked:

"Was John Alexander McLellan entitled to lot 15 in 5th concession of Cockburn Island under location ticket, either granted or assigned to him? Has the ticket been cancelled? If so, when, and for what reason? Has any person, since such cancellation, acquired any right or interest in the lot from the Government? If so, the name and address of such person."

That question was asked in June, 1891, and the answer was as follows:—

"Lot 15, concession 5, Cockburn Island, was sold to John Alexander McLellan. The sale of this lot was cancelled on the 3rd of July, 1888, under section 46 of the Indian Act, for non-fulfilment of the conditions of sale. No return has as yet been made to the department by the local agent of the resale of this lot."

I stated a moment ago that when addressing the House this afternoon, I was under the impression that the Minister had stated that the papers were confidential and could not be produced. I find that that was not his answer, and I was led astray by a portion of a letter which I received concerning this matter in which it is stated:

"I have applied to Mr. Ross and the Indian Department for information and the only answer I can get is that certain affidavits were filed which caused the cancellation. I cannot learn the contents of the affidavits or who made them, the department taking the ground, a very peculiar one it seems to me, that these affidavits are confidential."

In speaking this afternoon, I had in my mind the letter in my possession. I have just a few words to add. The Minister says there can be no objection to now producing all the papers and affidavits and every document under which the department acted in cancelling these sales. So far, so well. I am aware that the present Minister of the Interior is not to blame, if there is any blame attaching to any person, as the transaction occurred before he took office. This sale appears to have been cancelled on the 3rd of July, 1888. Since that time up to the present moment—for the last letter I have upon this subject is dated only a few days ago—the legal advisers of Mr. McLellan have been unable to ascertain from the department or their agent on Cockburn Island the causes which led the Government to cancel these location tickets. They were informed from outside quarters that the evidence produced before the department, which induced the department to act, was certain statutory declarations made by parties whose names they could not find out. I do not know whether this information is correct or not, but will know when the papers are on the Table. It is somewhat extraordinary, however, that this man should have acquired a right, whatever it might be under that location ticket, to purchase land upon certain terms, and should have had that right cancelled without any notice being given them, and without submitting to them the evidence upon which the department acted, or

without calling upon them to show cause why their ticket should not be cancelled. That seems to me a very extraordinary proceeding. It seems to me the denial of a trial to which the humblest citizen of the country is entitled. The Minister of the Interior tells us that the right to cut the timber upon these lots has been sold to Messrs. Hitchcock & Foster, of the city of Chicago. They are I believe men who take out cedar posts which they manufacture into paving material and with which they pave the streets of the United States. My information is that they were at the bottom of the whole transaction, through their agent, Mr. Davis, who lives on the Island. They wanted the timber on these two lots, at all events on one lot, and my information is on the two, and their agent on the Island manipulated the matter, as I am credibly informed, through the Government agent so as to have these licenses cancelled, and the timber upon the lands was at once sold by the department to Hitchcock & Foster, of Chicago. And I am told that the affidavits put into the department were put in at the instance of Davis and forwarded by the local agent to the department. I will take the liberty of reading a letter I have on this subject, and if the facts stated in it are at all true, there has been a very grievous wrong done these men :

"I was the owner under a location ticket which had been transferred to me of lot 16, 4th concession, Cockburn Island, and my brother John Alexander McLellan, was the locatee of lot 15 in 5th concession. These are Indian lands and are under the management of Mr. B. W. Ross, the Indian agent on Cockburn Island. The location rights of myself and my brother were cancelled, and I cannot understand the reason why. My own land was cancelled within six months from the time the location ticket was issued. I have applied to Mr. Ross and to the Indian Department for information, and the only answer I can get is that certain affidavits were filed which caused the cancellation. I cannot learn the contents of these affidavits, or who made them, the department taking the ground, a very peculiar one it seems to me, that these affidavits are confidential. It is strange that a man's rights can be taken away from him without his being heard, and without his knowing anything of the reasons why. It happens that Hitchcock & Foster, a Chicago firm which deals in telegraph poles, cedar posts, ties, &c., were instrumental in procuring the cancellation. They have been operating on the Island for some time and have a depot there."

There is the statement made by this man as to the circumstances connected with the cancellation of these licenses, and he has never been informed why his license was taken away from him ; he has never had an opportunity of showing that these statements were true. I think in all fairness the department owes it to these men to give them an opportunity of showing that the statements made in these affidavits are not true, if such is the case, and if their lands have been improperly taken from them and their license has been improperly cancelled, then I am sure the hon. gentleman who presides over the department will not be unwilling to see that justice is done to these men. If as citizens of this country, they have acquired rights, as they claim they had, it is their privilege and their certain right, before their property is taken from them, to have an opportunity of showing why it should not be taken. That is among the rights accorded to every citizen, and this right should not be denied in the Department of the Interior. In bringing this matter before the attention of the Minister, I have done what these people who feel aggrieved have asked me to do, and I ask from the Minister, for them, that this matter shall be again opened up and properly investigated by the department ; for it does seem to me that these unfortunate men have suffered for the purpose of helping on other people who were desirous of getting what they had received from the department. I am not blaming the department except in this that I think it was the duty of the department to have notified these people that application was made to cancel their license, and to have given them an opportunity of presenting their claims to the department, and to show why the license should not be cancelled.

Mr. DEWDNEY. So far as I have information it appears that Mr. McLellan and Mr. Smith, who subsequently sold one of the lots to McLellan, purchased those lots, subject to the license which Hitchcock & Foster had at that time, and that McLellan and his agents were cutting timber on land for which Hitchcock & Foster had a license ; and for that reason I understood the license was cancelled.

Mr. LISTER. These men were not given any opportunity of having their side of the case heard.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I shall take an opportunity of looking into the matter, and will bring down these papers at the earliest moment.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the Minister to the fact that, from the statement he has just made, it is obvious these men have been very harshly treated. If it was reported to the department that they were cutting timber where they had no right, that is no reason why their location ticket should be cancelled and why all their own rights should be forfeited. It may have been a case of trespass, but because they were trespassing, and invading property that was not their own, that is no reason why their own property should be confiscated. It seems to me from the facts, as stated, that there can be no possible reason why these men should be treated in that manner. They took their location in 1887, and about two years afterwards their location ticket was cancelled, and they were deprived of all the rights they had acquired under those tickets ; not only that, but they were so dealt with without any notice to them. If the agent makes a report, I understand that the department may feel justified in acting upon that report, but it is a very harsh course for the Government to take to cancel the location ticket of these men without allowing them an opportunity to speak for themselves, and to show cause why they should not be treated in this manner.

Motion agreed to.

ACCOMMODATION OF GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Return showing the amount of additional property purchased on or adjacent to Government railways for increased accommodation or other purposes ; the quantity purchased or paid for within the period from the 1st of July, 1891, to the 1st of April, 1892 ; the party from whom purchased ; the price paid ; the purpose for which the property is used or is to be used.

Mr. HAGGART. The first part of the return is not very clear, because that would mean all the purchases made since the commencement on the Intercolonial Railway, the Cape Breton Railway and the different branches, and the Grand Trunk Rail-

way. Does the hon. gentleman mean to confine it only to purchases made between 1891 and 1892?

Mr. McMULLEN. My object is to get a return of the amount of property purchased from the 1st July, 1891, to the 1st April, 1892, not to refer to any property anterior to that date.

Motion agreed to.

POSTMASTER OF McINTYRE.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Return giving all papers, letters, petitions, applications, and every other document relating to the dismissal of the postmaster of McIntyre, and the appointment of his successor.

He said: In moving for this return I may state that I am informed that the postmaster of McIntyre was appointed some 17 years ago, and since that time he has never kept the office, but it was kept by a young man who was deformed and who was disqualified for performing ordinary labour. I understand that he performed the duties of the office in a manner very acceptable to the people there. Lately, I understand, the postmaster has been dismissed, and the post office has been taken away from the charge of this young man, in order to give it to a supporter of the Government, and without any charge being made against the postmaster, as I am informed, although I have no personal knowledge of the matter. I am informed by letter that the postmaster never occupied the office, that the office has been kept in the same place ever since it was established, and by this same family. So far as I can learn no charge has been made of any serious character against the postmaster, but the office was transferred from this young man who is deformed, in order, as I said before, to give it to a Government supporter.

Motion agreed to.

POSTMASTER OF EUGENIA.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Return giving all papers, letters, petitions, applications and every other document relating to the dismissal of the postmaster of Eugenia and the appointment of his successor.

He said: Mr. Purdy has been the postmaster at this place for about 30 years, and, as I understand, has performed the duties of the office in a very acceptable manner. Lately, the office has been kept by a Mr. Hogg, and I understand that there is no objection to the management of the office by Mr. Hogg. A short time ago, I am informed that Mr. Purdy was dismissed, and that the office has been given to another person whose name I do not know just now, but who is a supporter of the Government. I understand that the party appointed has not yet taken charge, and that the post office is still under the charge of Mr. Purdy or Mr. Hogg, his deputy. I, therefore, move for this return.

Motion agreed to.

YAMASKA RIVER DAMAGES.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copies of report of any enquiry held under the authority of the Department of Public Works with a view to estimate the losses inflicted on proprietors of the Commune of Yamaska, by the erection of a dam in the Yamaska River.

He said: I would call the attention of the present Minister of Public Works, as I did call the attention of the late Minister of Public Works, two or three sessions ago, to the great damages which have been caused to the proprietors on the river Yamaska by the erection of a dam. The Minister of Public Works then promised me that he would enquire into the matter, as to any damages which might have occurred and to what extent. I do not know whether anything has been done since, but I have been given to understand that the promise was made of an immediate enquiry. In fact, I was shown a telegram from an engineer of the Public Works Department just before the late election to the effect that an investigation would be made at an early date. I would like to learn if any enquiry has been made.

Mr. OUIMET. I have enquired from the department as to whether anything has been done in connection with this matter, and I am told that no such enquiry has ever been held. I am not aware myself, nor can I find out from any of my officers, that any such promise was made as that to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Motion agreed to.

PONTIAC COUNTY RAILWAY DEBT.

Mr. MURRAY moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, memorials, and documents exchanged between the Government, or any member thereof and any persons, companies or corporations as to the propriety or advisability of relieving or recouping the County of Pontiac of its railway indebtedness.

He said: Before I had the honour of representing the County of Pontiac, I understood that applications of that nature were made to the Government, and in fact I was one of a deputation which last session interviewed the late Premier in reference to this particular matter. I have also written to the present Minister of Railways on the subject, and I have also sent a copy of my letter to the present Premier. It may be considered an extraordinary thing for me to ask the Government to come to the relief of the County of Pontiac, but I think the position of that county is very exceptional. A large deputation waited on the late Premier last session asking to be recouped for bonuses which had been voted in the Province of Ontario, and while, for my part, I was prepared to concede all justice to the counties whose cases were similar to that of Pontiac, I think those counties obtained their railways and participated in all the advantages. No doubt those railways were intended to increase the prosperity of the districts and create commercial centres, and the increase of the growth of such places in that way benefited individuals and enabled them to make money. They represented very wealthy agricultural counties as a rule, and they paid large sums and did not feel the burden. But I am sorry to say the condition of Pontiac is quite different. The people voted in 1881 $100,000 for the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway, a company that has not been able to carry out the original intentions as regards the construction of the road. For some reason or other the people were sorry immediately after they had voted the money that they had done so, and endeavoured to prevent the warden signing the debentures. He resigned rather than sign them and they were signed by his successor.

The question as to the legality of the debentures arose, and the county went into litigation with the bondholders and carried the case from court to court until it finally reached the Privy Council. The consequence is, as the House will readily understand, that the county is not only liable for the original amount, but also for all the law costs and interest that has accrued since; in fact the whole debt amounts to $175,000. The question might naturally be asked, why should the County of Pontiac ask relief from the Government? We contend that Pontiac is a colonization county, that this is a colonization railway and interprovincial and international in its character, that such railways have received liberal aid from the Government of Canada. Take the Northern Railway that extends from Toronto to North Bay. It received $12,000 per mile for 110 miles, or $1,300,000 by way of subsidies. I do not believe that the municipalities through which the road passed were asked to contribute one dollar. This road is going northward, and Pontiac is one of the most western portions of the Province of Quebec, and it can fairly be considered as a colonizing railway. Moreover, it is intended to intersect with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Pembroke. So, considering the large subsidies given, as in the case of the Northern Railway, and considering that Pembroke has been relieved of its indebtedness of $75,000, which was given to the old Canada Central Railway, and no doubt the town was relieved from that indebtedness for just reasons, the request of the County of Pontiac should be granted. Then take the County of Ottawa. It granted $200,000 to the North Shore Railway; but the people escaped payment of their indebtedness through some technicality, or at all events they did not pay it. The Dominion Government have authorized the treasury to pay to the Province of Quebec $12,000 a mile to that railway from Montreal to Ottawa. Considering all these circumstances, and that Pontiac is so near to these places that have been relieved, and considering the history of bonuses given to railways since Confederation, considering further that municipalities which borrowed under the old municipal loan fund both in Ontario and Quebec were able to make a favourable settlement of all such bonuses, and that non-borrowing municipalities were compensated in proportion, this concession should be granted to the County of Pontiac. I am sorry to say that Pontiac did not participate in any arrangement under this Act to which I have referred, and did not receive any compensation in lieu of money advanced under the municipal Act. Then I wish to point out the present condition of Pontiac so far as this debt affects the prosperity of the people of the county. During the last ten years the population has not increased in that county. That it is altogether due to this cause or to other causes combined, I am not prepared to say, but this burden of debt had had a great deal to do with crippling the growth of the county. In 1881 the population was 19,989; in 1891 it has increased 229, not including the new settlement at the head of Lake Temiscamingue of 1,966 souls. In Ottawa County in 1881 the population was 49,432; in 1891 it had increased 16,000. Right across the river from Pontiac there is the County of Renfrew, with a population of 38,166 in 1881, and in 1891 it showed an increase of 8,811. If all the Dominion of Canada had increased in proportion the census would show a much more happy state of things. The Nipissing district had only a population of 1,959 in 1881, but last year the population was 13,000. The population of Ottawa County was of course largely increased. Why should not the population of Pontiac have grown in like proportion as compared with the adjacent counties? The county has fairly good agricultural advantages and many advantages equally possessed by adjacent counties, and there is no reason why the population should not have grown except that this burden of debt which not only prevents people coming in but drives people away. Settlers are leaving the county, not to go to the Canadian North-West, but in too many cases to the United States. I know that from my own personal knowledge, and they state as a reason that there is no encouragement to live in a county so long as this large debt is hanging over the heads of the people. Parliament is voting large sums of money for immigration purposes, and yet we are driving the people out of the County of Pontiac, where they possess many advantages, and surely it is not the policy of the Dominion Government that this state of affairs should continue to exist. I have conceived it to be my duty to bring this matter before the House. True, I was elected as an opponent of the present Government, but I have sufficient faith in the Government to believe they will do an act of simple justice to the county. I do not hesitate to ask for the rights of the people, and I have some hope that the Government will see the desirability, in the general interests of the country, to do justice to Pontiac. If that railway were once completed, matters would not be in such a serious condition, although the people then would not derive all the advantages they expected, as it was to be a continuation of the North Shore Railway and to be extended to the mouth of the Deep River, whereas it is now contemplated to carry it 20 miles east of that to Pembroke. If it should be completed to Pembroke it would shorten the distance from Ottawa to that point by 12 miles as compared with the present route by the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is one reason among others why the Government should, I think, come to the relief of the county, and release it from the payment of this indebtedness. Besides, if that road were completed as proposed, the fine water power at Allumette and other rapids, which is almost equal to the water power at the Chaudière, could be utilized. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of the National Policy increasing our manufacturing industries, and yet there is a place where 50 factories could spring up at once. If the road was completed to Pembroke, it would be the means of utilizing that water privilege for manufacturing purposes. Now, Sir, speaking of myself being here as an opponent of the Government, in 1878 of course the people were led to believe that great things would follow if they would adopt the National Policy. I do not wish to enter into that question now, but I will say that if I am here to-day as an opponent of the Government it is because the National Policy has done nothing for the people of my county, and there is not in that county any direct evidence of any good coming from it, because we have no manufactories there at all. The largest incorporated village we have in the county has a population of only some seven hundred odd souls,

and although the County of Pontiac is so near the capital of the country, yet the people are isolated, and they have no proper home markets in which to sell their produce. They are in an unfortunate position, and I do trust that this question will receive fair and due consideration at the hands of the Government not only in the interest of the county alone, but in the general interests of the Dominion, because I contend that when one county is in a depressed condition it reflects on the whole Dominion. I do not wish to occupy the attention of the House at any great length, but I do express the earnest hope that the Government will look at this matter in a business-like way as I believe they will, and that they will without delay make some provision by which the people of Pontiac will be relieved from that great incubus of a railway debt.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman I have to say there are no petitions, memorials or documents in possession of the department asking that the County of Pontiac be relieved from its indebtedness on account of what has been given to the Pontiac Railway Company, except the petition which I to-day received from the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman complained of the action the Government have taken in this matter, but as this railway is not an undertaking connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it is not one of those great undertakings for the purpose of connecting the centres of commerce in the country, I can say that there is no railway system in the country which has received in proportion a more generous support from the Government than has the Pontiac Railway. They received from the Dominion Government a subsidy of $3,200 a mile, and from, the Provincial Government a subsidy of $6,000 a mile. I think the object of the road is to complete it to the town of Pembroke. There is a subsidy yet unearned for 24 miles, which the Government has promised to assist to the extent of $3,200 a mile, and for that portion of the road there is yet to be obtained from the Provincial Government a subsidy of $6,000 per mile. The hon. gentleman states that the county did not receive the benefit from the railway which they expected to receive. I presume they made their own bargain with the railway company, and under that bargain they were obliged to pay, because the company, I suppose, have performed the conditions of it. As I understand, the arrangement made with the railway company was that they were to build 20 miles of railway within the County of Pontiac, and upon doing that they were to receive $100,000. The hon. gentleman states that the County of Ottawa was relieved of its indebtedness by some error in the grant, and that the County of Pontiac wished to be relieved in a similar manner but were not successful. He states that this section of the country received no benefit from the National Policy, that the people were being driven away in great numbers from the county, and that a similar state of affairs does not occur in the County of Renfrew on the opposite side of the river. The fact of the matter is, that the $100,000 voted by the County of Pontiac for the purpose of assisting this railway could have no effect on emigration there, because the people of the county have not paid one cent towards the railway which they had promised to assist to the extent of $100,000. The hon. gentleman says that the counties on the other side of the Ottawa River were relieved from their indebtedness, but that is true only to a certain extent. They were relieved because they had a mortgage on the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company, and one of the conditions of the mortgage was that the railway company was to repay them the amount. The railway company had an arrangement with the Provincial Government by which they were to receive a certain amount of land, and by relieving the Ontario Government from their obligations to pay that amount to them, they were relieved partially from the amount of their indebtedness. Besides, under the arrangement these counties were entitled to a certain amount of the municipal loan fund indebtedness. They were deprived of the whole amount to which they were entitled from the Provincial Government on account of indebtedness to the Government, because of advances to the railway. While other municipalities received their share of that money, the Counties of Lanark and Renfrew received none. In fact they paid the full amount of indebtedness to the Government, either by the claim they had against the Brockville and Ottawa Railway, or by their not receiving their share of the municipal loan fund indebtedness. If we were to relieve the hon. gentleman's county, or to pay the amount of $175,000 towards this railway, the effect would be that every municipality throughout the Dominion of Canada, which has contributed anything towards building roads, would be in as good a position as Pontiac County to ask this Government to relieve them of the amounts they advanced towards railways. It would be a dangerous precedent for this Government to set, in granting any sum of money for the purpose of relieving the County of Pontiac of the indebtedness they entered into in order to construct that railroad. The Dominion Government have done all they could in furthering the enterprise which they considered a benefit in opening up that section of the country. They have contributed the usual sum of money towards the portion of the road that is built, and they offer a further sum of $3,200 per mile to the remaining portion of the line when it is completed. I say that the only documents, petitions or anything else which the department have in their possession is the simple petition which was presented by the hon. gentleman to myself, which I shall have no objection to bring down at any time.

Mr. MURRAY. How does the hon. Minister justify the relief given to the town of Pembroke?

Mr. HAGGART, I understood that the portion of the road built through the town of Pembroke was part of the Canada Central, and was in the interest of the Dominion generally, having been built for the purpose of making connection between this section of the country and the city of Montreal, and with the main artery of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the town of Pembroke had contributed a certain sum of money towards that object; and that as the Government of the day has assumed the responsibility of assisting largely in the construction of that road, the town ought to be relieved. On these grounds the Government of the day felt perfectly justified in taking that course, and I believe that the leader of the Opposition at that time, Mr. Blake,

telegraphed to the hon. gentleman who was running in the constituency at the time, that he thought the town of Pembroke should be relieved of the indebtedness.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am only too happy to add a few words to what has already been so well and so ably said by my hon. friend from Pontiac. I know very well that the reply which has just been given by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals pretty much settles the question. The reason why I take some interest in this matter is that the road passes through a portion of the county which I represent —some 24 or 25 miles, I believe. Unlike the County of Pontiac, the County of Ottawa did not think proper to vote a bonus in favour of this road, and we have all the benefits of the railway, which are certainly considerable, without being obliged to pay towards its construction ; and we can appreciate those advantages, for the road is unquestionably one of the most important in the Province of Quebec. Now, the farmers of the County of Pontiac have every reason to view with considerable apprehension the tax which is about to be levied on them on account of the payment of this bonus. If I understood the hon. Minister correctly, he said that they had not yet paid one cent. That is true, but the execution is now in the hands of the sheriff and may be issued at any moment. I do not think it is so much assistance to the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway Company that the hon. member for Pontiac is asking, as relief to the county which has voted this bonus. The hon. Minister finds fault with the County of Pontiac for asking to be relieved of this bonus of $100,000 ; but I venture to say that if the County of Lanark had had to pay for the construction of the Tay Canal, the hon. gentleman would not offer an objection if it were proposed that the Government should relieve the county from the payment of the $400,000 or $500,000 which that canal cost. He found no fault whatever with the Government of the day when they thought proper to expend half a million dollars on that work, which is of far less value or importance to the country generally than the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway. Not a word did he say against it ; but if I remember rightly he spoke very eloquently on behalf of it. He has had his own reason for doing so, perhaps four or five hundred thousand reasons. However, I think it is quite right for the County of Pontiac to ask to be relieved from the payment of this bonus. Let it be borne in mind that when the people of that county voted the bonus, they were under the impression that they would eventually be released from this severe obligation. It is true, the County of Ottawa voted $200,000 in favour of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, as was pointed out, but the warden of the county at that time did not think proper to sign the bonds, and though I believe he was sued, the county contested the suit and won it ; so that the County of Ottawa has all the advantages of the road and has been relieved of the bonus by the action of the warden. It was not so with Pontiac, and I think a great deal of consideration should be shown to this demand. The hon. member pointed out, what is perfectly true, that the County of Pontiac has not prospered as a county adjoining the capital should prosper. Bear in mind that this road is not confined simply to the County of Pontiac. The hon. Minister says that it is not a great inter-provincial road. When completed it will be an inter-provincial road. It will start from the Province of Ontario, cross the Ottawa, pass through the County of Pontiac and also through the County of Ottawa, and connect again at Ottawa city with the Province of Ontario. It will be a great freight carrying road, and will be of important assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway ; it will be especially of assistance to the Counties of Pontiac and Ottawa, and as such will be a benefit to a very important portion of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I say that the County of Pontiac is not exactly as prosperous as it might be, I do not wish to say that this is due solely to the fact that the farmers are in dread of the tax that will be levied upon them. Still, that fact exists, and it is well known that many a man is not anxious to-day to take up farm land in that county because of this impending tax. The obligation has been disputed by the county, and the question has gone through court after court, has been carried to the Privy Council, and has been decided against the county. This is unfortunate. If the hon. Minister has not memorials or petitions—and I believe he has not, the only person who sent him a memorial being I believe the hon. member for Pontiac sitting in the House to-day—he knows well that deputations have come repeatedly from the County of Pontiac and pressed their claim upon the Government and also brought it under the notice of the country. Sir, I am glad to be able to second this motion, and I trust that the hon. Minister of Railways and his colleagues in the Government will yet give this question more serious consideration than they have given it this evening.

Mr. PERRY. This appears to me to be rather a hard case against the settlers in the County of Pontiac. I understand that that company who have built a portion of this road through a part of the County of Ottawa and through the County of Pontiac have already been granted an extension of time and they are now applying for a further extension of time without giving any guarantee whatever that even at the end of five years they will have the road built. Now, we must bear in mind that only a very small portion of the people of Pontiac have the benefit of this road, and that if it is not completed as contemplated two-thirds of the people of that county will have no benefit whatever in return for the amount of money which they voted and which I suppose is to be collected from them if we are to judge from the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways to-night. I contend that this is a very hard case. If this $175,000 is to be collected from the people of Pontiac, it will be equal to $9 a head on every man, woman and child in that county. Now, if the Government mean to encourage immigration, why do they not build that portion of the road ? Why not come to the relief of the County of Pontiac, and not only that, but grant a further subsidy sufficient to ensure the completion of the road through the county, and in that way encourage immigration ? It will be better for the Government to take a portion of the $300,000 which they had mis-spent in humbugging and bringing immigrants here and making a present to Pontiac, and keep the population of the county. I would like to know what

benefit the people of Canada has from the Tay Canal, on which $200,000 or $300,000 have been spent? What benefit do the people of the County of Renfrew derive from the building of that canal? That is only another instance of the wasteful policy of the Government. They will squander away money in this way, but when a member rises who has a case which deserves to be heard and to be done justice to, they refuse to listen. There was no guarantee in the first instance, and the consequence is that the road has not been completed. There may be gentlemen connected with the railway who are in high positions, and who, I suppose, will have influence enough to get a Bill through giving further extension, but, in the meantime, the poor people of Pontiac, who are not now receiving any benefit out of the $175,000 which they are called on to pay before the road is completed, and without any guarantee that it will be built, will have to suffer. Is the sheriff to be sent like a wolf on to their lands to seize everything? These people have a right to be indemnified, and they have a right to a guarantee that the road will be finished before being called upon to pay the last instalment of $175,000.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the Minister of Railways to say that there had never been a petition asking for relief from this railway subsidy by the County of Pontiac. Well, this is not the first time we have heard of the question. Year after year, we have heard allusions to the proposed scheme for giving relief to this county; and at last we learn that there has never been a petition to the Government asking for relief, and we learn now that the decision of the Government is that there shall be no relief. To that extent, at all events, the discussion has not been profitless. It has given us the Government's final decision in the matter, and the people of Pontiac will know that they have nothing further to expect. I wish, however, to correct the Minister of Railways in one point. He said that the Pontiac Railway had been treated as generously as any other railway in Canada. I would remind him of two exceptions. One was the Lake St. John Railway. I think you will find that the aid which that railway has received, Dominion, provincial and municipal, far exceeds that which this railway has received. The railway in question, the Pontiac Railway, is admitted to be for the general interests of Canada, and is destined to connect ultimately with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is not only interprovincial, connecting the two provinces, connecting the capital of Canada with the back country, but it is also destined to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It has not received, if the figures are correct, equal to what was received by the Lake St. John Railway. There is another railway, the Northern Pacific Junction, extending from Gravenhurst to North Bay, which has received in cash from the Dominion treasury, $12,000 per mile for 110 miles. It cannot be argued that the location of the Northern Junction was for Dominion purposes, because it has been located wholly in the interests of a locality, and not at all in the interests of through traffic. It is so far easterly, so far out of the line of the shortest available route to the North-West, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has determined at the earliest possible moment to build an independent line from the provincial system up through the Algoma District to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that in the case of the Northern Pacific Junction the Government gave a bonus of $12,000 cash per mile for a railway to serve local purposes only. I am not aware whether the country served by the Northern Pacific is less able to bear the cost of railway construction than the territory represented by the hon. member for Pontiac, but it does seem to me unfortunate that there is no fixed principle in granting this aid, and that it seems to depend upon the whim of the Government or the degree of pressure that may be brought to bear upon them from time to time. However, I understand the Government have given this question a quietus. They have given their answer to the people of Pontiac, and I suppose the answer is that the people of Pontiac can pay this debt or suffer under it as best they may. Would it not be better, if the Government desired to avoid abuse, to have a fixed policy under which aid would be given enterprises of this character, regardless of political influence? Instead of that, there being no fixed policy except one of buying aid and patronage and political support, these questions are continually coming up. However, the Government have accepted the situation, and have told the people of Pontiac to expect nothing. At the same time, the hon. member for Pontiac has certainly done his duty. He has brought to light a curious state of affairs. For years the people have been told that great pressure was brought to bear on the Administration to grant relief, and now we learn that the whole thing was a sham, that the people have been misled and played with, and now we are told there never has been a solicitation offered up on their behalf in this matter.

Mr. BOWELL. The members who have represented Ontario for some years past will be rather surprised at the remark which fell from the hon. member for North York, that $12,000 per mile was granted in aid of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway for local purposes only.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not the statement I used.

Mr. BOWELL. I took down the hon. gentleman's words. The statement he made was that the Government gave $12,000 per mile to this road for local purposes only.

Mr. MULOCK. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to bandy words with the hon. gentleman and to throw the lie across the House.

Mr. MULOCK. It is incorrect. I stated that the grant was made for the purpose ostensibly of connecting the Ontario system with the Pacific Railway with the purpose of connecting the old Ontario system with the transcontinental railway, and that the Government did not take steps to see that the road was properly located, and that they allowed the connection between Gravenhurst and North Bay to be made at the eastern end of Lake Nipissing so that the railway was, located out of its proper position for connecting with the North-West, and that it practically became a local road for local purposes only.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has made another speech explanatory of what he said before, and the remarks which he made could give no

other idea to the House or to the country than that the Government had granted this bonus to the road for local purposes only.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the effect of it.

Mr. BOWELL. It is true that afterwards the hon. gentleman said the road was not located in the proper position, and he says now that the Pacific Railway, by which I suppose he means the Canadian Pacific Railway, has decided that that is not the correct route, and that they have surveyed another. Any one who knows the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the management of the road from Callendar to North Bay, knows that that is not the reason why the Canadian Pacific Railway has taken the steps which it has of late. It is because the road has fallen under the control and management of the Grand Trunk and cannot be utilized by the Canadian Pacific Railway as originally intended.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not the reason.

Mr. BOWELL. I am speaking, I think, from some knowledge that I have in reference to the construction of that road, having had something to do with the granting of $12,000 a mile originally. That grant was made for the sole purpose of enabling the mercantile community, and those interested in trade, particularly in Ontario, to have a western connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Before the construction of that line of communication with the North-West, they had to send their goods either *viâ* the lakes to Port Arthur, or by coming eastward to Carleton Place and then taking the road to the west. The road had been located and surveyed, and had been agitated for years before any aid was given by the Canadian Government to construct it, and the aid was given for the sole purpose of giving to the Province of Ontario as direct communication as possible with the great transcontinental road. Whether the location was correct or not, I am not going to say, but the Act giving the grant stated that the road was not to be in the hands of one company or the other, that it was to be a neutral road; but, subsequently, the Grand Trunk Railway obtained possession of the Northern Railway, which had immediate connection with the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, and has been managed and controlled by them since. Hence the advantages which would otherwise have accrued to the Canadian Pacific Railway have not resulted. Whether that has been detrimental to the interests of Ontario or not, I will not now discuss, but it was not for local purposes, but for provincial purposes, that the large grant of $12,000 a mile was made in aid of this road. The people of Ontario complained very reasonably that they were not deriving any advantages from the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway except by the circuitous route they had to take in order to reach it; and, though a large portion of the road ran through Ontario, it was only opening up the northern portion of the province, while the front, the settled portion, the part of the province where the great population was and where commerce came from, had no advantages whatever. My colleagues from the other provinces, recognizing the just demand of Ontario for that immediate connection, readily consented to give large aid towards the building of that road. In reference to the St. John Railway, there is no analogy at all between the bonusing of that road from Quebec to Lake St. John and the railway in the County of Pontiac or any other railway with which I have any acquaintance. The part of the country around Chicoutimi and around Lake St. John, which is a very fine country, was inaccessible to any one. Farmers might be there for centuries, but there was no means of getting their produce to market except by bringing it down by the Saguenay or other waters connected with the St. Lawrence. I confess I looked with suspicion, or rather I looked not favourably, upon this project until I ascertained from personal observation that the large section of country there was of great value, capable of sustaining thousands of people who would otherwise leave the Province of Quebec and go to the United States or our own North-West; and I believe that any one from the Province of Ontario, no matter how prejudiced he might be, if he visited that region, would come to the conclusion which the Government came to, that it was a wise policy to grant large aid to that road. The policy which has been ably advocated by the member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray), opens up a very wide question, a question much wider than is involved in the $150,000 to which the hon. gentleman has referred. He gave the House no reason, to my mind, certainly no reason that could not be advanced by any county in the Province of Ontario, and I suppose by any county in the Province of Quebec, for being relieved of the amount they had contributed to railway aid. I know that in my own county the city of Belleville is indebted for $150,000 given to railways, and one or two townships in my riding are indebted for a large amount of money, which they voted for the construction of railways. When this question was before the country and when it was urged upon the Government that they should relieve these municipalities, I told my constituents that it should not be done, and that, if it were to be done, it would cost from ten to twelve millions of dollars. The hon. gentleman spoke of the success of the County of Ottawa in relieving itself from the payment of the amount promised. I think the city of Ottawa did precisely the same thing to the extent of $100,000 in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Had they had as pliant a Local Legislature in the Province of Quebec as they had in the Province of Ontario, probably they might not have been relieved. I know that the city of Belleville contested the question with the Grand Junction Railway to the extent of $50,000; it was in court, they would not fulfil the condition upon which the grant was made, but the Legislature of the Province of Ontario stepped in and took it out of the court, legalized the by-law and compelled us to pay it. Now, if there is any municipality in the Dominion placed in a similar position, they would have a better claim, for if they had been allowed to remain in the courts of the province, I have not the slightest doubt that they would have been relieved of the payment; but the Legislature said: You obtained the railway for which you originally voted a bonus, true, they may not have complied with all the conditions of the by-law granting the aid, but as you obtained that for which you gave the vote, you ought to pay it, and they compelled us to pay it. If my hon. friend's county was in that position he would have some cause of complaint, but as intimated by the Minister of Railways, his county tried to do that which the County of Ottawa did, and which I

believe the city of Ottawa did, which got relieved from payment through some technicality, to use his own words. Under the circumstances, considering the amount of money involved in the adoption of the principle, which the hon gentleman has laid down, I do not think the country is prepared to adopt it. It may sound very well, and it may be a capital, I was going to say, plank, to use a familiar word, upon which to go to the people, and tell them that the hon. gentleman tried to get this amount, and that he had the support of one of the influential members of the Opposition. I fancy if the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock) ever came to occupy the responsible position of adviser to the Crown as to the mode in which the revenues of this country should be expended, he would be the last to give his consent to the relief of the County of Pontiac of this $150,000, unless he included all the other municipalities in the Dominion, especially in the Province of Ontario. If he did, even with his large majority, and in the political complexion of the County of North York, I question whether he would ever come back to this House again.

Mr. MULOCK. I would have a hard task to undo all your mischief, I admit.

Mr. BOWELL. I am much inclined to think that he would not attempt to undo such mischief. But it is convenient for politicians of a certain class to advocate measures, not directly, but by innuendo and insinuation, so that they may be used in an approaching election. Having said this much in reference to the Northern Pacific Railway, and upon the general principle of relieving the municipalities, I will close by saying that I think neither the country nor this House are prepared to adopt the principle advocated by the member for Pontiac.

Mr. MURRAY. I must say that I am very much surprised at the speech delivered by the Minister of Railways. I did expect that he would at least consider the matter further and would not at once decide adversely to the claims I advanced on behalf of my constituents. I thought, at least, he would confer with his colleagues before taking this very important step and peremptorily refusing our claim. Perhaps he may have done so, I do not know. At all events, we are told now, in plain words, that Pontiac has nothing to expect from the present Government in the way of getting relief from its unfortunate position. Now, the Minister says that during my remarks I stated that the people were dissatisfied with the National Policy. I made some reference to the National Policy; I said that some of the promises made in 1878 by the supporters of the National Policy were not realized, and that the people were disappointed.

Mr. HAGGART. What I said was that the hon. gentleman said that they had received no benefit from the National Policy.

Mr. MURRAY. I said they had received no direct benefit from the National Policy. Now, it is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that it would be establishing a precedent. We know there are exceptions to all rules. I do not get up from my seat in this House to speak for the purpose of making a plank to be used at some future time for election purposes; I get up to speak in the interest of my constituents in order to ask for them what I believe to be their rights. Referring to the history of bonuses and the Government relief of municipalities, Pembroke has been mentioned. What position did the Government take with regard to that bonus? Why, Sir, I, as a resident of the town of Pembroke, put my name to a memorial asking the Government to give the municipality relief for the reasons that we set forth, because after that money was granted to the Canada Central Railway, it subsequently became a link in the Canadian Pacific Railway. What action did the Government take? If it was right to recoup the town, why was it not done at once? There was no action taken on that memorial for three years, until the election, when I was myself a candidate against the Government candidate. The Government then passed an Order in Council promising relief to Pembroke subject to the ratification of Parliament. The impression was that it was not done simply as a matter of right, but through fear of losing the constituency. The Government may say to the people of Pontiac: You made a mistake, you should have been wiser, you should have protected yourselves, you should not have voted this money until you got what was promised and the agreement was carried out. They may say to the people of Pontiac: We have constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway to the North-West, we have given $12,000 a mile to that road to be built *via* Sudbury westward, and if you do not like the condition of things it is your own fault, you have brought it on yourselves, you can leave Pontiac and go to the North-West or to the western States. That is what the Government are virtually telling the people of Pontiac in the reply they gave to my motion this evening. That is the effect it will produce. Let the present Government take the consequence. I have done my plain duty and the onus rests upon them. It will take but a very short time to convince the Government that notwithstanding all that has been said, they should make an exception in the case of Pontiac. I do not care whether there is any precedent or not. I say the condition and position of Pontiac are such that it has a claim upon the favourable consideration of the Government, and that the Government ought to come to the relief of the people.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT ST. THOMAS.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Correspondence concerning the appointment of Mr. W. H. Ingram as Collector of Customs at St. Thomas, Ontario.

He said: The office of collector of customs at St. Thomas had remained vacant for a very long time until a comparatively late date, since the bye-election in the Riding of East Elgin. During all this time there was naturally a great deal of canvassing and discussion amongst the leaders of the Conservative party in that city and riding as to who should receive the honour and emolument of this position. There were many who had claims. There was a gentleman who had been an active and influential supporter of the Conservative party for over 40 years, who had been frequently mayor of the town of St. Thomas, when it was a town, and who had sat for a term in this Parliament. There were several other gentlemen whose claims were somewhat similar. There were a couple of ex-mayors of the city and the present mayor of the

city, whose names were canvassed freely by their party friends and those who did not belong to that party. It is admitted on all hands that one or other of those gentlemen, whose names I need not give to the House, had a right to the position. The appointment of any of them would have satisfied the general feeling that some one of the long tried servants of the party should obtain this valuable post. Some of us had our favourites. But after all this long waiting, after all the presentation of claims on the part of those gentlemen, the brother of the member of the riding has been appointed to this place. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) has been successful in regard to patronage, for I have been informed that not only has this brother been appointed to the customs at St. Thomas, but that since his appointment, another brother has been appointed to some position in the North-West—the position I do not at present know. There was a time in the history of constitutional government in this country, when it was not thought the proper thing to appoint members of one's own immediate family to public positions of emolument. There was a time when I had occasion to interview a leading member of the late Administration, of which I was a supporter, in respect to the appointment of a gentleman in London. I urged the gentleman's claims on the Minister, and I was not contradicted as to the man's fitness to the position and as to his claims on the Government; but the Minister said: "Do you not know, my dear Casey, that he is a second cousin of mine, and I dare not recommend him to anything?" We do not hear that given as an excuse now for not appointing a man to office, as it has become the recognized thing that Ministers and members should appoint their brothers, sons, and sons-in-law and their connections in all degrees so far as the extent of the family and the number of offices vacant will permit. There are several families in this House, or lately represented in the Cabinet, whose names are proverbial for the extent to which this family provision has taken place. But it was hardly expected in Elgin that the new member for the East Riding would follow the bad example set him by previous politicians who have gone in the old groove. The member for East Elgin owes his place in politics and his power of appointing men to positions of emolument, not so much to friends of the party to which he belongs as to members of the other party who supported him principally on account of personal sympathy. He owes his introduction to politics chiefly to his connection with the labouring classes. A large number of labourers of St. Thomas voted for him because he had been a labouring man himself. His friends on the railway supported him because he was their comrade and chum, and they wished to see him elected no matter what his politics were. They supported him not on party grounds, but owing to his connection with the labour movement and from private friendships, and they did not expect his position would be made the source of money or advantage to himself and family. I doubt whether they will take those appointments in good part. The brother whom he has placed in this position in the customs was at one time a resident of St. Thomas and employed in the railway service, but for some time, I believe, he had joined the exodus and started business for himself in Buffalo. It was only a short time before the general election that he returned home, and began to take an active part in politics. I do not know whether he had gone so far as to declare his intention of becoming an American citizen or not, for many Canadians hesitate a long time before they do so. All the old party workers were passed over for this comparatively new aspirant, whose only qualification was his relationship to the member for the riding. But on further enquiry it appears he had another claim. The hon. gentleman told us in the House about it the other night. He pointed out that during the revision this gentleman took an active part. You, Mr. Speaker, have called my attention to the fact that I am referring to a previous debate. I am merely calling attention to a state of facts applicable to the present case, and I do not desire to debate the question. I think under these circumstances I am entitled to quote from the remarks of a previous debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may quote by way of illustration, but he must not refer to the matter of discussion or subject of debate.

Mr. CASEY. I merely wish to quote by way of illustrating the manner in which the voters' list was revised, as it affects his brother now appointed to a certain office. The hon. gentleman said:

"The revising officer, when he received the proof-sheets from the Printing Bureau, called my brother who represented me and called also the representative of my opponent, and they both went deliberately over the list. My brother, in my interests and that of the party I represented, took care that none of our friends were omitted, as it was his right and his duty to do. But the gentleman on the other side, not having attended the revision, as my brother had, from the commencement to the end, but having, on the other hand, sent a certain representative to one court and another to another, thus rendering themselves unable to say truthfully that such a name should be left off and such another one should be put on, were at a disadvantage in this respect."

Mr. SPEAKER. How does the hon. gentleman propose to read from a previous debate during this session by way of illustration? It is entirely contrary to the rule.

Mr. CASEY. Then I will state, as is well known, that the hon. gentleman's brother did attend with the judge during the whole of the revision of the list, that he was called in by the judge to assist in comparing the proof sheets from the Printing Bureau with the revised lists that were sent down by the judge to the Printing Bureau. The hon. gentleman has stated, and it is well known, that on that occasion his brother obtained changes on the list and in the proofs as they came back from the Printing Bureau. The hon. member stated that his brother took care to see that if the printer by any accident or misprint had omitted a name that should have been on, or put on a name that should be off, that that was corrected on the final revised proof by the judge, and he has pointed out to us on different occasions that as his brother had been present at all courts of revision, and as the other side was not represented, his brother had the advantage of securing these corrections on the revised proofs, and he availed himself of the advantage to secure such corrections. The responsibility for this course of conduct rests largely with the revising officer, but I doubt very much whether he was within his rights in asking any one to sit with him to compare the printer's proof with the copy. He certainly was not within his powers when he made any changes whatever from the copy which he sent down to the Queen's Printer, because in so doing he virtually opened up the whole case

again, and was holding a new revision court. But Sir, the fact to which I wish to call particular attention is that the hon. gentleman's brother took advantage of this laxity on the part of the revising officer, and did secure changes according to the hon. gentleman's own statement as I could understand it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope my hon. friend sees the relevancy of this to the motion, because I do not.

Mr. CASEY. I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, the claim this gentleman had for appointment to the office, and the advantages which he had over the other competitors. This is one of his claims that he had been able to assist in gerrymandering the voters' list for the city of St. Thomas and the adjoining townships. Still further it appears that this gentleman was employed in delicate work outside of the county, for we have a letter published in the newspapers written by him in the town of St. Mary's to a friend in St. Thomas ; it says :

"DEAR SIR,—Your telegram to hand this afternoon and am glad to hear from you. Things were quite dull until to-night and mayhap to-morrow it may be all O. K. Hold yourself in readiness at any time. I will write you when to come if O. K., if not I will write you 'no good.' Mr. R. Bir,.....is not here yet; keep patient."

I see a part of the letter is omitted from the copy I have before me as compared with the copy I first saw. This gentleman stated in the letter as I saw it at first, that the parties who had the influence had not yet arrived at the scene of action, and what the "influence" was, must be left to politicians to guess. We know what sort of influence is alluded to, especially when coupled with the name of the organizer of the party as about to be present upon the scene. Now, Sir, this active attention to the voters' lists, this rather peculiar re-revising of the voters' lists, and this connection with the distribution of "influence" in other ridings as well as East Elgin, seem to have been the reasons, in addition to the question of relationship, why this gentleman was elected to this office. If I am mistaken in that supposition probably the papers for which I move will correct me.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put I would like to say a few words. The hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has taken this occasion to make a personal attack upon my career and conduct since I became the representative of the riding of East Elgin. The motion is a very small one indeed, and I think that a very few words from the mover would have obtained the papers for him to examine. Now, in respect to my success in Elgin County, which the hon. gentleman has referred to, I desire to say that when I first received the nomination for the Local Legislature in West Elgin, the county which the hon. gentleman has the pleasure of representing in this House, I accepted the nomination for that constituency from the Liberal-Conservative Association of West Elgin, and I did not receive it as a labour candidate, though as a labouring man I succeeded in redeeming that county which was lost to the Conservative party for 17 years. Representing the people for four years in the Local Legislature of this province, during that time I learned from the tactics of the leader of the Government of Ontario, who appointed his son as sheriff of Toronto, and I succeeded so well in learning from the tactics of that gentleman, that I recognized the services of my brother to the Conservative party in Elgin County, and in consequence of that I appointed him Collector of Customs.

Mr. MULOCK. His Excellency had nothing to do with it at all?

Mr. INGRAM. I will tell you about the exodus after a while. I should have said I recommended my brother for appointment. With reference to the remarks of the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) in regard to my brother in the North-West Territories, I think the hon. gentleman must have been reading the St. Thomas *Journal*, a paper that has never shown very much respect or consideration for me, and which has never missed an opportunity of abusing me from every standpoint ; but notwithstanding all its abuse I always managed to come out on the top of the heap just the same. I desire to correct the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) in his statement about my brother moving away from this country to Buffalo. My brother did not leave St. Thomas for good, but on the contrary he has been a resident of St. Thomas for 20 years in so far as keeping his furniture and his home there goes. It is true he went to Buffalo and leased a place there for a short time. But he did not move away his furniture and therefore the hon. gentleman is incorrect in that respect. Again, with reference to the statement of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that I had secured an appointment for my brother in the North-West I have again to deny that. My brother is not looking for an appointment, and would not accept one if it were offered to him, so that in that statement the hon. gentleman is also wrong.

Mr. CASEY. I was misinformed then.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman says that my brother did a great deal of work in connection with the voters' list. That is quite true, but I can remind my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that when he consulted the judge and after the judge had explained to him the manner in which the list was revised, that hon. gentleman told the judge that he was perfectly satisfied with the manner in which the revision had been conducted. I have also in my possession, and can produce it to the House in a very few moments if necessary, a document signed by five of the leading Reformers of the County of Elgin, testifying that the judge as revising officer of the County of Elgin did his duty and his duty only as laid down in the law. Now, so far as the statement of the member for West Elgin goes, that I claimed in this House the other evening that my brother had added names to the list after the court of revision had sat, or taken names away from the list after the court of revision, I have also to state that the hon. gentleman is quite wrong there. If I did not make myself plain on that occasion, I desire to make myself plain now, and I distinctly wish to state to the hon. gentleman and to the House, that not one name was added to that list nor not one name was taken away from that list, after the court of revision had completed its work. With respect to the letter from South Perth which the hon. gentleman has referred to, I wish him to understand that there is a protest now pending against the hon. gentleman who represents the county (Mr. Pridham), and when that trial does take place, hon. gentlemen will see where the influence came from. They will see the reason, and

they will find out to their own discredit why that letter was written, and if hon. gentlemen opposite will have no cause to complain after the results of the proceedings in that court, I am quite sure that the Conservative party in this country will have no cause to complain either. That letter will be shown up, and will be shown up in grand style, and when it is, it will not be to the advantage of hon. gentlemen opposite. That is all I wish to say in respect to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. I think it is pretty near time now that he and a number of others in the County of Elgin who have fared so very badly within the last five or six years, should quit using the tactics of casting reflections on a humble member like myself, which they have been doing more or less ever since I have had anything to do with politics in the County of Elgin. I think my conduct and career have been as creditable to me and to the party I belong to as the conduct and career of the hon. gentleman have been to him or his party, and it ill becomes him to cast reflections on me in the manner he has done. I have fought the hon. gentleman and his party in Elgin County for five or six years, and so long as I live and breathe I am prepared to fight them still; and any thing that I have done in doing that has been honourable and above board. I am prepared to continue that course in the future as I have done it in the past, and I have no doubt that the majority of the electors of East Elgin will give me their support.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is exceedingly mistaken if he thinks that I am insinuating anything against his character. I am criticizing his public conduct as a member of Parliament and a dispenser of patronage. So far from attacking his character, I have always spoken very highly of him as an individual, and have defended his character when it has been attacked, and I expect the same courtesy from him. He evidently intended to sneer at me in some respect by some remarks he made; but that is not the course which I have followed towards him, and I do not intend to follow any different course. The hon. member said he had redeemed West Elgin, which had been held by Liberals for seventeen years before. That is all a mistake. The hon. member never sat for the West Riding of Elgin which had been represented by Liberals for seventeen years up to that time; but he sat for a new riding which was composed of what had been the West Riding of Elgin with the city of St. Thomas added on. In the old riding of West Elgin there was a majority of over 400 against him. His majority was made up altogether in the city of St. Thomas, and principally from among the very worthy class of men to whom I have referred, who allowed their personal feelings to overbalance any party leanings which they may have had; a great many have none at all. The hon. gentleman says that I assured Judge Hughes after the lists were revised that I was satisfied with the way in which they had been revised. I never saw or spoke to Judge Hughes on the subject, after the matters with which I found fault had occurred, after the final revision of the proofs, and after, as I understood the hon. member to inform us, irregularities had taken place. I never saw him after that, and expressed no opinion to him whatever. I do not remember before that time having expressed my complete satisfaction with the manner in which he conducted the revision. I may have expressed a modified satisfaction with the manner in which he had managed it, but I never did express complete satisfaction with the way in which the list was revised. I am not complaining now of the revision of the list, but of changes which took place after it had been revised, and when nothing was to be done but to see that the proofs which were returned from the Printing Bureau corresponded with the copy sent down. I saw the hon. gentleman's own statement to that effect made in a previous debate; and now he says that no name was added or removed. I am unable, on account of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, to confront him with his statement and to show how inconsistent it is with what he says now; but there may be another opportunity of doing so.

Mr. INGRAM. If I am not trespassing, I would like to read this letter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak again, except by the courtesy of the House, and even then I think it should not be allowed. I think the House ought to sustain me in maintaining the rules.

Mr. McKAY. In respect to the appointment of Mr. Ingram as collector of customs at St. Thomas, I think the member for the county has a perfect right to recommend to the patronage of the Government any person he chooses. In reference to the subject before the House, I would like to read the following letter:—

"DEAR SIR,—That the lists upon which the recent election for East Elgin was held were adverse to Liberals goes without saying, and some feel inclined to lay all the blame therefor upon Judge Hughes, the revising officer. The difficulty rather arises from the fact that under the Franchise Act a revision becomes an expensive matter to either party, and that Reformers are without the means which seem to be accessible to our Conservative friends. Electors must also, while the Franchise Act remains in force, learn that only their individual attention to the matter can at all ensure their names appearing upon the lists. We, who attended the revising officer's court, were treated with courtesy and fairness, and we think it only fair to Judge Hughes to say that such is so.

(Sgd.) "W. E. STEVENS,
"N. MACDONALD,
"JUNIUS BRADLEY,
"F. HUNT,
"R. J. MILLER."

This letter expresses the opinion of leading Reformers of East Elgin in regard to the conduct of the revising officer in revising the voters' list of that county, and their opinion will be endorsed by all the members on this side of the House, and I have no doubt on the other side as well.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Return showing the names of all employés on the Prince Edward Island Railway who have been dismissed since the 1st day of July, 1887, and the reason for such dismissal.

He said: In making this motion I desire to say that a number of employés have been dismissed from the Prince Edward Island Railway during the last few years, and it is a matter of great importance to some of them to find out the reason why they were dismissed. In fact, the country has a right to know whether these men neglected their duty or not. We see it is stated in the papers that

great alterations are to be made in the management of the railway, that several employés are to be dismissed and several stations closed, and I want to know the reason why. I am not aware that the people of Prince Edward Island have too much accommodation. They have too little. If the Government think it is right to keep the country from having the benefit of the railway which they built themselves and paid for, if they think it is wise and sound policy to prevent the people having the benefit they ought to have from their road, I think it is a step in the wrong direction. It is commencing to economize at the wrong end. I think they might find some other place to economize in besides the Island of Prince Edward, and I hope the Minister of Railways will be magnanimous enough to see that the people of the Island have the accommodation they ought to have. I would like to have some information about these dismissals which are going to take place. If it is because the officials are incompetent and neglectful of their duty it is all right, but if it is on the score of economy the Government should be careful that efficiency is not sacrificed to economy. I hear that the trackmaster, who has been in the service 17 or 18 years, is to be dismissed. Is he to be superannuated? I believe not. He is young enough to work and willing to work, and I would like to know why he is going to be dismissed. I am sure one man is not sufficient to look after the whole road as trackmaster, and if the Government are going to neglect the management of the road they had better bear in mind what happened some years ago, through the mismanagement and penuriousness of the department, when the Government had to pay a large amount as compensation for damages.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would invite the Minister of Railways, before this motion is carried, to state to the House, if he can, the number of those who have been dismissed under recent regulations. I understand that, in view of the policy of trying to make both ends meet, it has been determined to make large reductions in the staff of the Island Railway as well as of the Intercolonial. I do not propose to discuss that question, because I have not the data on which to discuss it properly, but I would like to have some information, and the House is entitled to know to what extent this reduction is to be made. In that connection, I would say a word on behalf of one gentleman whose name has been mentioned in the Island papers as about to be dismissed. He is a man of very great railway experience, a very exceptional man in every way, of the very highest character, and I believe the hon. gentleman will find that the chief engineer of railways, who knows him well, will speak of him in the highest possible terms. I refer to trackmaster John McPherson. He has been on the railway as trackmaster over the western section of the road, and has had under his charge 70 or 80 miles or more for the last 18 years. He came there with a very large railway experience and is an exceedingly prudent, careful man, who has always given the utmost satisfaction to those in whose employ he has been. He is a most economical and conscientious man, and I am sure there has never been an attempt made to retrench on the part of the powers that be of that road, which did not meet, so far as his department is concerned, his concurrence. In addition to that, he has the advantage of always being a very good Tory, and I suppose will continue so until the end of his days. However, apart from all politics, he is one of those rare men you find in communities who are respected by every one and who bring to the discharge of their duties faithfulness, integrity and a desire to serve the public. Although I am under no compliment to him because he has always done what he could against me, I have yet no complaint to make against him, as he is entitled to his convictions, but, knowing him so intimately, and having had so many opportunities of seeing the excellent character of the work he does, I take this opportunity of saying a word on his behalf. I am quite sure the hon. gentleman will find every word I have said borne out by the chief engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not prepared at present to state what course the Government intend to take with reference to the reductions, if any, they intend to make in Prince Edward Island. There has been a recommendation by the engineer-in-chief which has a tendency towards economy in the management of that road, and I believe some notices have been given in that direction, but the Government have not yet decided what course they will pursue in the matter. I shall have the papers brought down.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Detailed copy of the certificate of Acting Chief Engineer that $32,000 paid to Bancroft & Connolly was done in addition to all previous certificates on Kingston Graving Dock, as mentioned in Auditor General's Report, page C–119.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Copy of the location ticket granted for lot 16 in the 4th Concession, Cockburn Island, and any assignment or transfer thereof to Peter McLellan. Also, copy of affidavits or declarations, letters and other papers from any person or persons to the department in any way relating to said lot or the cancellation of the said ticket. Also, copy of any order made for the cancellation of said ticket. —(Mr. Lister.)

FIRST READINGS

Bill (No. 78) for the relief of James Alfred M. Aikins (from the Senate).- (Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 79) for the relief of Ada Donigan (from the Senate).—(Mr. Taylor.)

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. When will the Redistribution Bill be printed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will take it up on Thursday.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 3rd May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

THE INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 71) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has stated that the Bill is to apply the Inland Revenue Act to the North-West Territories, but he has given no reason whatever for the changes he proposes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I thought I explained the powers of the Bill, and stated that it was to extend the Act to the North-West Territories. The explanation I gave before with respect to the provision making the law operative in the North-West Territories is all I can give now. The law as at present, without the amendments I propose, is not applicable to the North-West Territories or to the District of Keewatin. By this amendment the law is made applicable to the North-West Territories, but not to the District of Keewatin. On account of the changes which have taken place, it is necessary that the Inland Revenue Act should be in force in those Territories.

Mr. LAURIER. The Bill which is now introduced by the hon. gentleman is far broader in its scope than the hon. gentleman seems to comprehend. The hon. gentleman simply says that this measure provides for the introduction of the provisions of the Inland Revenue Act in the North-West Territories; in other words, that the restrictions which have hitherto applied to the North-West Territories with respect to the manufacture and sale of liquor are to be removed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is not what it means.

Mr. LAURIER. What does it mean?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It applies the Inland Revenue Act to the North-West Territories.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a question as to whether the restriction as to the sale of liquor has been renewed or not. For my part, I am not prepared to answer the question in the affirmative, for I am not aware of any measure that has removed the prohibition hitherto existing in the North-West Territories with respect to the manufacture of liquor. If the restriction as to the sale of liquor has been removed, it can only have been done according to the Act of last year, by which the same powers now enjoyed by the provinces are also conferred on the Legislature of the North-West Territories. For instance, the Legislature of the North-West Territories is empowered to issue licenses for shops, saloons, taverns and other places in order to raise a revenue for territorial and municipal purposes. I am not aware that, when this provision was introduced last year, Parliament ever contemplated removing the prohibition which has existed to the sale of liquor in the North-West Territories. If the legislation of last year has had that effect, Parliament never had such idea until this moment. The time may have come for the removal of the restrictions which have hitherto applied to those Territories, but I am not sure the time has arrived. That is a subject to which I invite the attention of the hon. gentleman. If we adopt this Bill we are taking a new departure as regards the policy hitherto pursued in the North-West Territories, and a very serious departure, and one which deserves more attention at the hands of the House than the hon. gentleman is prepared to give to it.

Mr. HAGGART.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman, I think, has not been well served by his recollection of the provisions of the Act of last year. Speaking from memory, I may say there is a distinct provision in the Act that the North-West Assembly may repeal the prohibitory clauses of the North-West Territories Act as contained in the Revised Statutes, and over and above that power is given to them to grant licenses. They have passed an ordinance repealing the provisions of the North-West Territories Act and they have substituted a license system in their stead. So all that has been done.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not aware of the provision of which the hon. Minister speaks. But as to the other provision, it is a general clause found in the British North America Act giving power to provinces to issue licenses to shops and saloons for the purpose of levying a revenue, and for no other purpose. This raises the question whether in such a clause the power of prohibition which was implied in its enactments was removed by such a disposition.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Section 19 of the Act of last session contains this provision:

"Notwithstanding anything in this Act or the said Act contained, the Legislative Assembly may by ordinance repeal the provisions of section—26 to 40, both inclusive."

These are the prohibitory enactments—

"And also in so far as they apply to the Territories comprising the several electoral divisions mentioned in the schedule to this Act, the provisions of 22 to 100, also both inclusive, of the said Act, together with all amendments thereto, and may re-enact the said provisions or substitute other provisions in lieu thereof."

Under that provision the Assembly passed the ordinance.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 69) respecting Witnesses and Evidence.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the Bill be referred to the Select Joint Committee to which was referred Bill (No. 7) respecting the Criminal Law.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Quarantine $35,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to enquire of the Minister, in the first place, where that sample book is which he promised to lay on the Table of the House?

Mr. CARLING. I will lay it on the Table in a few minutes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to enquire, in the second place, whether the hon. gentleman has examined into the letter read by my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) and purporting to be written by the Deputy Minister and received by Mr. Casper Hett, and

what explanation he has to give to the House in connection with it ?

Mr. CARLING. I have made enquiry and I have a memorandum from the deputy of my department, which, if the House would like, I will read, or lay on the Table.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. CARLING—

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
"OTTAWA, 3rd May, 1892.

"MY DEAR SIR,—With the sanction of the Minister of Agriculture I enclose to you, herewith, a copy of a memorandum which I have written in relation to a payment to Mr. Casper Hett, of Berlin, Ont., for copyright of a German pamphlet, in 1887. I am moved to do this from reading in the *Hansard* of 29th April, in an official report of your speech, the following words :—

" 'If the Government paid for the writing of that pamphlet, then the copyright belonged to the Government.'

"The context shows that you were moved to express this supposition on the very positive but equally incorrect allegations which had been previously made in the debate.

"The point is so important that the whole matter in question is rested upon it; and it is, therefore, that I pray you to consider it by the light of the indubitable statements of fact in my memorandum herewith.

"I have an intimate conviction that no reference of this kind can be made in vain to your sense of justice and honour.

"Believe me, &c.,
"Yours truly,
"JOHN LOWE,
"*Deputy Minister of Agriculture.*

"To the Hon.
"Mr. MACKENZIE BOWELL, M.P.
"Minister of Militia, &c."

"MEMORANDUM FOR THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.

"In reference to a letter of mine to Mr. Casper Hett, German publisher, of Berlin, Ont., written on 26th January, 1887, I have to make to you the following remarks; a copy of which, with your sanction, I communicate to the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie Bowell.

"It is true that I wrote to Mr. Hett the letter read by Mr. Somerville in the House on Friday night, not as insinuated and alleged to enable him to obtain an undue payment not allowed by the audit of the Queen's Printer, but as an act of common honesty, to enable him to obtain a payment for authorship, which was his property, which the department had used, and in accordance with the established practice in such cases. I had no personal nor any reason to favour Mr. Hett. He was to me an utter stranger.

"The facts simply are: that on your ministerial authorization I ordered the printing of a German pamphlet at the office of Mr. Hett, in Berlin, Ont., in the early part of the year 1886.

"We had then no pamphlet which we deemed advisable to publish adapted to the special information of Germans. Mr. Hett volunteered to have one written and secured the services of Mr. J. Y. Shantz for that purpose. This was accepted. Mr. Shantz was well known to the department. He had been largely instrumental in the bringing and settlement of the Mennonites in Ontario. Mr. Hett further offered to obtain for publication in the pamphlet testimonials from the Russian-German Mennonite settlers in Manitoba, even at the cost of Mr. Shantz going personally and specially to that province to obtain that information.

"Mr. Hett sent in his bill for printing 50,000 copies of this pamphlet in the German language, containing 32 pages, for an amount of $751.60; but this amount, on the audit of the Queen's Printer, on the special tariff of rates of which all pamphlets printed by the department were audited, was cut down to $434.74; that is, for printing charges only.

"Mr. Hett represented that a payment of this amount for his work would land him in actual loss. He told me that the prices charged in the bill he had sent in were only the ordinary commercial rates for printing which were usual in his establishment.

"I saw that he had not made any charge for authorship, which was his property, and not that of the department; and I ascertained that he was not aware it was the invariable practice of the department in respect to all pamphlets used by it, for which it had given no consideration, written by persons outside, that authorship be paid for, at a fair price, either in the form of purchase of copyright, or a royalty for the use of it.

"I did not consider that the amount by which his bill had been cut down, in order to bring it within the printing tariff above referred to, would be improper or unfair to pay for the copyright of this pamphlet, with the electrotypes in addition, from which it was printed. In other words, making the cost of the whole work done by Mr. Hett, for authorship containing special and valuable information furnished, printing and presswork, with the electro-plates thrown in, of a pamphlet of 32 pages, about a cent and a half a copy; or with the paper added, which cost about three-fifths of a cent, the total cost of this pamphlet, including all the considerations stated, would be a very small fraction over two cents a copy.

"When the account for printing this pamphlet was sent in the usual course to the Auditor General, he wrote a letter under date 27th April, 1887, in which he desired to be informed as to the basis on which the value of copyright was ascertained, and in reply in my official letter, dated 29th April, I furnished him with a statement of the facts. I repeat my adherence to that statement; and respecting which I may point out that the Auditor passed it without further remarks. The determination of all such values must rest on the particular facts in each case. In that of Mr. Hett, I thought at the time, and I think still, that an amount at least equivalent to the difference between his own commercial printing charges and the amount by which his bill had been cut down by the audit of the Queen's Printer, would be fair and just.

"I accordingly made representations in this sense to you, and I was authorized to make a settlement with Mr. Hett on the basis stated.

"I do not think that anything less than this would have been even honest; and while I feel that it is my first duty to protect the department, in so far as lies in my power, from any undue charges, I cannot see that the performance of such duty in any way called on me to take advantage of the ignorance of any one. On the contrary, I am sure my duty was not to do so. And I cannot see why I should not have frankly pointed out, by letter or otherwise, any error which I saw that any one had committed to his disadvantage; nor could I believe any Government would justify any other course. Had I not done so in this case the net practical result would have been that the Dominion would have been $316.80 the richer, at the cost of a suppression of truth by an official taking an undue advantage of one with whom the Government had dealings;—that is if the party should not at some date in the then future have discovered the fact of difference between copyright and printing, and have demanded his rights accordingly.

"I subjoin the correspondence with the Auditor General, above referred to.

"Respectfully submitted.
(Sgd.) "JOHN LOWE,
"*Deputy Minister of Agriculture.*

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
"30th April, 1892."

"AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE.
"OTTAWA, 27th April, 1887.

"SIR,—I find that the following sums have been paid by your department on copyright account :—

Le Cultivateur, use of English copyright "Gaspesia".....	$	90 00
" " French " "		90 00
La Liberté " copyright "Nord-Ouest"..		100 00
Casp. Hett, copyright of German pamphlet....		316 86

"I would be glad to know the basis upon which the value of the copyright was determined in each of the above cases.

"I have the honour, &c., &c.,
(Sgd.) "J. L. McDOUGALL,
"*Auditor General.*

"JOHN LOWE, Esq.,
"Acting Deputy Minister,
"Department of Agriculture."

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
"OTTAWA, 29th April, 1887.

"SIR,—I have to acknowledge your letter of the 27th inst., in which you ask to be told the basis upon which the value of copyright is determined in the cases cited by you. There cannot of course be any fixed standard on which the value of a copyright is determined, but I may state that the considerations for the department have

always relation to the extent of the work and the value of the labour, which, on the face, would be necessary for the production, coupled in some cases with considerations of expense which may be incurred in obtaining the information contained in the work.

"The German pamphlet to which you refer, for which copyright was paid to Mr. C, Hett included the transfer to the department of the plates from which the work was printed, and also the cost of obtaining certain information from the Mennonites of Manitoba.

"The same kind of considerations came with respect to the items of copyright (referred to in your letter) to *Le Cultivateur*, for an English and French edition of "Gaspesia," and to *La Liberté* for a copyright of the pamphlet intituled "Nord-Ouest," with the exception that, in these cases, there was no transfer of plates to the department.

"I have no doubt that the values paid by the department in all these cases were just and reasonable.

"I have, &c.,

(Sgd.) "JOHN LOWE,

"*Acting Deputy Minister of Agriculture.*

"To the Auditor General."

On the letter in answer to the Auditor General from Mr. Lowe, the Auditor General paid the account.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think the correspondence is not complete, because we ought to have the correspondence which led up to the making of this contract with Mr. Casper Hett for the writing of this pamphlet. As it stands, the matter is incomplete, and it is difficult to arrive at a proper conclusion. I think the Minister will admit that we are entitled to the correspondence which led to the bargain being made with Mr. Casper Hett.

Mr. CARLING. So far as I am aware at present, the arrangements were made by the department for printing the pamphlet.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Were these plates purchased from Mr. Casper Hett ever used afterwards? Was a second edition of the pamphlet printed?

Mr. CARLING. No, I do not think so. At that time we were anxious to get a German pamphlet. The Germans in the County of Waterloo joined together and became security to the Government for a loan of $100,000 some years previous, and Mr. Schantz was the man who was responsible for getting sufficient security to the Government for the $100,000 to bring out Mennonites. Mr. Schantz resides in Berlin, Waterloo, and he secured, prepared or assisted in preparing matters in this pamphlet, as he had a great deal of experience with the Germans and Mennonites, and these pamphlets were for distribution among them, so that they could send them to their friends in the old country. Many were distributed also among other German settlements and sent to the old country for distribution by our agents at Liverpool and on the continent among German people.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Government suggested this, because it appeared that the Minister is responsible for the action taken by Mr. Lowe in regard to this matter. As I heard the letter read, I think Mr. Lowe said he was instructed by the Minister to write this letter to Mr. Casper Hett.

Mr. CARLING. No, he asked me for my approval of having a German pamphlet printed, and on his memo. paper he marked this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I followed the hon. gentleman when he was reading the pamphlet, Mr. Lowe certainly said that the peculiar mode of payment arrived at was approved by the Minister who was authorized to carry it out.

Mr. CARLING. He says in his report that when the Queen's Printer had produced this bill, he reported to him that it would be fair to allow for the manuscript and for the electro-plates, and that it would be reasonable that amount should be allowed. It has been the practice in the Department of Agriculture, ever since Mr. Lowe has been there and during the time my hon. friend was in the Government. It had then been the rule in the department, and there is nothing unusual in paying for the manuscript and paying for the plates of this German pamphlet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose you have a copy?

Mr. CARLING. I have not one by me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose you have a copy that you can get, and I would like to see a copy if you will send for it.

Mr. CARLING. I shall be glad to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One question is whether this $300 was a reasonable allowance for the pamphlet, and we might form some idea in regard to that by seeing the pamphlet itself.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The suggestion made in the letter of Mr. Lowe was that the amount of $316.86 would be a little high for that pamphlet. No doubt Mr. Lowe is correct in that. I understand from the Minister that it was a 32-page pamphlet, and a 32-page pamphlet would not cost more than $16 to reset the whole pamphlet.

Mr. CARLING. Does it not cost more for German type than for any other?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Not any more. German type can be set as cheaply as English type, and it would not cost more than $16 to do that, and we are allowing $316.86. It is true that it is supposed that some of this is paid for writing the pamphlet, but it appears that this man did not write it, and it is apparent on the face of the statement that the price paid for the writing of the pamphlet was an outrageous price, and was not intended as a just payment at all, but was intended to make up a payment to this man for work which he did not perform. Any ordinary writer could write a 32-page pamphlet in a day. This man Schantz had been out to Manitoba and knew the Mennonite settlement. He knew all he had to write about perfectly well, and Casper Hett was paid $300 for this copyright which he was not entitled to at all, because the deputy told him he might assume the copyright to be his. I do not think the explanation of the Minister makes this any better than it was before. The Auditor General saw that it was an exorbitant amount, and he cut it down, and then the Minister or his deputy came to the relief of Mr. Casper Hett, and paid for what was worth certainly no more than $30 to the Government, if it was of any value at all, the amount of $300. It appears that has been the practice all through, as I am informed, in the printing of these immigration pamphlets. Formerly it went to such an extent that, as I proved before the House and before the Public Accounts Committee, 14 prices were paid, 14 times more than the Government contractors would have done the work for, and in many cases these outside persons

were also paid for the copyright. It is only another way of putting money into the pockets of these people which they did not earn, and I do not see how the Government can justify the action of Mr. Lowe, though now he has turned the responsibility over to the Minister of Agriculture himself. I should like to know if the Minister of Militia has changed his mind since he said the other night that this conduct on the part of a deputy head should be punished. Is he now prepared to say that the Deputy Minister should not be punished, or is he prepared to carry out what he said when he condemned the action of the Deputy Minister and said that he should be punished, or, when the Minister assumes the responsibility, is he prepared to say that the Minister should be punished for this action which he has condemned ?

Mr. LISTER. It is clear that, if Mr. Casper Hett had received $756, the sum he charged against the Government, we would never have heard anything about the copyright. Now, it becomes very important to find what was the arrangement made with this Casper Hett as to the printing of this pamphlet, because it is evident that it was an afterthought that Mr. Casper Hett should be paid for the copyright and the electrotype. I suppose, when this was given out, it was well understood that the price would be fixed and audited by the Auditor General, and it is perfectly clear from the correspondence that nothing was said about payment for the copyright or the electrotype. I would like to know by what authority the Deputy Minister or the secretary of the department, as he was at that time, undertook to make this arrangement. I think the Minister of Agriculture told us the other night that he knew nothing about the matter, that it was not done by his authority.

Mr. CARLING. I said it happened six or seven years ago, and I did not remember about it, but I would enquire into it, and report to the House.

Mr. LISTER. It is clear that no arrangement was made with this man for the purchase of the copyright or the electrotype, and it is also clear that if he had been paid the $756 we would have heard nothing further about the copyright ; but it is also clear that the department suggested to him the purchase of the copyright which he did not own, because certain proceedings had to be gone through before he could own the copyright, and as a matter of fact the copyright was not of any value at all. The Minister says this was six or seven years ago, and consequently this payment of $300 was made to this man to cover the original account he put in, which was reduced by the Auditor. So flagrant did this matter appear, so utterly unjustifiable was it to the House when the matter was up before—and I venture to say that the explanation we had to-day is not satisfactory and does not explain the transaction—that the Minister of Militia stood up and said :

"I do not know what I might do. I am very much inclined to think that if the hon. gentleman wrote me a report I might do as the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) did, I might not have the time, or not think it worth reading. Referring to this letter, which I have not seen before, I fully agree with the remarks made in reference to it. It is an improper letter for any deputy head to write, and I am satisfied that the Minister of Agriculture and the Government of which he forms a part, will see that the deputies do not write letters of that kind, or if they do that they will receive what they ought to receive after they are made public. If the Government paid for the writing of that pamphlet, then the copyright belonged to the Government, and I do not hesitate to say that. having been made public—how my hon. friend obtained it I do not know—I think I can safely say to this committee and to the public that steps will be taken to ascertain why a deputy head of a department would write a letter of that kind in order to extract moneys from the coffers of the country which should never have been paid."

Now, there is the statement of the Minister of Militia who heard the letter the other night, and spoke upon the subject. The matter is a small transaction, but I think it is only one of a great many others which, if made public, would show that some of the deputy heads in the departments of the Government are not acting solely and simply in the interest of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. The remarks of the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) are, I am sorry to say, of the usual character, and not exactly fair or candid. He has a happy faculty, or an unhappy one, rather, of stating just half the truth and then stopping. I leave the committee to judge how far that is fair in dealing with a public officer, or even in dealing with a political opponent. We hear that mode of argument very often on the stump, but here, among members of Parliament, where each one is supposed to know at least something of the subject on which he speaks, I am inclined to think another course had better be pursued. The hon. gentleman, in referring to this letter of Mr. Hett, quoted only a portion of it, and that portion was in reference to the purchase of the copyright. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says that Mr. Hett was not the owner of that copyright ; that I do not know. The correspondence, however, shows that he procured the writing of the pamphlet, and if he procured the writing of the pamphlet, and Mr. Schantz gave him the benefit of his brains and intellect, and allowed him to print it and charge for it, I suppose he would be the owner of it. However, that is not the point particularly at issue. The hon. gentleman for North Brant says this pamphlet could be reset for $16. Well, probably he may have seen it ; I have not ; if that be true, then it must be an exceedingly small pamphlet, and printed in very large type. I think the hon. gentleman's practical knowledge would lead him to a different conclusion. If there is but one thousand ems per page in each of the 32 pages, and that could be set up and a profit given to the proprietor, certainly it could not be done for less than 50 cents per thousand—I am using now the technical terms of printers ; but I question very much whether a pamphlet of that character, unless it was set up in what the printers term pica, or somewhat larger type, would not contain a greater quantity of ems than would justify the statement made by the hon. gentleman. Now, to my mind, there must have been over two thousand ems per page rather than one thousand. If it was set in smaller type than the type in which I have seen these pamphlets printed, there would be a still greater quantity. The hon. gentleman knows what I mean when I speak of the different sizes of type, and when I speak of the quantity of matter that is contained in an ordinary pamphlet, say, perhaps, the size of the Estimates, or a little smaller.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Supposing there were two thousand in it how much would it be worth each page ?

Mr. BOWELL. That would double your estimate; if there were 32 pages, it would make it $32 instead of $16.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Not at all, because 30 cents per thousand would be enough for the composition.

Mr. BOWELL. No, they pay more than that for ordinary newspaper work.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Not in Berlin.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps the hon. member thinks Berlin an out of the way part of the world where work is done for nothing. However, I do not know any place in Canada where they do work of that kind for so small a sum. I know that in an ordinary newspaper office at the present day, and for some years past, they pay 35 or 40 cents per thousand, and even as high as 42 cents. Then the profit of the publisher must be added to that. So much for that point. It must be borne in mind, also, that the Queen's Printer audited this account. I suppose he had sufficient knowledge of the value of the composition, that is, the setting up of the type, to use a printer's phrase, to know what it was worth. Adding the value of the press-work and other work in connection with it, he valued it at over $400. But that is not particularly what I rose to discuss. I might say, however, to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), that the first portion of the remarks that he read of what I said the other night, referred to another subject altogether, and not to this letter. What I said, and what I adhere to at the present moment, was that if this letter had been written to suggest to Mr. Hett the obtaining of money for the copyright, or for the writing of a pamphlet which had previously been paid for by the Government, then he would have been censurable, and so would every one connected with it. It was upon that view of the matter that I made my statement the other night. As to the propriety of writing the letter at all, I am not prepared at this moment to say that I would even justify that, but the explanation given by Mr. Lowe, I consider, fully exonerates him from any attempt to extract from the coffers—using the words I did the other night—money improperly. He states, in his letter to the Auditor General, and in his explanatory letter, that they had paid for the writing of what he terms one English copy of the "Gaspesia," $90, and for the French copy, $90 also; they paid for the copyright of a pamphlet entitled "Nord-Ouest," and upon that basis he suggested to Mr. Hett the propriety of charging for the writing, or the copyright of this work, and he justifies that upon the ground that such had been the practice of the department ever since he had had anything to do with it, and that to do other than to pay him for the copyright, or for the writing of the pamphlet in addition to mechanical work, would be doing Mr. Hett an injustice. I am of the opinion that Mr. Lowe's explanation, taking into account the practice which prevailed at the time concerning the payment of copyrights—whether the sum paid was too much or not, I shall give no opinion—justifies him in the course he took. I am not as ready a writer as my hon. friend opposite, but I do not think he will find many men who are able to sit down and write a pamphlet of 32 pages in 10 hours, supposing it to contain the amount of matter I have indicated, about 64,000 ems of ordinary type. It requires a good deal of study to enable any person to write a pamphlet which is fit for circulation. It is not like sitting down and dashing off a column of matter for a newspaper upon current subjects of the day; he must have been educated, he must have educated himself in order to obtain the information which was necessary for the production of a pamphlet which any department would be justified in sending forth to the world. It is also a fact that the plates are still in possession of the Government as well as the copyright, although I am not giving an opinion as to whether they are of any value. But should the work be considered of sufficient value to be circulated among Germans in Germany or other parts of the world in order to induce immigrants to come from that country to Canada, it can be made available at any time for that purpose. It is evident the Auditor General desired an explanation of these payments, and not only in connection with the German pamphlet but in connection with the others. That explanation having been given, he came to the conclusion that the work had been properly paid for, and he passed the account without further objection. Why this correspondence was not published at the time by the Auditor General as is the custom now, I do not know, except it be that he confines himself to publishing correspondence between the heads or deputy heads of departments when he does not agree with the conclusions at which they arrive, and he leaves Parliament to consider as to whether he is correct or the department with which he has had the correspondence. If that conclusion be correct, I take it for granted that the Auditor General must have been satisfied with that explanation, and consequently passed the account. With respect to the hon. gentleman's remark, that it would not be worth $10 or $15 to write a pamphlet of that kind, I must leave it for him to judge.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do you think it is worth $300?

Mr. BOWELL. I should like to see the pamphlet first, and to know what information it contains, and further ascertain how much labour was entailed, and how much time was expended to acquire the knowledge necessary, and whether the statement made by Mr. Hett to Mr. Lowe that Mr. Schantz went to the North-West in order to obtain the certificates of the Mennonites and German settlers in that country is correct or not. If that be correct, I can easily understand that the writing of the pamphlet would be worth $300 or $400. I am very glad, after the long acquaintance I have had with Mr. Lowe, to acquit him of having written a letter to obtain money for work which had previously been paid for, and it was because the letter was open to that interpretation I made those remarks. I am not going into the general question referred to by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) as to printing in the past. We have discussed that subject over and over again, both in the Public Accounts Committee, during the existence of the present Government, and also very fully during the reign of the hon. gentleman's friends. That has been a prolific source of debate, particularly by those who have any practical knowledge of the work. I believe that in the future the system which had prevailed in regard to these pamphlets and the extent to which they have been

circulated will not be carried out to the extent it has been in the past.

Mr. LISTER. I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture if I understood him correctly to say the other evening that this pamphlet has been prepared or written and printed by order of the department?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. Is it not the rule of the department, where those pamphlets are printed by order of the department, that the copyright belongs to the department without charge?

Mr. CARLING. No. It has been the custom of the department for twenty-one years to pay for copyright.

Mr. LISTER. From information I have received, I understand that where a pamphlet is printed by order of the department, then the copyright belongs to the department. The price paid for the pamphlet covers not only the composition and the printing, but all copyright interest in it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) That was the view of the matter stated to the House by the Minister of Militia, who is a practical man. His statement was that if the Government paid for writing the pamphlet, then the copyright belonged to the Government.

Mr. CARLING. He had not been paid for the writing of it, when the work was given to him to do. He was paid for the copyright after the writing was done.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Government simply paid for the printing?

Mr. CARLING. $400 was simply for the printing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was paid for the writing?

Mr. CARLING. He was paid $400 for the printing, and his account was taxed by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How much was he paid for writing the pamphlet?

Mr. BOWELL. The Auditor General's Report shows it. I would infer that, taking the account of Mr. Hett, it includes the whole work in connection with writing, copyright—if he thought of such a thing at the time—and printing the pamphlet. When the account was laid before the Queen's Printer he checked it so far as regards the printing. Then that having been passed, Mr. Lowe said that Mr. Hett was entitled to be paid for the writing or copyright, whichever it may be called, and for the plates.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If we take that view the Minister was under a misapprehension as regards the rule of the department.

Mr. BOWELL. When I made that statement, I was under the impression that the department had paid for it, and then the letter would be highly improper, because it would be exacting money twice.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). So far as the department is concerned, it is not a question with the deputy now, but it is a question with the head of the department, because he authorized the preparation of the pamphlet. I do not quite understand the position of the Minister of Militia to-day in view of his explanation, because it was not on statements made by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), or other members on this side of the House, that the Minister formed his opinion of this matter. He had the letter in his hands, and it was after reading that he came to the conclusion that there was only one inference to be drawn from it, and it was the inference drawn by the hon. member for North Brant, that it was a dishonourable and dishonest transaction which the deputy forced on the department. The conclusion at which the Minister arrived is shown to have been reached under circumstances I have stated, because he said:

"Referring to this letter, which I have not seen before, I fully agree with the remarks made in reference to it."

It would appear from the letter that there had been correspondence previous to this, because the writer goes on to say:

"As regards copyright and the reference to the letter which I received to-day, I do not see it is necessary to make an actual registration of copyright, but you might still assume it to be your property, and we might purchase it from you."

So that there would seem to have been previous correspondence. I should judge from this that Mr. Hett had been asking: If I am to assume that the copyright is mine it will be necessary for me to register it, will it not? And the reply to him was in effect: You need not actually register it; you can assume it to be yours, that will answer our purpose, we won't want to be assured that you are the author of it through registration or anything of that kind. The letter says:

"As respects the copyright, and referring to your letter which I received to-day, I do not see that it is necessary to make an actual registration of the copyright, but you might still assume it to be your property, and we purchase it from you. You mention also that you would sell us the electrotypes of the entire German pamphlet. Would you kindly inform me at what price you value these? I ask this question because the amount of your account was originally $750.60 while the audit of the Queen's Printer did not allow you more than $434.74, making a difference of $316.86, which is the amount I wish to pay you. Perhaps the electrotypes and the copyright might be included in this amount. $313.86 would be a little high for the copyright alone of that pamphlet. Please write me by return of post, and I will endeavour to have the matter settled with you as soon as possible.

(Sgd.) "JOHN LOWE."

I think every one will agree with the Minister of Militia, who reads that letter for himself as he did, that that was an improper letter, and that any Deputy Minister who would write it should be dealt with. The deputy who did write it has been dealt with and his answer to the House has been: I did write it, but the Minister instructed me to do so. The question, then, is with the Minister. Is that the way our departments are managed here, that when accounts are sent in and audited by the proper person, Ministers should instruct their deputies to write back and say to these individuals: "I think you might get nearly double the amount of what is proper to pay you, if you would only follow out some suggestions which I make to you. There is the copyright, we will not say anything about the right of the Government to have it, but if you assume that you are not paid for it, and you need not go to the trouble of registering it so as to make sure that we have something of value, but assume it to be yours, and we are desirous of paying you $316 more than the proper officer says you are entitled to. It may seem too much for

the copyright alone, but cannot you throw in the electro-plates as well, as they will not be of any use to you and perhaps both together will sound a little better." So it would sound better, because, according to the explanation given by the deputy to the Auditor General, in one similar case we have $90 paid and in another $100 paid, and in the case in question $316 paid. As the deputy himself points out, the only value received from this gentleman more than the others was the matter of the electro-plates. I cannot judge of the value of these myself, but my friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville), who is familiar with the business, says they are worth about 8 cents a pound, and there might be, perhaps, ten or twelve pounds of them. We can see that the difference between $90 as paid to the others, assuming it was right to pay them in their case which the Minister of Militia was not sure about, and $316.86 is a very marked difference indeed. But the letter itself, the fact that the suggestion should come from the Minister that this man should take the course he did, is not, I think, justified even by the deputy when he attempts to do so. The deputy takes the ground that it was his duty, seeing that Mr. Hett had made a mistake, to point out the mistake to him; and he thinks it would have been very wrong if he had not done so. He says:

"If I had not done so, the net practical result would have been that the Dominion would have been $316.86 the richer at the cost of the suppression of truth, by an official taking an undue advantage of one with whom the Government had dealings, that is if the party had not at some date in the near future discovered the fact of the difference between copyright and printing and have demanded his rights accordingly."

If he did not want to take advantage of Mr. Hett why did he not point out this to him before the account was audited by the proper officer, and how did it come that he simply pointed this out to him after the account had been audited and it was found that it was $316 more than it should be? If the proper officer had passed the whole account of $700, would the truth have been suppressed then, or would the deputy, on the instructions of the Minister, have suggested to him that there were $316, which he could claim for the copyright and electro-plates? I think not. The whole letter bears upon the face of it this construction: This gentleman wanted to have more money than it was proper for him to receive for the printing of this pamphlet, and the way was very plainly suggested to him, in such a manner that when a gentleman reading as the Minister of Militia did, not by any outside remarks or consideration, but judging the letter of itself, could only come to the one conclusion, that it was a letter written with a view as he states:

"To write a letter of that kind in order to extract money from the coffers of the country which should never have been paid."

That is the only construction that could be put upon the letter by the Minister of Militia at that time, speaking with all the knowledge of a Minister and also as one conversant with this kind of work. It is a transaction on which the Minister of Agriculture should give further explanations than we have before us now. He should bring down the correspondence which took place prior to this letter and the correspondence which may have followed it, because it is pointed out by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) that we find from the Auditor General's Report that this very sum of $316.86 was paid, although it was three times the amount that was ever paid to any one else before, so far as we have any record of it, under the plea of paying him for his copyright.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to ask the Minister if he will bring down any correspondence in the department leading up to this letter which was written by the Deputy Minister? I think we are entitled to that, and we will be better able to understand the matter if we have the whole of the correspondence.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say what correspondence may have taken place, but if I have any correspondence I will bring it down to the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. Would the Minister be able to say whether there is any minute in the department with regard to the arrangement that was made by this man with the department? The Minister says it was not by correspondence that the arrangement was made, but would there be any memo. in the department setting forth the arrangement before the pamphlet was printed?

Mr. CARLING. The arrangement was that 50,000 German pamphlets were ordered to be printed by Mr. Casper Hett, and after the account was rendered the correspondence spoken of here was brought before me, and it was shown to me that it was the custom of the department to purchase the copyright or manuscript and also the electro-plates, and I certified to the payment of the account.

Mr. McMULLEN. Had Mr. Hett the manuscript with him at the time these pamphlets were ordered?

Mr. CARLING. I do not remember. The Deputy Minister brought the matter before me as to the printing of German pamphlets. We have had a great many demands for German literature from different parts of the continent and from Great Britain, and also from the German population of the North-West who wanted pamphlets to send to their friends in the old country. We were very glad, indeed, to encourage that kind of thing, as there are no better immigration agents than those who have recently come to the country and are doing well, and who write to their friends inviting them to come and sending pamphlets giving a description of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman say whether the manuscript was read over by any person in the department and sanctioned by the department before it went to press?

Mr. CARLING. I am confident that it was so, though I would not say positively, because we have a German in the department who looks over all German correspondence and other matter. I feel quite satisfied that it would be looked over and reported to the deputy and approved of.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister be good enough to say what was covered by the original account of $751.50? Did it include printing, paper and composition?

Mr. CARLING. It did not include paper; it included printing. That was the account that was rendered to the department, and that was the account submitted to the Queen's Printer, who allowed him $400 for the printing only.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister say whether it is correct, as stated in the report of the deputy, that the gentleman who wrote the manuscript went to the North-West to get information? I understood from the report that Mr. Hett had been selected to do this printing because of the interest which he had taken in bringing out the Mennonites and settling them in Manitoba.

Mr. CARLING. No. I think the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood me. I said that Mr. Schantz, who was a resident of Berlin and who took a very active part in bringing out the Mennonites and settling them in the North-West, for which the Government loaned him $100,000, which has all been paid with interest, took a great interest in having a German pamphlet published, and volunteered to help in any way he could in the way of getting information and obtaining certificates from people who lived in the country.

Mr. MULOCK. If you strike out Mr. Hett's name from my remarks and put in Mr. Schantz's, my remarks stand. I understood the Deputy Minister to say that this allowance was made, not for the mere labour of compiling the pamphlet, but to defray the expenses of Mr. Schantz going to the Mennonite settlement and getting information from which to write it. Is it correct that he went there for that purpose or not?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say that he went there.

Mr. MULOCK. The amount in dispute, $316.86, is apparently given without any examination as to what would be fair and right; because for similar work done in French, a very much smaller sum was paid. For one in French $90 was allowed, and for another on the North-West in the French language $100 was allowed, while for some extraordinary reason the authorship of this German pamphlet is valued at $316.

Mr. CARLING. No, there were the plates also.

Mr. MULOCK. Their value is only nominal. I understood from the hon. member for North Brant that they are worth only a dollar or two as old metal. They are of no other value, because you never used them again. There was no second edition. They were simply paid for to afford some foundation for paying the account. That is admitted. The deputy seemed to be desirous of affording some excuse or apology for this demand on the treasury, and so these plates, which were of no more value than old metal——

Mr. CARLING. We might have used them.

Mr. MULOCK. But there was no intention of using them at that time.

Mr. CARLING. Yes, there was.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, the plates have been of no practical use, and Mr. Lowe says that he is willing that $316 should be allowed, not simply for the labour of authorship, assuming that a man would sit down and with the information at hand prepare the pamphlet, but he professes to allow this very large sum on the theory that Mr. Schantz in the preparation of this pamphlet had gone to the North-West to inform himself. Now, the facts are wholly inconsistent with that. The Minister himself has given a denial of that. He has told us that Mr. Schantz superintended the bringing out of these settlers, accompanied them to their district, planted them there, borrowed a large sum from the Government and paid it back, and generally knew all about the settlement—knew the geography of the country where they were settled, and was in communication with them, and did not require to make a special trip to the North-West in order to write this pamphlet. But the deputy has asserted that this large sum is so large because of the expense of the author in making this trip to the North-West to get the necessary information. Now, it is clear that he did not make a trip for any such purpose, and did not make it at all. He had been there for some purpose and had this information. If, therefore, we strike out the supposed allowance for the trip which he did not make, and the reference to which is a mistake on the part of Mr. Lowe, how much ought the true account to be?

Mr. CARLING. I think it must be known to the hon. gentleman that any one writing a pamphlet of 32 pages must gather information. He cannot sit down and write a pamphlet out of his fancy without procuring information.

Mr. LISTER. He had all that information before.

Mr. CARLING. In what way did he have it before?

Mr. LISTER. He had been with the immigrants and knew all about the country.

Mr. CARLING. He had been with the Mennonites and knew the general advantages of Canada, and the nature of our policy; but we have in this pamphlet special information, as we have in other pamphlets prepared for distribution, and I think it must be admitted that to gather information not only with regard to the Mennonite settlement, but with regard to British Columbia, the North-West and the advantages offered in Manitoba and the older provinces, involves a great deal of time and trouble. I know that Professor Fream came out to this country and travelled through the North-West and wrote a book on Canada. Professor Tanner wrote another, and when able writers have written on the resources of Canada, and we have published and distributed in all parts of Canada and Europe their writings, I think that you will admit that they deserve compensation for all they have done.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman does not answer the point at all. This statement shows that Mr. Schantz was selected to do this because he had been to the North-West and because he had all the information before him.

Mr. CARLING. He had the information with regard to the men in our settlement, in which he took a particular interest, but not information with regard to the whole country.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister cannot say now—if he can, let him say it—that after the order was given Mr. Schantz to prepare the report, Mr. Schantz went to the North-West to get the necessary information to write it.

Mr. CARLING. All I can say is that the order was given to Mr. Hett to get Mr. Schantz to prepare the report.

Mr. MULOCK. The report laid on the Table states, and we have it in evidence, that the authorship is worth $90 or $100 because that is what has been paid all along the line by the Government for simi-

lar work; and for what reason is this large sum, three or four times that amount, paid Mr. Schantz? The report purports to say it was paid because he made a special trip to the North-West to instruct himself, and now we have it he did nothing of the kind. He had the information in his head, and sitting in Berlin, he writes it for the Government contractors. So that the transaction is a fraud on the face of it; and now we have on the face of that document, a misstatement made by the Deputy Minister, because he is suggesting that Mr. Schantz made a special trip to the North-West to get the information to write a pamphlet. The Minister has cut that ground away because he has shown that Mr. Schantz had all the information in his head and did not require to go out of his own house.

Mr. BOWELL. I will read the report, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will see he is attributing statements to the Minister of Agriculture which he certainly did not make. Mr. Lowe says:

"We had then no pamphlet which we deemed advisable to publish for the special information of the Germans. Mr. Hett volunteered to have one written and secured the services of Mr. J. B. Schantz for that purpose. This was accepted. Mr. Schantz was well known to the department."

He had been largely instrumental in bringing the settlement of Mennonites into Ontario. Mr. Hett further offered to obtain for publication in the pamphlet testimonials from the Russian-German Mennonite settlers in Manitoba, even at the cost of Mr. Schantz going personally and specially to that province to obtain the information. He does not say that he went, but he says that he would obtain this information even at the expense of sending Mr. Schantz to Manitoba and the North-West to obtain it, for the purpose of including testimonials in the pamphlet for the information of those who may desire to come out to the country. I am not aware, and I have listened attentively to the debate, that the Minister of Agriculture has said one word beyond what Mr. Lowe says in this memo. I do not know—and I take it from what the Minister of Agriculture has said that he does not know—whether Mr. Schantz went to Manitoba or not, but that was a part of the bargain made with Mr. Hett by the department, that this information should be obtained even at the expense of going to Manitoba. My own interpretation of the account—I am not discussing whether it was too large or too small—is that Mr. Hett charged $730 to cover all his expenses in connection with the preparing and the printing of the pamphlet. When the account was cut down by the Queen's Printer to the amount allowed by the department for such work, Mr. Lowe suggested he ought to be paid for the authorship and what other expense he had been put to. That is borne out by the remarks of the hon. member for North Brant when he first referred to the subject, because he says that, "on referring to the Auditor General's Report, he finds an account, which I presume is the account I speak of because the figures are exactly alike—from the Berlin *Gazette* for 50,000 German pamphlets, and I find that the copyright and the electro-plates were paid for at the price mentioned in this letter, a total of $750. The original account rendered by Mr. Hett was paid in full." That would imply the hon. gentleman took the same view of the question as I did, that Mr. Hett in rendering his account, rendered it for all services rendered, including the preparation of the pamphlet and printing and whatever other work had been done, but it had been cut down by the Queen's Printer to the actual cost of printing as allowed by the printing establishment and Mr. Hett was paid an additional $300 for authorship, &c., and no doubt at the suggestion of the Minister.

Mr. LISTER. How do you know it was the actual cost of the printing?

Mr. BOWELL. I say the actual cost as allowed by the department in Ottawa. If I were doing a job of that kind myself, I would, as my hon. friend would, charge a profit over and above the actual cost; and judging from lawyers' accounts, we know very well it is the study of the law and the number of years they have applied in acquiring information which enables them to give advice they charge for in addition to the actual labour performed at the moment. If it were not, lawyers would not be as rich as they are to-day.

Mr. LISTER. I do not know about the riches of lawyers, but they do not get the start of Government printers. The Minister of Agriculture has said that it has always been the custom to pay for the copyright. I have it from the copyright branch of the department, that where an order is given for a pamphlet such as this, the copyright belongs to the Government and is the property of the Government without any payment for the copyright at all. I have it direct from the department, that where a pamphlet is written by order of the department the author has no right to a copyright.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to ask the hon. member if he is aware that information with regard to the whole country was published in the pamphlet as well as information with regard to Manitoba? He led us to believe that Mr. Schantz not only wrote with regard to the North-West, but also gave information with regard to the older provinces and British Columbia.

Mr. CARLING. I understand the pamphlet speaks of the whole country as suitable for immigrants.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the hon. gentleman read the pamphlet?

Mr. CARLING. I do not understand German.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We should have a copy of that pamphlet brought down.

Mr. CARLING. I think I can procure one for the hon. gentleman, and will be glad to bring it down.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I think it would be advisable to have the electrotypes laid on the Table as well. I see that Mr. Lowe says:

"We had then no pamphlet which we deemed advisable to publish adapted to the special information of Germans."

That is rather an extraordinary statement for the Deputy Minister to make. It was not more than one or two years previous to this that the Government paid a man named Bennett, an English printer down in Prescott, who had no German type, some $7,000 or $8,000 for printing a German pamphlet, and this man Bennett purchased the German type and started a German printing office in Prescott where there are no Germans at all. They paid this man Bennett enormous sums of money for printing German pamphlets, and then we have a

statement that the Government had no German pamphlets for the information of Germans. Why, they practically started a German printing office in Prescott, and they gave this man named Bennett enough profit to enable him to establish that office, and yet the Minister says they had no German pamphlets to inform the German people. I think, before we are through with this investigation, we ought to have the whole matter referred to the Public Accounts Committee in order to receive information under oath in regard to it. It was a gross piece of extravagance and favouritism on the part of the Government and it must be manifest to any one who reads this letter of Mr. Lowe that the offer he made to Mr. Casper Hett was an attempt to defraud this country of $316, because the Government obtained no value for it. I think that, before this money is voted, we should have the pamphlet itself laid on the Table.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In the town of Berlin, in the Province of Ontario, there is a large printing office which has been long established and is well equipped, capable of doing all this work, an office where they understand German and have all the facilities for getting out German pamphlets. That is the office of the *Journal*. Then in Stratford there is the *Kolonist*, and in the town of Walkerton we have the *Glocke*. They have the material to do all that work, and I think it would be better for the Government to give that work to people who are doing a legitimate business among the German people, who are qualified to revise and supervise the publication of pamphlets of this character and get them to meet the views of the Government, than to act as they have in connection with this transaction which is now before the House. This transaction is most objectionable and utterly indefensible. I am not surprised that the Minister of Militia cannot swallow this, though he has, as a rule, a great power of swallowing.

Quarantine—Grosse Isle..... .....$20,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we ought to have some explanation why the man in charge here received such a large amount last year as $4,659. His salary is $3,000; and then we have, additional services, 1879, $600; arrears of increased pay, $225; allowance for horse and livery, 1890, $200; ditto, ditto for 1891, $200; ration allowance 305 days, $305; living allowance, 37 days at $3.50, $129.50; and so on. We should have some explanation as to how this man draws such an enormous amount of money.

Mr. CARLING. The salary of Dr. Montizambert is $3,000, and he is allowed what should have been paid the previous year to bring his salary up to this amount.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the Minister mean to say that he did not get his salary the previous year?

Mr. CARLING. Not his full salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. What was the portion not paid?

Mr. CARLING. $225.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this amount of $600 for—additional services?

Mr. CARLING. That includes this.

Mr. McMULLEN. No; it says: "Additional services, 1889, $600." That cannot be the arrears of salary.

Mr. CARLING. It is not in addition to the $3,000 but in addition to the salary he had been receiving, making it up to the $3,000.

Mr. LISTER. It says for additional services. What are his services, anyway?

Mr. CARLING. I said the amount was for additional services for the previous year. That is the fact. He was paid $600 for additional services, that is for his salary for the previous year.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the page of the Auditor General's Report, he will find "arrears of increased pay, $225." What is that?

Mr. CARLING. The two payments of $600 and $225 to Dr. Montizambert are for extra services arising out of the quarantine regulations, from the 1st January, 1889, to June, 1890. Then there is the increase of salary made by the Order in Council.

Mr. LISTER. When was the salary increased?

Mr. CARLING. 1st January, 1889. Before that date it was $2,400.

Mr. LISTER. The $600 had nothing to do with the salary?

Mr. CARLING. It was an addition to his salary. He had been receiving $2,400.

Mr. LISTER. That cannot be. The item says "additional services," not an addition to his salary. The item appears to be for services over and above the services he was to perform as an officer.

Mr. CARLING. I have only to say to my hon. friend that the statement I have made is correct, however it is entered in the book.

Mr. LISTER. What does this item mean—"arrears of increased pay, $220?"

Mr. CARLING. It was for the time that he was entitled to his pay. $225 made up the amount that he should have had.

Mr. LISTER. Then did you date back the increase of salary? Because it is an astonishing thing that if his salary was increased in the usual way, he should have drawn increased pay.

Mr. CARLING. It was from the 1st January, 1889.

Mr. LISTER. It appears that this man's salary was increased. That increase would date from a certain time. Did the Order in Council relate to back time that had passed?

Mr. CARLING. I am not prepared to say that, but this was for the salary that was agreed to be given to him from a certain date. I do not know the date.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we should have the information the committee asks for in connection with this item before it passes. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman let the matter stand until after six o'clock, and bring down the information.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think the Minister really understands the true position of this matter. The deputy, no doubt, does, and if the matter was allowed to stand until after dinner, the information could be obtained in the meantime. It does

seem to me that this man is drawing a very large salary indeed; he may have a great deal of work to do. He has been drawing a salary of $3,000, and for additional services a sum which the Minister says is additional to his salary, although it is not so entered in the book. It does look as if this $600 was paid for extra additional services over and above the service he is supposed to perform as superintendent. Then there is $225 for arrears of increased pay. Now, I think the House has a perfect right to know what that means: when that increase of pay was first given, what time he was entitled to draw that increase of pay, and what were the reasons that induced the Government to give him increased pay at all? Was it for increased work, or was it because his efficiency in his profession entitled him to it? Then I see he is allowed for a horse and livery. That is an astonishing item too. If he is allowed for a horse, he should not have a livery. If it is livery-hire, we ought to know it. If he owns a horse and charges it to the country as a livery stable keeper would, then he has no right to get that money at all. He would only be entitled for what the keeping of the horse would cost. This gentleman seems to be favoured by the Minister.

Mr. CARLING. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister inform us exactly what Dr. Montizambert's duties are, how many months' services he has to put in?

Mr. CARLING. From the opening of navigation to the close. He generally goes down about the latter part of April, and does not leave until November.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. During the other part of the year does he practice his profession?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose he does. I think he lives in Quebec.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The receipts of this gentleman are not confined to the amount on page 227-B; if you turn to 230-B we find he got $159.85 for making a trip to Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. CARLING. That was for attending a Public Health Convention, and, of course, it was important that he, as the head of the quarantine of Canada, should attend a meeting of the quarantine officers of the United States. It was for the benefit of our quarantine.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did he make a report to the Government of that trip?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, it is to be found in the report of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LISTER. Then I see there is a ration allowance for 305 days; how is that? He gets $3,000 a year, $600 for additional services, $225 for arrears of increased pay, allowance for horse livery, $200, and he gets a rational allowance for 305 days, but he only works six months in the year. Then he gets a living allowance of $129.50. He will be charging us for his boots and socks after this.

Mr. CARLING. That living allowance is only when he is travelling.

Mr. LISTER. He could not travel a great deal, because he is only in the service of the Government as superintendent about six months in the year.

Mr. CARLING. His time is taken up during fully eight months in the year in connection with Government duties at quarantine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes it that this officer has received rations for 305 days? This is a very unusual amount for an officer to receive with this salary.

Mr. CARLING. It may cover more than one year. These officers are allowed $1 per day for rations during the time they are employed by the Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How can the amount of one year be placed in the accounts for another year?

Mr. CARLING. That may very easily occur. The June rations might run into July.

Mr. McMULLEN. We desire to obtain some information with respect to horse-hire.

Mr. CARLING. The Island is four or five miles long, and the officer has to visit the hospital and other places in connection with quarantine. He is allowed to hire a horse to enable him to take those journeys on the Island.

Mr. LISTER. Does he keep a horse, or does he hire one?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that the arrangement at present is that the Government allow $200, and the officer can either hire or keep a horse.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the same system in regard to vaccination pursued now as formerly? We have had a system hitherto in operation on vessels carrying passengers under which only steerage passengers are vaccinated, the passengers in the intermediate and saloon not being subject to vaccination. This question is at the present time of some importance, as there are rumours abroad of small-pox breaking out in different parts of the United States, and it is desirable the Government should exercise every precaution in order to prevent the spread of that most contagious disease.

Mr. CARLING. I understand the passengers are not vaccinated at present, if a satisfactory statement is obtained by the health officer regarding the health of the passengers. Of course if there is small-pox on board the passengers will be vaccinated. The practice in this regard is not the same as it was when the small-pox epidemic prevailed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. So you do not compel steerage passengers to be vaccinated if they can show vaccination marks on their arms?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you apply the same rule to intermediate and saloon passengers?

Mr. CARLING. At the present time we do not insist on vaccinating the passengers, as we did a few years ago. Of course if small-pox was on board ship, the doctor would insist on vaccinating the passengers. I think the vaccination would be confined, however, to the steerage and intermediate passengers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was it not formerly a portion of the duty of the doctor at quarantine station to vaccinate the passengers who arrived?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If that duty is taken away, should not the officer's salary be less instead of more?

Mr. CARLING. The amount of work is steadily increasing, because the number of vessels coming up the St. Lawrence is larger than it was two or three years ago, and all the vessels have to be inspected whether they come up night or day.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do I understand that the rule now is that the Government compel only those in the steerage to be vaccinated, if they cannot produce certificates or give evidence that they have been vaccinated, or does this rule apply to the intermediate and cabin passengers as well? Is there any distinction made?

Mr. CARLING. I believe the distinction is caused by the adoption of the system adopted in the United States, under which saloon passengers are not vaccinated. If we were to insist on saloon passengers being vaccinated, it would drive travel from our steamers coming up the St. Lawrence to New York.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If that is thought to be a healthy regulation, I do not see why it should not apply to saloon passengers, because they are not less liable to take small-pox than are steerage passengers. I do not understand why a distinction should be made, for in reality the contagion would be just as bad in one part of the ship as in another. I do not think any class is exempt from small-pox, or that any locality is exempt from the disease. If we are going to act in this matter from policy, following the example of the United States, we should make a broad and general rule and allow it to be applied to the intermediate and saloon as well as to the steerage passengers. Do not compel passengers to be vaccinated if they have been vaccinated, for such is a barbarous practice. I knew a young man, who although he had been vaccinated, was compelled to be revaccinated, which brought on a serious illness from blood-poisoning following vaccination. There was no necessity for this revaccination, because he was already enjoying the immunity that vaccine virus could have given him. What was really done was the infliction of a dissecting wound, which endangered his life. It is right to accept certificates of examination, and let the marks be evidence of vaccination, and then we should apply a general rule to all passengers in vessels.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). It is necessary that we should take the utmost precaution in order to secure the vaccination of immigrants who come to this country. I understand that by the rules of the department they have no control over the passengers who embark from the old country to compel them to produce evidence of their having been vaccinated previous to their departure. I learn that the vaccination on board vessels takes place about the last days of the voyage, and very frequently after the ship enters the St. Lawrence River. The reason given by the ship's surgeons for this is that sea-sickness occurs almost immediately after the departure from the port, and that the passengers are in such a condition of health that it is not wise to add to their discomfort by vaccination. The consequence is that the vaccination is delayed almost to the very last day before arrival. What is the result of that? The vaccinal protection incubation period is about eight days; while the incubation period of small-pox is about fourteen days. Suppose a person were exposed to the small-pox virus in England he could cross the ocean and pass to the place of destination without any indication that he had the disease, and as the vaccinal protection would take eight days to develop, the result will be that the small-pox would develop before the protective effects of the vaccine operated. Dr. Montizambert points this out very plainly in his report, and he says it is one of the most important steps the Government could take that they should secure vaccination previous to embarkation, and require a certificate of the immigrants previous to going on board ship that they were vaccinated within the previous seven years. If this were done the protective effect of vaccination would be fully established in the system when they arrive here. Any hon. members who have read the report of Dr. Montizambert will find that two years ago small-pox developed among settlers as far west as Minnesota, from exposure in Norway. When the immigrants in that case passed through quarantine there were no indications of disease, but, nevertheless, small-pox developed in Minnesota, it having been brought from Norway in the manner I have described. Dr. Montizambert says himself:

"That the doctors on board ship are not to be trusted. They are not appointed by the Government, are in no way responsible to the Government, and they try to pass the thing as quietly through their hands as possible."

He gives this illustration. He says:

"I have gone on board at Rimouski and I found the doctor gave a certificate under oath that all the parties on board were either vaccinated to his own knowledge or had marks of vaccination on them. I have gone on that ship from that place to Grosse Isle and I found during my voyage of ten hours that I had to vaccinate 318 of those who were on board. Therefore if I had taken the statement of the doctor these 318 would have passed through the quarantine without being vaccinated at all."

He impresses upon the Government the importance of seeking to secure some methods by which these persons will be vaccinated either on the first of the voyage or previous to the voyage taking place. There is, I believe, a law on the English Statute-book, which makes provision that no diseased person can be accepted on board ship while so diseased, as it is supposed that that diseased immigrant would spread infection among those who are on board. That disease is visible, but a man may be diseased by exposure to small-pox virus, and contain within his system a centre of disease which is not recognizable, and therefore it should be required that these persons should be vaccinated before they go on board ship. Now in regard to quarantine. It may be said that although the Government spend a large sum of money, yet, if it is properly and honestly spent, it cannot be spent to a better purpose, in my opinion. It is the duty of this Government to protect the people of this country from possible infection by immigrants, and I understand that the apparatus used on Grosse Isle for the purpose of the quarantine is not up to the requirements of the service. We find that the doctor is annually complaining that he is unable to carry out the provisions of the law properly with the present appliances which he has at his command. It is known to all those who have given the matter any attention at all, that the quarantine officers have to go out sometimes in the middle of the night and

more frequently during the day, to meet the ship that is coming into port, for the purpose of fumigating it. The apparatus or appliances have to be carried on the *Hygeia* or other small boats, and it is stated by those who know that, in stormy weather, it is very difficult to get the tug or steamboat containing the appliances sufficiently near to the ship, so that the result is that the fumigation of the vessel is far from being perfect. If that is the case, I think the Government would do well to see that proper appliances are supplied there. The suggestion is made that a deep-water wharf should be constructed which would accommodate vessels drawing 22 feet so that the vessels will be brought to the wharf and upon that wharf the necessary apparatus could be fixed permanently. The appliances required for this service are a fan for the purpose of blowing out the impure air from the vessel and for blowing in the disinfected air, and also a large tank containing corrosive sublimate, a solution used for the purpose of disinfection. I press upon the attention of the Government the importance of placing the medical officer in a position whereby he can properly look after the health of the immigrants so as to prevent those who carry contagious disease settling in the country unknown to the quarantine service. I think it is the duty of the Government to save money in other ways, and to place proper appliances at these quarantine stations so as to prevent immigrants from becoming centres of contagion and disease throughout the country, and to protect the health of the inhabitants already here. Although I believe that large sums of money are unnecessarily spent by this Government, yet I believe also that it would pay this country to spend sufficient money to place the quarantine service in an efficient condition, and to supply the appliances known to science to-day. My object in placing this before the Government is to draw their attention to this matter, because there is no more important matter than the health of our people. In counteracting and preventing the importation of disease from abroad I think we should not be stingy in regard to spending a few dollars to give the advantages and facilities which are necessary, provided these few dollars are properly and honestly expended.

Mr. McMULLEN, The Minister stated that the doctor received for horse-hire and livery $200 per year. Turning up the Auditor General's Report for 1890 I see that he got $200 for horse and livery, and in 1891 he got $400. How does the Minister explain this?

Mr. CARLING It is explained by the accountant of the department, that that was payment for two years.

Mr. McMULLEN. But the hon. gentleman must notice that the Auditor General's Report for 1890 shows that he was paid $200 for that year, and the report for 1891 shows that he was paid $400 for that year. How does the hon. gentleman explain that?

Mr. CARLING. The only way I can explain it is that the accountant informs me that the years sometimes run into one another, but he only gets $200 per annum.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that for the year ending 30th June, 1889, he was also paid for travelling and horse-hire, $142.43. I could understand the hon. Minister's explanation if the Auditor General's Report for 1890 did not contain the item of $200 in addition to the item of $400 in the report for 1891.

Mr. CARLING. The payment may relate to another year. The Auditor General looks after those matters very carefully, and he has never questioned this allowance and I am satisfied that this quarantine officer receives only $200 a year, although the accounts for one year may have run into another year.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears to me that this man is a very expensive officer. I notice that besides his salary he gets $600 for services and expenses for studying steam disinfectants. I think the hon. Minister might fairly bring down the particulars of this item with the others after six o'clock.

Mr. CARLING. We will allow this item to stand.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I notice a statement in one of the newspapers that it was the intention of the Government that quarantine should be attached to the Department of Marine. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLING. I am not responsible for what appears in the newspapers.

Quarantine—St. John.....$2,500

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that there is an allowance for boat service of $600 to W. S. Harding, the inspector, who receives $1,200 a year. What is this?

Mr. CARLING. It is an allowance made for the hire of boats and men to go out to meet vessels. Instead of paying so much per day or per month, we make this allowance.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the officer keep a boat of his own?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that this man is getting $1,800 a year in place of $1,200. We pay him the salary of $1,200 and also $600, I fancy, to keep a pleasure boat to ride around in. I would like to know what kind of a boat it is and everything about it. It may be another *Joe*.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that it is a sail-boat and also a row-boat, and he has to hire a man to look after it, sometimes two men. This amount has been allowed to the officers at St. John and Halifax for a great many years.

Quarantine—Halifax..... .....$3,000

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a boat service here also, for which Dr. Wickwire is allowed $600. I would like to know what kind of a boat this is?

Mr. CARLING. Dr. Wickwire hires a boat because he has no boat of his own.

Quarantine—Victoria, B.C..... ..... $5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you want $3,000 more for? Please explain.

Mr. CARLING. The increase is owing to the fact that at Albert Head Quarantine Station, there have been many patients with small-pox, and we have had to spend a large amount of money in improving the accommodation. There is a large number of vessels besides, with Chinese and Japanese, which have to be quarantined.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find an item for horse and buggy-hire, $145. Can the Minister explain that?

Mr. CARLING. The hospital is over thirteen miles from Victoria, and the quarantine officer has to drive to and from the hospital.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the hon. gentleman any details about charges for rations at Grosse Isle?

Mr. CARLING. The quarantine year begins with the 1st of April and ends the 30th November, in all 244 days. In 1888-89 Dr. Montizambert received rations allowance for 214 days. In 1889-90 he received rations allowance for 213 days. In 1890-91 he received rations allowance for 305 days, making an average of 244 days for the three years. I understand this is due to the fact that the amount lapses over from one year to another, and possibly we may have run a little short of the year's expenses and have taken it out of the next year, and an average may be struck in that way.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The conclusion one would naturally draw is that in the years he drew pay for less days than 244, that would be the actual number of days he drew rations.

Mr. CARLING. They are paid for eight months, or 244 days.

Quarantine—Port Hawkesbury..... $300

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the explanation of this small amount?

Mr. CARLING. Vessels passing through the Gut of Canso have to be inspected frequently, and it was felt important we should have some one there at a small salary to look after it.

Cattle Quarantine..... .... $15,000

Mr. LISTER. There is a charge in the Auditor General's Report of $1,500 to Dr. McEachran, veterinary surgeon. Where is his office?

Mr. CARLING. In Montreal.

Mr. LISTER. What are his duties?

Mr. CARLING. He is chief quarantine officer, and he supervises all the cattle that are shipped to the old country. All the cattle are inspected by him or his assistants.

Mr. LANGELIER. I was under the impression that Dr. Couture was the chief quarantine officer for cattle. He is in charge of the quarantine station at Lévis, which is the only one in the Dominion. I know Dr. McEachran is a most distinguished veterinary surgeon, perhaps the most distinguished in the Dominion, but he lives in Montreal and the quarantine station is in Quebec, and Dr. Couture has always been the quarantine superintendent.

Mr. CARLING. Dr. Couture is kept at Quebec and Dr. McEachran goes to all parts of the Dominion to look after the inspection of cattle.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. Dr. McEachran is the inspector for the export trade under whose inspection cattle are marked. They are marked with a large V. R. in oil and paint. They have letters large enough to cover the back of a sheep all the way from the shoulders. It looks very bad on both cattle and sheep, especially those that go to pasture or go to be fed when they arrive in Europe. The dealers have been complaining a good deal in regard to this marking, and we would like the Government to change the marking and give the animals some other mark than has been adopted. I think the inspection is a good thing, and the more rigid it is the better for our trade, but we do not want to have these animals marked in such a way as to make it detrimental to the sale of cattle and sheep in the English market. Probably they could adopt some plan by which it might be shown that the animals had been inspected while at the same time it would not be detrimental to their sale on the other side.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I see that Dr. McEachran not only received the salary of $1,500, but he also received for special service to the United States, November 1 to 21, 21 days at $20, less salary for same time, $87.50, $332.00; fares, $110.05; pullmans, $29.25; cabs, $48.50; board, $196.10, making an additional amount of $244.60. It appears to be a strange thing, if Dr. McEachran receives a salary of $1,500, that he should be allowed $332.50 extra, besides his travelling expenses and hotel expenses, and I think it should be explained why he gets this addition to his salary.

Mr. CARLING. Dr. McEachran's salary is nothing at all for a professional man, and he would not think of accepting that if he had to give us his whole time, but, when we require his services on some special work, or to go to the United States and make some special report, we have to pay him something additional as a professional man besides his travelling expenses. I presume that would have to be done with any one.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What did he go to report on?

Mr. CARLING. He went to report on the cattle disease in the United States. Pleuro-pneumonia was said to exist there, and it was very important that we should have a report on the subject. We had a correspondence with the authorities in Great Britain, through the High Commissioner, and an endeavour was made to have our cattle scheduled, while, at the same time, they were trying to get their cattle in without being scheduled. We were anxious to ascertain to what extent pleuro-pneumonia existed in the United States. It was really a confidential visit which Dr. McEachran made to various parts of the United States.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If his report was confidential, I suppose it is not published in the official report.

Mr. CARLING. No; it is not published, but we gave as much information as we could to the High Commissioner.

Mr. LISTER. Then I understand that this gentleman gets this salary of $1,500, but the Government is not entitled to all his time.

Mr. CARLING. He gets $1,500 and has full charge of the quarantine station there. If anything occurs in any part of the Dominion, in Nova Scotia

or the North-West, or any other part which requires a clever man, we select Dr. McEachran and pay him for his visits.

Mr. LISTER. When his duties call him to any part of Canada outside of Montreal, does his salary of $1,500 cover his pay, or does he get $20 a day besides, as it appears he did while in the United States?

Mr. CARLING. I think his expenses in the United States were special, and probably it was necessary that we should pay him more than we would for an ordinary service in Canada.

Mr. LISTER. Then you do not pay him anything extra in Canada?

Mr. CARLING. Except when he goes away from Montreal. Then we have to pay him extra.

Mr. LISTER. Then in Montreal he receives $1,500 a year, which is about $3 a day, but whenever he goes away from Montreal he is to receive in addition to that salary about $20 a day, in addition to his travelling expenses.

Mr. CARLING. I am informed that this was the only time we paid him anything extra.

Mr. LISTER. Can the hon. gentleman state, or does he know, that Dr. McEachran is the manager of the Waldron Ranch Company in the North-West Territories?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot say that, but I know he is connected with one of the ranch companies.

Mr. LISTER. The Waldron Ranch Company is one of the largest ranch companies in the Territories, and I am told that Dr. McEachran spends a large portion of his time in looking after the interests of that company, and, that being the case, I think it is incompatible with the performance of his duties as an officer of the Government. He should be either called upon to resign his position of manager of this ranch company or to resign his position as an officer of the Government. I think the Minister will find that the greater portion of Dr. McEachran's time is devoted to the ranch company in which he is interested not only as a stockholder but as manager under a large salary, and it seems to me to be an extraordinary thing for the Government to allow him to divide his time, a large portion of it being spent in a place other than that to which his duty calls him.

Mr. CARLING. I do not think that we could expect Dr. McEachran to give his whole time for the salary we pay him. His reputation in Canada and in England stands very high, and I think we are very much indebted to him for his efforts in preventing our cattle from being scheduled. He does not think that he is paid anything at all like his services are worth. I do not think we could afford to give him a salary that would secure his whole time.

Mr. LISTER. I have no doubt that his services are of considerable value, but I do not admit they are indispensable. If he died to-morrow no doubt some other gentleman could be found who would discharge the duties of the office quite as efficiently as Dr. McEachran. The salary the Government gives to a veterinary surgeon in Montreal is a very liberal salary indeed, and I have no doubt that if the Government so desired, they could get a gentleman of equal qualifications to give his whole time for the same salary. The hon. gentleman must not forget that in this Dominion our medical schools are turning out many professional men thoroughly qualified to discharge every duty that Dr. McEachran could possibly be called upon to discharge. I do not think the Government ought to permit their officer to engage in any enterprise which, of necessity, compels him to be away from his official business for a great portion of the year. I cannot help feeling that this cry about scheduling our cattle is considerable of a bugaboo held up to frighten people. No doubt if our cattle happened to be diseased they would be scheduled, and the fact that Dr. McEachran is a veterinary officer of the Government does not prevent diseases from attacking our cattle, and consequently does not prevent our cattle from being scheduled.

Mr. DAVIN. I can speak from knowledge in the North-West of the value of Dr. McEachran's services. My hon. friend speaks of the number of clever men turned out of our institutions yearly; but he is greatly mistaken if he supposes that turning out clever students will give you men that can with certainty diagnose the subtle diseases to which cattle are liable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. You know, Mr. Chairman, what Oliver Goldsmith says: "The loud laugh speaks the vacant mind"; and the loud laugh of my hon. friends around me shows how completely vacant are their minds on all questions that affect cattle and cattle diseases. We had cases in the North-West where cattle were supposed by a very clever veterinary surgeon to be infected with pleuro-pneumonia, and Dr. McEachran has come there and examined the cattle, and he has declared authoritatively that those cattle suffered from no infectious disease whatever; although a very clever young man, such as my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) wants the Government to employ, declared that they were so affected. Why, a clever young man might land Canada, and land the Government, and land the great interests of the North-West Territories, in confusion, by giving up his whole time to the country at $1,500 a year. What we want is the highest skill we can have at the least price, and the only way you can attain that end is by employing a great professional man to give you all the time that is necessary in Montreal to deal with the issue placed before him. I will take an illustration from my hon. friend's profession. What would be thought of a man that will rise up and argue, as my hon. friend does, about the vast fees that are given to some lawyers. He might say: Why, we are turning out from our universities, and from Osgoode Hall, very able men, barristers learned in the law, and a complaisant Government in Toronto will make them Queen's Counsels for you, and you could get the services of any of these young men for a $20, $30 or $50 fee, whereas you give to some eminent man a fee of $1,000 or $2,000, and yet the $2,000 lawyer does not give up his whole time. What you want is all the time of the $2,000 man necessary to win your case. What we want from Dr. McEachran is all the time necessary to attend with consummate skill, as he does, to the veterinary business the Government has for him to do in Montreal.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We are to understand from the explanation of the Minister that this sum

of $1,500 is not a salary at all, but it is a retaining fee that the Government gives Dr. McEachran. If it is a retaining fee, then it ought so to be stated in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Minister if he has considered the advisability of establishing a quarantine at Fort Macleod? In that part of the country, I am told, there are a great many cattle crossing the line, and the cattle trade at that centre is a great one at the present time. Great numbers of horses are brought in from the other side, and cattle are brought in in many places without any inspection whatever. I see from the Minister's return that the cattle are inspected, but I do not think that an ordinary inspection is sufficient to detect or prevent danger. The number of cattle in that locality is very large, and if cattle infected with pleuro-pneumonia were brought in from the other side, as they may be at any time, it would cause great loss to the country. I fully agree with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that it is important to have a professional man in charge of this business whose reputation extends even beyond Canada, because it is a guarantee that this special matter is looked after, and it will go a long way towards satisfying the people in the old country that there is no danger in buying cattle from Canada. Nor do I think that paying him a reasonable salary is objectionable. If I understand the matter correctly, the man would naturally be obliged to attend to different lines of professional work in different parts of the country. It would be impossible to be in several places at once, and he would be occasionally obliged to employ others in connection with the work, and the payment of a larger salary was therefore necessary. Some portions of the work can be done by assistants, but in detecting disease no better man can be found than the one whom we have there. Has the Minister considered the desirability of establishing a quarantine station at Macleod, or in that district?

Mr. CARLING. Cattle are not coming in now from the United States, as they have been coming in for a number of years. We are enforcing the same quarantine regulations in regard to the western portions of the North-West Territories and British Columbia that we have enforced in Ontario and the eastern provinces. Only a short time ago cattle were brought in from British Columbia for slaughtering purposes, and now that we are enforcing the regulations cattle are not coming in so freely. We have now in the North-West sufficient cattle for our own requirements and for sale, and we do not expect under the quarantine regulations that cattle will be brought in from the United States, as they were some years ago. We have quite sufficient in our own country, and cattle will only be allowed to be brought in for improving our breeds, as is the case in Ontario, Quebec and other provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. I find the importation into the Dominion during 1891, by land, was as follows:—Ontario (Point Edward) cattle, 51; swine, 26. Emerson, Man., cattle, 1,022; sheep, 123; swine, 275; horses, 1,767. Manitou, Man., cattle, 320; swine, 10; mules, 8; horses 362. Deloraine, Man., cattle, 179; sheep, 21; swine, 2; mules 5; horses, 147. Fort Macleod, N.W.T., cattle, 945; sheep, 4,004; horses, 817. It thus appears that a considerable number of animals are coming into the country.

Mr. CARLING. Settlers' stock is allowed to come in without quarantine, and the cattle arriving at Emerson and other points were, no doubt, so brought in by settlers, after inspection. They have been brought in at Macleod because we are only now enforcing the regulations of the older provinces there.

Mr. GIBSON. I think the case so ably defended by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) must have been somewhat defective, as I find Mr. Dyke has been paid $335 for travelling *re* cattle in England. If Dr. McEachran's services are of such value, why is it necessary to pay Mr. Dyke for looking after these cattle after they have arrived? I notice that gentleman received $1,557 for travel in Liverpool and $2,100 for services, also $2,319 for the distribution of pamphlets, or a total of $6,309. Then the rent of the office is $1,226, taxes $268, or a total of $7,804. The total expenses of the office at Liverpool last year were $10,699. I desire to ask the Minister if he can explain why Mr. Dyke was required to travel *re* cattle after they had been thoroughly examined by Dr. McEachran in Montreal?

Mr. CARLING. The expenses to which the hon. gentleman has referred are not all in connection with Mr. Dyke's salary. Some are expenses for publishing pamphlets, for postage, rent of office, fuel and other expenses.

Mr. GIBSON. I find I am quite correct in the figures I have given, because there is an amount for continental postage of $167; postage and translating reports of farm delegates, $499. I find that the expense of the pamphlets printed in the High Commissioner's office in London amounts to $13,000. I claim that any man could go from Land's End to John O'Groats and deliver them in person at the rate of $100 a week, and that there is no reason why this sum of $5,200 should have been paid. There is an item of $600 for postage of pamphlets, in addition to the amount of $2,317 to which I have referred.

Mr. LISTER. I wish to say to the Minister with regard to this wonderful Dr. McEachran, so lauded by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)—who is a very able man no doubt, but is nothing like so able a man as he thinks himself to be—that all the work done in Montreal is done by his brother, C. McEachran. While he is out in the North-West looking after the Waldron Ranch in that country, while he is lecturing in the college, of which I believe he is the head, his brother, C. McEachran, is doing the work in Montreal, assisted by Mr. Baker. It is very well to laud some particular individual, and make it appear that our whole safety depends on his knowledge and qualifications; but I apprehend that if the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec were canvassed, there would be found other men in the veterinary profession, including professors in the veterinary college, who had as sound judgment as Dr. McEachran, and who, I believe, would be prepared to give their whole time to this business. It is simply ridiculous to employ this gentleman and to allow him to engage two other persons to discharge all the work in his office. The Waldron Ranch is a large institution. There are 600 or 700 horses on it, a large amount of money is invested in it, and Dr. McEachran is very deeply interested, and most of his time is, I am told, spent in the North-West looking after his personal interests. If

it is necessary to have such a skilled gentleman constantly on the scene to watch for the dire disease which we all talk about so much, how can the Government spare this man from Montreal for months at a time and leave the work to some one else not nearly so skilled ? One of two conclusions must be drawn, either that this person is not necessary in Montreal, or that other men are sufficiently skilled to discharge all the duties of the office.

Mr. McGREGOR. In regard to Dr. McEachran, with whom I am acquainted, I think the Government do well to have such a man in their employ. He is one of the most able veterinary surgeons in Canada to-day, he is one of the very best we have, and as a consulting veterinary surgeon he is first-class. His brother, Chas. McEachran, is also a good veterinary surgeon, and I know him very well.

Mr. LISTER. He is one of the very best.

Mr. McGREGOR. He is a very good one. I know further, that the time given by Dr. McEachran to the North-West is not for any very great period, his duties lying principally in Montreal. In regard to diagnosis of disease, I am certain we have no better veterinary surgeon than Dr. D. McEachran. We have also his brother Charles there, and I am satisfied the work will be thoroughly well done. It is true we might get others to do the work as well, but there would be no great object in changing when we can get a man so eminent as Dr. McEachran. If I did not know the two gentlemen well I would not speak so highly of them. I know them as gentlemen who are first-class veterinary surgeons, and men who are anxious to do their duty to their country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did I not understand the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to say that he was aware a large number of cattle and sheep were being smuggled into the North-West from the United States ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know what the hon. gentleman understood, as I am not responsible for his understanding, but I said that I was informed that such was the case.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then I was right in understanding it that way.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is putting a wrong construction on what I said. I was not aware from my own knowledge, but I said I was informed of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then if the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was informed of it he must have been informed of it some time ago, and he should have told the Government so that the officers would put a stop to it.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I am doing now.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is late in the day.

Mr. SPROULE. It only lately came to my notice.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman was lax in discharging his duty, in my opinion. Of course neither he nor any of the members on the opposite side of the House believe in smuggling, and it seems to me that he should have informed the Government of this earlier so that he might put a stop to it. It is well known that the cattle in the United States are scheduled, and if disease is smuggled into the country with the cattle, what safety is there for Canadian exporters ? Even such an eminent man as Dr. McEachran could not prevent us from being scheduled if disease were smuggled into the country in this way. I see that Mr. J. Lowe was paid for some travel in connection with quarantine. I was not aware that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture was an expert in this matter, and perhaps the Minister can explain what duties he performed.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) was unfair to me in what he said. I did not say the cattle were smuggled across, but I understood they were driven across——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know what is the matter with the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to-night. I wonder is it because that he thinks that no one should attempt to say anything on behalf of the farmers or cattle trade except himself. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) says the members on this side are against smuggling, and I presume we are to infer the gentlemen on the other side are in favour of smuggling. I think I did my duty in this matter as any member of this House should do. When it came to my knowledge I informed the Minister of Agriculture. It was only recently that I got the information, and I repeated it again to-night at what I think was a proper opportunity when this subject was under discussion. I was discharging my duty and I do not think I should be subjected to the unfair criticism levelled at me for so doing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It appears to me the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has not improved his position. He says that the cattle were not smuggled but driven across, and surely he does not suppose that any one in this country would for a moment suppose that the Yankees who are smuggling the cattle would carry them across ? Certainly they were driven across, but when they were driven across they were smuggled across. Does he suppose they would bring them across in a carpet bag or a Saratoga trunk ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think some of the hon. members opposite could be carried across in a carpet bag.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) need have no fears as to the action the Government have taken in looking after the smugglers in the North-West. If my hon. friend will apply to the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) he may find out that some people think there is a little too much vigilance there, and that it gives him a great deal of trouble in protecting what he believes to be the interest of the settlers when they cross into Canada. The Government have been alive to the necessity of watching that frontier very closely, and to such an extent that instead of appointing local officers to watch a frontier of some thousands of miles, the Mounted Police have been stationed from the Rocky Mountains down to Emerson, and that section of the frontier is patrolled daily by the Police. When cattle are brought across they can usually track them through the prairie grass, and they are either sent back, or, if smuggled, seized and handed over to the customs officers. Everything has been done that can be done in order not only to protect the revenue against this kind of depredation, but

in order to prevent the introduction of cattle that might be supposed to be afflicted with disease. Whether they are brought in at the outports, or to the south of Fort Macleod on the St. Mary's River, and also at Coutt's, a station on the Galt road, where it connects with the Montana road, officers are there, and no cattle are allowed to come into the country either for settlers or for ranching purposes until they have been thoroughly inspected either by a veterinary surgeon or by the collectors at these ports. Every precaution has been taken by the utilizing of the Mounted Police and the customs officers, to prevent that which my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) fears has been in existence for some years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Minister of Militia is quite fair to the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) because he intimates that the hon. member for Selkirk if appealed to would be ready to complain of the vigilance of the customs officers along the frontier. Surely one who is so devoted to the system of protection as the hon. member for Selkirk would not complain of the vigilance of the customs officers? The hon. gentleman has certainly far too much faith in the principles of protection, and the vigilant enforcement of the customs laws to complain of anything in that direction. I could not help noticing the extraordinary defence which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made for the very large payment to Dr. McEachran as veterinary surgeon. The hon. gentleman says that the doctor's services were required in the North-West, and he told us of the very great calamity that would befall the inhabitants of this country if there was not one possessing the skill, the vigilance and the devotion of Dr. McEachran to visit the North-West to prevent diseased cattle being imported from the United States into Canada; yet the Minister of Agriculture spoiled the defence of the hon. gentleman by saying that no cattle were being brought in. The Minister of Agriculture says that Dr. McEachran's services are required at Montreal, and not in the North-West Territories, as there is another party stationed at Fort Macleod, who receives a salary of $1,400 for the inspection of the cattle that are no longer brought into the country. Dr. McEachran received something like $2,400 from the public treasury last year, of which I suppose one-third must be for travelling expenses, because we are informed that his salary was about $1,500 a year. Now, so far as we can learn, Dr. McEachran does not visit the North-West country except as a member of a certain ranch company and one of its managers, and on this account his services to the company are required, not in Montreal, but in the North-West Territories. Now, has the Minister of Agriculture proposed to the doctor the choice between his services to the public and his services to the company? Not at all. The Minister intimates that he will not compel the doctor to make that choice; and yet it is perfectly clear to my mind that the public interest requires that the doctor should either give his time to the discharge of his duties at the point where he is called upon to perform those duties, or he should abandon them altogether and devote himself to the company with which he is associated. I think it was last year that we had complaint made in this House with reference to the conduct of Dr. McEachran in connection with this ranch company. If I remember rightly, he was charged with violently tearing down the houses of some of the settlers in that district. Is not this the same Dr. McEachran who was so accused? I think it was pretty well established that he attacked the houses of parties who were settled within the limits of the ranch, and who had acquired interests in the property which they occupied, and did serious injury to those people who had settled there under the authority of the Government. This conduct on his part goes a long way to show that his devotion to the company is much greater than his devotion to the public service; and if the hon. member for East Grey had referred to these attacks by the doctor upon settlers in that district and had shown the injury which he had done to them and the extent to which he was impeding the settlement of the country by spreading insecurity abroad among the settlers, he would have done a good deal more towards elucidating the interest of Dr. McEachran in the North-West than he did by attempting to show that the doctor went there for the purpose of preventing diseased American cattle from coming into the country, which the Minister of Agriculture assures us are not coming in. We have the evidence of the Auditor General's Report that another party, and not Dr. McEachran, is paid for the discharge of that duty in the Territories; and it does seem to me that the House ought to insist on Dr. McEachran making choice between the public duties that devolve upon him at Montreal and the private duties that devolve upon him as a member of the ranch company in the North-West Territories. These two points are too widely separated from each other to admit of the doctor discharging his duties properly in both places. When required in Montreal he may be in the North-West Territories, and when required in the North-West Territories he may be in Montreal. It is pretty clear that the public interest in this matter is likely to suffer from his retention in the post which he now occupies. Certainly, his conduct in attacking the settlers in that particular district shows that he is much more devoted to the interest of the ranch company than he can be to the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Bothwell is even more unfair to Dr. McEachran than he is towards the member for East Grey. He starts first by misrepresenting what the member for East Grey said, and afterwards minimizes the important work which Dr. McEachran has done. I did not say that Dr. McEachran made any trips to the North-West, for the simple reason that I did not know whether or not he was in the habit of going to that ranch, nor did I know whether or not he had any interest in it. But I think the hon. member for Bothwell discloses why he and his friends object so much to Dr. McEachran. There seems to be a sore spot somewhere on account of the work he has been doing in the North-West Territories. The hon. member for West Lambton spoke of him trying to keep out of the country a certain infectious disease, I suppose pleuro-pneumonia. If that were the only disease to which animals are liable his duties might be confined to that; but it is well known that animals are liable to almost as many diseases as human flesh is, and therefore the doctor's duties would be

as numerous as those of any doctor in his professional practice. But the hon. member misrepresented me in this. I said, in defence of the apparently large salary which Dr. McEachran was getting, that it might be that others were employed to do a portion of the work that he was supposed to do. Diseases may break out at the same time in different parts of the country, and it is impossible for Dr. McEachran to attend to them all; and, therefore, I presume he must employ others to do his work. Dr. McEachran is expected to go to any part of the country where diseases break out among animals. I remember his going to Essex to investigate a disease which broke out among the swine, and he has been employed several times in the Maritime Provinces in a similar capacity. I also remember when he was obliged to go to the North-West to examine into diseases supposed to exist in that country. He did his work faithfully and well, and his ability was shown by the result of his investigations and his diagnoses which were correct in every particular. Therefore, he is a suitable man for the work he is doing, and if we do pay him a large salary he is entitled to it.

Mr. WATSON. Do the Government inspectors pay any attention to diseased animals except those crossing the boundary line?

Mr. CARLING. They do not make inspections except when called upon to do so. But if there is any disease breaking out, they are at once called upon to make a report to the department, and if the disease has broken out to any great extent we send Dr. McEachran to visit the section of the country himself and consult with the officers there.

Mr. WATSON. A little over a year ago the Manitoba Government passed an Act taking power to appoint local inspectors for Manitoba. Hon. gentlemen opposite have admitted that animals in the North-West Territories are subject to disease. We have found that such is the case. Occasionally there is a car load of horses shipped from British Columbia and the North-West Territories into Manitoba which have carried in disease, and the Manitoba Government felt it necessary to pass an Act to take power to appoint local inspectors who would not interfere with the Dominion inspectors. That Act was disallowed by the Dominion Government. Was the Minister of Agriculture consulted in the matter?

Mr. CARLING. I do not think I was consulted, and I do not think I would be in a matter of that kind which is a question of law and policy of the Government.

Mr. WATSON. It appeared to the people of Manitoba that it was very necessary to have such local inspectors because, not only from the west but occasionally from the east—although glanders are not prevalent in Ontario—that disease was imported into the country. It was thought necessary to make a thorough inspection of all animals imported either from east or west or the international boundary line; and the people of Manitoba thought it was not right that the Government should interfere with the Act passed by them for the purpose of protecting the health of the animals. Of course hon. gentlemen know that the disease of glanders springs up very rapidly, and we think the Local Government should be allowed to appoint local inspectors who would have power to inspect all animals coming into the province and who would not interfere with the Dominion inspectors.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not recollect the Act the hon. gentleman refers to, and I can hardly believe, if it had been a question simply of a contagious disease Act passed by the Local Government, that it would have been disallowed, because in the North-West Territories they have such an Act in operation. Only a few days ago I had a letter from one of my constituents stating that four or five horses had been destroyed under the Act and asking compensation of the Dominion Government.

Mr. WATSON. It was disallowed.

Mr. BOWELL. How long ago?

Mr. WATSON. I think it was disallowed some six months ago. We had an Act there some years ago, but there was an Act passed of recent date and disallowed. I do not know whether the Act contained anything more except to provide for the appointment of veterinary surgeons or inspectors, but the Act was disallowed, and I think that the explanation given by correspondence from the chief veterinary surgeon of that province, Mr. Charles Liddell, who was one of the inspectors and who corresponded with the Justice Department, was that he thought it necessary such an Act should be in existence in Manitoba.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We have heard the Minister of Agriculture explain the duties of Dr. McEachran, and the hon. member for East Grey has declared that he is called upon to travel all over the country to perform these duties. By looking at the Auditor General's Report, the committee will find that Dr. McEachran only paid $59.10 railway fares during the past year. Now, it must be admitted that if he travelled very much he must have paid a great deal more in railway fares than that. It is therefore evident he travelled very little in Canada last year, and is not entitled to receive all the credit given to him by the hon. Minister to-night and by the hon. member for East Grey, because the Minister has admitted that when he travels on Government work he charges the Government for his fares.

Mr. FLINT. The matter was brought up last session with regard to the gentleman who occupies that office. When I brought up that question last session with regard to the conduct of Dr. McEachran in the matter of the difficulties between the Waldron Ranch Company, of which he is president, and a large number of settlers whose lands were taken away by that company, I was not aware he was then an official of the Government, supposed to be located at Montreal. I produced last session the most convincing proofs that the Waldron Ranch Company, or rather Dr. McEachran, its president, who has acted almost solely as the company, had in their treatment of a number of settlers so conducted themselves as to damage the Government of this country in the minds of the settlers, and had shown a disposition which I consider as nothing short of tyrannical and arbitrary in the highest degree. So strong was the case on its own merits that, without any extra difficulty in presenting it to the Minister of the Interior, he very courteously promised that the matters which were then complained of would be looked into; and, if I understood him correctly early in the session, he

informed my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that these matters were in course of adjustment and that the Government would consider the claims of these unfortunate settlers. I hope that he will be able to settle these matters so as to undo the unjust, harsh, cruel and arbitrary treatment of these settlers by the Waldron Ranch Company. I would be glad to read some letters which I have received, which have moved my indignation to a high degree. A few poor settlers locating in that distant portion of the country are placed at a great disadvantage in fighting, either in the courts or by petition to the Government, the powerful Waldron Ranch Company, of which Dr. McEachran is president. The tenor of the letters which I have had has given me a very disagreeable opinion of the temper and style of this Dr. McEachran, though I do not know him personally. I will read one letter and a portion of another, which will show that he occupies a position of antagonism to some 30 or 40 settlers whom the Government has promised to indemnify for the injustice they have received at his hands, and I think it is highly unbecoming that this same man should be an official of the Dominion Government receiving a large salary. The first letter I have is from Fort Macleod, dated the 8th March, 1892, and signed by Mr. Harry H. Dunbar. He says:

"I wish to make a statement to you of my grievances with the Government and the Waldron Ranch Company, so that, through your kindness, they may be laid before the House, and probably aid to open the eyes of a now blinded people to the tyranny and corruption of our present Government."

I am prepared to say that the attack of this gentleman on the Government is caused by the harshness and cruelty of the Waldron Ranch Company, or, in other words, of the man whose case we are now considering, and, if it is in the mind of this man and others that the Government is responsible for their treatment, the Government has only to thank its own official who has instilled this feeling into these people because of the losses and the distress they have been compelled by him to undergo.—

"In September, 1889, I made application to the land office at Lethbridge to homestead south-east quarter of section 20, township 9, range 28, also to purchase south-west quarter of section 21, township 9, range 28, on which was a suitable place to build. Receiving no reply, I concluded from what information my brothers had received at the land office at Lethbridge that there would be no hindrance to actual settlement. I put up a house on stone foundation, but heard nothing from the land agent till McEachran, in company with Pearce, land commissioner, came and ordered me with many threats to cease operations. I then in the following July started to cut hay, but was forbidden to do so by McEachran, and as others had been served with injunctions of restraint I knew that I should be likewise dealt with. I was thus obliged to quit the place. Thoroughly disgusted with this usage, I left the country and went to Washington, United States, and my house was afterwards thrown down by McEachran, returning at the end of a year to find the same state of affairs still existing. Hoping that you and your party may be able to awaken the people to a true knowledge of the settlers' grievances in this township,

"I remain, yours obediently,

"HARRY H. DUNBAR."

I am not putting this forward as an absolutely conclusive answer to all that might be said from a strictly legal standpoint on the part of the Waldron Ranch Company, but these are the conclusions come to by an honest, hardworking, laborious and industrious settler as to the way in which he was treated. Hon. gentlemen who were here, and I suppose there are few of them here now, will recollect the circumstances under which this man and his brothers were driven off the land they had taken in 1882. They will recollect that, after the land office had granted them a certificate and they had entered into possession, had dug ditches, erected fences, sown seed, and were seeking to obtain the result of long years of labour, their homestead entry was cancelled at the land office at Lethbridge and they found themselves involved in a lawsuit and in an enormous bill of costs, and under that situation they were compelled to throw themselves entirely upon the mercy of the Government. The Government promised to consider their hard situation and to give them lands elsewhere in lieu of the lands they had, which had been granted over their heads to the Waldron Ranch Company. I am not seeking to enter into the legal or equitable bearings of the dispute between these people and the Waldron Ranch Company, but I think it is improper that a man occupying the position of president or manager of that company should be continued in the position of an officer of the Government when he is in direct antagonism to a large number of settlers. Last year we quoted extracts from two newspapers published at or near Fort Macleod, which generally support the Government, but which objected to the Waldron Ranch Company and their dealings with the settlers. They contended, as I do now, that that company's dealings with the settlers has disturbed the minds of those settlers as to their safety in settling on their lands after they had taken all the steps which they were expected to take, and when some of them were driven from their land, had their houses torn down and were unable to obtain any redress. I have another letter in my possession from one of these complainants, and, as it is more formal than the one I have read, I will read a few passages of it for the information of the committee. This letter is signed by Anthony Dixon, and is dated Porcupine Hill, 4th February, 1892:

"Learning you are taking an interest in this Waldron business and glad to know that we have a friend who will try and protect the grieved settlers, I will let you know my grievances.

"I have been in this country ten years this spring and living within twenty miles of Macleod ever since I came. I left my father's house on the 25th of March, 1882, and was engaged for two years to work in the Indian Department in the North-West; it was the Superintendent of Indian Affairs whom I engaged with. There were twenty of us came out at the same time all engaged for the same purpose. My father settled in the County of York, in the township of Etobicoke, over forty years ago. He was a farmer, he had seven sons, they all have the same occupation at present in that locality except myself. My father died in 1882, four months after I left home. My mother still lives on the old homestead within six miles of Toronto. (My father came from England aged seventy-two years). My ranch was taken up in 1889 and has been continuously occupied ever since. I purchased it from the Rev. McKay in the spring of 1885 for the sum of $500 and occupied it ever since undisturbed until July last. I have about 100 head of stock to provide for, principally cattle. I will write you a copy of what I sent to Jas. McMullen, M.P., and I also sent one to the Minister of the Interior as follows:—

"I am and have been a settler on the Waldron lease for the past six years, and have held in undisturbed possession thereon 320 acres of land until July last, when I was served, at the instance of Dr. McEachran, the manager of the Waldron lease, with a writ of injunction restraining me from any enjoyments of said land. This injunction has been the means of putting me to serious loss and inconvenience in the following manner: (1.) That I have been prevented from improving my land by fencing, I having, at the time, my fields in crop and only half fenced when the injunction was served, thereby causing considerable loss to my crop owing to the cattle getting in and partially destroying it. (2.) That I could not cut hay

on what I considered, and do now consider my own land, thereby causing me extra trouble and expense in procuring the same for my cattle during the winter. If it had not been for my cousin having a ranch about two and a third miles from me, and being able to buy hay from him, I should either have had to sell my stock or else get hay about twenty miles from my ranch which would have been utterly impossible for me to do, owing to want of means. (3.) I have lost very seriously so far this winter, and the cattle, especially calves, have suffered greatly for the want of more buildings which I intended building last fall, for the calves have to be taken up and fed and properly housed during the cold weather. (4.) That I have, on previous occasions, gone to Macleod (60 miles each time) in connection with this injunction, and that Dr. McEachran failed to appear, causing me a loss of money and time, and leaving me in a bad position, as I am completely tied down and cannot do anything. Dr. McEachran and Mr. Pearce, the Government surveyor, called at my ranch a year ago last summer and looked at my stakes. I asked Mr. Pearce at the time, in the presence of Dr. McEachran, how many acres of land I could hold, and he told me 320 acres. Mr. Pearce then asked Dr. McEachran if he had anything to say, and he distinctly answered no. And everything was very satisfactory to all parties at that time. In my opinion, the main cause of that writ of injunction being served on me, was simply owing to the fact of my having refused to comply with his wishes regarding a piece of fencing which I was going to put up on my own land as a protection to my own crop and hay. I consider what loss and damage I have sustained through this injunction being served on me up to the present time to be about $1,200. Trusting you will give this your attention and kind consideration."

Now, I am not going to enlarge upon this matter, but I had no other opportunity to bring it forward unless I did so on some formal resolution. I have done so in the interests of these settlers, and I shall rely upon the promise made by the Minister of the Interior that their grievances, and their losses and injuries will be looked into and considered, and that the Government will give them that indemnity which their case demands for the unfortunate position they have been placed in, owing to the negotiations between the Government and the Waldron Ranch Company, of which Dr. McEachran is president. I think the whole story shows that that gentleman cannot be very actively employed in the duties of his office in Montreal or Quebec, and that he has abundant time, it appears, to manage the affairs of a large and wealthy corporation, as well as attending to too much litigation in connection with the difficulties between the ranch and the settlers. I trust this discussion will induce the Government, or the proper department, to take a deeper interest in this matter than they appear to have done in the past, and that out of it all some measure of justice may be vouchsafed to those poor settlers.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a word in reference to what the hon. gentleman said about Dr. McEachran's travelling. He said he could not have travelled much if he only drew $59 for travelling expenses. If he will look on page B-231 he will see charges: Pullmans, $10; cabs, $35. Go over to the next page and he will find there: fares, $110.05; pullmans, $29.25; cabs, $48.50, so that the hon. member was not exactly correct.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The item that I mentioned was for travel in the United States when he went there on special business in November, 21 days at $20 a day.

Mr. SPROULE. Less his salary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then, in addition are the items the hon. gentleman has mentioned, and also the items of board, $196.10, and telegrams, 40 cents. When I referred to his travelling, I was discussing a matter that had been discussed by the Minister of Agriculture and the member for East Grey as to the duties which Dr. McEachran performed in Canada, not with reference to the duties which he performed in making this visit to the United States, which was a special visit and for which he was paid specially, $332.50 more than his salary of $1,500 which he received, and he was paid besides all his travelling expenses, pullman cars, cab-hire, board, &c., amounting to $196.10. The hon. member for Grey will see that I was perfectly consistent in saying that Dr. McEachran only travelled to the extent of $59.10 for fares in Canada. The hon. gentleman can verify my statement by referring to page 231-B of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DALY. I wish to reply to a remark of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), and to give some information to that hon. gentleman and to the House. I will simply confine myself to the question of the disallowance by the Dominion Government of an Act of the Local Legislature in reference to the diseases of animals. In 1890 the Manitoba Legislature passed an Act respecting the diseases of animals, and the reasons of the Dominion Government, I presume, for disallowing that Act, were that it contravened the British North America Act, as the subject of quarantine is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government under sub-section 11 of section 91 of that Act. My recollection is that the disallowance of that Act was solely on account of its contravention of that provision, quarantine being clearly without the jurisdiction of the Dominiun Government. In reference to the inspection of animals I may say the Government of Manitoba have a thorough system, and a thorough organization for the inspection of animals. In every district, or every county, there is an official for that purpose, and they have taken every possible means to stamp out any disease that may occur. I am sure that so far as the Dominion Government is concerned, in their disallowance of this Act, they had no desire to interfere with any matter that was clearly within the jurisdiction of the Legislature of Manitoba. But when that Legislature sought to legislate in regard to quarantine and interfere with the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament, the Act necessarily had to be disallowed.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member stated that we had a system of inspection in Manitoba, but that it was done by veterinary surgeons who could only be obtained occasionally, when they are required. The Local Government undertook to appoint provincial inspectors, to attend to the inspection of all animals coming into the province. They had to visit every point on the Canadian Pacific Railway where cattle crossed the boundary line going into the North-West Territories, and certain points east of Winnipeg. The member for Selkirk must agree that, whether this enactment was within the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba or not, and whether it was necessary for the Dominion Government to disallow it because it was *ultra vires*, it was a wise protection on the part of the Manitoba Government to pass such a measure and to enforce such inspection, and it would have been well if the Act could have been kept in force.

Mr. DALY. The Act has been re-enacted with the objectionable clause left out. The provision for district veterinary surgeons is still in force.

Unorganized Quarantine service.. .....$2,000

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The expenditure under this vote last year was $32.40. How does it occur that $2,000 is asked ?

Mr. CARLING. It is to have funds with which to adopt protective measures in case of any disease breaking out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many inmates are there in the lazaretto at Tracadie ?

Mr. CARLING. Twenty-two.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are there less than last year ?

Mr. CARLING. During the year there have been three or four admissions, and three or four deaths have occurred, and the number remains about the same.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is this the only grant given to the institution ?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, $4,500.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is any aid given by the Local Government ?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who has charge of the institution ?

Mr. CARLING. The Sisters of St. Joseph; there is also a physician and a chaplain in connection with it.

Lachine Canal.....$175,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is being done in regard to the Lachine Canal, and for what purpose is this vote intended ?

Mr. HAGGART. This amount is for locks and bridges and works to secure the depth required for vessels drawing 14 feet of water, whereas at present the canal is only adapted for 12 feet navigation. In order to complete the enlargement to 14 feet, the deepening of the canal will be required for six and one-half miles. This will involve the purchase of land on which the excavated material can be deposited, and in order to avoid claims for damages owing to the low-lying land in the neighbourhood of the canal being inundated, for which in the past the Government has paid heavy compensation, it is desirable there should be an open drain constructed at the foot of the canal slope to carry off the water. It will carry the water to River St. Pierre, which will communicate with the St. Lawrence. The River St. Pierre will require to be deepened to the St. Lawrence. The land for the drain has to be purchased. For the purpose of constructing the canal entrance, the town of Lachine has been cut off, and the adjacent lands have been subjected to flooding from the river. To carry off the water and afford a regular discharge, a covered sewer 6,000 feet long is to be built from Lachine to the proposed canal, the land being furnished at the cost of the town. Wellington street at Montreal is crossed by two bridges, one a highway bridge, and the other a railway bridge. The opening for the passage of vessels is only 46 feet wide, while the navigable depth is 15 feet. It is proposed to replace those bridges and build a highway bridge with four carriage tracks and two sidewalks, and increase the width to 60 feet for the passage of vessels, and make it navigable to a depth of 18 feet. The sum of $175,000 is necessary for the purpose of carrying out these works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand the Minister to say that there would be 18 feet depth of water in the basin ?

Mr. HAGGART. From Wellington basin to Montreal harbour.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount of land do you propose to acquire for dumping purposes ?

Mr. HAGGART. It is for land on which to pile material taken out of the canal to a depth of 14 feet, and for the ditching.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much land will be required for the purpose, and what price are the Government going to pay for it.

Mr. HAGGART. About 30 acres will be taken for the ditching.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And for the mere purpose of dumping.

Mr. HAGGART. It will include the dumping.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the price paid ?

Mr. HAGGART. The cost of the land will be over $36,000.

Lake St. Louis..... .....$35,000

Mr. HAGGART. This is for deepening the channel between the shoals above and below the lighthouse, to give 14 feet depth of water.

Soulanges Canal $400,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what is this sum to be expended ?

Mr. HAGGART. It is for the purpose of constructing the canal that will take the place of the old Beauharnois Canal. The estimated expenditure is $4,750,000. The expenditure already made is $11,304. The estimated expenditure up to the 30th June will be about $88,000.

Mr. GIBSON. Have any of the contracts been awarded on this canal ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, two of them. One to O'Brien & Co. of Montreal, and the other section to Mr. Goodwin, of Ottawa. They were the lowest tenderers in both cases.

Mr. DEVLIN. How many tenders were received, might I ask ?

Mr. HAGGART. Eighteen tenders were received for both of them.

Mr. GIBSON. Would you be kind enough to tell us the number of that section that went to Goodwin, and the number that went to O'Brien ?

Mr. HAGGART. Goodwin's is the lowest section, I think, No. 11, and O'Brien's section is the one next to that in which the guard lock is proposed to be.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the length of this canal ?

Mr. HAGGART. About thirteen miles, I think.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the length of the Beauharnois Canal ?

Mr. HAGGART. About the same length, I think.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It does seem to me very extraordinary that we should begin to build a canal on the north side of the river when there is one already on the other side, and that we should incur an expenditure of upwards of $4,000,000, which will simply be to do what is already done by the existing canal. One would think that were the subject fully considered before the canal was located in the first instance, and a very large sum expended on that canal, that looking at the amount of shipping on the St. Lawrence that passes there, there will be nothing in the advantage, whatever it may be on the north side of the river, in the new canal, to compensate for this very large expenditure of money. Certainly if we were out of debt and quite free from taxation, and in a very prosperous condition, the expenditure of so large a sum of money for such an undertaking might be justified, but when we look at the amount of commerce upon the St. Lawrence and the little difference there can be between these two canals for commercial purposes, it does seems to me a great waste of public money, and I do not think the public opinion of this Dominion at the present time, considering our very high rate of taxation, will justify this expenditure. It is to be regretted that this expenditure should be commenced now. I need not repeat what has been said a dozen times this session with reference to our losing our population, but the fact stares us in the face that we are losing not only all the immigration that is coming here, but more than half our natural increase of population besides. I do not see how the Government can expect to retain the population of this country when such heavy burdens are imposed upon the people for enterprises which are really so profitless in themselves. If we were without a means of water communication altogether, and the question was at the present time, whether there should be a canal or no canal at all, then the expenditure might be warranted, but when you have an existing channel of communication adequate for our present purposes, it does seem to me a great waste of public money and a very unwise course to pursue at this moment.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it would be well that we should consider this whole matter. It is to be regretted that this work should have been commenced at all until its necessity was fully and clearly decided upon. It is well known two-thirds of the grain shipped from the west is unloaded at Kingston, and put into barges, and run down through the canals to Montreal to be there transferred to ocean-going vessels. If we should be able to ship grain at Port Arthur and send it direct to Liverpool, it would be necessary that we should have an improved service so as to accommodate ocean-going vessels, but I do not think it is the intention to adopt that system of transport in the near future. When we consider that railways are now constructed in all parts and operated so cheaply, and that the canal service is growing less in every country of the world, even in the United States where it is only kept open for the sake of competition to railways, we must come to the conclusion that this is a very unwise expenditure now. If we could deepen the old canal I think it would be much better. There may be engineering difficulties in the way of this, but this beginning of the new canal with an anticipated expenditure of an enormous amount of money, looks to me as an unnecessary and imprudent undertaking in our present financial condition.

Mr. HAGGART. The policy of deepening the canals was decided upon a number of years ago, and in furtherance of that policy there has been an expenditure in the neighbourhood of $27,000,000. In order to complete the St. Lawrence canal system, so as to give a depth of 14 feet, length of lock 275 feet, and 45 feet wide, to accommodate vessels of 1,700 or 1,800 tons, it will require $10,000,000. The reason for selecting the north shore was, that the deepening of the canal on the south shore to 14 feet would require a greater expenditure than it would to build a new canal on the north shore. The estimated cost of increased expenditure for deepening the old canal and making it as efficient as the new canal would be a million dollars more than the construction of the new canal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who supplied these estimates?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Munro, the engineer, and his staff. I have a comparison here of the cost of enlarging the old canal on the south shore, and the construction of the new canal on the north shore and I will read it if the hon. gentleman wishes. On the north shore the estimated cost of a seven-lock line from Valleyfield is $5,700,000. Another plan on the south side is for a seven-lock line with its terminus at Knight's Point, at a total cost of $5,450,000.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does that follow the bed of the old canal?

Mr. HAGGART. One follows the bed of the old canal with its entrance at Valleyfield, and the other has its entrance at Knight's Point, a couple of miles above Valleyfield. The estimated cost of the north shore canal, including the cost of right of way, is $4,750,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the right of way been purchased for the entire line?

Mr. HAGGART. There is only a portion purchased yet, as the expenditure on the canal, last year, was only $11,000 or $12,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of what the right of way is going to cost per acre?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot say exactly, but the estimate is in the neighbourhood of $50 an acre.

Mr. GIBSON. While I am opposed to this expenditure generally speaking, I think it is better to build a new canal than to enlarge the old one. There are a good many difficulties in the way of deepening the old canal. Its construction was a political mistake in the first place, and there is no reason why the Government should continue that mistake. Moreover, we find from the estimates of the engineers that this new canal will be built for some $750,000 less, to say nothing of the impracticability of increasing the depth of the old canal.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman and the hon. Minister of Railways to say that the construction of a canal on the south shore in the first place was a political mistake. My memory goes back to the time when that selection was made, and I state unhesitatingly and without

fear of contradiction that the selection was made as the result of a careful engineering examination of both sides of the river. I am sorry that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is not in his place to-night to discuss this matter a little further. His constituents are much more interested than mine; but I must say that many of the statements he made on a previous occasion, which were the result of careful study and investigation of the question, were not satisfactorily answered by the hon. Minister of Railways. It has not been shown that the existing canal on the south shore is not amply adequate to supply all the demands made by the trade of the country, and we have no reason to suppose that it will not be adequate to meet those demands for some time to come. There is a general disposition to assume that the people on the south shore of the river are satisfied with the policy of the Government with regard to this matter. They are not satisfied that the engineer who was charged with the examination of the alleged difficulties in the way of deepening the canal on the south shore made that careful and thorough examination which the circumstances required, and the action of the Government with regard to this matter will cause intense dissatisfaction to all the people on the south shore of the St. Lawrence in that part of the Province of Quebec.

Cornwall Canal $500,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this vote for?

Mr. HAGGART. With the exception of the superstructure of three road bridges and other small works, all is required to finish the deepening of the canal to 14 feet. This amount is required to pay for the works under contract to be executed during the years 1892 and 1893.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much has been expended up to date?

Mr. HAGGART. The estimated cost of the whole is $4,000,000. The total expenditure to date is $1,952,858; and the amount required to complete is $2,047,142.

Mr. GIBSON. Can the Minister say how much of this is going towards blasting the channel?

Mr. HAGGART. The advisability of abandoning the blasting, which is being done by Gilbert & Sons, and substituting a dam at Sheiks's Island in place thereof, is under the consideration of the department. We are taking a vote of $100,000 for that purpose in case the engineering staff should think it preferable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know about what will the deepening of the St. Lawrence Canals cost altogether?

Mr. HAGGART. The deepening of the river will cost $700,000. The Galops Canal and the Rapide Plat will cost $1,700,000, $1,600,000, $30,000 and $600,000. That includes the Galops Canal and the rapids outside, the Rapide Plat Canal, and the river above Farran's Point Canal, and the Farran's Point Canal. The estimated cost of the Cornwall Canal is $4,000,000, the St. Lawrence Canal $4,750,000, and the Lachine Canal $7,800,000; altogether close on $20,000,000. There has been expended on the Galops Canal and Rapide Plat, Farran's Point, $1,850,000; on the Cornwall Canal $2,197,900; on the Soulanges Canal about $100,000; on the Lachine Canal $6,549,200. I will give you the total estimated cost from Lake Superior down to Montreal. The total estimated cost of all these improvements, including the Sault Canal, will be $43,000,000, the amount expended on which is $27,465,000, leaving the completing of the St. Lawrence and the Sault Canal in the neighbourhood of $15,000,000.

Rapide Plat..... $250,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is that?

Mr. HAGGART. Just below the Galops Canal at Morrisburg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that a very large proportion is revote. What works are to be carried out there?

Mr. HAGGART. $250,000 is required to pay for the works to be executed during the year 1892-93. The appropriation of 1891-92 was $400,000, the amount expended is $200,000 and the amount required to finish is $250,000. There are two docks. The one at the upper end is completed.

St. Lawrence River Canal..... $200,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is this to be expended and where?

Mr. HAGGART. This work consists in the formation of a channel 33 feet long and 200 feet wide, of a sufficient depth to allow vessels drawing 14 feet of water to pass safely. The contractors are Gilbert & Sons. The sum of $100,000 will be required for work done in the new channel, including settlement with the contractors. It is right opposite the Galops Canal and is the alternate plan proposed by Mr. Page, a cut in the river itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the particular section in which there was some statement to the effect that the rocks had been dumped back?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. The information I have from the engineer is that some parts of the channel were not to the depth they were formerly reported to be. It was alleged by the contractor that some of the material he was ordered to spoil in a particular place was washed in again, and I ordered a new servey to be made to find out the facts of the case. The contractors were Gilbert & Sons of Montreal.

Murray Canal..... $60,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this for?

Mr. HAGGART. To settle with the contractor who built the stone basin, and to build a bridge-tender's house and wharves and mooring posts, and also for stone masonry and rip-rapping, and $7,000 for contingencies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What report has the hon. gentleman as to the position of that?

Mr. HAGGART. The report is that it has worked very well. There are 11 feet of water there now, and the average depth is 11 feet unless at extreme low water, when it is 10½ feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Any trouble with slides?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were the receipts for tolls on that canal last year?

Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. gentleman will find that in the Auditor General's Report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any alteration in the tariff for the appointment of bridge-keepers and others on that canal or does that remain unaltered? What is the expense of keeping this canal up.

Mr. HAGGART. $6,500 for staff and $6,000 for repairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find the tolls received amounted to $796.52. Does the hon. gentleman expect any considerable increase in the tolls? Because to expend $12,500 on maintenance and receive $796 as a revenue is not a very profitable investment.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think the Government want to be recouped in a direct manner from the canals. The advantages are all indirect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that seems an excessively small return.

Trent Canal..... ..... $74,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought to know what the hon. gentleman is going to do with this vote, and what he is going to do with the Trent system altogether.

Mr. HAGGART. The $74,000 is to be spent on a lock between Lakefield and Balsam Lake.

Mr. DAWSON. I should like to know what duties Mr. A. F. Wood performed during the 69 days he was employed by the department apparently in valuing damages on this canal. I find here his services for 69 days at $10; living allowance, 11 days at $3, and 61 days at $3.50, and I find that the amount of damages paid only came to $2,556, although the cost of valuating amounted to $1,092.73, and the legal expenses to $819. The cost of valuing appears to have been $1,912, while the damages assessed were only $2,556. I would like to know how many lots were valued, and whether any more work was done by Mr. Wood than the valuation of the lands owned by persons whose names appear on page C-89 of the Auditor General's Report. I should also like to know if this Mr. A. F. Wood is the member representing North Hastings in the Provincial Legislature.

Mr. HAGGART. I think he is the same gentleman. I suppose the reason for the arbitrator's fees and the legal expenses being so large is the great number of claims that were put in which were not large in amount. There might be one for $8 or $10, or for $50 or $60, and no doubt the legal expenses would almost come to a half of the amount of the damages awarded.

Mr. DAWSON. Does Mr. Wood render any statement of his disbursement for living expenses, because $3.50 a day is rather excessive?

Mr. HAGGART. That is the regular allowance.

Mr. DAWSON. Does he render a statement of his travelling expenses?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. DAWSON. I also see that he received $91.75 in connection with the Tay Canal, and that the damages awarded there amounted to $189. He is evidently a favourite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to hear what policy the hon. gentleman intends to pursue in regard to the construction of this Trent Canal. All kinds of statements have been made in regard to it, but, if I can judge by the estimates now put before us, the hon. gentlemen do not propose to go on with the construction of the Trent Canal at all, because it is absurd to suppose that $74,000 is sufficient to enable them to go on with the work of the character which was stated to us a few years ago. I think it is about time that the Minister told us the intention of the Government in regard to this canal, because it is clear that these sums of $50,000, $60,000 or $70,000, if they are not absolutely thrown away, cannot be turned to practical account in the way of carrying out this scheme of navigation.

Mr. HAGGART. The policy of the Government is the same as it always was in regard to this work. The reason why a larger amount is not asked for now is that the revenue of the country is not such as to justify the Government in asking for authority to expend more money on this work at present, but the Government hopes to have a better opportunity in the future in that respect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not very satisfactory. This has been going on for eleven years. There have been half a dozen commissions appointed and there have been a dozen promises made whenever an election was coming on, and it appears to me that the only reason for this small expenditure being asked now is to enable the Government still to hold out this as a bait before the three or four constituencies that are supposed to be interested in the Trent Valley Canal. The Government stated that they had a rather extensive report on this canal made by some gentlemen who were employed three or four years ago to report in reference to it, and, if now all the Government can say is that they take this vote in order to dangle the bait again before the eyes of the constituencies, I think the electors will be even more gullible than usual if they place any more faith in the Trent Valley Canal.

Mr. GIBSON. On what basis were the damages awarded by Mr. Wood? I find the expenses amounted to $1,092.73, and the whole of the damages amounted to only $2,551. It seems to me that the expenses of this man are out of all proportion to the work he did.

Mr. HAGGART. The only explanation I can give to the hon. gentleman is the one I gave a short time ago, that these damages, in a great many cases, would be comparatively trifling; and the cost of assessing them, and the legal expenses incurred to find out whether the party is entitled to the amount, may, as the hon. gentleman said, amount to nearly one-half the amount of damages.

Mr. GIBSON. There were twenty-two persons awarded damages, and it took him 69 days, or a little over three days for each person to make the enquiry, and his expenses in connection with the adjudication of these cases came to just about half the amount of the damages.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman forgets that there may be four or five times as many cases examined as are reported upon by Mr. Wood, and

these claims may remain unpaid. He gets his pay for the work that he does and when his work is done. The titles have to be enquired into and reported upon by legal authority, and many of these people who were claiming damages may not have received them.

Mr. GIBSON. The Minister must have overlooked the fact that in addition to Mr. Wood's charges for valuation, there were some $800 paid for legal expenses for looking into these titles. Then Mr. Wood was paid $1,192 in addition to the legal expenses.

Mr. DAWSON. I would like to ask what the Trent Valley Commission are doing?

Mr. HAGGART. They were appointed 3 years ago. I suppose their report has been made to the department, and full information has been laid before the House 2 or 3 years ago.

Mr. DAWSON. The Minister ought to be in a position to give some information with reference to such a large expenditure.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not even had time to read the report yet.

Mr. DAWSON. What is the object of the commission? What are they engaged in doing now?

Mr. HAGGART. They are not doing anything; their commission has expired.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can the Minister state what length of navigation they have in that Trent Valley Canal altogether now?

Mr. HAGGART. 58⅝ miles.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What is the total expenditure on this work? What depth of water is there in that canal?

Mr. HAGGART. It is intended for a five foot and a-half navigation. The appropriation for 1891-92 is $74,000. The total expenditure up to the 30th June, 1891, has been $768,139, which does not include the appropriation of the $74,000 for 1891-92. Of this there has been expended only $9,000. $64,000 is a revote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practically, all work has been suspended on it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How much of that is constructed work, and is in canal?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not likely there is any constructed canal. The reaches between the different places are filled with water by putting dams across and raising the depth of the water. I do not think any sections of it are quite completed yet. The expenditure has been principally for land damages, and for erecting dams to cause the depth of water, and for locks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the expenditure on the canal?

Mr. HAGGART. $4,500 for staff, and $3,000 for repairs. This is for capital expenditure alone, and it is new work proposed to be built, an extension of the system.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How much of an extension does the Minister expect to accomplish by this amount?

Mr. HAGGART. A good deal of work is done between Lakefield and Balsam Lake, but there are some dams to be put in, and the length of navigation which it makes is 17¾ miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This 58 miles, is it all in one piece, and where does it extend from?

Mr. HAGGART. It extends from Trenton to Frankford. There is a section from Frankford to Hoard's Creek; another section from Hoard's Creek to Heeley's Falls; another section from Heeley's Falls to Peterborough; another from Peterborough to Lakefield; another from Lakefield to Balsam Lake: another from Balsam Lake to Lake Simcoe; another from Lake Simcoe to Couchiching; and another from that point to Machedash Bay. The navigable portions of it are from Frankford to Hoard's Creek, from Heeley's Falls to Peterborough, and from Lakefield to Balsam Lake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. None of these are together. How many miles of continuous navigation is there in any one place, apart from Lake Simcoe?

Mr. HAGGART. Fifteen miles is the longest piece navigable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total length of the whole canal, and what will be the cost when it is completed so as to give a five foot navigation?

Mr. HAGGART. One estimate by Mr. Page is $9,000,000, and there is another by Mr. Rubidge of $8,500,000. We remember that the hon. gentleman who represented North Victoria last session criticised these figures severely, and said the work could be done for about one-half these figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand it will cost $9,000,000 to build this canal, and $700,000 have been expended. Is that what the hon. gentleman says?

Mr. HAGGART. $775,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In all probability at equal speed in the course of 500 years the Trent Valley navigation will be completed. Could not the Government hurry up this work a little? It appears to me that this Trent Valley undertaking has become a regular farce, and when we find that $9,000 is the total amount expended in one year, and that the longest stretch of navigation is fifteen miles, it is time for some policy to be decided upon, either that the amount shall disappear from the Estimates and the announcement be made that it is not the intention of the Government to build the canal, or that the Government shall proceed with the work and carry it out, if it be a work of public utility.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see by the Auditor General's Report that this commission has been a very expensive body. Each commissioner receives $20 per day and a living allowance of $3 to $5 per day and travelling expenses. Have the commissioners finally completed their labours, and have they reported?

Mr. HAGGART. The report was presented six months ago; it is printed and distributed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What has been the total cost of the commission and report?

Mr. HAGGART. The whole evidence has not yet been received.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many miles above Trenton does navigation begin?

Mr. HAGGART. 7¼ miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then there is a stretch of how many miles?

Mr. HAGGART. 10¾ miles to Campbellford.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then how much remains unimproved?

Mr. HAGGART. About 5 miles that are not navigable.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is this amount to be expended in getting towards the outlet in order that we may have through traffic on the canal?

Mr. HAGGART. It is to be expended between Lakefield and Balsam Lake.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you mean to start to push the work at one end, as this is intended to be a through route? Is it intended to start near Trenton with this money and work so as to have a complete system, and construct a through waterway? At present it is being built in sections inland. Is this expenditure to be made at one end?

Mr. HAGGART. I could not tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When is it the intention to begin at one end of the work?

Mr. HAGGART. It is not decided yet.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This work has been going on many years, and if it is in the public interest it should be taken hold of in a business-like manner and pushed forward. The hon. Minister will admit that a great public work like this should not be used for ulterior purposes at election times. It should either be prosecuted if in the interest of the country, or it should be dropped. If it is to be pushed forward work should be commenced at one end in order that some beneficial results may be derived from it. What is the nature of the traffic on the completed portion and what good purpose is at present served by the canal?

Mr. HUGHES. I may perhaps explain this matter, as I am thoroughly acquainted with the route. Between Balsam Lake and Cameron Lake there is a lock. Between Cameron and Sturgeon there is a lock. Between Sturgeon and Pigeon there is a lock. Through Pigeon and Buckhorn there is a water stretch. Then there is a lock between Buckhorn and Deer, another between Deer and Lovesick, and locks between Lovesick and Stony Lake. Then there is a water stretch through Stony and Clear to Young's Point, where there is a lock. Then the river is navigable to Lakefield, in all a direct navigable stretch upwards of 75 miles, or, including all the lakes, upwards of 150 miles. A canal will have to be constructed connecting Lakefield with Peterborough. At the present time steamers can run from Peterborough to Heeley's Falls above Campbellford. The river is navigable with locks, one being a couple of miles below Peterborough. There is a stretch through Otonabee River and Rice Lake to Hastings. There is a lock at Hastings. The river is again navigable to Heeley's, between which point and Campbellford, a distance of about 5 miles, the river is not navigable. Some time ago a deputation waited on the Minister of Railways and Canals, and although the Government had not yet completed their plan of construction, we were led to believe that the portion between Rice Lake or Peterborough and Lakefield would receive attention. Then there is a stretch of navigable water to Frankford, with one lock at Chisholm's Rapids. Between Campbellford and Heeley's Falls two or three locks will be required. A work will have to be constructed to secure communication between Lakefield and Peterborough, a distance of 6 or 7 miles. The distance from Frankford to Trenton is nearly 8 miles down the rapids. Were these works completed it would give us communication from the inland counties to the seaboard. The Government has given us to understand that they are going to do this work gradually from year to year, and in my opinion it would be very foolish to undertake it in any other way.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand it a little better now, but I wish to know when do the Government intend to undertake the construction of that work from Frankford to the Bay of Quinté?

Mr. HAGGART. I answered the hon. gentleman that I was not prepared to state.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would not that be the most important part of the work so as to make available what is constructed already.

Mr. HAGGART. They think the work at present being constructed, and that has been constructed, the most necessary for the amount of money expended.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would have an outlet to the bay if you had the portion constructed from Frankford out. What would be the cost of that particular work?

Mr. HAGGART. It would cost from Trenton to Frankford $1,218,729.

Mr. HUGHES. There are a large number of lakes which are connected with this canal and along these lakes and rivers are a great many various kinds of wood products. At the present time a large number of steamers are annually engaged in towing this lumber to market. They tow it to the nearest railroad station and there is a good deal of local traffic at the present time. If the canal were constructed from Trenton to Frankford it would open up only a little bit of navigable water from Campbellford to Frankford where there is no timber, and where the Central and Ontario Railway, and the Grand Junction Railway now accommodate the farmers in sending their produce to the market. I think the Government has properly decided to construct the canal so as to connect these large lakes and thus afford the timber produce an outlet to the market.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood from the gentleman who preceded the sitting member in the representation of that county that this was a very important work, and that all these counties interested were anxious to have the work proceeded with rapidly. The hon. gentleman for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) now says that he is quite satisfied with the progress made and that it would be wrong for the Government to make any greater haste. If he represents the views of the people of these counties in that way, it is a little different from what has been represented here before. I have no desire to see any undue expenditure, but I think that if the importance of this Trent Valley Canal depended upon the representation of the former member for North Victoria and other gentlemen in this House, it would be a fair question

for us to enquire, if we are to duplicate canals, and build a canal on one side of the St. Lawrence when we have one already constructed on the other side, whether the immediate construction of the Trent Canal would not be of equal importance and equally justified? Of course the Government will feel relieved when the representatives from these counties assure them that the Trent Canal is not a work of such importance that it needs to be hurried on any faster that it has been.

Mr. HUGHES. I regret exceedingly that the hon. member for Brant (Mr Paterson) should be misled by the representative who preceded me from North Victoria. I regret that he was not better acquainted with that gentleman than to listen to anything that he would tell him.

Mr. McMULLEN. Take it back.

Mr. HUGHES. I will take nothing back. However, what the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) says about us not being anxious to have the canal pushed forward to completion is entirely wide of the mark. We are anxious to have the canal pushed forward and to have all the money expended that the Government can properly expend. But we want it expended judiciously and where it will give us the most benefit. We believe that by building these connecting links, and in following the same plan as the late former leader of the Liberal Government followed, in the construction between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, that it would give us who represent that locality, more immediate service and would benefit the whole Dominion just as much. Just as soon as we can get this inter-lake communication complete, then we will press for the terminal links. We want the money expended, and we do not save our eloquence in pressing for it upon the floor of this House. We have already for the last two or three months been pressing this matter on the attention of the Government, and I am glad to be able to say that we have received very satisfactory encouragement.

Mr. BENNETT. Representing as I do a constituency greatly interested in this work, I would wish to make a few remarks in reference to this subject. In the first place the question of the Trent Valley Canal is by no means a new one before the public of Ontario. For a great many years the proposition has been on foot, to connect the waters of the Georgian Bay with the waters of Lake Ontario, and for a great many years I may say that proposition was formulated in advance by Mr. Capreol, of Toronto, and other gentlemen equally interested in it. However, I think it has been demonstrated and proved that the expense that would be necessitated by the route proposed, namely a canal scheme from the waters of the Georgian Bay to the waters of Lake Simcoe would be too expensive in that regard, and from there to the waters of Lake Ontario at some point near Toronto. Of late years a proposition has come before the public, and I think it is meeting with considerable approval, that there should be utilized all these water stretches which run through the northern part of Ontario. There, as hon. gentlemen doubtless know, by reference to the map, are a great many large rivers and large lakes which can be utilized. It is true, however, I regret to say, that there are also there some costly and expensive pieces of canal to be constructed; however, a considerable portion of the work has been done, and a large expenditure will be necessitated to complete it. Now, as I understand it there are four or five obstructions in several portions of the work and as these have been gone over by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I will not detain the House with any lenghty reference to them. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House wish to be facetious, or I had better say wish to be sarcastic, at the expense of the hon. member for North Victoria, and they point to the fact that the gentleman who preceded him in the representation of that county was much more deeply interested in the work than the present member. All I can say to that is, that the verdict of the people of North Victoria has not been at all to the effect that they thought that Mr. Barron's remarks or actions in reference to this canal, were very sincere or very honest, but they believed that they were advanced with the one object alone of making political capital against the present Administration. I propose to speak of the work as a great national enterprise more than as a local project, although as a local project it is fraught with the greatest possible import to the constituencies along the route. We know that at present the export grain from the great North-West has been so enormous that, in the past year, the Canadian Pacific Railway have been forced not only to carry it to the Atlantic seaboard but also to the Pacific. As a result of the increasing trade which must eventually grow, it must be patent to every person that another means of transport in addition to the railway must be had. We know that it has been established for many years past that no carriage is cheaper than carriage by water, which has been proved conclusively in the case of the Erie Canal, which is only comparatively speaking a ditch compared with what this water scheme, if carried into effect, would be. And yet we know as a matter of fact that millions of bushels of wheat are carried over the Erie Canal in preference to being carried by the railroads. The general public, despite all the croakings of hon. gentlemen opposite, have still faith in the country, and if this work can be completed, and I think it can, at an expenditure of $5,000,000, it is not such a work as should appal the electorate of the Dominion. The people of the Province of Ontario have I think to a major extent contributed to the revenue of the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, not per head.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, there are so few people down there that probably that is the case. But I say that the large Province of Ontario has contributed to the greatest extent, while it has not had the benefit of great public works to an equal extent with other portions of the Dominion. It is true that indirectly we have derived great benefits from the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Welland and other canals; but these works benefited the Dominion as a whole. The Province of Ontario alone has not had the expenditure to which I believe it is entitled in consideration of the large amount of revenue it contributes to the general exchequer. This work is not only a local work, although from that point of view it should be considered, in view of the revenue derived from the Province of Ontario; but I contend that it is a work of the very greatest national importance. I believe that once completed it would become one of the

greatest national routes for the carriage of grain to the seaboard. At the town where I live, Midland, we have seen vessels carrying 100,000 bushels of grain from Chicago and Port Arthur; and if this canal were finished from one lake to the other, the result would be that many such vessels would carry grain from Port Arthur to that point to be transhipped in barges carrying 10,000 or 12,000 bushels, which would be carried through the canal to Montreal, where, by means of floating elevators, the grain would be transferred to the ocean steamers, and in return large quantities of merchandise would be carried back having for its destination the North-West. Therefore, from a national standpoint, this work should be encouraged. I regret that the Ministers have not seen fit to put a larger amount in the Estimates this year; but I am satisfied from the assurances given by the Ministers that the work will receive prompt action in the coming fall.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think that the hon. gentleman heard the Minister quite correctly.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not referring to what the Minister of Railways has stated in the House. I am referring to what he and some other Ministers stated to a deputation who interviewed them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Hon. gentlemen laugh. Perhaps they do not know that the loud laugh sometimes bespeaks the vacant mind. I think it is vacancy on this question in the minds of the hon. gentlemen that prompts them to laugh so. However, I do trust that the Ministry will during the coming summer have a thorough survey made of the canal, and I hope that in the estimates of next year a sufficiently large amount will be placed to complete one of the links along the line. I, representing the constituency which I do, am not to a great extent hampered as to which portion of the canal should be at once put under contract. However, I can say this, that I have sufficient confidence in the wisdom of the Minister of Railways and Canals and the other Ministers to believe that they will do what is right in the premises. As the constituency of North Victoria has seen fit to send here a member who is really honest in his desire to see this work go on, so I think it will be recognized that my efforts in that behalf are honest and not like those of my predecessor in this House. It is said that next year the canal will be under contract; and hon. gentlemen opposite may have the mortification of seeing more public works in progress, even though they should have the effect of sending more members to support the Government and keeping those hon. gentlemen in the position they seem to fit so admirably, the cold shades of Opposition.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. Minister of Railways will have some difficulty, I presume, in the construction of this important artery connecting the Georgian Bay with Lake Ontario, in reconciling his supporters on the subject. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) wants this canal built gradually, very gradually, slowly; a work that was commenced before he was born he wants completed about a thousand years after he dies. That is his honesty. I think he said his opponent was not honest.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not say so, but if you have a mind to say so, I would endorse the statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think the endorsement would be received in any bank where the hon. gentleman is known.

Mr. HUGHES. The people of North Victoria received it, and received you too, doctor.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Government, I think, will meet the wishes of the hon. member and build the canal very gradually, very slowly.

Mr. HUGHES. Hear, hear; that is what we want.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In place of affording access to the free water stretches, we find the Government patching away in the middle. Sometimes the water overflows, but they still patch away in the middle, and the great advantages which the people would gain by having an outlet to the lake so as to get to Montreal, are not given to them. I cannot find any record of the beginning of the construction of this canal, though I have searched for it in the archives. They started away up in the interior. It appears that the canal goes through several constituencies, and all of the members representing these constituencies, with one exception, want the work done gradually. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) wants it done a little faster, and the hon. member for North Victoria wants it done a little slower. I presume he wants it to last during his political career in the House. That hon. gentleman has, perhaps, received some consolation from this scheme in his short political career, and he is afraid, if it were expedited, that perhaps the leverage which gave him his honest record might be taken away. I have looked at the report of the engineer in reference to this great highway which is to connect the Georgian Bay with Lake Ontario, and I am surprised at the hon. member for North Victoria being satisfied with it. Speaking of Fenelon Falls, the engineer says:

"A breach was made by ice in the side dam leading from the main dam. This was repaired, as it allowed the water to fall below the normal level.

"At Bobcaygeon a workshop was built at the dry dock for the convenience of those using the dock. At Buckhorn a large quantity of gravel was washed down the canal into the lock chamber. This was removed."

It is very gratifying to know that was done. That is quite enough for the fogey member for North Victoria. At Burleigh the report says:

"The dams here were thoroughly gravelled. It was found that a much greater quantity was required to make a thorough job than was at first thought necessary. The dams are now tight, and there has been no trouble since in keeping the water at its normal height. The apron of one of the sluices was taken out by saw logs. This was repaired."

That is very gratifying indeed. At Young's Point:

"A boat slide for the passage of small boats over the dam was constructed at a small expenditure. This has been greatly appreciated by the owners of small boats who are continually passing up and down."

That is very gratifying. It is the great highway between Georgian Bay and Lake Ontario, and they will allow small boats to go over the dam. That will be useful for the canoe association up there. At Lakefield, which is the great highway, one in which the people have taken a deep interest and have elected members to support this policy of going slow:

"A top was built on one of the old piers at the Narrows, so as to form an ice-break. Provision was also made for the placing of a light on it."

That is very gratifying. At Peterborough :

"A landing pier was built at the south end of the town, extending from the north side of Wolf street to the Canadian Pacific Railway track. The want of sufficient landing space has long been felt. The landing pier was placed in its present position at the solicitation of the street and bridge committee of the town. The ice did considerable damage to the sluice piers, which were repaired."

Now if the Minister of Railways would make an opening into Lake Ontario, would not that obviate the dangers and difficulties of the ice? He keeps a dam in order to flood these places, and then I see by the report he is paying thousands of dollars for land damages by the overflow. At Hastings, when the old wooden swing bridge was removed, it was found that a considerable portion of the pivot pier had to be rebuilt in order to get a good foundation to set the new iron swing bridge on. It rotted down and had to be replaced by iron and the hon. member for North Victoria will probably find out by this how long it has been built.—

"A new iron swing bridge made at the Central Bridge Works, Peterborough, replaced the old wooden structure and has given every satisfaction. The navigation channel between Lakefield and Bobcaygeon was cleaned out and buoyed."

That is the work done on this canal last year. That is the great work they took such a deep interest in and which is so entirely satisfactory to the members who support the Government after they got in. They are pleased with the progress. I fancy the policy of the Government with regard to this is slow enough to satisfy the most fossilized Tory that ever existed. Well, if they are satisfied it is all right. It is wonderful just before the elections, you will find a large estimate made for the building of this canal a little faster than it has been going on. As to the observations made with regard to the gentleman (Mr. Barron) who formerly represented Victoria so ably and well, and made himself a name and fame, who will be known long after the present member leaves this House, and who will have a glorious resurrection and be in this House again enjoying the confidence of the people, who in a moment of frenzy and a desire to get the canal built set him aside for a supporter of the Government who promised to build the canal a little slower, it would be well for the hon. member for North Victoria were he able to put on the shoes of that gentleman and wear them so well and so worthily. If there is any benefit in this canal, I would like to see it completed. I do not want to see it pushed the way it is being at present, putting in a bridge here and a workshop there, tearing up old work that has become rotten, but I want to see it constructed and not be used for all time as an engine of corruption. If it is to be of any advantage, it should be pushed ahead without delay. If the Government are in earnest, let them put something in the Estimates worthy of the enterprise which is to connect the two great waters. If it is not to be of any advantage, let the Government drop it and not fritter away the people's money in this way. Let them go at it like business men or abandon it altogether. It is a singular thing that the people along the line are satisfied with the progress made. It is a wonder they are not dissatisfied.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister know how much of this $775,000 has been expended in surveys and commissions and other expenses not connected with the actual construction of the work?

Mr. HAGGART. None has been expended on commissions. That is not included in the amount.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How much has been expended on surveys and commissions?

Mr. HAGGART. I have no idea. It does not appear in my department at all and to find out the amount we would have to go through the public accounts.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This being a work of such importance that the Minister promised the hon. member for East Simcoe privately that it would be pushed on very fively, we should have some details. The hon. member for Simcoe congratulates himself and the hon. member for North Victoria that they are honest champions of this work and have every confidence in the Government, and they declare that their predecessors were dishonest in their advocacy of this work. I would like to know whether the hon. member for East Simcoe, while he thinks his predecessor was dishonest in this matter, when he finds the Minister of Canals putting $69,000 in the Estimates for the prosecution of this work, after telling him privately he was going to push the work, thinks the Minister of Canals is particularly honest or not. That would be quite as pertinent as casting reflections on a gentleman not present now. They were not able to discover from anything said by the predecessor of those hon. gentlemen that they were not sincere but they did not toady to the Government, but spoke from the belief that the work they were advocating was in the interest of Canada. They did not assume any humble, cringing, begging, apologetic tone towards the Minister, but pointed out why they did consider this work should be proceeded with more rapidly. I suppose it may be satisfying to the Minister to find gentlemen now representing the constituency commend him for the slow progress he has made. But a work of this kind ought not to be kept and used as a means for political advantage for the party in power. That that is the case, that it is so viewed, may be fairly inferred from the closing remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who said he hoped the Government would go on and expend money on this canal and on other public works even at a slow rate, even if it should result in bringing more supporters to the Government from the different constituencies. A more open acknowledgment that the public works of this country are used by the Government for the purpose of corrupting the constituencies was never made, and I think it was a shameful statement to be made by any one in the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister state the amount of tolls collected on this canal last year?

Mr. HAGGART. It appears in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the amount was $756. Can the hon. gentleman say what the wages bill was?

Mr. HAGGART. The amount asked for the staff is $4,500, and for repairs $3,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that this is a very considerable loss to the country every year. It may contribute to the advantage of a certain class, but it cannot be said to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. I think it would be better to change the name from the Trent Valley Canal to the Tory Canal.

Mr. BENNETT. With righteous indignation, most of which I think is affected, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) thought fit to refer to me as a champion of bribery and corruption. What I said was that I hoped this work would be completed by the present Administration, and I trusted that the people along the route of that canal would acknowledge the work as a national enterprise, and also the fact that if this Government carried it out, they would return supporters to this or any other Conservative Administration that might follow. It ill becomes the hon. gentleman to refer to the erection of public works for the purpose of baiting the electorate. Let me tell you what was done in my own riding by the Local Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not going to refer to Quebec. Gentlemen opposite do not like to hear anything about that province. In consequence of the conservative character of the city of Toronto, the Ontario Government erected in the East Riding of Simcoe an immense idiot asylum, and the result is that the idiots, of whom unfortunately there are too many in the country, are carried from all over the province at an immense expense, not to the centre of the province but to this asylum in the East Riding of Simcoe. That building was put up there for no purpose other than to keep it safe for Mr. Drury, who was a member of the Administration.

Mr. WATSON. The Tories are all in the asylum.

Mr. BENNETT. My hon. friend is safe from the asylum at the distance at which he lives. I attacked the hon. member for North Victoria of last session for a ring of insincerity which I saw in his advocacy of this scheme. As far as the hon. member for East Simcoe was concerned, when a large deputation came down to place the construction of this canal before the Government, he would not come, and why? Because he could not get a pass, because he had not his expenses paid. Afterwards, when we applied to him as the representative of the riding, and asked him if he would favour a grant of public money, he said he could not say until he found out what Mr. Laurier was going to do about it. He thought that the party interests must be served first and those of the country afterwards. I trust that the Government will go on with the work as speedily as possible, and I trust that a large section will be completed next year, and that not only the constituencies along the route of the canal will approve of the work being undertaken and return members to support the Government, but that all parts of the province and of the Dominion, recognizing the importance of the work, will support the Government in making any large grants they may propose in order to secure the consummation of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. The discussion of this matter promises to be as tedious as the construction of the Trent Valley Canal. We have a long day ahead of us to-morrow, and I propose, if hon. gentlemen opposite consent, that we might pass this and the two succeeding small items, and then adjourn, so as to give us a season of rest in preparation for to-morrow.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 81) for the relief of Herbert Rimmington Mead—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Taylor.)

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 4th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MANITOBA SCHOOL ACT.

Mr. WATSON asked, What amount has been paid by the Dominion Government to date for legal and other expenses in connection with testing the constitutionality of the "Manitoba School Act," being a suit of Barrett *vs.* City of Winnipeg?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About $4,800.

CHARGES AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Edgar: That certain charges of corruption against Sir Adolphe P. Caron be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to enter at length into the question before the House. It is a matter of very grave importance not only to the body of which we form a part, but more particularly to the member of the Government who has been charged with a grave dereliction of duty. When the motion was moved by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and the reply made by the leader of the House, the Minister of Justice, it was then indicated that if any definite charges were made, involving the honour or the ministerial conduct of the Postmaster General, the Government would not be a party to preventing an investigation into any charges which might be so made. It was very clearly and distinctly pointed out by the Minister of Justice, in the remarks made by him at that time, that these charges were not of that distinct character they should be where a man's reputation was involved, more particularly one holding the responsible position of a Minister of the Crown and a Privy Councillor, that the resolution was not of that definite character it should be to justify its acceptance. It was then stated that any definite charges made against the Postmaster General, or against any other member of the Administration, would receive not only attention but that it would be the duty of the Government to have the fullest investigation made into such

charges. It was also stated by the Postmaster General himself before leaving the House that he was quite prepared, not only to meet any charges which might be made against him, but that he was anxious to have an investigation into his conduct so far as the charges related to his action as a Minister of the Crown; and in his connection with the parties with whom it was said he was associated in the construction of a railway and the subsidies granted in aid thereof. Since that time, much more definite and pointed charges have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite during the discussion. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made statements which, had they been included in the resolution would have at once been accepted as good reason for immediately proceeding with the investigation. These were supplemented by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who, on two or three occasions during the debate, made positive and distinct statements as to the malfeasance of office and improper conduct on the part of the Postmaster General. The hon. gentleman, as is his wont, shakes his head, but when I read these extracts, perhaps he will give me credit for not misinterpreting the language which he used, or the interpretation which can be properly and legitimately placed upon his statements. In addition to that, the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), the gentleman who first fulminated the charges in the resolution which he proposed, in explaining what he meant, made the charges much more pointed and distinct, giving in addition to what was already stated in the resolution, sufficient ground to warrant the Government in asking this House to take such steps as will lead to a proper and thorough investigation into the allegations which have been made, such as they are, by insinuation and innuendo, not only in the resolution, but more pointedly and distinctly by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), in the speeches which they made. The Government has no desire to screen any malfeasance of office on the part of any of its members, nor do the members of the Government individually desire to shirk any responsibility in connection with an investigation which involves their character as men, or their reputation as Ministers of the Crown. Having said this much, and without entering into or combatting any of the statements made by the hon. gentlemen opposite who have addressed the House on this subject, although there is ample room to show that their statements in many respects are not warranted by the facts, nor justified by the remarks made by the Minister of Justice;—I say that although there is ample room not only to combat but to show the unfairness with which a charge of so grave a character as this has been made, I do not propose to enter at all at the present moment into that question. I shall simply confine myself, under the circumstances, to moving an amendment to the motion which has been proposed by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), an amendment which I think will meet the approval not only of the House of Commons but of the people of this country. I shall, therefore, move, seconded by Mr. Foster, that all the words after "That" in the main motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

James D. Edgar, the member representing the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Ontario in this House, having stated from his place in this House, that he is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence:

1. That during each of the years 1882 to 1891 inclusive, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company received by way of bonus from the Dominion of Canada, subsidies amounting in the aggregate to upwards of one million dollars, which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of the Ministers of the Crown.

2. That arrangements were entered into by the said railway company whereby the expenditure of said subsidies was made by a construction company through or in conjunction with one H. J. Beemer, a contractor—and the said Beemer and those who assisted him in financing for the said railway works, received the benefit of the said subsidies.

3. That during the whole of the said period from 1882 to 1891, the Honourable Sir Adolphe P. Caron was, and still is, a member of the House of Commons of Canada, a member of the Canadian Government and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for Canada.

4. That the said Sir A. P. Caron was, during the whole, or the greater part of the said period, one of the members of the said construction company, and thus had means of knowledge of, and did know of the dealings with the said subsidies and their destination after they were paid over by the Government to the said railway company.

5. That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and from moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same.

6. That during the said period out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same, large sums of money were from time to time corruptly paid and contributed, at the request and with the knowledge of said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

7. That the Temiscouata Railway Company was given incorporation by Letters Patent issued by the Canadian Government on 6th October, 1885, and since that date the said railway company has received from the Dominion of Canada subsidies to the extent of $649,200—which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of Ministers of the Crown.

8. That since the 6th October, 1885, and while the said Temiscouata Railway was being constructed in part by means of the said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money from the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies.

9. That also since the said 6th October, 1885, the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies, paid and contributed large sums at the request, and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member, and that after some of such last-mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which the said Sir A. P. Caron was a member.

That in the course of the debate arising on the resolution based on such statements of the said Mr. Edgar, it was stated by the Hon. Mr. Mills, the member representing the electoral district of Bothwell, as follows:—

"So when the leader of the Government and his colleague undertake to seriously argue that this House is denuded of all its power to enquire into the misappropriation of public money for the purpose of corrupting the electors of this country, because the trial of election petitions has been referred to the courts, I take issue with those hon. gentlemen on that ground. The trial of election petitions is one thing. The use of public money for deliberate corruption of the electors by a member of the Administration is a proper matter for enquiry by this House, and it is not in the smallest degree restricted in any way by reason of the trial of election petitions having been referred to the courts."

That it was further stated by the said Mr. Mills:

"These charges point to a member of this House in his official capacity as a member of the Administration, rather than to his conduct as a member of this House. What, in effect, are the charges here made? They point to the fact that the Crown was advised to appropriate large sums of money for particular purposes, and that these moneys were diverted from these public purposes and placed in the hands of a Minister of the Crown for the purpose of corrupting the electorate in certain portions of the Dominion of Canada."

That it was further stated by the said Mr. Mills:

"There is a statement made here that this hon. gentleman, the Postmaster General, is the Minister of the Crown who advised these subsidies being appropriated to aid these companies. There is a charge that he obtained a portion of the subsidy so voted, or its equivalent, from these companies, and used it for his own purpose in his own election, and in the elections in twenty-three constituencies in this Dominion. That charge is specific and clear enough. It is also stated that after some of these moneys were received by him this same gentleman advised the Crown to grant other subsidies to other parties, and that from these other subsidies, moneys were also obtained."

That it was further stated by the said Mr. Mills as follows:—

"If he advised the Crown to make these appropriations, and had an understanding with one of the railway companies participating in them that these moneys, or a portion of them, should go to him, we ought to know it; we are entitled to know it."

That it was stated in the said debate by Sir Richard Cartwright, the member representing the electoral district of the South Riding of Oxford, referring to the said charges of the said Mr. Edgar, as follows:—

"What in the name of wonder is it that my hon. friend beside me has charged the Postmaster General with? He has charged him in no vague language, but in terms, with being guilty of the most corrupt conspiracy, for the purpose of destroying the electoral liberties of the people of Canada, of which any adviser of the Crown can be found guilty."

It was stated in the said debate by Mr. Edgar aforesaid, as follows:—

"Those railways which are involved in this charge, were aided by the Dominion and Provincial Governments, and what I complain of is the appropriation of Dominion subsidies by the Postmaster General."

And again:

"The Minister of Marine drew a nice point when he said that I did not, as I should have done, charge his colleague with public robbery. Well, I did not put it in those words but in words which I certainly intended to mean robbing the public. If it is not public robbery for a member to take moneys out of public subsidies, I would like to know what is." And again:

"So I think if I get a chance to go on and prove these charges there will be what is, under the law, a most abominable conspiracy."

That, from the aforesaid statements made by the said J. D. Edgar, and from comments and arguments thereon by the said David Mills and Sir Richard Cartwright and the said James D. Edgar from their places in this House, it appears that it was the intention of the said J. D. Edgar by said statement to charge Sir A. P. Caron, a member of this House, and of the Honourable the Privy Council of Canada, with grave offences and derelictions of duty, notwithstanding that the said statement of the said J. D. Edgar, first above cited, did not make any definite or precise charge against him.

That the following charges and allegations are indicated by the said statement made by the said J. D. Edgar, and by the comments and arguments of the aforesaid other members of this House and by his own comments thereon as intended to be made in the said statement, against the said Sir A. P. Caron, namely:

1. That, during each of the years 1882 to 1891 inclusive, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company received by way of bonus from the Dominion of Canada, subsidies amounting in the aggregate to upwards of a million of dollars, which subsidies were voted by Parliament on the recommendation of Ministers of the Crown.

2. That, during the whole of the said period from 1882 to 1891, the Honourable Sir A. P. Caron was, and still is, a member of the Canadian Government, and one of Her Majesty's Privy Councillors for Canada, and was also a member of the House of Commons in each Parliament which has been elected since the year 1882.

3. That, during the said period, and while the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron knowingly aided and participated in diverting the said subsidies from the purpose for which they were granted, by receiving, for election purposes, from the said railway company, or from a construction company formed for the construction of the said railway, or from one H. J. Beemer, as manager thereof, or contractor of the said railway, large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same; and also, during the said period, did further knowingly so aid and participate by obtaining from the said companies or one of them, the payment out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised by the said companies, or one of them, on the credit of the same, of large sums of money for election purposes, and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government of which he was a member.

4. That, after some of the last-mentioned payments were so obtained and made, the said Sir A. P. Caron, in consideration thereof, corruptly aided and assisted the said company to obtain further and other subsidies from the Dominion Parliament.

5. That, since the 6th of October, 1885, the said Temiscouata Railway Company recived various subsidies from the Dominion of Canada, amounting in all to about $649,200, and that the said Sir A. P. Caron knowingly aided and participated in diverting the said subsidies from the purposes for which they were granted, by receiving from the said company large sums of money out of the said subsidies, or out of moneys raised on the credit of the same, and also by obtaining the payment by the said company, out of the said subsidies, or out of moneys raised on the credit of the same, of large sums of money to aid in his election as a member of the House of Commons, and to the election of other persons as members of the House.

6. That after some of the last-mentioned payments were so obtained and made, the said Sir A. P. Caron, in consideration thereof, corruptly aided and assisted the said company to obtain further and other subsidies from the Dominion of Parliament.

7. That the said Sir A. P. Caron misappropriated public money for the purpose of corrupting the electors of Canada, to wit, a portion of the moneys voted as subsidies as hereinbefore stated.

8. That the Crown having been advised to appropriate large sums of money for public purposes, to wit, the said subsidies, such moneys, or a portion of them, were diverted from the purposes for which they were so appropriated, and placed in the hands of Sir A. P. Caron for the purpose of corrupting the electorate in certain portions of Canada.

9. That the said Sir A. P. Caron had an understanding, when the said subsidies or some of them were voted or recommended, with one or more of the railway companies participating in said appropriations, or with a person or persons interested in said appropriations, that the moneys so appropriated by Parliament, or portions of them, should go to him.

10. That the said Sir A. P. Caron, by virtue of the fact so alleged, entered into a corrupt conspiracy with the said companies, or one or more of them.

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that enquiry should be made as to the truth or falsity of the allegations and charges last mentioned, and numbered respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 (being the allegations and charges included in the original statement of the said James D. Edgar, and those made in the course of the debate thereon), and that for that purpose the House deems it proper and convenient that the evidence relating to such allegations and charges should be taken by one or more commissioners to be appointed under chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada and having all the powers mentioned in said chapter, and that such evidence should be laid before this House when completed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. The conclusion at which the Government has arrived in connection with this matter seems to have furnished the Opposition with a cause for apparent amusement. I am rather inclined to think their derisive cheers are just what they would have given, no matter what course might have been taken or suggested by the Government. I believe that the country will concur in the course and approve of the policy adopted by the Government in this matter. I believe the country will be better satisfied that the truth can be arrived at much better by a commis-

sion of one or more independent gentlemen, whose duty it will be to discriminate and hear the evidence and discuss it, than by a body of politicians who compose the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It must be borne in mind that the Government do not propose in this resolution to ask for any opinion on the part of the commissioners who may hold this investigation. They ask, not to have their finding, but the evidence, which will be taken under oath and laid before Parliament to deal with. I could understand the derisive cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite if we had asked to have the matter referred to a commission and for that commission to report their opinion, and then fall back upon the opinion which they might give as to the falsity or the truth of the charges formulated against the Postmaster General. But in this case we ask an independent body, if I may term it so, or an independent individual, to take whatever evidence may be produced by the mover of the original resolution and report that evidence to this House; and then it will be for the members of the Commons of Canada to say whether the Postmaster General is guilty of dereliction of duty and malfeasance of office and the corrupt practices alleged against him. I am convinced that the members of the Opposition do not desire an investigation.

Mr. LISTER. Give us a committee.

Mr. BOWELL. Would hon. gentlemen like to stay here until next spring. I could point to hon. gentlemen on that side and draw a line of circumstantial evidence which I think they would not like to have promulgated in a resolution. Were I to commence with some acts which I could trace, from the robbery of a provincial treasury, down to an election fund, which I believe I could prove, hon. gentlemen opposite would very justly say to the member for Hastings: You had better say you believe they are true before you try to blacken the reputation of any one.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We would give you a committee of the House at once.

Mr. BOWELL. We have had some little experience of committees in the past.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOWELL. We have had some little experience of committees of this House as well as where gentlemen on the Opposition had the majority in a province, and we know what the results have been. It is not necessary that I should point to the result of the investigation which has lately taken place in a sister province. It is not necessary that I should go back to the time when charges were made against Ministers of the Crown in the Province of Ontario, and where the Minister himself changed the resolution so as to make it distinct and positive against himself, and refused an investigation in the manner demanded by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Against unnamed parties?

Mr. BOWELL. No, but against the whole Government. I cannot be led away by either the sophistries or the legal acumen of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island. I know his great aptitude for diverting the attention of the House from the points at issue. I have given reasons which I believe should actuate every fair-minded man in Canada in considering that this investigation should be clear and positive, and that the evidence should be taken by gentlemen not influenced either by political considerations or by any other considerations except those of arriving at the truth; believing that, and believing that the truth can be obtained much better by the evidence being taken as suggested in the amendment, and that that evidence should be referred to this House to deal with in the future, I believe that this course is infinitely better than referring the question either to a special committee or to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I may add that the hon. the Postmaster General occupies precisely the same position which he occupied when he made his statement to the House, that is, that he is anxious that a fair and impartial enquiry shall be made into his conduct with regard to these charges.

Mr. FLINT. I think the Minister of Militia will agree with me that perhaps it is somewhat unfortunate that he has not waited till the conclusion of the debate before preparing and presenting his amendment, because, in all probability, by that time he would have had several more paragraphs which he would have found it advisable to include in his amendment.

Mr. BOWELL. I shall have no objection to add them afterwards.

Mr. FLINT. Those who will follow me will touch on many important matters which I shall not have time to discuss, and which it is advisable that a Royal Commission should investigate. If those statements are correct, and if they deal properly with all the charges, then I think they also should be fully considered. It would seem, Sir, that since we closed this discussion the other evening a new light has dawned upon the occupants of the Treasury benches, and that they have seen that it was advisable to take at all events a portion of the advice tendered them by some of their supporters; advice tendered to them, no doubt, to the effect that in addition to the matters then before the House there were so many other subjects for consideration as should have been worthy of presentation either to a committee of the House or to a commission to be appointed in consequence of this resolution. There are so many new facts elucidated by the amendment, that, although they have been repeated in our presence by the mover of the resolution, and by yourself, Mr. Speaker, and have been so eloquently and ably translated by our assistant Clerk of the House, I would not venture to refer to them, because I have not had an opportunity of going over them *seriatim* and studying their bearing carefully in connection with the original charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), I may say, however, that the position which I take is, that the charges which are now presented to the House are not the original charges which were brought for our consideration, nor is the tribunal to which it is proposed to refer them the tribunal which was selected by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and which has been selected by the genius of British institutions to try matters of this kind, almost from the earliest periods of constitutional history down to the present time. I contend that the Parliament of the Dominion, as also the English Parliament, although I agree with my friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) it is not, strictly speaking, a court of justice, yet it is the high court of inquisition of the nation—is the proper place in which to try this matter. It is the court of

Parliament, not bound by the strict technical rules of the courts of justice; it is the court selected by the people in constitutional form to try the responsible Ministers of the Crown for all high crimes and misdemeanours which may be committed against the people of this country. We are not discussing, nor do we propose to discuss under the charges which have been brought here, offences cognizable by the courts of the land; but we have asked, if these charges are true, to cause an inquest to be made, through the powers committed to us by the constitution, into constitutional offences. We maintain that this Parliament is the only court which has the power and the jurisdiction to try these charges. Now, we are met by several objections, and we are met with a long list of precedents, the only object of which is, in my humble opinion, to narrow down the scope of this enquiry and to minimize the character of these charges which were brought before us. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are now seeking to so becloud these charges, and to so mix them up and confuse them in the public mind, that the real gravamen and the weight of them will be lost in the confusion that must result from any attempt to bring their discussion fairly before the people. I think that these charges should be discussed from another standpoint, and that they should be looked at from a broader basis. There can be no doubt that throughout this country ever since the days of the celebrated Pacific scandal, there has existed in the public mind --whether well-founded or ill-founded it is not for me to say—a strong impression that the great powers and the enormous funds placed at the disposal of the Dominion Administration have been used in an unwarrantable, unconstitutional and dishonest manner, in order to exercise an improper influence on the electors of the country at the polls during the periods of general and bye-elections. When charges are made bringing to book a responsible officer of the Crown, saying that he, by his influence in Parliament and in the Government, has been a go-between between the dispensers of party funds and the public treasury, then I think that we should waive aside all of these narrow technicalities which are perfectly proper and consistent in a court of law, but which are not proper in dealing with matters of this kind in the House of Commons. The hon. Minister of Justice, in opening the discussion upon this question the other evening, very carefully retraced one or two of the steps which he had taken in connection with former investigations or former charges made in this House. It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that, during the last session, I had the honour to bring charges of not so serious a character as these, in regard to a fellow-member, and which I did with much regret, but as a public duty. I was met, almost at the outset, by the statement of the Minister of Justice, that the member for Yarmouth took his official position in this House and his privileges as a representative in his hands when he made these charges. The only inference I could draw from that was, that if the charges were made without any evidence whatever, that the House under the guidance of the Minister would be justified in expelling the member who brought these charges. Although I differed from the Minister at that time, and although the covert threat had no influence on my mind, because I felt that if I had discharged to the best of my abilities the duties I felt imposed upon me as a member of this House, my constituents would rise above all considerations of these threats and would reward me for attempting to carry out my duty by a re-election; yet I felt the Minister of Justice was laying down a principle which I never met with before in my readings in connection with parliamentary government. However, in the opening of this present discussion the Minister of Justice frankly stated that charges of this or a similar character made by an hon. member of this House which were not substantiated and were shown to be absolutely groundless, subjected the hon. member merely to the censure of the House, and then he could take whatever course seemed fit to him when such censure had been passed. At the outset of the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), we were met with a few leading objections quite familiar to those who practice in the courts of law, objections, in the first place, to the jurisdiction of this House, or through a committee of this House, to try charges of this character. We were met by the objection that even if this House has jurisdiction, that there are other courts, or other powers in the country which have jurisdiction of a similar character, and that it would be advisable to refer charges of this kind to some other jurisdiction. We were also met with the objection that even if we have the jurisdiction, or even if there is another jurisdiction equally powerful to sift the evidence and to punish offenders, yet that these charges, even if admitted, did not amount to a constitutional offence; and throughout the whole of the speeches of the Minister of Justice and of gentlemen on the other side of the House who followed him, we find the charges continually referred to as if they were against the Postmaster General as a member of this House. I do not so read the charges. I read the charges to apply to the Postmaster General partly as a member of this House, but largely, however, as an adviser of the Crown, and principally as a member of the Government dealing with the public funds. From that standpoint, I find very little reference to his position by any of the speakers who have opposed the adoption of the resolution as presented by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). Then, again, in addition to the objection made to the jurisdiction of the House, and to the conclusion which would be derived from the wording of these charges if substantially proved, I find that there are political objections urged, notably by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Dickey). Although he frankly admitted that probably these considerations ought not to have the same weight as strictly technical objections, yet he dragged into the consideration of this question, as other hon. members have, political considerations as an offset to the charges which have been made. Now, I contend that no matter what charges may be made against any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, no matter how they may have conducted themselves as politicians, no matter how strongly they may have been condemned for anything that has been proved against them, either in elections for this House or for any of the Local Legislatures, that forms no answer to the charges made here against the Postmaster General, and those who are charged with being associated with him in improperly using the public money for the purpose of corrupting the electorate of the country. My hon. friend from Cumberland quoted with considerable

gusto from that great constitutional orator and thinker, Edmund Burke, in his desire to prove that Parliament was not the proper body to consider charges of this kind; and his reference seemed to me to have so little bearing upon this case, or at any rate to have so little weight when contrasted with other statements and with the whole course of life of that distinguished man, that I will beg pardon for alluding to it somewhat at length. Quoting from the Life of Burke by Morley, he proved or contended that Parliament was not a court of justice. This we are perfectly willing to admit. There were attempts made in ancient times to set up the court of Parliament as a court of justice, and to hale before it offenders against the general laws of the land, and punish them by the exercise of the powers of Parliament. Those efforts failed, and it was subsequently held by constitutional writers and thinkers and by great jurists that Parliament was not a court of justice to try and punish offenders who could be punished by the ordinary procedure of the courts of common law. But we have here an offence which, so far as I am able to read it, is not an offence against any statute law or against the common law; but it is an offence against what is recognized as the moral law, an offence against the constitutional rights of the people, and an offence against this Parliament as the dispenser of public money. Burke referred to the matter of enquiries before Parliament, of which he was a champion; and any student of his great speeches will discover in them all that he was a leader during his political existence in enquiries into abuses of power on the part of the administrators of the Government, and on the part of those exercising the power of England beyond the seas. Many of the greatest enquiries ever entered upon by the British Parliament, notably those in connection with the East India Company, in connection with the troubles in Ireland, in connection with the wars in America, in connection with the Crown's disposal of public money, in connection with the Hastings case, were either instigated or powerfully supported by Edmund Burke. In bringing before the House in 1768 his motion for an enquiry into the military trouble which arose, some of his observations are so pointed and seem to apply so clearly to cases of this nature that I will quote them for the benefit of hon. gentlemen:

"Burke brought the matter before the House in a motion for a committee of enquiry, supported by one of the most lucid and able of his minor speeches. 'If ever the time should come,' he concluded, 'when this House shall be found prompt to execute and slow to enquire; ready to punish the excesses of the people, and slow to listen to their grievances; ready to grant supplies, and slow to examine the account; ready to envest magistrates with large powers, and slow to inquire into the exercise of them: ready to entertain notions of the military power as incorporated with the constitution—when you learn this in the air of St. James's, then the business is done; then the House of Commons will change that character which it receives from the people only.'"

This was a powerful vindication of the principle which the preamble of these resolutions asserts, that this House has granted large sums of money for useful public purposes, and that a certain hon. gentleman, occupying a high position in this House and in the Government of the country, which enabled him to exercise his influence in regard to appropriations by the House and in regard to their expenditure afterwards, has conspired with those who have been the recipients of this public money, to share with him, in the handling of these funds, and to use a portion of the proceeds voted for public purposes in order to corrupt the electorate, and thus strengthen himself and his colleagues in power. My hon. friend from Cumberland, referring to the duties and power of Parliament, also quoted from Hallam's Constitutional History; and although he made no particular reference to any particular chapter, he spoke of the whole tenor of Hallam's observations and comments on the powers of Parliament as supporting the position he assumed, namely, that this was not among the range of questions that Parliament could investigate, and that the form of the indictment or charge was not such as to invite this Parliament to appoint a committee to consider it. Now, let us see what Hallam says in a brief passage, and almost the only passage on the subject of an inquiry by the House of Commons, and see if that position is sustained:

"In June, 1689, a special committee was appointed to enquire into the miscarriages of the war in Ireland, especially as to the delay in relieving Londonderry. A similar committee was appointed in the Lords."

Here let me observe that I took the opportunity of looking up the report of this committee in the Commons Journals of 1689, and I find that the resolution asking for this committee of enquiry is very brief. It does not make any statement as to the grounds of the belief entertained by the member moving for the committee of enquiry, nor does it charge or at all indicate any particular persons or any specified times or places as those which are solely and necessarily bound up in the scope of the enquiry. The resolution is so brief that I will quote it:

"Resolved, that a committee be appointed to enquire who has been the occasion of the delays in sending relief over into Ireland, and particularly into Londonderry."

A short resolution of four lines, which led to such important consequences, led to the indictment and ruin of several important military officers, led to important legislation and important action on the part of the British Government in connection with affairs in Ireland. The report of the committee was made about six months after its appointment, and the evidence taken by the committee was exceedingly lengthy; upon the result of that evidence presented to the House, after notice given to the persons who were charged with the delays and losses and sufferings in Ireland, whereby the British power was abused and the people injured, Colonel Cunningham was put upon his trial, and many other officers found themselves defending themselves in the courts of law. Referring to this enquiry, Hallam says:

"The former reported severely against Colonel Lunday, governor of that city; and the House addressed the King that he might be sent over to be tried for the treason laid to his charge. I do not think there is any earlier precedent in the Journals for so specific an enquiry into the conduct of a public officer, especially one in military command. It marks, therefore, very distinctly the change of spirit which I have so frequently mentioned."

Thus we see the introduction of the new spirit by which the Commons insist upon their rights, as the Grand Inquisition of the Realm, bound by their duty to the Crown and their duty to the people to enquire into the injuries inflicted upon the people and the violation of the laws of the land, by means of commissioners of their own.—

"In Great Britain no courtier ever since ventured to deny this general right of enquiry, though it is a frequent practice to elude it. The right to enquire draws with it the necessary means, the examination of witnesses,

records, papers, enforced by the strong arm of parliamentary privilege."

And he says further:

"It is hardly necessary to enumerate later instances of exercising a right which had become indisputable, and, even before it rested on the basis of precedent, could not reasonably be denied to those who might advise, remonstrate and impeach."

So we find that it has been the habit to elude this, a habit which, no doubt, will be continued as long as Parliament exists, because the line of defence which has been indicated here is as old almost as the history of law, and will continue as long as public men are charged with any offences. There will always be a denial of jurisdiction; there will always be, probably, demurrers to the gravity of the charge; and there will, probably, always be a desire to mix up a large number of collateral non-important questions with the charge, in the effort to confuse the public mind and becloud the charges, and deceive those who are to pronounce judgment. Referring again to Burke's position with regard to matters of this kind as among the precedents which have been quoted, I would call the attention of the House to the famous case in 1770 wherein a motion was made for a committee to enquire into the administration of criminal justice and the proceedings of the judges in Westminster in cases relating to the liberty of the press. Now, every speaker who has addressed the House on the other side, although supporting the hon. gentlemen who oppose this enquiry, allege that the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario are vague and indefinite, and upon this ground they ask that they be thrown out of court as not amounting to sufficient to place a Minister of the Crown upon his trial or to demand an investigation at the hands of the representatives of the people. Let us see how that great statesman, Edmund Burke, treated a question of a far more important character, reflecting on the administration of justice. One would suppose that if the judge or a number of judges of the bench at Westminster Hall were publicly attacked in the House of Commons, their defenders there would insist that the charges be specific. One would suppose that in such a case all the technicalities and precedents, if any, which could be quoted favourable to the pretension of hon. gentlemen opposite, would be found in a resolution brought before the House of Commons in connection with charges against the judges of the land. The motion was:

"That a committee be appointed to enquire into the administration of criminal justice and the proceedings of judges in Westminster Hall, in cases relating to the liberty of the press and the power and duties of juries."

Mr. Burke said:

"The learned gentleman who introduced it, boldly arraigns the general conduct of our courts of justice, and the hon. gentleman who seconded him, as boldly arraigns the conduct of a particular judge."

Now we find no particular judge charged in the resolution, yet we find in the speech of the seconder of the resolution an attack on a particular judge and a severe arraignment of him.—

"Either charge should be alone sufficient to excite our closest attention. What effect, then, ought both in conjunction to produce? They ought to impel us, if not to an enquiry, at least to a minute and elaborate discussion. For what has the mover of the question arraigned? He has arraigned the general principles of jurisprudence now adopted by our judges, and has, in his way, proved them not only unconstitutional but illegal."

He then goes on to say:

Mr. FLINT.

"My sole object in supporting the proposed enquiry is the public welfare and the acquittal of the judges."

Although a friend of the judges, although a believer in their integrity, their learning, and their impartiality, he supported this resolution, in which no particular judge is named, on the ground that the enquiry was for the public welfare, and for the object of acquitting the judges. So I think that those who believe in their hearts that the persons accused of the offences named in these charges will be acquitted, should support the enquiry on that ground as well as on the ground of the public benefit which will arise from the investigation into the expenditure of the public subsidies to the two railways mentioned.—

"I am satisfied," he says again, "that an acquittal will be the consequence. In acting thus, I think myself their best friend, because no other plan will clear their character. Till this step is taken, in vain do they pretend to superior sanctity: in vain do some gentlemen tread their halls as holy ground, or reverence their courts as the temples of the Divinity."

And so he continues, on the line I have mentioned, to support an enquiry into the conduct of the judges. But our hon. friends, having failed in their enquiry into precedents, even precedents supporting the position taken by the hon. Minister of Justice at the outset, have brought us down to modern times and have drawn the proverbial red herring across the trail, by referring to so-called precedents of a recent date well known to this House. We have had the affair in Quebec referred to; we have had quoted with great gusto the movement in the Ontario House when the Hon. E. B. Wood was charged with certain political offences; and we find the investigation of last session referred to, as leaning against the hon. member for West Ontario and those who support him in this House. The Minister of Militia, in concluding his speech, referred to the Ontario case of Wood as a precedent supporting him in the amendment he has moved to-day. Now, I will call the attention of the House to that case, and ask their candid consideration of it, to see if it bears out the contention made by one of the members for Montreal and the Minister of Militia as at all parallel, as at all supporting the position they have assumed in connection with this matter. The general charge against Mr. Wood was made by Mr. Cameron, and he moved:

"For a committee to enquire whether any, and what, corrupt inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. E. Blake or any other member of the present Administration while members of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly."

Mr. Blake took exception to the phrase "any other member of the present Administration," and contended that that was too wide and general to place indefinitely before the House charges against the present Administration, and he moved in amendment:

"That the Hon. M. C. Cameron, a member of this House, having stated in his place that corrupt inducements or offers were made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position of Treasurer of Ontario, by the Hon. E. Blake and other members of the Administration while members of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly."

"Mr. CAMERON. I have not stated that there were other members. That is not my motion.

"Mr. BLAKE. I asked the hon. gentleman to state what other members he meant, and he declined. He, therefore, included us all. If his motion means to include myself, I am satisfied; or I am satisfied if it includes the

whole of the Government. But the hon. gentleman must name those whom he charges, before Parliament is called on to grant him a committee.

"Mr. CAMERON. The charge is that the Hon. E. B. Wood received a corrupt consideration, and that it came from the Hon. E. Blake. I believe that some of the Government had nothing to do with the matter."

The motion which was made in amendment to the charge of Mr. Cameron was to the effect that he should make his charge correspond with his motion. While his charge mentioned other members in that vague and general way, the motion mentioned only one member, and the amendment which was carried in the House was couched in these terms :

"Resolved, that the Hon. M. C. Cameron, member of this House, having stated in his place that a corrupt inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. E. Blake, while a member of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, a select committee be appointed to enquire whether any, and, if any, what corrupt inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. E. Blake, while a member of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly."

Consequently the House will see that all the observations made during that discussion, in which greater definiteness was demanded, centred in the point as to whether it was fair to charge other members of the Administration with being parties to an improper transaction unless their names were mentioned. I think we will all have to agree, that, if there were in the charges of the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) an allusion to "other members of the Administration" in those words, the Government would be correct in insisting that those members of the Administration who were charged should be named or that the whole Government as a body should be named, or the charge should be struck out as unfair and indefinite ; but in this case we have all the requisites that can bring home an offence of this character to the individuals who are charged. Let us take the case of the Pacific scandal, one so notorious, so generally canvassed, so thoroughly discussed in almost every phase and bearing it had on the public affairs of the country and the public men of that time, one involving such vast consequences to the reputation of public men and the stability of parties in this country, and let us follow the character of the charges which were made in that case and compare it with the character and form of the charges made in this case, and see if the charges made in this case do not bear a favourable comparison with the charges made in 1872. You are all aware that Mr. Huntington's charges were very brief. He rose in his place and stated :

"That, in anticipation of the legislation of last session, as to the Pacific Railway, an agreement was made between Sir Hugh Allan, acting for himself and certain other Canadian promoters, and G. W. McMullen, acting for certain United States capitalists, whereby the latter agreed to furnish all the funds necessary for the construction of the contemplated railway, and to give the former a certain percentage of interest in consideration of their interest and position, the scheme agreed on being ostensibly that of a Canadian railway with Sir Hugh Allan at its head,—

"That the Government were aware that negotiations were pending between these parties,—

"That subsequently an understanding was come to between the Government and Sir Hugh Allan and Mr. Abbott, M.P.,—that Sir Hugh Allan and his friends should advance a large sum of money for the purpose of aiding the elections of Ministers and their supporters at the ensuing general elections,—and that he and his friends should receive the contract for the construction of the railway,—

"That accordingly Sir Hugh Allan did advance a large sum of money for the purpose mentioned, and at the solicitation, and under the pressing instances of the Ministers,—

"That part of the moneys expended by Sir Hugh Allan in connection with the obtaining of the Act of incorporation and charter were paid to him by the said United States capitalists under the agreement with him,—it is

"Ordered, That a committee of seven members be appointed to enquire into all the circumstances connected with the negotiations for the construction of the Pacific Railway—with the legislation of last session on the subject, and with the granting of the charter to Sir Hugh Allan and others; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and with instructions to report in full the evidence taken before, and all proceedings of said committee."

Now, in what particular are these charges more specific or more full and detailed than those which are now before the House ? I do not allude to the amendment, but I mean the charges which have been brought before the House by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). They are almost precisely alike in their essential features, but how were they met on that occasion by the Government of that day ? Did Sir John Macdonald or his able colleagues rise in their places and contend, as has been contended in this discussion, that the charges were vague and indefinite, that this was not the court before which they should be tried, that there were other tribunals where they could be better investigated, and that the charges were not properly formulated for the consideration of the House ? Not at all. Relying upon their majority, which was quite large, relying upon the belief that Parliament would not deal further with the matter, they voted the motion down without discussion or debate. Public opinion then rose to such a height that the Government began to feel, as in this case, that something more must be done, and from the representations coming in from all parts of the country that they were not dealing rightly in flouting such important charges affecting the character of statesmen and injuring the credit of the country at home and abroad, they had to adopt another course, and a few days afterwards the Prime Minister was compelled to bring in, what ? A resolution making the statement more specific or dwelling upon newspaper reports as in this case ? Not at all, but he virtually accepted the charges made by Mr. Huntington as the basis of the enquiry, because, on the 8th April we find that :

"On motion of the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, a select committee of five members (of which committee the mover shall not be one) was appointed by this House to enquire into and report upon the several matters contained and stated in a resolution moved on Wednesday, the 2nd of April instant, by the hon. Mr. Huntington, member for the County of Shefford, relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, with power to send for persons, papers and records."

So that powerful Government, when its position was at stake, accepted the charges as made by Mr. Huntington, without alteration of form or extension of detail, as the basis for a committee of enquiry, and they were prepared to place themselves before that committee on the Huntington resolutions. The result of this transaction, although so injurious to the credit of large numbers of public men, although so alarming in its revelations of immorality of public life at that time, that result was the downfall of the Government of the day and the installation of a new Administration in its place. But the point I wish to make is that the charges upon which, and out of which, the succeed-

ing events grew which overthrew the Macdonald Administration, were by no means as full, and as explicit, and as detailed as the charges now before the House. We are, then, called upon to consider the Quebec charges, we are called upon to consider the history of the transactions which led to the overthrow of the Mercier Administration the other day in the Province of Quebec. I am certain if an instance is sought of any great public transaction wherein men strongly entrenched in power were overthrown, where public opinion was brought to bear upon what we all must realize as corruption in high places, hon. gentlemen are very unfortunate in citing the enquiry into the Mercier matter in the Province of Quebec. How was that brought to public attention? Was it in consequence of elaborate, detailed, complete and formal charges in any Legislature? That matter came up, as we are aware, almost accidentally, in the discussion on the passage of a Bill through another House. I am not saying that was not the proper manner in which to bring that matter forward. I do not see how, if a Bill is before a committee of this House, if a company come before this House, or a corporation asks for an amendment to its charter, I am not prepared to say that the committee is not empowered and justified in enquiring into the *bonâ fides* of the corporators, into the genuineness of the transaction which they wish to have legalized. But at any rate the enquiry arose out of charges made without any names whatsoever. In the charge brought by the solicitor of the Ontario Bank before a committee of the Senate, neither Mr. Mercier nor any of his colleagues were at all involved. The committee of the Senate merely investigated, without reference to individuals, the circumstances surrounding this charter and the proposed amendment, and as a result of the evidence brought out, public opinion in the neighbouring province was aroused and was brought to bear against those who appeared to be convicted of improper dealing with public funds, and a great party went down in the elections that followed. This was not a fair trial from the standpoint of the hon. gentleman. This was not a fair manner in which to bring a public man or his colleagues to book for alleged malfeasance in office, but at the same time hon. gentlemen are never weary of rejoicing in this House and elsewhere, and of expressing their congratulations as to the result that followed those investigations, and as to the public opinion which was aroused by them. Had the objection taken by hon. gentlemen opposite been successfully taken by those whose guilt was implied, we would not have had an investigation, we would not have had the rousing of public opinion, we would not have had the condemnation of those transactions in the Province of Quebec which appeared to the people of that province to be improper. We had last session a lengthy enquiry into charges made against a Minister of the Crown, and against a member of this House, and the ground was not taken here or elsewhere that has been taken in opposition to the charges made by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). Now, placing all those charges together, those at Quebec, those in the Tarte-McGreevy case, those in the Pacific scandal in 1872, they stand upon all-fours as regards their formalities, as regards the details given upon which to base an enquiry; they all stand upon the same footing. In the Tarte-McGreevy case we find there were subsidies appropriated by this House for great public works; there were subsidies appropriated to assist railway construction. In these charges we find there were subsidies appropriated by this House to assist railway construction; in the other case the charge was that these subsidies were improperly made use of, were paid to contractors with an understanding that part of it should be remitted for political purposes. In this case we find there is a construction company of which a Minister of the Crown is accused of being a shareholder, and that those funds went to this construction company; in the other case they went to the contractors, and by the construction company a portion of them were handed back again to the Minister or to his friends for political purposes. The only difference in the two cases is the difference in name; in the one case it was a railway, in the other case it may be a great public dock or a public harbour. In the one case it may be the Minister of Public Works, in the other case it may be the Postmaster General. In the one case the distributors of the money or the go-betweens, were public contractors, in the other case it was the construction company chartered by this Legislature. Now, there has been an effort made, in fact it has been broadly stated that even admitting these charges to be true, they are not such as ought to merit an enquiry at the hands of Parliament, if Parliament has the power. If it is true that $1,000,000 were voted by Parliament for the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, that a construction company, of which a Minister of the Crown was a member, was to expend these moneys in building that railway, that the Minister who recommended these sums to Parliament, who was a member of the construction company, corruptly received large sums of money out of these subsidies and moneys raised upon credit of the same, I ask this House, I ask any hon. gentleman, if that is not an offence which should be investigated by the representatives of this Legislature? If it is not true, as the person incriminated has stated, would they not be doing their duty by him, as Edmund Burke claimed he would be doing his duty by the judges incriminated in 1770, to give him an opportunity to prove his innocence, and to bring forward such evidence as would result in his acquittal? If it is true that during that period the subsidies were improperly paid and contributed for improper purposes with the knowledge of the Minister, and used for election purposes, is it not the duty of this Legislature to pass some resolution in connection with it, to ask for some legislation which may prevent a similar abuse in the future, and thus protect the people of this country from that misuse of public funds? Ancient precedents may be very useful, yet I contend in dealing with great moral and constitutional questions like this, every Legislature must, from the very necessities of the case, emancipate itself to a large degree from the narrow constructions of ancient precedents. From time to time Parliaments have always emancipated themselves from the precedents of the past, but unless it can be shown that it is opposed to the public interests, that it is repugnant to the fairest and broadest principles of justice, then hon. gentlemen are not justified in refusing to investigate these charges as made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). The same charge is made, in almost the same terms, in regard to the subsidy voted in aid of the Temis-

couata Railway, that a Minister of the Crown corruptly received large sums of money from the persons who controlled the construction of the road, and that, after those corrupt payments were made, other and further subsidies were granted, and that those sums so contributed by public contractors were dishonestly expended, with the knowledge of the Minister charged, in lavish and corrupt amounts for the purpose of influencing the electors, I cannot imagine why there should be this constant iteration, that this is necessarily and solely a charge against the Minister as a member of this House, that it necessarily involves, and solely involves, an attack upon him. Indirectly it may do so, but it is only the assertion of the right of this House to follow the public moneys voted by this Parliament out of the taxation taken from the people. The gist of the resolution is in the enquiry, and not in the other part of the resolution. I contend that Parliament should not divest itself of this duty cast upon it of making an enquiry into the disposal and distribution of these public funds. It is notorious, it is asserted with scarcely any contradiction, that enormous sums of money are used at general elections throughout this country. From the day of the Pacific scandal down to the present day large portions of the electorate are honestly of the belief that their rights have been overthrown by the corrupt use of moneys spent among those of the electors who are immoral and who take a low and degraded view of the franchise. A large majority of the electors are honest and straightforward and look upon the franchise as a sacred trust, and use it free from improper influences; but it is well known that a moderate percentage of corrupt voters, 10, 15 or 20 per cent, have no principles in connection with public questions, and do not look upon the receipt of money as a bribe, certainly not as an unpatriotic bribe, and it is, unfortunately, well known that the destinies of the country are to a large extent controlled by this weak, immoral and dishonourable vote. If this Parliament can, by throwing aside any mere technicalities, ascertain the means by which vast sums of money are taken from the public treasury and diverted from their proper objects and brought to bear on this percentage of weak and immoral voters, who thus shape the destinies of the country in spite of the views, consciences and wishes of the great majority of the honest electors, it is our duty to do so, no matter who may be hurt by the course of the investigation. These charges are made from time to time against both political parties. I do not pretend to say that the members of the Liberal party in some particulars may not make improper use of their own funds in controlling elections, but I do mean to say that it is impossible from the very nature of the case, they being out of office and having no control or influence over public funds, that they can be charged with improperly using public moneys either directly or indirectly in furthering the private ambitions of any individual members of the party. Bad as it may be to corrupt the electors or any portion of them by the expenditure of private money, it is infinitely worse to corrupt them with money voted by the representatives of the people for public purposes; and I repeat, that bad as it is to corrupt these electors by the use of party funds, it is nothing like so degrading as to use public moneys for the purpose, degrading and immoral as these actions must be both to those furnishing the money and those receiving it. We have the taunt thrown across the House, and we must receive it as pleasantly as possible, that the election courts show that Liberal candidates and Liberal representatives have violated the law. But any hon. gentleman who knows anything of the courts and their proceedings is aware that the investigation into general corruption by the election courts proves nothing whatever. It is well known that an election may be a very corrupt one, that there may have been a large amount of money expended on one side or the other in the constituency, and yet the election trial goes off on some minor point. There is no full and real investigation into the extent of the corruption and the guilt of the various parties, or as to the details of the expenditure of any corruption fund on either side, by means of the election courts. Take a case such as frequently occurs in a constituency, where large sums of money have been improperly spent, yet the hon. member is unseated in consequence of some trifling violation of the law, either because the controlling parties choose to select it as the ground on which the seat shall be vacated, or because of the difficulty experienced in proving some of the more flagrant cases. I contend that an investigation of this kind should be pursued by a committee of Parliament, a committee made up of hon. members on both sides of the House; an investigation pursued and based on charges of this kind would be able to follow these public moneys, and it is only in that respect we have a right to investigate the matter, and to show the methods by which large constituencies have been improperly influenced in the exercise of their franchise; and it is the duty of Parliament, following precedents acting upon constitutional grounds, to accept the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Ontario and to agree to its reference to the select standing committee, or if that committee is considered too large, to a smaller committee for investigation. I will not at the present time discuss the advantages and disadvantages of a Royal Commission. I must say I think it exceedingly strange that the leaders of the House should affirm that Parliament is not competent to investigate charges of this kind, that our power, as exercised, by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, has completely broken down and collapsed under the stress of modern emergencies, and hon. gentlemen are going to hand over to a partisan commission, necessarily partisan, because appointed by the very persons charged with the offence, and not appointed by the people of the country, the investigation of this case. It is derogatory to the power, privileges, and dignity of the House that such a proposition should be accepted. If the member charged should resign his place as one of those appointing this commission, if he should stand aloof while the whole evidence is being taken, and appear before the commission simply as one of those charged, perhaps something more might be said in favour of this proposal. But as a representative of the people in this House, I do object to a Minister of the Crown, charged with improperly using public money, appointing his own court to try himself or to investigate the circumstances under which an improper use of money has been exercised. Hon. gentlemen, it seems to me, are belittling the importance of this matter. During the last session we had formal charges laid aside on the ground

that the matters were old, that the charge was indefinite, and that even if it were true, that it was not sufficiently important—for that was the substance of the discussion upon the other side of the House—to cause an enquiry. Again, we find charges of an important character involving the reputation of a leading member of the Administration, involving the disposal of enormous sums of public money, involving the very stability of our electoral institutions, thrown out of this House, and vague, general assertions, extracts from speeches of hon. members upon this side of the House, brought in to confuse the issue. I think the people of this country are looking with more interest than hon. gentlemen opposite imagine as to the result of this matter. They are expecting that Parliament will assert itself, that Parliament will insist upon its rights and its privileges, and I believe that the charges already formulated are sufficiently explicit and sufficiently important to require an investigation at the hands of a committee of this House. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) insisted that this was purely a legal question, and that it should be dealt with upon the strictest principles of the courts of justice. Now, taking it from that standpoint alone, I think he will find that the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) conform to the strictest measure of an indictment for an offence in a court of law. This is not an offence indictable in a court of law. It is not an offence triable in any court of which we are aware, and it is not fair to say that the courts are open to those who object to the electoral corruption of the counties which are referred to in the closing paragraphs of this resolution. Corruption at an election is a specific offence which can only be tried by carrying out the strictest construction of the Controverted Elections Act. Once let the forty days pass in which you can file a petition, once make any error in the service of the papers upon the person charged, once make any error in form throughout the whole of these proceedings, and all opportunity for an investigation in the courts of law is over. We know what occurred in the Province of Nova Scotia within the past few months. Gentlemen upon both sides of this House were petitioned against upon the ground that there was electoral corruption by which they became members of this House. The petitions were in due form, they were duly served with all the accompanying documents, the courts met, the dates of trial were arranged, and it was hoped and expected by those who brought these charges and deposited their money in order to meet expenses, that the details of these improper expenditures would have been brought to light. It was hoped that not only would their opponents be unseated but that such a flood of light would be thrown on the methods used, as to lead to the reformation of electoral habits in these localities. But what occurred? Were these matters investigated, did they ever reach trial? No, they were thrown out upon technicalities, and in one of the courts of Nova Scotia, upon identically the same statement of facts under different judges, in one case the petition against an hon. member was dismissed, and in another case the petition was sustained and the hon. member must go to trial. I only allude to this to show the difficulties in many instances that are in the way of proving electoral corruption, even on a limited scale, under the Controverted Elections Act. Let us assume for the sake of argument that after the time at which election petitions could be presented, it was discovered, by a sincere public-spirited man, that the most unheard-of corruption had existed, that large sums of money had been improperly used in corrupting voters, that threats and intimidations of the grossest character had been brought to bear in order to carry the election in favour of the successful candidate; is it not quite apparent that all their efforts would be in vain to reach the root of these evils unless Parliament came to the rescue and granted such relief as the importance and merits of the case demanded? I fancy that in a large degree this may be one of the reasons why Parliament, although having relegated the trial of controverted elections to the courts, has not entirely surrendered it to the courts, but still holds in its own hands the right and duty and privilege of still further investigating charges which under the Controverted Elections Act cannot be reached. This is precisely one of the cases now under review. It details a constitutional offence which no court can reach, and which Parliament alone has the power and the right and the duty to investigate, and if necessary to adequately punish. Suppose a Minister of the Crown, suppose the whole Government should refuse, after an adverse vote in this Parliament, to carry out the constitutional duty imposed on them, and refuse to carry out the instructions of Parliament and refuse to resign, what court in this country would have jurisdiction in this case? The only power that could be brought to bear to compel the most powerful combination in this country to obey the constitutional law is the High Court of Parliament, and it is to that court we now appeal and not to a commission appointed by the agency or through the power of any of these charged with the offence, but to the High Court of Parliament, to the representatives of the people of this country, to investigate the expenditures of their money, and to trace to their termination the funds which a member standing in his place in this House alleges that he has satisfactory evidence in his possession to prove have been used to corrupt the people of this country. I have not had an opportunity of reading or considering the amendment moved by the Minister of Militia, but if it beclouds the issue or minimizes its importance, I hope that it will be rejected and that the House will come down to the issue brought before it by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and will insist that justice be done as asked for by him from his place in this House. Thus I believe it would contribute, not merely to the dignity of Parliament, but to the welfare of the people. If we can by any means remove this corrupting influence from our elections we will have taken a higher and nobler position than can be attained in any other way. Let the people of this country be called upon to condemn or support the Ministry, but let them do it apart from the influence of public funds used to corrupt a small percentage of the people, and they the least important of the community. I believe, Sir, that even those who are most sincerely of opinion that the Minister has not been guilty, will be doing him a service by giving him an opportunity of proving his innocence before the people of this country, and if he is guilty they will be consulting the dignity of Parliament and the welfare of the people by saying that all offences against the constitutional and unwritten law shall be punished as they deserve.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I echo the words used by the hon. member (Mr. Flint) at the close of his speech ; I think it is most important, for the sake of the hon. Minister and for the sake of the dignity of Parliament, that the charges made on the floor of this House by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and supplemented as they were, glossed as they were, explained as they were, by the speeches of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), by the speech of the leader of the Opposition, by the remarkable speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and by a speech subsequently made by the hon. member for West Ontario himself—I think it is most important that these charges should be sifted to the bottom, should be thoroughly enquired into ; that every means should be used to get at the truth or otherwise of these charges impugning the honour and position of a Minister of the Crown ; and, Sir, the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who has just addressed the House, seems to me to have taken a very curious position, because he says that if we take what is certainly a vague charge, made by the hon. member for West Ontario, we can have a very thorough and sifting investigation ; but if we take that charge, amplified, extended, enlarged as it has been by the speeches of the hon. member for Bothwell, and especially by the speech of the hon. member for West Ontario, he seems to imply that we cannot have a full investigation. Now, Sir, his assertion that we cannot have a full investigation if this amendment is carried, cannot be based upon the form of that amendment, save in this one respect, that instead of referring the issue to a committee of this House, it constitutes a Royal Commission to take evidence from whomsoever may go before it, directed and guided as may be, by any counsel he may think fit to choose, and reporting that evidence to this House. He asserts that that cannot be a thorough, a sifting, a complete enquiry.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Bothwell says "hear, hear," and in the course of his speech he spoke against the appointment of a Royal Commission ; but the Royal Commission which the hon. member for Bothwell had in his mind was a very different one from that proposed by the hon. Minister of Militia. The hon. member for Bothwell spoke of judges. This commission will not be a judge. This commission will have the powers of a court of record to compel witnesses to come before it, to examine and hear fully any evidence that may be placed before it ; but it will not devolve upon the commission to pronounce on that evidence. That is still in the possession of the House, and the House can declare on the evidence. If the House is dissatisfied in the least degree with the way in which the evidence has been taken, it is open to it to have the whole matter referred to a committee, giving its reasons, showing that there has been some unfairness on the part of the commission, or that the commission has been wanting in its duty in some way in hearing the evidence, and then the country will be as ready to support hon. gentlemen, I suppose, as it is now when they say, as they pretend has been the case, that this commission has been suggested, not for the purpose of making the enquiry thorough, full and complete, but in some way for the purpose of limiting and burking that enquiry. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, if I may make such a remark in passing, that our friends are profoundly disappointed at the course taken by the ministerial side. I am afraid that they are very sorry that this amendment, so wide, so extensive, so fundamental, has been proposed, and that they expected that instead of that course being taken, the monster majority, as they call it, would be induced to vote down the original motion as it stood. Nobody supposes that I am ready to come here at the bidding of any party to cloak any man charged——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, if these incredulous people around me do not believe it, the public know my character. The people know that I could not be brought here to vote to screen a man seriously charged. But, Sir, if this amendment, or an amendment something like it, had not been proposed, if an amendment, as I expected, had not come from the Opposition side of the House, embodying the definite charges that I have read in the speeches of the hon. gentlemen referred to, I do not know how any man having regard to the dignity of this House, having regard to common fairness, having regard to the independence and the liberty of the members of this House, could do other than vote down that original motion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Bothwell, who says "hear, hear," was in his speech, as he always is, very learned on the constitutional position of this House ; and the hon. member for Yarmouth, who is a lawyer, and who has been quoting Hallam to us, is also very learned on the constitutional position of this House ; and the changes have been rung on the High Court of Parliament as though this Parliament of Canada bore a strict analogy to the High Court of Parliament as described by that phrase in constitutional history. Sir, the High Court of Parliament as spoken of by that same writer Hallam and other constitutional writers, is not the House of Commons at all. It is the House of Lords and the House of Commons of England ; the House of Commons of England is the great inquest of the High Court of Parliament, and the reason for this is founded in constitutional principles and in principles of justice. The reason why the Commons could not be properly the High Court of Parliament is very clear, because since the system of impeachment came into existence, the court to try such cases has been the House of Lords. The court which first enquired into the case was the House of Commons, and I think Hallam lays it down—I am speaking now from memory, but if not Hallam, it is some constitutional writer of authority—that the House of Commons could not sit as a High Court of Parliament for this reason : that then you would have the judge and the prosecutor one and the same person ; so that when my hon. friend rings the changes on the High Court of Parliament—I do not know whether he misled himself or whether it is the hon. member for Bothwell who has misled him—he is using a phrase calculated, as he uses it, to mislead the community and this House.

Mr. FLINT. I said the House of Commons.

Mr. DAVIN. At the conclusion of my hon. friend's speech, he spoke of bringing these charges before the High Court of Parliament, and he justified this technical constitutional criticism of mine by that statement. This trial by committee is not at all as ancient as my hon. friend from Bothwell would make out. Why, the committees of the House of Commons in England did not get the power to hear evidence under oath until early in the eighteenth century; and the position taken by the hon. gentleman, that the House of Commons is the only body which can constitutionally try a charge of this kind, is not a tenable one at all. It so happens, although my hon. friend from Bothwell says that no precedent or no illustration to the contrary exists in English history, that we have in recent times in England a very remarkable illustration of the opinion which the greatest Parliament in the world holds as to the incompetence of a committee of the House of Commons for hearing certain charges. It will be remembered that out of the Irish political discussions, a case arose of O'Donnell against Walter. In the course of that case most violent charges were made against Mr. Parnell and others by Mr. Webster, the Attorney General and the counsel for the defence; and Sir Wilfred Lawson, on 9th July, 1888, asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Mr. Smith, whether, in view of the serious charges recently made against the hon. member for Cork, the Government would consent to the appointment of a select committee to enquire into the truth of those charges. Mr. Parnell himself then called for an enquiry. The First Lord of the Treasury said in reply:

"Mr. Speaker, I received the notice of the hon. baronet as I entered the House, but I have no hesitation in at once replying to the question which he addressed to me. I may say, Sir, that my view remains precisely the same as it was last year. This House is absolutely incompetent to deal with the grave charges to which the hon. baronet refers, or be at any time a tribunal of the character indicated. I have less hesitation in saying this, as there exists tribunals in this country on whose competence and absolute impartiality no doubt whatsoever can possibly be thrown."

On the 12th July, 1888, Mr. Parnell himself asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether he would afford facilities for enabling the judgment of the House to be taken on a motion for a select committee standing in the name of the hon. member for Cork. The First Lord of the Treasury, Mr. Smith, said:

"Mr. Speaker, the Government retain the opinion they have expressed, and in which the House concurred by a large majority last year, that the proposed tribunal is altogether unfit to deal with the question—limited as it is in scope and character—(mark these words)—which the hon. member proposes to refer to it, but they are willing to propose to Parliament to pass an Act appointing a commission, which should consist only or mainly of judges, with full powers as in the case of other statutory commissions to enquire into the allegations and charges made against members of Parliament by the defendants in the recent action of 'O'Donnell *v.* Walter and another.' It has always appeared to the Government that the proper course for hon. members concerned was to appeal to the courts of law for a complete examination of those charges."

What was the result? A very remarkable proceeding took place, unique in English history. An Act was passed appointing a commission of judges to enquire into this matter. What did the judges do? They did precisely what the Government has done with regard to this appointment. They were not content to take the charges as stated by those who were opposed to the men whose characters were implicated. They actually took the speech which the Attorney General, Mr. Webster, made in the case of O'Donnell against Walter. They took all his violent language, and they formulated from that speech, and from the articles that appeared in the *Times* headed "Parnellism and Crime," a series of charges against Mr. Parnell and the Parnellites, or rather they insisted on having the gentlemen who had made such charges formulate them. But that did not suit Sir Charles Russell, and he added other charges, and the consequence was that before that high court, one of the most august that ever sat in England, whether you take the character of the judges or the genius of the men who appeared before it, or the prominence of the men who were to be tried, or the issues at stake—you had at that commission which not even the court that tried Warren Hastings can throw into the shade as a great and august tribunal, precisely what has taken place in Parliament to-day. You had not the charges such as the Attorney General, Webster, wished them to remain as against Parnell and his followers, but you had charges made out of the speeches of Mr. Webster and out of the articles in the *Times*; you had these charges formulated, and you had, therefore, the full and complete issue. I say that that is a very remarkable illustration of the point I make, and that point is this: It is quite clear that, to begin with, we are not here in this Parliament what is called a High Court of Parliament in the constitutional history of England; it is further evident that it has even dawned upon hon. gentlemen and right hon. gentlemen in England that the efficiency of a committee of the House, as a machinery for taking evidence even, but, above all, its efficiency as a machinery for obtaining judgment, is very doubtful, to say the least of it. Now, the speech of my hon. friend, the member for Yarmouth—and I was sorry to hear it from him because he is a man for whom I have very great respect—had, after all, in it all the characteristics of pure talk in court to a jury, just for effect. He spoke about technicalities. He said that the result of having this Royal Commission would be that we should be bounded in by technicalities, and he told us that the result of these technicalities would be that we might not have that full investigation proper to a High Court of Parliament. What is the meaning of technicalities? What are the technicalities to which he refers? They are the laws of evidence, which you will find in three large volumes of Taylor. It is the law of evidence that the man charged with petty larceny can have the protection of, if he goes into court. Yet here you make charges against a man occupying one of the highest positions in the country, charges aiming at his political life and honour, and you are afraid that the judges who may take the evidence will have their judgment biassed by conducting the enquiry in accordance with the rules which the experience of centuries has shown to be good. What the hon. gentleman wanted was not a fair and full enquiry, but some kind of tribunal where, owing to the incompetence, perhaps, of the chairman—and I hope the chairmen of our committees will not be offended with me for saying so, though every chairman may be perfect in all respects as a member of Parliament—he may permit of a rambling license in a committee which, instead of furthering the efficiency of Parliament and showing the utility of committees and reflecting dignity on this House,

strikes at all the efficiency which has been supposed to attach to these things and brings the House and the committees into contempt. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) also spoke of narrowing down the scope of the enquiry. To use the elegant and classical language of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright): "in the name of wonder" what is the meaning of narrowing down the scope of the enquiry? How is it narrowed down? You have the same charge which the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) made.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Mr. DAVIN. You have the same charge, amplified by the words of the hon. member who shakes his disappointed head, amplified by the extravagant, gross, wild charges made by the hon. member for South Oxford, and what the Government say—I do not know what the Postmaster General says—is come not only with one or two little arrows, one or two antagonists, against us, but the Government takes the position of one of Scott's heroes, and says with James Fitz-James:

> "Come one, come all, this rock shall fly
> From its firm base as soon as I."

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Moncrieff.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the High River and Sheep Creek Irrigation and Water Power Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 56) to confirm an agreement between the Tobique Valley Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Skinner.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Murray.)

Bill (No. 77) to revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to "The Canadian-American Railway Company."—(Mr. Taylor.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 78) for the relief of James Albert Manning Aikins.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 79) for the relief of Ada Donigan.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wallace.)

RELIEF OF HERBERT RIMMINGTON MEAD.

Mr. TAYLOR moved second reading of Bill (No. 81) for the relief of Herbert Rimmington Mead.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are in the habit of taking a vote on these Bills. Am I to understand that the vote is postponed until the Bill comes back from the committee?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think that would be the better course. I have examined the evidence, and it seems to be in the usual course, and I thought it would be better that the Bill should have an opportunity of going before the committee. In fact, I must admit that I was under the impression that it was after that investigation that the vote was taken. I think it would be convenient to let it go to the committee first.

Motion agreed to on division.

CHARGES AGAINST SIR ADOLPHE CARON.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Edgar: That certain charges of corruption against Sir Adolphe P. Caron be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections; and the amendment of Mr. Bowell thereto.

Mr. DAVIN. Before dinner I had referred to the Parnell case as one illustration of the principle on which we are called upon by the amendment of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, to act. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to the state of opinion in England just prior to the issuance of that commission, and for this reason: My hon. friends of the Opposition, I regret to say, have been guilty of giving us the evil precedent of showing a distrust of the judiciary of Canada. Sir, I have heard a great deal from hostile lips against the late illustrious leader of the Conservative party, but I never heard one word in disparagement of the manner in which he filled up the judiciary of Canada. I have heard from men that could not breathe one fair word in respect to his political life eulogies of the manner in which he selected men to adorn the bench. Sir, I need not enlarge on the great advantage, the priceless heritage to a people to have a judiciary that is above suspicion. Although the position of a Superior Court judge in Canada is not so distinguished from a social point of view as that of a judge in the old country, yet, so far as I have heard, we have had a long line of judges in every province of Canada not unworthy to sit side by side with the men who have distinguished the bench in England. Therefore, if there could be any ground of argument in the tone of disparagement we heard in respect to the tribunal to which the issue with which we are now concerned is to be referred, there would be the same ground in respect to a tribunal of the same kind precisely established by either Royal Commission or Act of Parliament in England. I happened to be in England in 1887, and those who were not there will yet be familiar with what I found. I found that one of the greatest managers of men that ever played the part of a parliamentary leader, was held to have been ruined by the attacks of the *Times* on his character. Mr. Parnell in 1887 was under a cloud, and it was supposed that he was destroyed. I will tell this House further, that the very man—one of the men at any rate—who was writing these articles "Parnellism and Crime," one of the most distinguished students ever turned out of the university of which I happen to be an unworthy *alumnus*, did me the honour to invite me to dinner at the Reform Club to meet some old literary friends; and he spoke of Mr. Parnell as destroyed, and destroyed by these articles. I said to him: "I do not know him, I never saw him, I know nothing of him except what I have read; but can you suppose from the character we know

him to be, a leader of men, that he is guilty of the crime that is laid at his door by these articles?" He said, "I have him—he is a destroyed man." Now, what was the charge? The charge that was laid at the door of himself and his friends, and which made him, at the time, probably the most despised man among the masses of the English people, was that, when, on certain occasions, they thought it politic to denounce, and did denounce certain crimes in public, they afterwards led their supporters to believe such denunciations were not sincere. Mr. Parnell was accused of being implicated in the Phœnix Park murder. And, as I have said, he was supposed to be a destroyed man. Three judges, Mr. Justice Hannen, an Englishman, Mr. Justice Day, I do not know what countryman he is, and Mr. Justice Smith, an Englishman, formed a commission to try the charges which the leader of the House of Commons refused to submit to a parliamentary committee. What happened? These men, so far as judges with superior minds and learning could, shared the prejudices and passions of their environment. The trial went on. Public opinion was strongly against the accused. Yet what happened? Did that happen which hon. gentlemen hint here would happen if we had a similar tribunal? This is the finding: "We find that the charge 'when on certain occasions they thought it politic to denounce, and did denounce, certain crimes in public they afterwards led their supporters to believe such denunciations were not sincere,' is not established; we entirely exonerate Mr. Parnell and the other respondents of the charge of insincerity in their denunciations of the Phœnix Park murder, and find that the *fac simile* letter on which this charge was chiefly based against Mr. Parnell was a forgery." The House will remember that Mr. Parnell went into court against the *Times* and got exemplary damages. From that moment, Mr. Parnell's character as a public man rose higher than ever. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is an authority on constitutional law, dealt with the Minister of Justice in the course of his very erudite speech, and I will compliment him on the tone of patronage with which he dealt with the hon. and learned leader of the House. In criticising the Minister of Justice, he said:

> "Why, Sir, from the days of Edward III down to the present hour, the Government and the Parliament of England have adhered strongly to the principle, and have maintained the right of Parliament to investigate such matters, and they have held that the House of Commons is the sole body that has the right to conduct those investigations."

That is as to investigation in regard to charges such as these before the House. I suppose when the hon. member for Bothwell goes back to the time of Edward III he is referring to Latimer's case. That was an impeachment. Was the hon. gentleman referring to Latimer's case?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will tell the hon. gentleman by and by.

Mr. DAVIN. What the hon. gentleman means is this, that the kind of trial he wants to give to the Postmaster General is the trial that from the time of Edward III has been time-honoured in England. Either his words meant that or they were absurd nonsense. The hon. member might as well tell us whether they meant that or not. The hon. gentleman said:

> "And they have held that the House of Commons is the sole body that has a right to conduct these investigations."

This is of the character of an impeachment. The hon. gentleman means investigation of a judicial character; he does not mean the enquiries that take place in Parliament by reason of its inquisitorial character. I will say this for the hon. gentleman, who poses in this House not merely as a constitutional authority but as a logician, that throughout the whole of his speech we find the fallacy, if I will not be thought pedantic in saying so, of using the principal term of his argument in a dubious sense. He again and again confounds the character of Parliament as a court, to use his own phrase "the High Court of Parliament," and the character of Parliament as an inquisitorial body. As an inquisitorial body there is no limit to our power to enquire into anything any man holding official power can do, from the conduct of the Prime Minister, or the conduct of the commanding officer, down to the most humble postmaster in any country village. Anything that affects the public we can enquire minutely into, and in committee we constantly exercise that inquisitorial character. But when you come to deal with Parliament as a court it is a different matter, and our powers are by constitutional usage and in the interests of the public, in the interests even of the liberty of the subject, as the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) pointed out, and as was shown in a quotation from a speech made by Mr. Blake in the Ontario House, our powers are in all these instances strictly limited, although as an inquisitorial body our powers have hardly a limit. If the words of the hon. gentleman mean anything, and he repeats them in the language of his speech, he lays down the principle that from the time of Edward III, the manner in which charges of that sort which are made against Sir Adolphe Caron have been tried in England, is before a parliamentary committee. I say here, and I defy him to contradict it, that he cannot show a single instance where a charge of this character was ever tried in England before a parliamentary committee. I have here the record of a very remarkable trial, the trial of Lord Melville, the last impeachment that took place in England, and supposing I could only give this one case, the universal proposition laid down by my hon. friend would be destroyed. He laid down the universal proposition that in no case has the usage been departed from, from the time of Edward III; that the mode of trial of offences of the class he alleges against Sir Adolphe Caron, was to refer them to a committee of Parliament, or, in his own language, to try them before the House of Commons. Was the case of Lord Melville tried before a parliamentary committee? Let us see. I may say here, in passing, that if these charges which affected the honour of Lord Melville are looked at, you will see that they are specific charges, and that they state specifically the actual things with which Lord Melville was charged, so that he knew what he had to reply to. Now, when Mr. Whitbred moved the resolution charging Lord Melville, what was done by Mr. Pitt, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons, and who was then Prime Minister of England and the most powerful Minister that ever swayed the British House of Commons? He got up in his place and he moved that these charges be referred to a committee of the House of Commons.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says "hear, hear," but let him wait awhile. What did the British House of Commons do? The Imperial House of Commons actually voted down the proposition of their own leader, and the result was, after several efforts to bring Lord Melville to justice, he was impeached before the High Court of Parliament, in the only manner known to English constitutional history; and a prosecuting body went up from the Commons of England to the House of Lords. When I read and heard the speech of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I thought that he was astray in stating that it was the invariable rule in England to try offences in the manner in which he wants to have the Postmaster General tried now, for I could not recall a single instance of such a thing. I went to the Library and I took down various books, amongst others "The Institutions of the English Government," by Cox, and the very first charge mentioned there—although the hon. gentleman is afraid to admit it—is evidently the charge that he is thinking of when he refers to the time of Edward III. The charge was that against William Latimer and others for misdealings with the public revenue, and the record says that Latimer was impeached and accused by voice of the Commons before the Lords. He was condemned by the Lords in full Parliament to fine and imprisonment. The impeachment fell into disuse for some time, but it was again revived in the time of James I, when the impeachment was again conducted before the Lords, and so on down to the time of Lord Melville. I may mention to the House the familiar case of Warren Hastings as another instance of this. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the remarkable case of Lord Melville in which the Prime Minister of England wanted to refer certain charges, very analogous in character to the charges we are now considering, to a committee of the House of Commons, and the House of Commons actually voted down its own leader. I am afraid, devoutly believing as I used to in the authority of my hon. friend from Bothwell, that my faith in his constitutional law is somewhat shaken. Sir, a good deal has been said about the privilege of Parliament. I want to say something about the privilege of members of Parliament, and I say here that no higher crime and no greater misdemeanour can be committed by a member of Parliament, than to abuse his privilege of Parliament in aspersing the character of another member of Parliament, or any man outside Parliament either; and for a man like my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) to come to Parliament with such vague charges as these, without any particulars, and to try to asperse the character of a Minister of the Crown, or any member of Parliament; and for any hon. gentlemen to get up and make the gross and grave and dreadful statements they made founded on this vicious and cowardly charge——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, this mountebankish charge—for the object clearly was not to bring the Postmaster General to justice, but to throw a vague cloud of suspicions about his character, and about the Ministry. I say that hon. gentlemen who make such statements in this House without the fear of being brought to book, abuse the privilege of Parliament to the bamboozlement of the public, and the injury of the character of a Minister. Now, Sir, what is this charge? As they are in love with it, what is it? It is a kind of bat, which partakes of a dual character; it is an indictment improperly drawn, and it is a belated election petition multiplied about twenty-two fold, and as an election petition it is simply monstrous, absurd and impudent. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is more engaged in law than I have been for many years, and there are other hon. gentlemen who are daily in the practice of the law; but, though I am not, I know this, that the essence of an election petition is that particulars shall be given.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. I say you must give particulars in an election petition at that stage of ripeness when the charge is properly made. Are particulars given here? If you look at clause 6 of these charges, and at the phrase "other members," you will see that this bat might have spread its wings over half a continent, but when you look at the charges against the hon. Minister, why, it is a very small mouse indeed, and when you look at that little mouse, at the timidity in the eye, the ferocity in the jaw and in the claws, and at the general character of the whiskers, you can see that it bears a remarkable similarity to its parent from West Ontario. I say that this charge of the hon. member is a kind of bat which would fain spread its filmy and flimsy wings as an election petition over half the continent, and at the same time fix its venomous claws and teeth upon the character and standing of the hon. Postmaster General without giving him an inkling of what he had to reply to.

Mr. CASEY. It is more like a battery, perhaps.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, if it is, it is so far like the mover of this motion and like my hon. friend that it is a silenced battery. Well, Sir, the hon. member for West Ontario is as weak on his reasoning pins as some of his leaders. He thus deals with one of the leaders of the Government:

"The Minister of Marine drew a nice point when he said I had not, as I should have, charged his colleague with public robbery. Well, I did not put it in those words, but in words which I certainly intended to mean robbing the public."

If he intended to mean robbing the public, why did he not say it? He goes on:

"If it is not public robbery for a member to take money out of public subsidies, I would like to know what is? Then the Minister of Public Works drew another beautiful defence. He said that I had failed to set out conspiracy, that conspiracy was not shown in terms in my charge; and therefore it should fail. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer. Does he not know the law of conspiracy? Let him read up his Russell on Crimes, and he will see it is there declared that 'an unlawful conspiracy is to be inferred from the acts of the parties.' And I have tried to make clear what the acts of his hon. colleague were, and does not Russell go on to say that, 'not once in a thousand times can it be otherwise proved?' So, I think, if I get a chance to go on and prove these charges, there will be what is under the law, unless the Minister of Justice should change it in his new criminal code, a most abominable conspiracy."

Now, you see the reasoning of the hon. gentleman there. The hon. Minister of Public Works says: You should have set out the charge of conspiracy. The hon. gentleman replies: I do not set out the charge of conspiracy, but I want you to direct your attention to this. What, if he had been logical,

would he have directed attention to? He should have directed attention to some authority which would show that if you charge a man in court with conspiracy, you need not lay the charge; that would be the logical answer. Instead of that, he goes on to show how you should prove conspiracy. Suppose he went into a court before a judge hinting at conspiracy in some vague and shadowy way, and the judge said to him: There is no charge here; what do you intend to prove? If it looks like anything, it looks like conspiracy, and if you can prove that, why don't you lay the charge? The hon. member replies: Well, if you will allow me to go on, my lord, I think I may prove the case by the evidence. Would not the judge say to him, you must lay the charge or leave the court? And now, what are the hon. gentleman's friends arguing? When he runs into court and hints at conspiracy and misconduct on the part of the Minister, he and others say in heated speeches—speeches all wanting in judicial tone—which they are afraid to put into the charge; and the friends and colleagues of the hon. Postmaster General come forward and say, but that is what you want to prove—is it not?—and we will put it into the charge; we will not turn you out of court; we will make the charge and give you an opportunity of proving it. Then these hon. gentlemen come and whine and press their ridiculous bat-like resolution, instead of being ready, honestly and sincerely, if they have the facts, to prove them, and blessing God and blessing the Government for the opportunity which has been given them to do so. Now, the hon. member for South Oxford went further, I think went further than any other member in this House in what he said. Part of his language was quoted by the hon. Minister of Militia. But, Sir, the full language, the atrocious language, of the hon. member was not fully set out. He said—and mark the words of this hon. gentleman who would have to be one of the judges of the hon. Postmaster General:

"That during the whole of that time, if I understand the charge aright"——

Is it possible that the hon. member for West Ontario laid such a serious charge on the Table of this House and never consulted the Gamaliel of modesty and decency of speech who comes from South Oxford? This hon. gentleman, who wants the Parliament of Canada to take action on this charge practically says: The charge is this, if I understand it aright, but the language is so vague that I really do not know whether I understand it aright or not. He says:

"If I understand the charge aright, that hon. gentleman was actively engaged in, and profiting more or less from, the receipt of these large subsidies, which he, as Minister of the Crown, had advised to be granted to these railways; that, besides, he had corruptly used a large proportion of the subsidies granted by Parliament for the purpose of debauching the electors in a large number of counties. Now, I want the House to understand that if these charges be proved, the Minister beyond all question stands guilty of conspiracy and embezzlement. He stands guilty of more. He stands guilty of having committed this embezzlement for political purposes, that being one of the gravest offences that can be committed against parliamentary government. The charge that is made against the Postmaster General is in terms the charge of treason against this commonwealth."

But that is the very charge which is not in terms. Sir, those gentlemen are guilty of an abuse of the privileges of Parliament to such an extent that they put on the Table a charge which no honest man can read, and say with certainty that even corruption, as properly understood, is charged against the Postmaster General at all. He is charged with having corruptly received moneys. What would that mean? It might mean that he received moneys corruptly, as defined by the amendment; it might mean that he actually conspired with those men to get subsidies in order to get profits out of them either for elections or for himself; or it might merely mean that some contractor, some railway magnate, had given subscriptions to an election, and that we are to infer these subscriptions had been spent corruptly. It might mean one or the other; and I ask you whether it is a creditable thing to those gentlemen to be capable of stating in their speeches that the Postmaster General is guilty of embezzlement, is guilty of conspiracy, is guilty of public robbery, and yet, when they come to make a solemn charge, to be only capable of putting it in such a vague language that you cannot seize the meaning. I say that a graver abuse of the privileges of Parliament has never been committed. The hon. member for West Ontario, considering his long experience in this House, has set a very bad example indeed in this matter. Now, I wish to say one word about the character of the debate. We had a speech from the Minister of Justice, in which he declared twice explicitly that if any definite charges are made, they shall be enquired into. He stated it twice, and yet, although he thus stated it, we had the leader of the Opposition, from whom, to use the language of the hon. member for South Ontario, we might have expected better things, saying:

"When the hon. gentleman was before the people of this country, and when the Government of which he was a member was assailed for bribery and corruption, for winning elections by vicious practices, the hon. gentleman was brave, and he stated that he was willing to give a hearing to every man who made a charge against the Government or any of its members, that he was welcome to make that charge and to have it investigated, that the Government was afraid of nothing."

And he goes on to say that now the Minister of Justice draws back from that. What did the Minister of Justice say? His words were still ringing in this assembly when the leader of the Opposition spoke. He said:

"I have already assured the House that if any charges are framed which do come within that category, they will be entertained, and there will be no opposition on this side to an investigation."

And again and again throughout the debate, it was sought to be sent forth to the country that the Minister of Justice had on the public platform said one thing and had in this House said another, whereas the fact is that what he said here was that there are no charges on which issue can be joined; that this was not a charge on which we can join issue. Make your charges, he said, as men ought to make them; make them definite, and they shall be entertained. It is discreditable to Parliament, it is discreditable to that great party, the Reform party, the Opposition in this House, that charges should be made in that way, and that misrepresentation of opponents should be sent broadcast to the country, and no means whatever of getting at a large portion of the people to undeceive them. I say such a procedure is discreditable and a dishonour to the House. I say we are here discussing an issue about as serious as anything that could occupy the attention of this House. It affects the honour of the House, it affects the honour of a gentleman who has long had a seat in this

House. If these charges are true, they can be proved before the tribunal proposed by the Government to receive the evidence. If they are not true, the evidence no doubt will fail to establish them, and the hon. the Postmaster General will have his honour sustained; and I should not like to describe the position of dishonour in which, in such case, the members of the Opposition will stand. I say that the character of our public men as regards honour, public honesty, and intellectual eminence, is one that affects the foundation of our prosperity; and we ought to be jealous to see that we have on the Opposition benches men of the highest public character and men of eminent abilities and attainments. But I say this also, that whether a member of this House sits on the front benches or be the humblest member of it, we should, in the interests of the House, and of each one of us, and of the country, have a strict regard for justice, and take heed that we do not try, in order to catch a petty party victory, to lay down principles which would strike at the root of our independence, impair our efficiency and destroy our dignity.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will no doubt pardon me if I take the liberty of answering him in a language which may not be very familiar to him. As I fear that the debate might prove somewhat tiresome, both for the House and for myself, if I should undertake to use a language which is foreign to me, I prefer to speak in my native tongue, which is French. If I understand clearly the question which is before the House, it is whether we are to have a sham enquiry or a serious investigation into the charges made before the House by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). For my part, I consider that the scheme proposed by the hon. Minister of Militia in his amendment, will never lead to a knowledge of the truth or falsity of those accusations. Mr. Speaker, we have had, in the Province of Quebec, an opportunity of learning what good is to be expected from enquiries conducted by commissioners. We have been able to find out what measure of light such enquiries can bring to bear upon the matters to be investigated. I remember that, in 1882, an extremely grave accusation was formulated by a member of the Quebec Legislature, an accusation which involved a large number of members, and endangered their seats in the Assembly. Instead of referring the matter to a serious tribunal, instead of referring it to a committee of the Assembly, the Government appointed a Royal Commissioner, Hon. Judge Routhier, to enquire into it. I have nothing to say against the character of this distinguished magistrate, but as he alone had the carrying out of the enquiry, without the help of a counsel for the accusing party, and as he naturally did not know where the guilt rested, nor what witnesses could enlighten him, he simply called a few witnesses designated by public rumour, and there was the end of it. We see by that the uselessness of having such enquiries made by Royal Commissioners, beyond the control of Parliament, and before whom witnesses cannot be heard which should be heard. Now, the hon. member for Assiniboia has drawn upon the stock of English precedents to show that the appointment of Royal Commissions was the practice followed in England. But, Mr. Speaker, is there any necessity to look for English precedents. Have we not one here, hardly a year old, which may show that such matters may be referred not to Royal Commissioners, but to committees of this House? Last year, when the ex-member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) made his accusations before the House, why was the matter referred to a committee of the House? While the ex-Minister of Public Works, now the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin), was submitted to so serious, so important, an investigation, why is such an investigation now refused in the case of the hon. Postmaster General? Why was the hon. member for Northumberland East (Mr. Cochrane) sent before a committee of the House, when to-day such a committee is denied in this case? The reason is that those enquiries, controlled by the House, have brought about monstrous revelations, as black as could be brought to light, and now it is the intention that the truth as to similar accusations must be kept from the public gaze. Such is the only reason, Mr. Speaker, why an effort is now made to refer these charges not to a committee controlled by the House, not to a responsible committee, but to a single person who will deal with the matter as he will think fit, who will hear the witnesses he will choose to, and from whom the House or the country cannot expect justice full and complete. The hon. member has argued that the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario were vague and insufficient, and that consequently a committee of investigation should not be granted for such accusations. If, however, they are carefully examined, they will be found to contain four counts of indictment, four grave, definite charges. Let us take up the first. The hon. member for West Ontario charges the hon. Postmaster General with having, in 1882 and later, been a member of a company interested in a contract with the Government, receiving subsidies from the latter from time to time, according to the progress of work done by it. I am extremely surprised to find that in the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Militia, it is declared that the charges preferred, and into which the Government asks for an investigation, are similar to those formulated by the hon. member for West Ontario. Here is the last part of the amendment, to which I have just referred. It reads as follows:—

"That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that enquiry should be made, as to the truth or falsity of the allegations and charges last mentioned and numbered respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 (being the allegations and charges included in the original statement of the said James D. Edgar.)"

I regret exceedingly to see that the charges as enumerated by the hon. Minister of Militia in the latter part of his amendment, are not at all in accord with the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario, and that, among other discrepancies, they do not mention that the hon. Postmaster General was a member of a company interested in a contract with the Government. So that when the Government claim that they want to have an investigation on the same charges as those preferred by the hon. member for West Ontario, they misstate the facts, and shamefully try to deceive the public. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the import of a charge like this? I say that not only is this charge extremely serious, but that it is well defined, and that if it were proven the hon. Postmaster General would not be worthy a seat in this House, and should

consequently be expelled. It is sufficient, Mr. Speaker, to read the statute concerning the Independence of Parliament, to acquire the conviction. This charge made by the hon. member for West Ontario is extremely serious, and that even alone should be more than sufficient to warrant an investigation. This is how I find this charge formulated by the hon. member:

"4. That the said Sir A. P. Caron was, during the whole or the greater part of said period, one of the members of said construction company, and thus had means of knowledge, or did know of the dealings with the said subsidies, and their destination after they were paid by the Government by the said railway company."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, here is an exceedingly serious charge in which a member of this House is accused of being interested in a construction company, the said company having a contract with the Government by which it was to derive some profits from time to time according to the progress of its work. Now, what is the import of a charge like this? If we turn to chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, we find sections 12 and 13 as follows:—

"If any member of the House of Commons accepts any office or commission or is concerned or interested in any contract, agreement, service or work, which by the ninth or tenth section of this Act, renders a candidate incapable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, or knowingly sells any goods, wares or merchandise to, or performs any service for the Government of Canada, or for any offices of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is paid or to be paid, whether such contract, agreement or sale is expressed or implied, and whether the transaction is single or continuous, the seat of such member shall thereby be vacated, and his election shall thenceforth be null and void.

"13. If any person disqualified or declared incapable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, by the ninth or tenth section of this Act, or if any person duly elected, who has become disqualified to continue a member or to sit or vote, under the next preceding section of this Act, nevertheless sits or votes, or continues to sit or vote therein, he shall thereby forfeit the sum of two hundred dollars for each and every day on which he so sits or votes; and such sum shall be recoverable from him by any person who sues for the same in any court of competent civil jurisdiction in Canada."

So, Mr. Speaker, in the paragraph which I have just quoted from the declaration of the hon. member for West Ontario, the hon. Postmaster General is charged with having been a member of a construction company having a contract with the Government, and according to the sections 12 and 13 of the law which I have just read, a member in such a case is not only to be expelled from the House, but also liable to a penalty. Can it be claimed, in view of a charge as precise as this, as to which no pretext of ambiguity could be found, that the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario are not serious and definite. Those who say so, are not serious themselves, and seek to prevent the truth from being known. Let us now consider the second charge. It is to the effect that the hon. Postmaster General has received money from subsidies granted by the Government to this construction company. For my part, Mr. Speaker, if there were only this charge before us, it would appear to me sufficient to call for an investigation, because it would mean that subsidies granted for the building of a railway, instead of being applied to that object, have been illegally spent and handed over to a member of this House, to a member of the Government, who had voted for the granting of these subsidies. We all remember that the hon. members of the right, not so very long ago—barely a few months ago—covered their faces and talked of honesty, when it was a question of bringing before the Senate certain acts of the Quebec Government. We all remember that this honest people's party submitted Hon. Mr. Mercier to an investigation before the Senate, not because he had received moneys from the subsidies voted by the Provincial Parliament, but because one of his friends, who was not even a member of the Quebec Assembly, had received subsidies. The hon. members hid their faces and pretended they were scandalized. How virtuous they were! To-day a member of the Government is charged with the same offence as was alleged against Pacaud, and the Government approve him, shield him with their protection, and declare that the charges brought against him are too vague. When the question was to saddle the Mercier Government with the responsibility of Pacaud's acts, these gentlemen were scandalized, these virtuous men hid their faces, but when one of their own is accused, when the Pacaud of the Conservative party is accused of taking money from the public chest, by diverting subsidies from their object, as with one voice they cry: Oh, that's all right! Let him do it again, and we will protect him. But more than that, the hon. member from West Ontario charges the hon. Postmaster General of having "corruptly" received these subsidies. What is, under the circumstances, the meaning of this word "corruptly"? It means that these subsidies were given him as a recompense for services rendered this company, as a payment for what he had done for it. Now, I ask, if such a charge is not precise enough, not definite enough? Now, Mr. Speaker, is it not remembered that the Government employé, the valet of the Federal Government who lives at Spencer Wood, ordered the Hon. Mr. Mercier to have an investigation, not on charges as serious or as definite as those now before the House, but simply saying: I order you to have an investigation made of all that preceded, followed and accompanied the Baie des Chaleurs transaction. Did the Conservatives then argue that this investigation was ordered on vague and ill-defined charges? On the contrary they strongly justified the Lieutenant Governor in his action, and found just and proper that there should be an investigation without any precise charge having been made; but now when charges as categorical as those contained in the motion of the hon. member for West Ontario are formulated, they are not found definite enough. The third charge is certainly as serious and as important as those which I have mentioned. The question is to establish that the hon. Postmaster General corruptly received subsidies for his own election and the elections of other persons. These charges are laid down in paragraphs 6 and 9. Paragraph 6 reads as follows:—

"6. That during the said period, out of said subsidies, and out of moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same, large sums of money were from time to time corruptly paid and contributed at the request and with the knowledge of said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes and to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron and other members and supporters of the Government, of which he was a member."

Paragraph 9 is as follows:—

"9. That also since the said 6th October, 1885, the persons who from time to time controlled the said Temiscouata Railway Company and the said subsidies, or who were beneficially interested in the said subsidies, paid

and contributed large sums at the request and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, for election purposes to aid in the election to the House of Commons of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and other members and supporters of the Government, of which he was a member."

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if these two paragraphs are seriously examined they will be found to mean, that during the period therein mentioned the election of Sir A. P. Caron, as well as the elections of certain members of this House in 1887 and 1891, were carried by corruption. There cannot be any doubt as to the import of such a charge. Will any one pretend that these charges are so ill-defined that it would be impossible to make an investigation thereof? But it is said, as by the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Ouimet) the other day: "We would willingly grant you an investigation, but you will compromise the w ole Conservative party." So honest, that party! "We would fain allow you to come and pry into our papers, but you will put our seats in danger, and therefore we could not grant an enquiry." And yet it was this very Minister of Public Works who was posing for virtue on the hustings only a few months ago, during the provincial elections, this same Minister who to-day quakes at the prospect of his party being subjected to an investigation. And was there, forsooth, so much money spent and so much corruption practised, that an enquiry be refused as to what took place during the elections? The hon. Minister of Justice said that this matter should have been referred to the courts of justice. Does the hon. Minister forget what he did last year? Does he forget that he allowed an enquiry into the charges brought by Mr. Tarte against the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Hector Langevin) and against the member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy)? Does he forget that those accusations could have also been referred to the tribunals? There is at this very moment a case against Mr. McGreevy in the courts of justice. Why then did he not do last year what he does to-day? Why did he not say: "You bring charges against the member for Three Rivers, and the member for Quebec West; well these accusations can be referred to the courts of justice, therefore I refuse an investigation." No doubt they could be referred to the courts of justice, since the hon. Minister has even entered proceedings before the tribunals. But why did he not last year adopt the same course that he does to-day, to protect the ex-Minister of Public Works? Why did he not do the same thing for the ex-member for Quebec West? What was wanted then was to get rid of the ex-Minister of Public Works. There was a conspiracy to put obstacles in the way of that Minister, and this means was resorted to to destroy him and remove him from the political stage. The conduct of the Government, Mr. Speaker, could not be interpreted otherwise. But, says the hon. Minister of Public Works, how do you expect an enquiry to be made? You do not state in your charge that this money was paid under a previous understanding by which the money was to return to the Postmaster General. Well, I will answer this to the hon. the Minister of Public Works: It is a strange moral which you are preaching there; and I believe that the House will understand as I do, that if such a doctrine were to be adopted, grosser immorality could hardly be sanctioned. The hon. Minister of Public Works has twenty-five or thirty millions of dollars to spend annually. Let us suppose that this money be returned to him in the shape of testimonials or subscriptions from contractors. Then should the honourableness of his conduct be questioned, he could say: Why, you have no right to bring charges against me if you do not state that the money was given with the understanding that it should come back to me. You do not establish between the contractors who had received it, and myself, a corrupt understanding; and the hon. Minister of Public Works with a satisfied conscience would pocket the twenty-five millions he had given out, and the Conservative party would say, "What an honest man!"

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) Had I twenty-five millions I would share them.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Yes; the hon. Minister would perhaps share with his friends, but the crime would be the same. Well, this claim of the Minister of Public Works to the effect that a corrupt understanding should have been alleged, is surely very flimsy. But however advantageous such morality may be for his party, as it has been in 1887 and 1891, it is not such as should be preached, nor be accepted by the House and the country. The fourth charge against the hon. Postmaster General aims to establish that after having received this money from this company he caused new sums of money to be voted to the same company. It reads as follows:—

"That after some of such last mentioned corrupt payments and contributions were made, further and other subsidies were granted and paid to the said railway company by the Government of which the said Sir A. P. Caron was a member."

This is to be found at the end of the ninth paragraph. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no doubt that the charge such as formulated, has nothing ambiguous in it, and cannot be considered as too vague. It is expressly charged that after having received these subsidies from the construction company, the hon. Postmaster General has again voted, and caused to be voted, new subsidies to this company. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask myself if the hon. Minister was disinterested, if he was in a position honestly, equitably and justly to cause such subsidies to be voted. Was he in such a position as a member of this House must always be, in view of such things? It is not allowable for us to be paid money, and to vote new subsidies to the companies or parties who paid it. I say that such a thing must not be done in this country, and that the hon. Postmaster General has certainly derogated from the dignity of a member of Parliament. He has violated the rules of the House, and thereby become liable to be judged by the House, and be punished by it, if the charges brought against him are proven. We have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that they can be proven. No other proof is needed than what has been published in the Toronto *Globe* where, after having declared in his election account, published by his agent, that he had only spent from $900 to $1,000 in his election, the hon. Postmaster General is shown, by papers bearing his own signature, to have acknowledged the receipt of sums from ten to twenty times larger than that. Therefore, in placing this account in the hands of the returning officer, it must have been an untruth that he was stating. He was deceiving the country, and, therefore, after having been false to the laws of the land, in this public matter, this Minister becomes liable

to be judged by this House, and an enquiry should be made into his conduct. And why is there in the statute a clause obliging the judges sitting in election trials to make a report to this House stating to what extent money was used in the election, and to what extent frauds and illegal practices were resorted to? Why this clause, if not for the information of this House, in order that, if there be occasion it may institute enquiries to determine whether such frauds have really been committed, to find out the guilty, and to punish them. Since the law provides for this report from the judges, and since the House has been deceived by reports placed in the hands of the returning officer, as the thing is now proven with regard to the hon. Postmaster General, I say that this House must protect itself against such frauds committed by the hon. Postmaster General. If the House is well convinced that an attempt has been made to thwart justice and deceive the electorate by publishing false election accounts, I say that it is its duty to protect itself. I believe, Mr Speaker, that there is no necessity of further dwelling upon this point. If there is in the country an honest people's party, it is certainly not composed of the hon. members on the other side of the House, who have not the courage to face such grave charges brought against one of the Ministers, and to allow a serious enquiry to be made into charges so explicit. It is plain that the charges are not considered as vague as has been said, since the Government does not dare to review them in the amendment proposed to this House by the hon. Minister of Militia. Therefore, I say in conclusion, why are not these charges referred to a committee of enquiry? It is because it is feared that all the turpitudes that have been committed will come to light. It is feared that there are still too many honest men ready to make an enquiry as searching as possible. It is feared that there would be found among the friends of the Government, forming a part of the investigating committee members disinterested enough to say: We are not ready to swallow everything; we must dismiss the hon. Minister; he must be punished. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Government has been afraid to have the truth known, they have been afraid of the revelation of turpitudes such as came to light during the late investigations. They prefer appointing some safe man as a commissioner, shut him inside of four walls, and let him sham an investigation out of reach of the press and the public so that nothing can be known. But I am confident that the honesty of this House will not permit it to be so, that the Liberal party will find the support of truly honest men, and that the amendment of the hon. Minister of Militia will be rejected by a large majority.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends who speak French in this House will be good enough to excuse me if I use the English language this evening, since the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) who has just taken his seat furnishes me with an opportunity to recall a bit of the political history of the Province of Quebec. I wish to speak in English in order to better inform the House. I presume that the hon. member for Rouville and his friends do not desire that what I have to say be not understood by a large number of the members of this House. As I wish to be well understood I will use a language less familiar to me perhaps, but I hope, however, to succeed in conveying my meaning.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), in the speech which we have just heard in support of the motion presented to the House by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), and in opposition to the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Militia, has thought proper to commence his remarks by some comments on what has taken place in the Province of Quebec during the last few years. I sincerely thank the hon. member for Rouville in having thus taken the initiative and furnished me with the opportunity of giving to this House a little piece of political history in regard to the Province of Quebec, during the time I had the honour of sitting in the Provincial Legislature and since I have left it to come here. The hon. member for Rouville takes strong ground against the proposition of the Minister of Militia to refer the enquiry into the charges made by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) to a Royal Commission, and he points to what has taken place in Quebec lately with reference to enquiries held by Royal Commissions with a result which is known in this House and all over the country, and happily so. If the hon. member for Rouville had had the kindness to go a little further back and, before speaking of the investigations which took place in the Province of Quebec before Royal Commissions during the last few months, he had also given some information as to enquiries held in that province before parliamentary committees, he would have fulfilled his duty in telling this House when partisanship or partisan spirit runs very high, what you can expect from parliamentary committees. As he has not thought fit to relate this part of the story, it is my bounden duty to do so. Unfortunately, in the Province of Quebec, for the last few years, many investigations have taken place—I say unfortunately for the good name of our good province investigations have taken place—before parliamentary committees, and several investigations have taken place before Royal Commissions. The political history of the Province of Quebec for the last few years offers to us the possibility of making a comparison between the investigations held by these two different bodies—parliamentary committees and Royal Commissions. Before entering into the narrative of these investigations, which I will make as short as possible, because I want to return to the question before the House as soon as I can, I will call the attention of the hon. member for Rouville to a few very important errors which he has made in his remarks. In order to convince this House that it cannot expect a satisfactory investigation by a Royal Commission, he has, with very little courtesy indeed, alluded to the investigation made in the Province of Quebec by the Hon. Judge Routhier, who is an ornament to the bench not only of the Province of Quebec but of the whole Dominion of Canada, a man of unsullied honour, and of character beyond suspicion.

An hon. MEMBER. Question.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). The hon. gentleman who calls question had better let me go on and say what I have to say. I had the honour of a seat in the Legislative Assembly in Quebec at that time, and I remember exactly under what circumstances this investigation was ordered, but first, I would call attention to this point, which is of con-

siderable importance in view of the discussion which is now going on. Some charges had been made against the Ministers of the Crown in the Province of Quebec, with regard to the well known question of the sale of the North Shore Railway. The following Government thought proper to propose to the House that an investigation should take place, and the Government proposed that this investigation should be made by a Royal Commission, and it is a surprise to me to-night to hear from hon. gentlemen opposite their denunciation of investigations made by Royal Commission, when I remember very well that, sitting in the House in Quebec, the proposition made by the then Government was carried unanimously by the House, every one having full confidence in a Royal Commission to make the investigation. The ground for the attack which the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) has made upon Judge Routhier is that this investigation was only a sham, that witnesses were called almost in secrecy in a private chamber, and that the judge did only what he thought it was prudent to do under the circumstances, in order not to hurt those who were supposed to be his political friends. The hon. gentleman is altogether astray. Judge Routhier, before commencing his investigation, advertised in the papers and asked any one in the Province of Quebec, or in the Dominion of Canada, or in the wide world who could give him information, to come forward and give that information. He summoned almost all the members of the Legislative Assembly. I myself had the honour to appear before that commission. All the members of the Provincial Legislature who had made strong charges against the previous Government in reference to this railway were summoned, and we were surprised to learn at last that many of these violent denunciators in the House and on the platform were very reticent before the commission. Some of them, I believe, went away, but some mustered up courage to appear, and I will read a list of the witnesses belonging to the hon. gentleman's own party who did appear. The Hon. Mr. Mercier himself was one, and his evidence, in the report of the judge of the Royal Commission, takes about 48 pages. There was not much secrecy in that. Then there was also the Hon. Mr. Irvine, and the Hon. Mr. Bresse, a Legislative Councillor, who died recently. There was also Mr. Bernatchez, and there was Mr. Boyer who has since been a Minister without portfolio. The Hon. François Langelier also appeared, and his brother the Hon. Charles Langelier. Then there was the Hon. Félix Marchand, since the Speaker of the House, who was almost selected the other day as the leader of the Opposition in that Legislature.

Mr. LANGELIER. Every one who knew nothing about the charges was called as a witness, but those who knew anything about them were not called.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I would ask the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) to inform the House whether he was called as a witness and if he appeared as a witness.

Mr. LANGELIER. Yes.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). The hon. gentleman says "yes." Then he was one of those who knew nothing about the charges, and yet he was called. I ask the hon. gentleman in that case how it was I heard him at least 50 times all over the Province of Quebec denouncing the sale of the North Shore Railway as a most corrupt bargain, while now he says he was called as a witness because he knew nothing about it, and that as a matter of fact, it was true he knew nothing and had nothing to say.

Mr. BRODEUR. The charges were made against Conservative members, not against Liberals.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). Well, I am sure the Hon. Judge Routhier did not require this vindication of his character from me, but I thought it was my duty to say this much on the question brought before the House by the hon. member for Rouville. Now, if the House will allow me, I will cite a few more precedents in Quebec, where investigations were ordered to be made by Royal Commissions. One day a charge was made in the House by the then leader of the Opposition, who was Mr. Mercier himself. He charged the former Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, the Hon. Judge Mousseau, with having sold the contract for the parliament buildings in Quebec, and he asked for the appointment of a select committee to enquire into the charge. A committee was granted. I was then a member of the House, and was named a member of the committee. Remember that this took place near the end of the session, when we had nearly completed our parliamentary work, and when everybody expected to go home. The select committee met the day following, and I had the honour of being elected chairman of that committee. We went to work at once, and ascertained that the investigation would take a long time, and we thought it was our duty to report to the House that if the House maintained the order they had given us to proceed with the investigation, it would likely take several weeks, and, of course, it was for the House to decide whether the members who had no more parliamentary work to do, were to remain there waiting until the investigation was over. Moreover, a second charge was brought against Mr. Mercier himself, who was then leader of the Opposition, charging him with having sold his election contestation against the Prime Minister in the County of Jacques Cartier. The House ordered a select committee to investigate that charge, and I was appointed a member of that committee likewise, and also appointed chairman. We discovered that the enquiry would be a long one, and we reported that fact the same day to the House. Well, the House was reasonable enough not to decide to remain there for two or three months at the public expense, and the House unanimously decided that prorogation should take place, and that the members of the committee should be organized into a Royal Commission to sit after the session. We did so, and the enquiry took place. Both parties were agreed to the proposition. Now, I said awhile ago that we were able to judge of the usefulness of Royal Commissions in the great and responsible duty of making investigations into charges of that kind. I will give a few more illustrations taken from the Province of Quebec. Later on I was on the Opposition side of the House, and from the very first year we could easily perceive that a system of organized corruption and of organized robbery was being established, which culminated, after four years of practice, in the great Baie des Chaleurs scandal, and in the subsequent downfall

of the rascals who were robbing the Province of Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, we tried to hold enquiries on the opposite side of the House. Charges were formally laid, and we tried to have investigations made before the Committee on Public Accounts, and I suppose hon. gentlemen in this House would hardly believe what I am going to say if it was not a matter of fact known to every person who was acquainted with affairs in Quebec at that time. When the Public Accounts Committee were trying to investigate charges of wrong-doing against the Mercier Government, we often saw witnesses refuse to answer the question that was put to them, and we even saw Ministers of the Crown, in that committee, rising up, raising all sorts of questions of order, and telling the witness: Now, do not speak, thus shutting the mouth of the witness. To illustrate what I am now saying, I will relate one instance, which is very characteristic indeed. One day we had a witness before the Public Accounts Committee. He was being hard pressed, but was very reticent, and at last the question was put directly to him. It so happened that the friends of the Mercier Government had been a little over-confident that day, and the parties were just equally divided on the committee. Consequently it devolved upon the chairman to give the casting vote, and to our satisfaction and to the satisfaction of every honest man, he voted to oblige the witness to answer the question. We thought at last we had one case which we could report to the House, and which would go before the country, but we were sadly deceived. As hon. members know, it is a part of parliamentary procedure that when a parliamentary committee is making an enquiry and a witness refuses to answer a question upon being ordered by the committee, he is then reported by the committee to the House, and it is the duty of the House to sustain the action of the committee, and to bring the witness to the bar to answer the question. That is what took place last year in an investigation ordered by this House when a witness refused to answer. If we consult the records of the House we will find that there have been other instances of this nature in our history. But in the Province of Quebec, when the report of the committee was taken up in the House, the Government itself asked the House to vote down the report and order that the witness should not answer the question that had been put to him. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it was not very unwise for the hon. member for Rouville to bring up this question before the House, and to cite as precedents against Royal Commissions and in favour of parliamentary committees to investigate charges of that kind, the instances that have occurred in the Province of Quebec during the last few years. I deeply regret, I must say, and I think the hon. member for Rouville, after he has sobered down a little from his wild excitement and his partisan fanaticism, will also regret the allusion he made in this connection. The hon. gentleman made a severe attack against the person of the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec, who there represents the Queen of England, and the words he used were that he was *le valet du gouvernement fédéral*—the humble servant of the Federal Government. Words of that kind should never have fallen from the lips of any hon. member of this House. They will not affect the feelings of the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, because he is far above such denunciations, and his character is above such attacks. But there was this consolation for him, at all events, that in the stand he took during the crisis in the Province of Quebec he has been sustained by an immense majority of the electors, and by a majority of over 25 to 30 to support the new Government who have assumed responsibility for the action of the Lieutenant Governor before the Legislature and the province. I have been obliged, in consequence of the remarks which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur), to wander a little from the path which I proposed to travel in discussing this question, but I will return to it. I have been somewhat surprised, since the debate opened, to find that hon. gentlemen opposite, from their leader downward, have discussed this question, not from the constitutional point as to the right of Parliament to institute an enquiry, not as to the duty of this House to order an investigation, but they have spoken so as to prove that the Postmaster General is really guilty. The charges have been made, but no evidence has been taken, and no investigation has been instituted, and yet those hon. gentlemen have advanced so far as to find the Minister guilty and have so referred to him in their speeches, although they have not had the courage to make that declaration in the motion. The hon. member for Rouville went further, and with a frankness, for which I will not congratulate him, but which calls for mention, declared that the object was to have a general investigation for election purposes, that they wanted nothing else, and that this was their prime object. He admitted that they desired an enquiry as to the manner in which elections had been carried on by hon. members on this side of the House. It is very easy to answer the hon. member for Rouville on that point. I am sure of one thing, and I voice the feelings of all hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that we are ready to challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to a general investigation of election affairs, and we are confident as to the party which will come out the victors. We have only to recall their misfortunes of the last six months in order to induce hon. gentlemen opposite to suppress their enthusiasm and boastfulness. Another remark offered by the hon. member for Rouville I will deal with later on. With respect to the motion and amendment before the House, it is clear to every one who has given thought to the matter that we are face to face with two important duties, what I may call a double responsibility. Of course, the duty of this House towards the country is to vindicate its honour. But, on a question like this, we must not be actuated either by favour or antipathy, either by personal feeling or by personal hostility. If we owe it to the country, for the public good, that wrong wherever found and against whomsoever proved must be condemned, it is our duty also to do justice to the accused. For this double purpose the functions of Parliament are well defined. I need not read long extracts from constitutional authorities on the matter. No one denies the right of Parliament to enquire within the proper limits of its jurisdiction and when charges are properly and directly made before the House. Of course, in all matters relating to the administration of public affairs, as was so well explained by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), the House has a

right to investigate and enquire. The House, when it considers it its duty to do so, can visit with censure a member or a Minister of the Crown or the Government as a whole. When charges are brought against a Minister or against a member, for dereliction of duty as such, the House has a right to make an enquiry, if it comes to the conclusion that the charge is of a special nature and made in such a way that investigation should be granted. We need not discuss that point further, but I agree with many hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House that the motion as moved by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is not drafted in such a way that it can be entertained by the House. But assuming their responsibility of the government of the country, one of the Ministers of the Crown has moved an amendment, enlarging the charges so made by the member for West Ontario, after the speeches which the hon. gentlemen opposite have made, and proposing that the whole subject be referred to a Royal Commission. But after this proposal has been made, hon. gentlemen opposite are no more satisfied. When I read the amendment of the Minister of Militia I felt sure that the leader of the Opposition would at once rise and thank the Government for the position they had taken, for the manly courage which they had shown in determining to investigate the matter, and state that he would ask his friends to vote in favour of the amendment. On the contrary, we have seen hon. gentlemen opposite manifest expressions of disappointment. Why? Because their motion has been made for party objects. For party objects the resolution cannot be considered by the House. They were sorely disappointed because their expectations and hopes have not been realized, that the Government would merely ask their friends to vote down the motion, and then hon. gentlemen opposite would raise the cry all over the country that the Government had not had the courage to face an enquiry, and that the supporters of the Government were weak enough to sustain it in that position and vote down the charges and refuse all investigations into them. They are so disappointed because the matter is to be referred to a Royal Commission, or rather because an investigation is to take place. In deciding on this question, we are not to consider whether we should please hon. gentlemen opposite, but we are bound to do our duty, whatever they may think, of whatever kind of howl they may raise in the country. I contend that the motion of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) should not be entertained by this House, and my remarks will be very short on this point, for I will only say this: That the motion, as drafted by that hon. gentleman, is saturated with partisan hostility. I am sorry to say that in my humble opinion the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has certainly not approached this question with a due sense of his responsibility. He has set a very bad example to his political friends in this House, and I regret to say that they have followed that bad example in their speeches. It is easy to see, and we have ascertained it from the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side, that they are not at all guided by a judicial spirit in this matter, but by the sheerest partisan hostility. Now, Mr. Speaker, why is the charge to be referred to a Royal Commission, instead of being investigated by a parliamentary committee? I will speak my mind openly on this matter. Sir, I know what is the right of Parliament, and I know what is the duty of Parliament, but the actions of men in the world must also be guided by experience, and the experience I have had of these investigations held by parliamentary committees in the Province of Quebec; and I will go further and say that the experience I have had of the investigation made here last year by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, has forced the conclusion on my mind that a parliamentary committee, when partisanship and party fanaticism run high, is not a very safe ground where enquiry can be made with a view of giving full justice to the accused and full justice to the country. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind, with regard to the investigation held last year, that over six weeks of the time of this House was absolutely lost for nothing, and that the evidence could have been taken just as well and perhaps better if there had been less partisanship in the committee. If I had seen from the motion made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), or if I had ascertained from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite that we could safely rely or that the country could safely rely upon a fair and impartial and just investigation before a parliamentry committee, I would have been in favour of that course being taken. But, Mr. Speaker, I will say frankly and without hesitation, that from the speeches I have heard, it is my belief that hon. gentlemen opposite are not animated by a judicial spirit and are not fit to be trusted as judges. I say they are not to be trusted as judges because of their fanatical partisanship. They are not to be trusted, and why? Because they are preachers of purity and practitioners of corruption. They are not to be trusted, because they are philosophers of right and doers of wrong. They are not to be trusted, because they are bold and violent traducers of supposed offenders, and lenient and meek condoners of proven guilt and shame. I say, Mr. Speaker, that they are not to be trusted as fair judges on account of their fanatical partisanship, and need I illustrate my proposition otherwise than by calling attention to the speeches we have heard from them; when in these speeches they have been debating for hours and hours, not that the hon. Postmaster General should be submitted to his trial, but that he was actually found guilty of these charges. Every one knows that if a man is called to be a juror, and if it is well known that he has given his opinion beforehand that the man to be tried was guilty, that juror would be challenged and would not be admitted on the jury at all. Now, following the same good practice of law and evidence, it would be our duty, and the accused, I think, would have the right, to challenge all these hon. gentlemen opposite and to say that they ought not to be admitted as judges, because, beforehand and without hearing one word of evidence, they have pronounced him guilty before this House and before the country. I have said, Sir, that these gentlemen are not to be trusted as judges, because they are preachers of purity and practitioners of corruption, and I am right in so saying. From the 1st of January to the 31st of December in each year, every time the occasion offers, we hear these hon. gentleman preaching how honest, how innocent, how above suspicion, and how wonderfully pure they are, and when their deeds and actions are submitted

to the courts of justice in election trials, one by one we see them falling to the ground, found guilty of the grossest kind of corruption. I have said also that they were not to be trusted as judges, because they are philosophers of right and doers of wrong. We have the honour to be treated here, almost two or three times a week, to philosophical teachings from hon. gentlemen opposite, but I regret, and the country regrets that their actions and deeds are very little in accord with their philosophical teachings. I have said moreover, Mr. Speaker, that they are not to be trusted as judges, because they are bold and violent traducers of supposed offenders, and lenient and meek condoners of proven guilt and shame, and I am also right in saying that. We have heard denunciations made against certain supposed offenders in this House, when, as a matter of fact, these denunciations came from the same men who obeyed meekly, and who submitted themselves to be the partisans and instruments of the gang and the clique which has dishonoured the Province of Quebec for so many years. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that the party record of these hon. gentlemen was already bad enough : but the more I hear them the more I am convinced that their extreme partisanship is such as to disqualify them from acting as judges in a matter of this kind, after displaying that unfairness and want of judicial spirit which they have manifested in this House. Now, I must not conclude my remarks without saying a word in answer to a charge made in the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, and addressed generally to hon. members of this House belonging to the party to which I have the honour to belong. It appears, according to the hon. gentleman, that from the Prime Minister down to his humblest supporter, we are all together what he called an organized corruption. Well, Mr. Speaker, of course human nature is to be found everywhere. I will not pretend that the Conservative party and the friends of the Conservative party have always done during the last thirty or forty years what has been for the best interest of the country. Mistakes may have been made ; errors may have been committed ; but on the whole we can claim the merit as a great political party of having worked in earnest, with intelligence and patriotism, for the good of the country. And this charge of an organized corruption thrown from the other side of the House by the hon. member for South Oxford I hurl back to him ; and I will add this, that if there is in the history of Canada something worse than an organized corruption, it is the organized corruption of hon. gentlemen opposite, combined and doubled with their organized hypocrisy. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to detain the House any longer. I will conclude by saying that in my humble opinion, in deciding to refer the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario, but as explained and amplified by the amendment of the hon. Minister of Militia, this House will not abdicate its right to investigate the matter. It is only delegating one part of its power to a Royal Commission, to do that part of the work for the House, and to report the evidence to this House without comment, and without giving a judgment thereon. The evidence will be taken, and the whole thing will be brought back to this House ; the report will be laid on the Table. Every member will have an opportunity of reading it and forming his own judgment upon it ; and then the House will exercise its power of investigation in that part which is the most important—in rendering the judgment in the case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Who is to judge ?

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). The House, of course.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman said the House was not fit.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). I have not said anything of the kind. There is a difference between making the investigations ourselves in this House, where all the passions and the fanaticism of members can be brought into play, and rendering judgment. Even though the same passions and fanaticism may be brought into play when we render judgment, I am confident that there will be on the part of the majority of this House a sufficient sense of responsibility to render a fair and just judgment, and to put down fanaticism. Besides the reasons which I have given for referring the question to a Royal Commission, there is another very important one—that of convenience. The session is pretty well advanced ; we are on the eve of summer, and it would be against the public interest to detain the whole Parliament here at a great cost, for perhaps two or three months, when the same duties can be performed just as well and better, as I conceive, by a Royal Commission. Then we will take the matter up when it comes before the House in another session. Under the circumstances, and for these reasons, I think it is my duty as a member of this House to support the amendment of the hon. Minister of Militia, to refer this charge to a Royal Commission. Before resuming my seat, I will only say this in reply to a remark of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) in which he appealed to this House and also appealed in sounding phrases to the country, to support the party of honest men. Well, Mr. Speaker, I need not refer again to what has taken place in the Province of Quebec. But I think, all things considered, and without disparagement of my hon. friend from Rouville or of any of his friends in this House, that any of us sitting on this side of the House and supporting the Ministry which is now enjoying the confidence of the Crown, the confidence of a large majority in this House, and the confidence of a large majority of the people. can claim that we are just as good, just as honest, just as true, and just as patriotic men as any of the hon. members sitting on the other side of the House.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the hon. member for L'Islet should prefer to speak English on this occasion, for if he had spoken French we could immediately have had his speech distributed to his electors. And it would show him in glaring contradiction with what was said on the hustings of the Province of Quebec during the local elections.

Mr. DESJARDINS (L'Islet). (Translation.) I will save the hon. member the trouble, as I intend to have it distributed myself.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) The hon. member has done so much pirouetting around his chair, that it is hard to know what position he occupied on this question, as is generally the case on the questions which bring him to his feet. When the hon. member touches questions of prov-

incial politics, he gets mixed up, and sees everything through a mirage which makes truth very hard to recognize. It is true that for a long time he has hoped for the position of Treasurer, and that he has not got it, and will not likely get it for some time. Perhaps this might be considered as unfortunate, for if floods of words could do anything towards filling the Quebec chest, he would easily fill it. But not only does the hon. member contradict himself, but he also contradicts his chiefs, the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister. For in a speech delivered in Halifax on the 16th January last, by the hon. leader of the House, a report of which I find in the *Empire*, I read the following words:—

"He repeated the invitation made elsewhere, that if any one has any evidence of wrong-doing against any official or member of Parliament, be he private member or Minister, he pledged his honour that the fullest investigation should be made and the information used in the prosecution and punishment of the guilty party. Mr. Abbott's Government was fully determined and pledged to investigate, root out and punish wrong-doing wherever they found it."

It is true that the hon. member for L'Islet can say to himself that he is in good company in the matter of contradiction. He is in the company of his chief in the Senate, the Hon. Mr. Abbott, and of the leader of the House, Sir John Thompson, but his position is not the better for that. Such are the promises which were made in Halifax on the hustings and in the County of L'Islet, and the same promises were repeated by Hon. Mr. Abbott in the Senate. He asked all men of good will, Liberals as well as Conservatives, to formulate accusations in the House, and promised that a committee would be appointed to enquire into the charges. Here is the solemn declaration made by Hon. Mr. Abbott before the Senate:

"I would ask the hon. gentlemen opposite to join with us in trying to find out what the facts are about this alleged rascality. We ask them to give us the benefit of their experience in this enquiry, to assist us in ascertaining the facts and placing them before the public, in order that they may be dealt with properly, and, if found guilty, that summary vengeance may be exercised upon those who are found guilty of appropriating public money—stealing—be they high or low. That is the determination of this Government and this side of the House."

Well, what is to-day the answer which we hear to this? First, a refusal pure and simple of an investigation. One thing surprised me particularly. It is the solicitude evinced by the hon. members of the right for the hon. member for West Ontario with regard to his seat. They quote precedents to show that the hon. member for West Ontario need not fear losing his seat, even should the charges he made remain unproven. The hon. member knows that he stakes his seat. We feel on this side of the House that a member who from his place in the House formulates such grave, such serious charges against a colleague, against a Minister of the Crown, puts his seat at stake, and I for one consider that if he did not prove his allegations, he would have to resign his mandate. Therefore I say that on this point the position of our hon. friends is not tenable. But such is not the reason. It is understood that the charges can easily be proved, and it is feared that they will be. I hold in my hand written proofs of the charges which have been made. I will state that the words of the hon. Minister of Justice on the hustings, and of the Conservative press, during the last elections, went to say that an investigation would be made before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I will not quote opinions from the Opposition papers, for they might be suspected; but I will read from papers of the Government party. *La Presse*, which I understand to be the organ of the hon. Minister of Customs, said on 5th April:

"*La Presse* will make it its duty to publish a faithful report of the developments of this affair before the Committee on Privileges and Elections."

It was so well understood that the charge would be considered by the House, that is, by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that the House would have to deal with it, that the organs of the Government loudly repeated it. *Le Matin*, a paper recently founded by the honest Government of the Province of Quebec, a Government which owes its existence to charges which never were proven, spoke as follows:—

"A MINISTER UNDER ACCUSATION.

"One of the lieutenants of the Opposition, Mr. Edgar, has finally brought forth his little complaint against the Postmaster General. This indictment which was intended to be made terrible, is nothing but a résumé of the virulent articles published by *L'Electeur* against Sir A. P. Caron during the last three or four months.

"However, the evidence in support of the accusations made by Mr. Edgar will be heard before Parliament, and we will soon know the real value of these charges."

Here are Government newspapers which still reiterate the promises made before the electors:

"You will be granted an enquiry."

What does *Le Monde* say, the organ, I believe, of the ex-Minister of Public Works, and of the hon. Postmaster General, according to public rumour?

"At last the Opposition, by the voice of Mr. Edgar, has formulated charges against the hon. Postmaster General.

"Last night Mr. Edgar accused Sir A. P. Caron of having been a member of the Lake St. John and the Temiscouata Railway Companies, having favoured these two companies, and of having received from them, in 1887, $100,000 for electoral purposes.

"Sir A. P. Caron will meet his accusers before the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

"It is useless to prejudge the question.

"The wiser course is to wait for the evidence. It cannot be long coming now."

Another organ of the Government which declares that the evidence will be taken before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and when the matter comes up in the House, it is altogether another answer which is given to the request for an enquiry; and I must say, to the shame of these newspapers and the Conservative press of Quebec, that they are ready to take back their words, as the hon. member for L'Islet is in the habit of taking his back. There is another important Conservative newspaper from which I will read for the edification of this House—the paper which spoke of an alleged episcopal charge directed against the prevaricators of the Province of Quebec, during the last general local elections—*Le Trifluvien*, on the 6th April, published a letter from Mr. Scott, secretary of the Lake St. John Railway Company, in which this gentleman denies having paid any money to the hon. Postmaster General. This sheet says:

"If the enemies of Sir A. P. Caron are not satisfied with this denial, all there remains for them to do is to get a member of the Opposition to ask the House of Commons for an enquiry, and without being in the secrets of the gods, we are convinced that Sir A. P. Caron will be first to accede to the request. Now, then, gentlemen accusers, come forward. This is the time for proving your allegations. If you go back, who will be taken for liars"?

Mr. Speaker, is it possible to find in the Govern-

ment organs a more complete ratification of the words pronounced before the Senate and before the electors of the Province of Quebec last year, and by the hon. Minister of Justice at Halifax? We thought that these words were sincere, and that as soon as a categorical and precise accusation should be made these gentlemen would be only too glad to furnish us with the occasion of proving it, and that *La Tribune* was right in saying that if we drew back we should be taken for liars. We have come forward, we have brought forth well-defined accusations. These gentlemen had promised that they would accept the challenge, that at the first opportunity they would grant an enquiry, and now with shame in the heart, they are forced to quiet down, and stop their bravadoes. Another reason alleged for the refusal of an enquiry, is that the charges are too vague. When the hon. Postmaster General is concerned, we are told that the charges are too vague; when it is the hon. Minister of Railways, they are too stale. When shall we meet the wishes of these gentlemen? When the question was to carry elections, when there were numerous bye-elections to be secured in Ontario, these gentlemen had their mouths full of promises; they were ready to submit ministers, members and even simple prevaricating employés, to investigation. They were ready to submit to the Committee on Privileges and Elections anything calculated to bring out the truth. What do we see to-day? Now that we have accused them, and that they have been urged by their own newspapers to grant an enquiry and fulfil positive promises, these gentlemen offer us a Royal Commission to lure their supporters in the House into docile voting. They will probably find a servile majority ready to support their scheme of a Royal Commission which the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) has so eloquently dealt with.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has no right to say that the ministerial majority is servile.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I will withdraw the expression, but I have a full right to hold the view it expresses. Besides, I may say that I was not referring to the hon. member for St. Maurice, for I know that the hon. member is very independent—that when opportunity presents itself, which is not often, he votes against the Government. However, it is not important.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) Quite as important as the answer which the Bishop of Three Rivers made to the hon. member for Montmagny.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Now, it is said the charges are too vague. I am going to try and show the House that this would-be reason is no reason at all. I think they are perfectly precise and well-defined. The English independent papers which have dealt with this question, and even the organs of the Government, have understood perfectly the import of these accusations, and they have declared that the Government could not deny the enquiry. The *Witness* of 5th April, says:

"The charges against Sir A. P. Caron are of the very gravest character, and they are formally preferred in the impressive way by a responsible member of Parliament."

The *Star* of the 7th, 8th and 9th April says that the charges are precise, formal, and that the Government cannot refuse an enquiry. But, more than this, *La Minerve* itself, of 6th April, publishes an article, or rather a letter, written by the Hon. Joseph Tassé, senator, in which I find the following:—

"We have already spoken of the charges of the *Globe* against Sir A. P. Caron. Mr. Edgar has just assumed the responsibility of these charges in the House, and asked that they be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

"The Postmaster General is accused of having received from the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, as well as from the Temiscouata Railway Company, large sums of money taken from the subsidies voted by the Federal Parliament.

"He is also accused of having spent, during the general elections of 1887, more than $100,000 to corrupt the electors of St. Maurice, Champlain, Lévis and many other counties in the Province of Quebec.

"The Government itself is implicated in the accusations preferred by Mr. Edgar, who charges the Administration of a full knowledge of the alleged illegal doings of Sir Adolphe Caron.

"When the Postmaster General read, in February last, the charges made by the *Globe*, we know that he lost no time in denying them most emphatically. No doubt that he will know how to vindicate himself to the entire satisfaction of all his friends, and that the Liberals will come off with the costs of their suits and enquiry."

Mr. Speaker, is there not in all this the most positive proof that this point raised, as to the vagueness of the charges, could not stand a moment of serious discussion, when we see newspapers like the *Star* and the *Witness*, and even the virtuous *Minerve* state that they understand the charges as precise and formal, and that the Postmaster General must be the first to ask for an enquiry for his vindication? Now, the most interested man in pleading that he does not understand the charges brought against him, is the accused himself. Well, let us see his answer. Did the hon. Postmaster General say that he did not understand the charge? Did he answer that he did not know what defence he should offer? No, not at all. He answered:

"I take this the first opportunity which has been given me to state to the House that in every particular the charges made by the hon. gentleman are false."

Therefore, since he was ready to plead guilty or not guilty, without asking for a delay of a day, to prepare his defence, it shows that he was ready to meet his accuser, and that he understood the charge. Is it very becoming for these hon. gentlemen to say for him that he withdraws his plea of not guilty, that he pleads extenuating circumstances, or again that the charges are so vague that he cannot understand them? The hon. Minister of Marine stated that such vague charges would not be countenanced by any tribunal. It will be sufficient to refer to the Criminal Code, sections 58, 48, 111, 112, ch. 174 of R. S. C. to show that an information or a complaint brought before the grand jurors would not be rejected on account of defects in form. This will show that the charges as formulated would not be rejected by a tribunal, and that much less should an objection for defect in form be countenanced so as to put aside in this House a charge made in accordance with the law and the precedents. This charge is much more explicit than that brought by Mr. Tarte against the ex-Minister of Public Works, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, with the consequence that we know. But have not the Conservatives, or rather the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec, a man just as pure as they, who would not be guilty of an injustice against even the Liberals to promote the end of those who appointed him, has not this man taken advantage of a charge made before the Senate and

much more vague than the charge formulated before this House? Has not this man, prompted by his Ottawa friends, taken his inspiration from what transpired in another House, to ask for an investigation and put his Liberal Ministry under accusation, in spite of the constitution? Nevertheless, the Conservatives have said that Mr. Angers is a great man, that he saved the Province of Quebec; but when the question is to accuse one of their friends in this House, when a finger is lifted against one of these gentlemen, they seek refuge behind a question of a defect in form to ward off the charges and refuse an investigation. These charges are well-founded, and would be easy to prove. It is enough to recall what took place in the County of Montmagny for instance, in 1887. The hon. Postmaster General, in an interview with a reporter of the *Gazette* said that he had indeed spent a few dollars to help moneyless candidates. In 1887, my opponent was Mr. Landry, now a senator, a rich man. This is what happened. I hold in my hand *fac-simile* of papers signed by Mr. Hubert Hébert, the present revising officer, bearing the date 4th of February, and those who know Mr. Hébert's signature may easily satisfy themselves that these *fac-simile* were taken from genuine documents. This gentleman received from Mr. McGreevy on 4th and 10th February, 1887, the sum of $2,000, which was paid him on Sir A. P. Caron's order alone. It is, therefore, proven that in my county, Mr. Landry received of Mr. McGreevy the sum of $2,000 on the order of the hon. Postmaster General. But do you know how much he spent? Here is the account filed by his agent, and found in the report of the returning officer. He spent $140.12. Now, here is a man who receives $2,000 for legal expenses, in order that he may come in Montmagny and endeavour to defeat a poor candidate, who fights for a good cause in opposing the nefarious policy of the Government. And this man who received $2,000, now declares under his signature that he only spent $140.12. If he only spent this, then he must have robbed Mr. McGreevy; and if he spent $2,000 how could he declare that he had only spent $140.12? Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when one goes into court with proofs by writing and official documents, it is easy to get a decision. I must say that the hon. member for L'Islet gave a poor certificate to the members of this House. He stated that they are not fit to hold this trial. He stated that the hon. members lacked, if not intelligence, at least impartiality enough, to render a judgment. As to us we are in no way affected by what the hon. member for L'Islet may say; but it is a poor certificate for him to give his friends who, as they did last year, form the majority of the committee. For if we had an investigation before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the Government would be sure to control it by its majority. Moreover, there will be present the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) who always keeps a jealous eye over the enquiries, and I am convinced that he will do his duty on this occasion as he did last year. I protest on behalf of the majority of the Conservatives on the Committee on Privileges and Elections, against the insinuations made by the hon. member for L'Islet. But, whatever the hon. member may say, shall we not be the final judges in the matter in any event? Does not the amendment read so? It says that there shall be a Royal Commission which will report to the House, and the latter will pronounce finally. Now, if we are not competent this year, why should we be more so next? I conceive that the hon. member for L'Islet does not expect to be called upon to pass judgment over this affair, for, from what I hear, it appears that he is looking to a position in Quebec. Is that because he would not like to pronounce on this question? Therefore, this last contention, that the House is not sufficiently impartial, that the committee would not be composed of impartial judges, surely cannot stand, since we have in any event to pronounce finally. And if we are not competent to settle the question this year, how should we be more so next? I protest with all my strength against a Royal Commission as unjust and useless. I am here in the House to plead the cause of the majority of the electors of my county, who want an investigation, and I oppose this amendment. Without vainly boasting I think I am intelligent enough to vote on this question before it has passed through a Royal Commission, especially when the Royal Commissions—as were those recently appointed, particularly that against Hon. Mr. Mercier—are composed of political friends of the hon. gentlemen of the right. Such Royal Commissions will again be appointed when there will be some political rancour to satisfy against the Liberals, some accounts to be paid for, or in order to bring about the reimbursement of some lost deposit. I say, then, that the House must keep the control and hear the trial of its own members. I am absolutely against this amendment, and say that if we have to sit here for another six months, I am ready in order to claim our rights, and above all to avenge public morality and protect the treasury against organized plunder in Canada.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have heard with astonishment the violent speeches pronounced by some of our colleagues from the Province of Quebec against the hon. Postmaster General. I thought first that these hon. gentlemen, who belong to the Liberal party in this House, after having taken the precaution of causing the charges against the hon. Postmaster General to be made by a member from the Province of Ontario, had intended to abstain on this occasion, and to try and act as impartial judges in the case of one of their French colleagues from their province. Mr. Speaker, the nature of Mr. Pacaud's nurslings soon asserted itself. The nature of the disciples of the Mercier Government could not be kept from breaking out, and the House of Commons is now treated to the violence of speech indulged in by these hon. members during the last election campaign against the Conservative party. The mode suggested by the Government to carry out the investigation into the charges brought against the hon. Postmaster General is a very wise one. First it will save the House the annoyance of spending again the whole summer in the city of Ottawa. It will relieve the members from the very trying ordeal of spending here the summer season, and perhaps the season of the fall, in order to allow the lawyers hostile to the hon. Postmaster General to wage war against him before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to wage against him an unwarrantable war, to submit witnesses to all kinds of irrelevant questions, as was done last year during the investigation against

the ex-Minister of Public Works and his department; for it is admitted to-day by everybody, even the hon. members of the left—and it is enough to read the evidence to have a proof of it—that out of several thousand pages of evidence about four hundred pages only are relevant and have any bearing on the charges brought against the hon. ex-Minister. These enquiries before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, cost the country and the members more labour and money than an enquiry before a Royal Commission or before a competent and an impartial judge could cost. The hon. members want the country and this House to believe, that the Conservative party of the Province of Quebec dread the charges brought against the hon. Postmaster General, and want at all cost to burke this enquiry into the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario. Mr. Speaker, we do not want to burke this enquiry as the hon. member for Montmagny said. We are the majority in the Committee on Privileges and Elections. We want to give fair-play to the hon. Minister before an impartial judge who has nothing more to do with politics. We want to give fair-play to the hon. members of the left, so that they may prove their accusations. When this enquiry shall have been done, a report shall he made to the House, and the House will judge, the House will not have to complain that the committee composed of a Conservative majority has stifled pertinent investigation and suppressed questions put to the witnesses in the course of the enquiry. On the contrary it will have, within the strict limit of procedure, the right to put all pertinent questions bearing on the accusations brought against the hon. Postmaster General. But, Mr. Speaker, before trying an individual an investigation is made. If last year the Government had listened to all the complaints made by the hon. members of the left, either against the Ministers or the Government, or against members of the Conservative party, that session would not yet be over. The hon. members could not be exhausted. They would incessantly have new charges to make, after a five or six months enquiry, against a Minister. New charges would only have to be made, and the House would be kept at work permanently. I know that the hon. members of the Opposition go before the people and blame the Government for spending the public money. They, nevertheless, find the means to cause hundreds of thousands of dollars to be spent, either in useless investigations or in debates equally futile in this House. Well, the Government has shown wisdom in saving the House and the members the annoyance of spending the summer here, and in saving the country the expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars which have been spent to satisfy the spite of the left. I have the hope that the enquiry into the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario will be full and complete before the commission which will be chosen by the Government. And in the meanwhile the House will proceed with the legislation, and when the enquiry is finished—if it is not this session it will be for the next—the hon. members of the Opposition will have the opportunity to discuss the report of the Royal Commission. But if the evidence which shall he brought before the Royal Commission is not satisfactory, I do not see how the hon. members of the left, who have such damaging proofs in their hands, could make them good before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. For, as one of the hon. members of the Opposition said, this committee is largely composed of political opponents. The hon. member for Montmagny declared awhile ago, that he was confident that a great number of Conservative members were honest enough to judge with impartiality the case of the Postmaster General. I regret, Mr. Speaker, not to be able to return the compliment, for, if he has confidence in his political opponents he should have still more in a tribunal which has nothing to do with politics. Mr. Speaker, I would have been sorry if the Government had refused an investigation, although the charge made by the hon. member for West Ontario, be not precise in its terms. The hon. members who want an investigation made before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, speak of the hon. Postmaster General as of a man already convicted and condemned. Had these members the slightest notion of justice and impartiality—that sum of justice and impartiality which they hope to meet with in their opponents—they would exhibit less violence, since they have the certitude of establishing their charges by unimpeachable proofs. Mr. Speaker, I will leave unnoticed the provocations of the hon. members for Rouville and Montmagny, and their attacks upon our party. These members derisively designate us under the name of "the honest people's party." The same could not be said of their party, for, neither derisively or otherwise, will it ever be called the honest people's party. Under this style never will the Liberal party be designated. The verdict rendered at the last general election in the Province of Quebec, shows what degree of confidence the people have in the honesty of the cause of those who have been the nurslings and the disciples of the Mercier Government, of that Government which has exhausted all the resources of the province to return men who would support the hon. leader of the Opposition and carry him into power, in order that, together, they may be in a position to sack the public treasury, as they had that of the Province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, my fear is not that they will reach power for awhile, if they count on the Province of Quebec to give them a majority. That province has had enough of the misdeeds of the Mercier Government, supported by the friends of the Liberals in this House. That province has had enough of the allies of the gentlemen of the Opposition. The Province of Quebec has had enough of these men so easily scandalized by the faults, alleged or real, of their political opponents, and who have no reproach for the guilty in their own ranks. It has had too much of them to ever give anew its confidence to the nurslings and disciples of the regime which it has driven out of power.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman who has preceded me has introduced into this debate a number of considerations wholly foreign to the question actually submitted to this House. I do not intend to follow him on that ground and will simply say to him: If you have any accusations to make against any member on this side, take the responsibility of them like a man of courage, and I am certain that in such a case we will not have recourse to the special pleading indulged in by the speakers support-

ing the Government. Much has been said about Mr. Mercier and to hear the gentlemen of the other side, one would think that it was not the Postmaster General who was accused, but rather the ex-First Minister of the Province of Quebec. Sir, the acts of Mr. Mercier do not come within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. What concerns the Parliament of Canada is sufficient for us to consider, without attending to the provinces which can take care of themselves. I will call the attention of our opponents to the impropriety of attacking men who are not here to defend themselves, and who to-day are disarmed. Do they imagine that by using such means of defence they can alter public opinion? I accuse Peter of a political crime. They answer, Paul is guilty to the same extent, and they resume their seats proud of the magnificent reply. What we have to ask ourselves to-day, is, whether if the accusation made against the Postmaster General is grave enough to call for an investigation, and whether the Government is justified in refusing such an investigation on the original charge? What is the accusation? The member for West Ontario charges the Postmaster General with having drawn for election purposes, subsidies voted to the Lake St. John and the Temiscouata Railways—subsidies voted while he was a Minister of the Crown, and which he afterwards caused the companies in question to return to him to corrupt the electorate of the district of Quebec. The charges state:

"That during the elections of 1887 the sum of $100,000 of the subsidies to the Lake St. John Railroad was obtained at the request and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, and fraudulently expended in twenty-two counties in the Province of Quebec, and the accuser takes upon himself to prove that this system has been in operation since 1882, and that it was continued and at work until the general elections of 1891."

The gravity of the charge and its preciseness is at once seen. The Postmaster General has been a Minister since 1882. During this period, the companies already referred to applied to the Government for a grant of subsidies; the Minister uses his influence to obtain them, they are granted, and a part of the money thus granted finds its way into the hands of the Minister who distributes it to corrupt the electorate. The charge does not state that the Postmaster General stole the money, it is true. It allows that he gave it to his friends, who, in return for services rendered, gave him back a part of it. The accusation means this, or it means nothing, and drawn up as it is, it charges an abuse of confidence which is criminal from a legal and moral standpoint. The Postmaster General has denied the charge. Of course the accused pleads not guilty, but that plea is always accepted subject to verification, and I do not believe the accused Minister should be made an exception to the general rule. The charge is clear, precise, and leaves no opening for any subterfuge, yet the Government, through the Minister of Justice, refuses to investigate the original charge and substitutes a resolution of its own, on the pretext that it is too vague, and pretending that the crime, if crime there be, does not reach the Postmaster General in his quality as member of this House; that the Privileges and Elections Committee is a tribunal which is too partial; that the charge is too old; the Minister of Justice pleads an exception to the form to which he would not subscribe in a court of justice, and to which, indeed, a third class lawyer would not subscribe. The charge is too vague. Such is not the opinion of one of the Ministers who declared that it tended to dishonour his colleague; and such is not the opinion of ministerial papers, such as the Montreal *Star*, the Quebec *Chronicle*, the *Evénement*, of Quebec, which proclaim its gravity and demand the enquiry. The charge is too old and does not reach the accused as a member of this House! I do not know what the late member for Quebec West and the hon. member for Three Rivers must think of this declaration. If we notice the charge made by Mr. Tarte last year, we see that the ex-member for Quebec West is accused as far back as the year 1882 till 1890, as is shown by the concluding paragraph of the different charges, which is as follows:—That from the year 1883 to 1890, both inclusive, the said Thomas McGreevy received from Larkin, Connolly & Co., and from his brother, R. H. McGreevy, for the considerations above indicated a sum of about $200,000. "From 1883 to 1890." It would have been as easy last session to reply to Mr. Tarte that his charge did not reach the hon. member for Quebec West, since Parliament, having dissolved in 1891, he was by the fact absolved of the political crimes which have driven him to private life, and I ask why the Government did not last year take the ground which it takes now? Is it by chance that there are in the Cabinet, Ministers who possess secrets which must be kept inviolate, and which it would be dangerous to reveal, and others who are not in possession of any secrets? All appearances go towards conveying that impression. The virtue of sacrifice is evidently not the Postmaster General's and he appears determined not to allow himself to be immolated as his other colleague was—I do not blame him for defending his character, but what must be said of the Government which makes itself answerable for the faults of the Minister. Yet fine promises were made, and he must have been touching the Minister of Justice at the great Halifax meeting when he declared that Mr. Abbott's Government was determined to punish evil where evil would be found to exist, that the guilty, great or small, would receive the chastisement deserved. I can imagine the astonishment of his audience, if instead of speaking thus, he had pleaded, as he has done in this House. The public in face of the fact that its property had been stolen, would not have been satisfied with arguments over legal technicalities. But, then, several bye-elections were to be held, and it was necessary to convince the public that the Government into which new blood had been infused, this strong Government which had just been formed, was more virtuous than that which had preceded it, and that the First Minister who had organized and put through the Pacific affair had done penance for his old sin, and had been completely converted in his old age. But the elections are over, a new mandate has been confirmed for four years, and when we will accuse the Government of having compounded with prevaricating Ministers, we shall be answered that we are wanting in loyalty because we oppose the diverting of railway subsidies from their destination by Ministers of the Crown. For this past fourteen years, governments have used railway subsidies to make up election funds, those indispensable sinews of war, so seems to think one of the Ministers. We have seen parties entirely impecunious, float companies, apply to

Parliament, obtain charters and construct railroads, parties who did not subscribe one cent of capital, getting appointed to the presidency of companies some fine day selling out their charter and retiring from business, after having secured incomes out of the public funds, and having given nothing to the public in return. This policy has caused the loss to the country of millions which have been absorbed by such companies as I have described, and which have also served to strengthen the faltering faith of a number of electors in this Dominion. We have been able to learn something of these operations only when the friends have quarelled among themselves, and yet, though in that way but a small corner of the veil has been lifted, it has been given us to get a glimpse of the gigantic corruption which has ravaged the country for a number of years. When we discover any of these frauds and ask for the help of those in authority we are answered by arguments which are an insult to the intellect of this House. It is pretended by the leader of the House that because of violent political struggles it is almost impossible for a committee such as that of Privileges and Elections to render an impartial judgment. I admit that it is difficult to cause the disappearance of party spirit, but I ask who is to profit by the partiality complained of in this case? Certainly not the hon. gentleman who has made the charge. The majority of the committee will be composed of friends of the accused Minister, who, as everybody knows, will do all they can to free him of the accusations made against him, and the accused should be happy to be judged by his own friends and not by a more impartial tribunal. For my part, I am opposed, though to our disadvantage, perhaps, I am opposed to the idea enunciated of transferring to a Royal Commission composed of judges, for instance, the investigation into charges against a member of this House. Parliament is the natural guardian of its own honour, and to it belongs the right to decide who has a right to sit in it and who has not. I am opposed to Parliament depriving itself of a right which belongs to it absolutely. The members themselves are the natural judges where questions affecting the honour of the House are concerned. Moreover, as has unhappily been shown, judges acting in such cases, depart from their functions, and by meddling with our political disputes, lose the prestige of impartiality which is necessary to them. Besides, judges appointed by the executive are under the control of the executive and should not be called upon to judge the acts of those who compose the executive. Their functions are defined—let us not make them depart from these functions. The authority which appoints judges is that which grants or refuses the advancement, which is the aim of the functionaries of the judiciary as well as of the administration. This is sufficient for a judge, unless he be proof against all suggestions which individual interest may inspire, to feel that he is not completely independent, and to allow himself sometimes to render services, when judgments inspired by justice alone should be rendered. For these reasons, I am opposed unless under extraordinary circumstances which some particular case might justify, to the submitting of such enquiries to Royal Commissions composed of judges. A very singular theory has been advanced by one of the Ministers, the Minister of Public Works. It is that to justify the injury, on the charges as drawn up by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), it would have been necessary for the member making the accusation to have charged the Postmaster General with conspiracy to favour the companies referred to. But the hon. gentleman must know that conspiracy can seldom be shown by formal proof. It has never entered into the mind of any one that parties who conspire to defraud either draw up authenticated statements of their crime, or leave behind them incriminating evidence. This is so much the case that the authorities who have treated this subject of criminal law, say that "conspiracy is inferred from facts proven and from circumstances." It would be practically impossible to otherwise prove conspiracy. The same hon. gentleman is unwilling to allow the holding of the trial of the Conservative party with reference to the general elections of 1887. This admission is so admirably frank that it is important to note it, but I do not see in that a very strong argument to prevent the enquiry. Our adversaries often boast that they have made the country what it is. We believe if Canada has progressed during the past quarter of a century, it has done so without the aid of Governments and since our opponents have governed almost without interruption and corruption exists, to them particularly is due the fact that our population is inoculated with it. It is useless to dwell on the past, and notwithstanding my conviction that the gentlemen on the other side are the great sinners, they should in future, if they have not in the past, try to stamp out that great social danger and try to avoid the political corruption in the future which has existed in the past. Political corruption has this which is peculiar to itself. It purchases with money suffrages which should be accorded to confidence alone, and as a means to achieve its ends, it sells in the same way for money public appointments and contracts which merit and ability alone should obtain. The consequence is that we have no longer the free expression of the opinion of the majority of the electors. Our Government is no longer that of the majority, but that of the minority; the constitution is violated. The election of a representative in many counties resembles more a bargain than a free choice. If the evil continues to grow in the same proportion, soon principles and discussion will be out of the question. A candidate will not be asked if he possesses the necessary qualifications, but if his purse is well filled and if he has an open hand. The bag of dollars will be the ram with which all doors will be broken in and consciences stormed. Deep research is not necessary to show that such a condition of things constitutes an imminent danger to our institutions. It is the very negation of representative government. For all these reasons it is proper to ask that those traffickers be driven from public life who would make of politics a bazaar and of our country a mart.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in the motion of the hon. member for West Ontario, mention is made of the County of St. Maurice. I wish to state from my place in the House, that at no time when I was a candidate for election, either in 1887 or 1891, did I receive either directly or indirectly, a single cent from the hon. Postmaster General. This statement may have its importance under the circumstances, since my county

is mentioned in the motion offered by the hon. member for West Ontario. The hon. member for Montmagny made a comical reference to the members from the district of Three Rivers. This district, Mr. Speaker, is represented in this House by three Conservatives and two Liberals. The latter are the members for Maskinongé and Nicolet; the Conservatives, Sir Hector Langevin, Mr. Carignan and myself. I may add that when I have the honour of addressing this House, I do so under a mandate entrusted to me by as intelligent a county as there is in the Province of Quebec: that the electors of this county are as honest as those who returned the hon. member for Montmagny. I will also add, Mr. Speaker, that my electors do not like the light of the hon. member for Montmagny; and the reason for it is very simple, for his light is no better than that which comes from elsewhere.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Your county is going to be snuffed out.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) If my county goes out of existence, it will not be by the act of the electors, but by effect of the Bill now before the House, the Gerrymandering Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be an injustice to put an end to the existence of the County of St. Maurice, and to reduce to four members the representation of the district of Three Rivers. If the county is preserved, I am sure to come back to the House, and to be entrusted with the mandate of the electors by as large a majority as I had before. Mention was made of the religious lights shining from Three Rivers. All I have to say is that such light is well worth the light that comes from below Quebec. The motion of the hon. member for West Ontario is out of the question, for should it be adopted by the House we would have to spend the whole summer here. The House will remember what took place last year. In the Tarte-McGreevy matter, the accuser has not had the courage to be a candidate again in his county, and an honest man against whom nothing could be proven was made to suffer. The gentlemen of the Opposition who to-day are so adverse to Royal Commissions have not always been of the same mind. They all approved the Royal Commission which was appointed to drive out from the Legislative Council of Quebec the Legislative Councillor Mr. Lavallée. On that occasion, the Liberals did not go to the Legislative Council for an enquiry into the matter.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Mr. Lavallée had resigned.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) I know all about that would-be resignation, which was signed in a bar room at Joliette.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) A dubious compliment to Mr. Lavallée.

Mr. DESAULNIERS. (Translation.) When these gentlemen are in the Opposition their shouts are loud against the extravagance of their opponents; they do their best to scare the people into giving them the power, and promise to do better than their predecessors. We have heard these gentlemen cry against the squanderings of the Conservatives. The people gave them a chance to fulfil their promises, and what did we see, Mr. Speaker? We have seen them, to the shame of the Province of Quebec, drag into the mire the prestige of the province. We have seen these men trade in public contracts, speculate on everything. The people drove them out of power, and to-day they come and throw mud on a French Canadian Minister. They were successful against one Minister last year, and this year they want to do the same with another. Should an enquiry be granted, they would be at the same game again next year. The hon. Minister of Public Works would perhaps have his turn. The public would end by saying that the Conservatives in Ottawa resemble the Liberals in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. FRASER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BOWELL. Surely the hon. member cannot be in earnest in desiring to adjourn the debate at this time of night, unless he proposes to keep it up for a number of days. I am sure if there are any others who desire to speak, the House will listen to them very attentively and patiently. But that we should adjourn before it is 12 o'clock is something unusual on a question of this kind.

Mr. LAURIER. What does the leader of the House say to this proposition?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid we cannot agree to it. It would be inconvenient to a large number of members.

Mr. FRASER. I had hoped that the motion would prevail, because I was anxious to hear from our friends opposite some further reason why the course of procedure they have proposed should be assented to by this House. I think the speeches delivered upon this subject by the Ministers will make nice reading, in view of the further proceedings in this House, of the speeches delivered on the amendment moved by the Minister of Militia; I am sure this reading will gladden the hearts of all true Conservatives in this country. I congratulate the Government very much that they have had to fall back on the redoubtable Minister of War, who, when he found the Government in the last ditch, boldly, like the Napoleonic captain that he is, came to their relief and moved this amendment to get them out of the difficulty. It was what might be expected of such a gentleman. His previous training in that office, if only for a short time, made him feel that it was necessary in the interest of his party that he should lead the forlorn hope by such a resolution. Now, Sir, it is very strange that we should have this amendment made by the Government. I must say that I am in full sympathy with the remarks made by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll). It strikes me as somewhat remarkable tha thon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious for a vote. Where are the men who have prided themselves on having the instincts of true Conservatives as to what ought to be done in this country to put down the wrongs that exist? Where was the voice of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn)? Where was he when this brave battle was being fought? Did he rise, as every man in the country expected he would, and as I believe the beatings of his own manly heart prompted him to do, and stand up once for all to see that justice was done to this country? Now, I lay it down, first, that this Parliament should give to no tribunal that which rightly belongs to itself. The question of a

man's character does not concern this Parliament. That matter must be decided by his constituents alone. But his conduct as a member of Parliament, and everything he does in connection with the trust confided in him by his constituents, is a matter which concerns this Parliament, and of which no other power can take cognisance. We are asked to give to men who are nameless, so far as this Parliament is concerned, the care of the dignity and honour of this House. When these charges were made by a responsible member of this House, was the hon. Minister against whom they are made afraid of an investigation? Would not we expect that the hon. member would rise in his place and say: You can pursue these charges as far as you like, prove them as deeply as you may, for so firmly entrenched is my name in honour, that nothing this Parliament can investigate will cast any blot on it. But that is not the position the hon. member has taken. Is it to be said that any member of Parliament is going to conceal himself behind a Royal Commission when Parliament says that these charges should be investigated in the light of day? I was waiting with some anxiety to hear from other gentlemen opposite; I was waiting to hear the aged members speak and give their experience of past Parliaments. I was anxious to hear that hon. member who sits next to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCarthy). I expected he would rise and give us the great benefit of his legal experience as to what ought to be done. We are in this country very unhappy in the position in which our knights are found. Why was not this thought of last winter, when the charges were made against that hon. gentleman who sits now before me (Sir Hector Langevin)? Why was it not thought that a Royal Commission was the fitting method of investigating his shortcomings? Why was he subjected to the strain of a parliamentary enquiry and, according to the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, an unfair enquiry, at that time? It appears to me that it is rather unfortunate for a man to be a knight in this Parliament. Whether or not the mere fact that a man becomes a knight puts him in a position to do that which he ought not to do, I know not; whether he has acquired this distinctive privilege, of making night dark, I know not; whether he has acquired his virtues before he is knighted, I know not; but this much I do know, that those upon whom Her Majesty has conferred these favours seem to have become beknighted afterwards. It only remains for the leader of this House now, who is not in his place, who seems to be the standing counsel for his brother knights when they get into difficulties, to say that this Parliament shall be prevented from making that enquiry. Now, is this, after all, a matter of proper enquiry? Are the charges specific; would they be subject—and I appeal to gentlemen who are of the same profession as myself—would they be subject to demurrer in a court? Would they be such a statement of facts in an ordinary case as would compel a defendant to answer? Surely we are not going to stand upon the method of our going in Parliament; surely hon. gentlemen will not say that we are to be debarred from proceeding on account of the method proposed. Surely this country, from one end to the other, has heard enough already about the methods that prevail in Parliament. Are we still further to give the electorate of this Dominion to understand that

matters that are considered wrong among honest men outside, matters that an hon. member outside would not commit except with shame, shall find not only defenders in Parliament, but those who will say that the charges are not worthy of investigation? I hold that the method proposed of sending this matter to a Royal Commission is simply one the Government have taken for the time being in order to avoid investigation, in the hope that finally they will escape it altogether, and in the hope that they will be able to make the people believe they are honest men. There is only one way of meeting a difficulty like this, and that is by having it probed to the bottom by Parliament. Do hon. gentlemen think that all the facts elicited last winter would have been brought to light if the method now proposed had been pursued? Could the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) have discovered the entity of Bancroft by the method now proposed? I repeat there is only one method of dealing with a question of this kind. When an hon. member rises in his place and makes a statement such as the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) made, surely Parliament is not going to feel it to be unworthy of its dignity to enquire into the character of its members? A small matter indeed! Although hon. gentlemen talked at the outset that the charges were not specific enough—and it will be remembered that this was the only defence offered in the first place—now they consider them specific enough, after omitting two or three statements. This is a very strange position for hon. gentlemen to opposite to take. If the Minister of Justice considered the charge not sufficiently specific, what can be thought of the action of the Minister of Militia, when in the amendment he has proposed with the approval of his party, he admits that the charges are sufficiently specific to warrant the appointment of a Royal Commission? It will not be forgotten that such an investigation will proceed on the assumption that the Government has discovered, not that this Parliament has discovered, that this was a matter that should be sent to a Royal Commission, for the very chapter under which this proceeding is taken says that Government makes the enquiry, not Parliament. I am not ready to give the Government or any other body the privilege of enquiring into that which we have a right to enquire into, and at some time, if we forget what is the proper action in this matter, we shall find our power usurped. Will any hon. member fear an investigation by Parliament? Not if he is innocent. Let it not be forgotten that Parliament is now in session. The act under which we are now asked to proceed gives power to the Government, if anything wrong occurs during recess or in the administration of government, to order an enquiry to be held, and the matters investigated fully; but this does not apply to a matter like the present one, which occurs on the floor of the House, is not related to the government of the country, but to the character of a member of this House and the methods pursued during the election. It is not even suggested that the Act was framed for any such purpose. Does any man think Parliament ever dreamed of giving to any commission, and that a nameless commission, such power? I am sure we would not grant such power. Much more than that, it must not be forgotten that Parliament has in the past enquired into these questions here. I cannot place too much stress on

the fact of the investigations which took place last winter. Does it follow, as I think it must follow, that hon. gentlemen opposite, having allowed the investigations last year, have discovered that it was a dangerous experiment, because they did not wish the light of day to be thrown on their conduct, and accordingly they are determined that the light of day shall not be thrown on their conduct now, and are determined to prevent an investigation that will reveal them in the same light as last year? Are they afraid that the people are beginning to feel that nothing but the fullest investigation should take place, and that they will be able to bring the people to believe that by proposing the method of a Royal Commission they have shown themselves to be desirous of ferreting out wrong? I observed in an illustrated paper a cartoon, which I am sure anticipated the action of the Government to-day. It represented the Premier sitting as judge, the Minister of Justice acting as prosecuting attorney; the men who last year were found to be guilty of crimes for which, if committed in private life, they would have been sent to goal, were the jury, and a poor boy not much higher than this desk was standing in the criminal box and was the only criminal prosecuted. Did this cartoon anticipate the action of the Government and indicate the spirit in which the Government has acted? I am appealing to hon. members who in their inmost soul feel this is not the right way to prosecute the enquiry. I commisserate some hon. gentlemen opposite, who with their high-toned ideas of public and private life, would freely condemn such an act if it occurred in private life; yet such are the depths of party feeling that men who would scorn in private life to protect any offender are ready to protect some man or men here in Parliament to-day. There are hon. gentlemen who I suppose would vote for this amendment to whom we could entrust our honour, whose word would be good, who would do no dishonourable action, and yet they are forced by party exigencies to support the methods proposed by the Government, fearing that their party friends would have to suffer if an investigation were instituted as proposed. Parliament has no right to lay aside its own conscience in trying the conduct of members or their acts as public servants or as trustees of the people who sent them here. Nor will it be forgotten that this change of base is brought about without any regard for such cases as that covered by the resolution. I am sure all hon. gentlemen were very much surprised when the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) made the statements, to observe the manner in which it was discussed on the Treasury benches; they will remember the ringing cheers which greeted the Minister of Justice as he rose and announced that the charges were not sufficiently specific, and in order to strengthen his position he mentioned that for some indefinite period of time the hon. gentleman did not happen to be a member of this House, because he was seeking re-election. Those same hon. gentlemen opposite cheered lustily when the Minister of Militia announced that there was sufficient in the statement with which to institute a Royal Commission. A few days ago there was not sufficient in the statement to cause it to receive any attention, and yet we are now informed that the Government are ready to appoint a Royal Commission to make enquiry—the last refuge of parliamentarians—an investigation which might besmirch their reputation and expose a Minister, as others have been exposed in this House. I contend that we should follow the methods pursued by this Parliament. Perhaps the House will permit me to refer again to the investigations of last year. No one would suppose the results that have occurred would occur. Why? Because hon. gentlemen rose and denied the charges, said there was nothing in them, and could not be supported by evidence. Those hon. gentlemen thought the investigation would not prove that which subsequently it did prove. Now, Sir, if that method was proper when pursued in regard to one knight; it ought to be equally proper in regard to the other, nor will the denial of the Postmaster General, who is not in his place, and rightly so, to-night, suffice to lead this country to believe that there is no foundation for the charges. I am sure that hon. gentlemen will understand from what happened here last year that the court appointed by Parliament was not only a competent court, but that it was the very best court to investigate such matters. As was very well said by one of the hon. gentlemen who preceded, what have hon. gentlemen opposite to fear from a majority of their own friends, with five Government supporters to three Reformers, or a like proportion in a larger number? What has the hon. gentleman who has to be tried to fear? The hon. gentlemen opposite say you cannot have a fair trial from a parliamentary committee, but I fear that some of these hon. gentlemen themselves believe that the evidence would be of such a character that they themselves would stand in an unenviable light before the country unless they opposed this motion. They, therefore, want to shirk the unwholesome responsibility, so far as they are concerned, by throwing it upon other shoulders, so that they will not have to meet the difficulty. I claim that this is not the method that should be pursued in this case. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said that the gentlemen on this side of the House were disappointed. There is no doubt about it that we are disappointed, but we are not disappointed in the same sense as he would have us understand. We had vainly hoped that the statements made by the Premier and by other Ministers, that this country was going to be rid of the evil which is eating into the very vitals of the body politic, were true in fact. We had hoped that the promises in these orations, made perhaps under the influence of a large crowd, whom they expected to gain, were going to be carried into effect when Parliament met. But, Sir, are we come to this now, that when a Minister of the Crown makes a statement to the effect that if any person has any charge to make, and which he is prepared to prove, the matter would be investigated, that we are to suppose the Minister never meant it? Are we not bound to suppose that they were honest in their statements? Did ever any man think that these Ministers would have not only to eat their own words, but to eat themselves? We accepted in good faith the statements they made, and we came here anxious to assist them in this good work, and the very statements these Ministers made acknowledged the fact that wrongs did exist. They themselves, from the investigation that was made last year, were forced to conclude that wrongs did exist in the public service, and are they not ready now to carry out the promises they

made? Do they fear enquiry? Ah, Mr. Speaker, that is just the difficulty. The light thrown by Parliament upon the methods pursued by their friends is not just the light they want. I am sure, however, that if my hon. friend the Minister of Militia was left to his own guidance in this matter he would say: Though it should strike my nearest friend, let us have this investigation; though it should strike my follower, whom I love most dearly, let the enquiry be made. I can understand if hon. gentlemen opposite said that all questions of this kind should be submitted to a stated tribunal already in existence, but as was suggested, rather playfully perhaps by the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), what if the Government should appoint a man on this commission in whom some people in this country are wicked enough not to have confidence, for instance, the County Court judge for London; or, what if they should appoint some prospective judge, some follower of their own who expects to be raised to the bench? Is it to be thought that this person would be altogether unclouded when sitting on the bench investigating this matter? Does any man suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite who shirk the responsibility now are going to be very particular about the appointment they make to this tribunal? Do you think these gentlemen, when they know that it is the only method by which they can escape an investigation, and realizing as they do the results that will follow, do you suppose that they will be very nice as to whom they will appoint on this Royal Commission? Does any one suppose that they will seek a gentleman who will be above suspicion? I do not believe that after the exhibition here to-night any one would be simple enough to believe that. Mr. Speaker, there is another point to which I wish to call the attention of the House. It was attempted to be shown that in the case of Parnell a similar course was pursued as is now suggested from the Treasury benches, but I would not insult the intelligence of this House by saying that there was any similarity between these two cases. The matter referred to in the Parnell case was a statement made in the conducting of the case, and as nice questions of law arose as to how far a counsel could go in the conducting of the case, the whole question arose there. I will call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that in England such a course as is proposed here would never have been pursued. One hon. gentleman on the other side of the House asked us for a similar case that happened in England, and the answer came that no such case could exist in England. Only the other day a member of the Imperial Parliament in his private capacity as a solicitor treated some trust funds in a manner that did not bring the return they ought to bring to the owners, and did Parliament send that case to the courts? That was the proper place for it, I suppose, if the arguments of the Government and their supporters here to-night are correct. Did Parliament tell the accusers to proceed and get a judgment against this man? Not at all. Parliament of its own motion took the question up and they expelled the member.

An hon. MEMBER. There was a judgment of the court.

Mr. FRASER. Certainly the matter went into the court, but Parliament did not let it rest there, and they took cognizance of the fact that the man was dealing as a solicitor in a way that he should not. Will it be said that the taking of $100,000—if the charge is correct, and I am assuming for the present that it is—and the using of this money of the people in debauching the electors of this country, is a matter into which we can have no investigation, or if we do have an investigation that it should be before a tribunal of which Parliament and the people of this country know absolutely nothing? I am certain that the very statements made by the Ministers, to the effect that in their righteous indignation they were rising to purge this country from the evils to which it had been exposed, did more than anything else to lead the people to believe that they were in earnest, and caused them to strengthen the hands of government that they might have a strong majority in purging this Government of the excrescences that have grown upon it. How have the Government to-night answered the loyal response of the people of this country? In the first instance, they have answered it by simply stating that they would not have any enquiry into this matter at all, and in the second place, that they would consent to a trial by a Royal Commission instead of a trial before the representatives of the people. If I do not misjudge the people of this country that will not suffice for them. I believe that our people are thoroughly in earnest about having honest government, and despite all the authorities produced by Government supporters here, they will not take such a proposition as an answer to their demand, and they will not assume the fact that a Royal Commission which is going to be appointed some time in the future will be of any more benefit towards purging the country of these evils than will be the appointment of the Royal Commission in bringing about prohibition. Reference to Royal Commissions are a well-known method of shelving questions that are disagreeable to gentlemen who happen to occupy the Treasury benches, and I contend that the suggestion of the Government was not a proper way in which to meet these serious charges, nor is it proper, so far as our own individual dignity is concerned, or so far as the best interests of the country are concerned. It will not do for hon. gentlemen opposite to shirk their duty by naming a Royal Commission, and if I mistake not the people of Canada, they will not accept such a move on the part of the Government as satisfactory. If we place side by side the speeches made by the members of the Government a few days ago and the speeches made to-day we see at once their change of front in this matter. I would like to hear from hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches who spoke on this question before some remarks now on this amendment. I know their well-known ability to tack to the wind as closely as possible. Let it not be forgotten that the Government are not treating the question in this manner because they think it right. The indignation of this country, aroused by the fact that they were trying to burke this enquiry, has brought the Government to their senses, even so far as to induce them to move this amendment. I believe we would not have even this, but that they saw from the utterances of the press, the utterances of prominent men, and I have no doubt also from the number of letters they received, that something had to be done; and I have no doubt that in this good work some hon. gentlemen who sit at their backs had some

part. I have no doubt that conscientious convictions dawned in upon a number of gentlemen on the other side. I have no doubt that the force which compelled the Government to act in this way came from such high-spirited gentlemen as the hon. member for Toronto and others, who felt that, whatever happened, they could not be brought down to the common level of saying there should be no investigation. What would the loyal people of Ontario say if the champion of their rights condoned the faults of Sir Adolphe Caron? Methinks that the gentle tap of that hon. gentleman upon the shoulder of the Minister of Justice, and that silvery voice of his brought them to their senses, as from the well-spring of his great soul he warned them of the country's desire. I stated a little while ago that I regretted very much that these thunderbolts from a clear sky always fell on a knight. I would like if we had the luxury of a commoner struck sometimes, because it would show that after all we are mortal, like the knights. But when a matter of this kind is to be enquired into, it is the duty of Parliament to carry on the enquiry in a constitutional manner. Whatever the result of this matter may be, I am sure that the hon. gentlemen who are now leading the House in the way they are doing will regret it, and I am sure that when the history of Parliament comes to be written the fact that they have not adopted the best method of trying this case will be set down against them. After all, this is not misspent time. We talk of tariffs, of railways, of the business of the country. Shall it be said that the fact that men do wrong with public money, using it for bribing constituencies, is not a greater question than all these questions combined? What is going to exalt any nation but righteousness?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. I am glad that a response comes from hon. gentlemen opposite. I know that their lives and conduct are in harmony with that sentiment. Are we going to build this country upon a foundation of this kind? Are we going to build it upon the investment of public money in purchasing votes? Are we going to make this country strong by making its electorate weak? Are we going to have a manly electorate in this country, citizens of whom any country might be proud, by bribing them with the very money extorted from them by the tariff now in existence? It is bad enough for them to have to pay more for everything they have to use in consequence of the tariff; but when, added to that, their very poverty is made sport of with the money taken from them, surely hon. gentlemen will not say that they are building solid and deep the foundations of this country. You may talk of loyalty. The only loyalty the people want is loyalty to what is right and good; and all the buncombe loyalty of all the so-called loyalists in this country will not make this country strong if its foundations are not laid in principles of right and good. We have adopted not only the methods of taxation but the villainous system of bribing the electorate which follows naturally in the wake of the system of protection prevailing in the United States, and I have heard men say unblushingly that this is all right. Why, Sir, last session, at a committee meeting, I heard a Privy Councillor rise and state that from contractors and those who profited from the tariff he would ask for money for election purposes, on the ground that the Government had helped them. We shall never get out of this slough except in one way, by investigating in Parliament matters of this kind—not in a room where this man or that man may go, where this or that reporter may be present, but here before the members of this House, sent here to see that the government of the country is carried on by righteous methods, before men sent here to report for the press in all parts of the Dominion, and where Parliament can see that honest methods are adopted. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite themselves feel that the method they propose is not the correct method. Now, I am not going to detain the House longer, except to say that I regret very much that the Government have taken their present course. I am not here by any means to say that I desire that everything contained in these charges shall be proven correct. For myself, I would much prefer that it should be proved there is no truth in them. I am sure that every man with a desire to see this country not only stand well in the hearts of its own citizens, but gain credit abroad, must want to see the Government adopt honest methods. I am sure that no true Canadian will want to see these charges proved to be true. Surely we have received enough chastisement. Surely our name has gone abroad, not with the greatest possible praise: and I for my part would much prefer that these charges should turn out to be unfounded. But the very fact that the beginning of the investigation is met in this manner compels me to feel that there must be much more in these charges than the hon. gentleman would like to admit. I cannot help thinking that this method of shelving them is the very best proof that there is fear somewhere that they are going to strike not only the hon. Minister himself, but others with him. What of it? Is it not better that we should have it understood that whenever a matter of this kind comes before Parliament it shall be investigated? All honest men should join and say, we must make a new departure. Are old methods to continue? Or are we going to let our people understand that such things must now come to an end? You may mock at these things until the people come after a time to think that they are right, and the sneer and the laugh at those who want this country to be established on the best foundations is the reply that we shall get. Why, I read of a gentleman stating that he was running for Parliament, and that he was elected by simply boasting that the whole investigation last year did not affect a single vote in his constituency. God help a constituency that is not affected by wrong-doing. It is well represented by a man who would boast that nothing of that kind would affect it. Are we to stand up and condone these offences? I am sure that there are hon. gentlemen opposite who would not, but who are forced to do it. For my part, I am going to vote against this amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear." I may say "hear, hear," when they vote for it. I am ready to have my vote against it canvassed while the hon. gentlemen vote for it. I am ready that, not only before the people of this country now, but any time hereafter, it shall be said I voted against this resolution. Let hon. gentlemen opposite take

the glory of voting in favour of it. Let them think that the "hear, hear" of the present is going to absolve them from the righteous consequences of their act—they are welcome to it. I can understand the policy that brings out their "hear, hears" of the present, but in their cooler moments they may regret the course they have taken. We ought to vote against this amendment, because it is derogatory to Parliament that this matter should be investigated in any other method than by a committee of this House. I shall vote against it, because it is in the interests of the people that the money collected from them should be used honestly. I shall vote against it in the interests of the hon. gentleman himself who is charged, because I want to see a fair trial; and here, surrounded by his own friends, he cannot help having a fair trial. I want to see him make good his statement, if he can, that there is no truth in the charges. For all these reasons, I am going to vote against the amendment, and I trust, not looking at the matter in any individual spirit, not looking at it in the light of to-night or in the light of the Government that now exists, but in the light of the future of the country, we may here now say that if wrong exists this Parliament is independent enough to put it down, whether we strike high or low, and show the people that this Parliament knows no distinction, except that distinction of keeping our conduct in such matters in line with that of the great Parliament of the mother country. There it never entered the brain of Liberal or Tory to do that which would bring disgrace on their parliamentary institutions. During the recess an hon. Minister attempted to say that they were just as corrupt in England as they are here. Perhaps so, but they do not at least think so themselves, and it is no answer to these charges that we are not more corrupt than they. It is a poor method of defence to shield ourselves behind the backs of others in wrong doing. For ourselves, there is a straight line before us, which we should follow; and it would be well, if such things exist in England, and I do not believe they do, that we should lead them in progress in the right direction; and I am sure we shall best do that by voting down this amendment, by applying ourselves, as men sent here in the best interests of the people, to see that in this country nothing unjust exists without bringing to speedy trial the wrong-doer, whether he be in high or low places, whether he be in the Government or the Opposition ranks, so that the people will understand we are pleading their cause and acting in the best interests of all that is honourable and noble in this country.

Mr. COCKBURN. The hon. member for Guysborough has twice, in the course of his eloquent stump speech, been kind enough to ask me if I would guide him in his blindness and give him my views on the question before this House. At the same time, he has been so good as to say that he has great confidence in my integrity and honesty of purpose. I may say that, for the first time in our lives, the member for Guysborough and myself are united on the question of unrestricted reciprocity, as whatever kindly feelings he entertains towards me I reciprocate in the most unqualified manner. At the same time, he will allow that there may be difference of opinion in this matter. I may tell him that I consider that the charges preferred by the hon. member for West Ontario are indeed of a most serious character, and deserve the mature consideration of this House, whether that consideration be given directly by the House in the shape of a parliamentary Committee on Privileges and Elections, or whether the House may adopt another method leading to the same result. At the same time, I may state that I consider such enquiries, unless they are absolutely required by the public welfare, are doubly injurious to the public interests, as they tend to lessen the dignity of every member of this House, and tend, at the same time, to dull and blunt, and ultimately destroy, the moral sense of the electorate itself; and what may appear to hon. gentlemen on the other side as perhaps still worse, they inflict serious injury on our financial credit in the European market.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They should be investigated in the Senate, too.

Mr. COCKBURN. I will come to the Senate, and give the hon. gentleman the result before I am done with this matter. The denial made by the Postmaster General, his statement that these charges are false in every particular, is such a denial as would be accepted by all his friends and all those who know the gentleman best. His disclaimer, plain and unequivocal as it has been, while satisfactory to his friends, has apparently not been accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite; and in fact the hon. member for Guysborough went out of his way to cast an insult on the Postmaster General by stating, in his peculiar manner, that he for one was not prepared to receive any such declaration. Well, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite are not only not prepared to accept the statement of the Postmaster General, but are prepared to press this charge to its final issue, and to take full advantage, as they have a right to do, of the offer made publicly by the leader of this House during the bye-elections, that into whatever charges of wrong-doing which might be brought against any official or any member of Parliament the fullest investigation should be made, and the information used for the prosecution and punishment of the guilty. His words did credit to the hon. gentleman, and I think that we may at least be honest enough to admit that, from what we know of that gentleman, it is his desire and determination to carry out the promise thus made. The hon. member for West Ontario has stated from his seat in the House that he has assumed the great responsibility of making charges against one of his fellow members. I do not for a moment deny his right to do so. It is a right which every member enjoys, but he must distinctly understand that he does so at his own peril.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Justice says "no."

Mr. COCKBURN. I am astonished to hear the leader of Her Majesty's Opposition say "hear, hear" when I say that the hon. member for West Ontario makes those charges at his own peril, because if he is unable to show that in making them he had good ground, then, in the words of his leader, he is not fit to associate with gentlemen, and he is a person who ought to be expelled from this House.

Mr. EDGAR. That is right.

Mr. COCKBURN. Sir, mostly all the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario are, I must say, to my mind, sufficiently clear and specific to entitle him to demand an enquiry, either by the standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, or, if possible, by some other body more competent or at least equally competent. But I must confess, that when I came to paragraph 10 of these charges, and saw the cool proposal made that we should wade through twenty-two elections in the Province of Quebec in the year 1882, twenty-two elections in 1887, and twenty-two elections in 1891, or that we should try a total of sixty-six elections, together with the fifteen bye-elections which took place there, making a total collection of eighty-one elections that the hon. gentleman was kind enough to hand over to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the conclusion was forced on my mind that knowing as he did from his long parliamentary experience that no representative body with any respect for itself would grant such an enquiry, he was riding all the time for a fall, and was merely trying to force the Government to throw out these charges, simply because it was unable to accept them in bulk. When we reflect upon the powers of Parliament it ought to fill every member with a determination to live up to the powers entrusted to us. The powers of Parliament are transcendent and supreme. There is no fear of those powers being diminished. They are now embodied in Acts which are the results of long struggles. Parliament, it may be said, has power over everything. It had power during the reign of Henry VIII to alter the succession or to revise it, especially in reference to his children, Edward, Mary and Elizabeth. It had power to alter it again in the case of William and Mary. It has power to alter the constitution itself, as we see in the Act of Union, and also in regard to the triennial and septennial parliaments. As Delolme says: It has power to do anything except to make a man a woman or a woman a man. In fact, Queen Victoria herself, however much we may love and venerate her, has only a parliamentary title and reigns by virtue of a parliamentary statute. If these are the powers which Parliament possesses, we should be very careful how we exercise them, and therefore I cordially reciprocate the statement made by the leader of the Opposition the other day that, if these charges were lightly made, the man who made them should be expelled from the House. That was a sound doctrine, and one which should always be held. We are told that the charges are not specific. My friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says the specific charges have been omitted. Well, as far as I can see, it is the specific charges that have been retained, and it is this general fishing expedition which has been omitted. The hon. gentleman has kindly referred to the part I took in the Baie des Chaleurs enquiry. I will read to him the charge made in reference to that, and perhaps the hon. gentleman may be able to induce the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) to model his indictment upon it. It is honest, simple and straightforward, and, being honest, simple and straightforward, it has been attended with great and glorious results. It has revivified a province, and, if I had been tempted to take advantage of the course proposed by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), I could have brought up evidence to make the cheeks of gentlemen opposite pale before me; but I thought it my duty to confine myself to the sum of $175,000 which I said had been turned aside from the purpose for which it was intended; and although, in the enquiry, I came across any amount of evidence, I did not think it was my duty to convert Parliament into a moral sink or a moral sewer, but rather to leave it as a place where gentlemen could meet together and converse as gentlemen. I therefore refrained from bringing charges which I might have brought. If, however, our customs are to be changed, if this is no longer to be an assembly of gentlemen, but a place where we are to meet in order to bullyrag one another, I am quite willing to open up again the question of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and, if I do, some gentlemen on the other side, before I have done with them, will be in such a condition that their best friends will not know them. I said I would read the charge made before the committee which was entrusted with the investigation into the Baie des Chaleurs matter:

"That out of certain moneys, amounting to $280,000, authorized by the Government of the Province of Quebec to be paid to the company on account of the subsidies granted by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec in consideration of the construction and completion of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, a sum of money amounting to $175,000 had been improperly retained and improperly applied to purposes other than the construction and completion of the said road and having no connection therewith."

Mr. EDGAR. By whom?

Mr. COCKBURN. These were the words of the charge, and I think my hon. friends opposite will admit that the investigation was conducted, as far as its ends were concerned, most successfully. Perhaps I ought to have added a rider to the motion asking what was done with this money in certain constituencies in Lower Canada. I knew of this money having been sent to certain counties, but I refrained from doing that. In this enquiry we have nothing to deal with beyond the main question. If it can be established that Sir Adolphe Caron, being a Minister of the Crown, was at the same time a member of a construction company or a contractor, and was assisting to divert public money from its proper purposes, that is quite enough. It is the right of Parliament to vote supplies, and it only obtained that privilege after great struggles, resulting in the execution of one of our English kings. All we have to do now is to punish those who are reported to have neglected their duty in guarding these supplies. But that we should go and institute an investigation into 66 elections, with the knowledge beforehand that we cannot change one single seat, with the knowledge, too, that many of those who took part in these elections are gone over to the silent majority, and many others have abandoned political life, is a proposition that cannot be entertained. What, we ask, in the name of common sense, are we going to gain by this movement, which is sprung upon us from a desire of mud-slinging, a desire, if possible, to gain some petty party advantage? Above such considerations the Liberal party ought to rise. It has men as leaders who have bigger souls than that, and I am more than astonished that they ever allowed a rider of this kind to be annexed to the motion or charge. I do not know if my hon. friend from Guysborough wishes any further information. I may tell him, however, that so far from the Royal Commission being what he supposes it will be—when he says there were Royal Commissions attended with bad

results—there was a Royal Commission in Quebec, and there was a Royal Commission appointed in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway scandal. By the 114th clause of the Revised Statutes of Canada Royal Commissions are instituted whenever the Governor General in Council deems it expedient to cause an enquiry to be made into any matter concerning the good government of Canada, or the conduct of any part of the business thereof. Under the statute the commission may summon and enforce attendance of witnesses, who may be examined under oath. I find in Bourinot this foot note referring to the Canadian Pacific Railway investigation:

"The commissioners in this trying case simply reported the evidence they had taken, and stated no conclusion, on the ground that the execution of their function should not in any way prejudice whatever proceedings Parliament might desire to take."

Now, you have there the gist of the whole thing. This Royal Commission that is proposed "cannot prejudice whatever proceedings Parliament might desire to take." The evidence is given to us, not in the way, perhaps, some gentlemen might desire. I was astonished to hear the eminent counsel from Guysborough getting up and condemning commissions, and the way in which they take evidence. I am no lawyer, but so far as I understand it, the laws of evidence by which courts are guided, are the crystallized legal experience of twenty or thirty generations. They have been found by long experience to be the best methods of eliciting the truth, and I am sure that my hon. friend from Guysborough would be the last man who would try to elicit a lie, or by any innuendo try to cover up a truth. Now, if the duties of a Royal Commission are as they are reported to be in this extract I have read, it is in our power, when this report comes to us, to throw it aside. We can demand a further investigation, or a new investigation, or we may refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Anything to postpone it.

Mr. COCKBURN. No, Sir, I think it is most unfair to say there is desire on the part of the Government to postpone it. Sir, we have nothing to fear. Look at the late elections. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, entered this House two years ago with 90 stalwart men behind him; 30 of them fell when the hand of justice was stretched out. No, Sir, we have nothing to fear. Our hands are so far pure and clean.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKBURN. Yours may be clean now, but there are 33 per cent of your members that have been washed out. It was a long washing and a hard washing, but you needed to wash a whole province, in a manner, before you were able to stand forth in your glory.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will address the Chair.

Mr. COCKBURN. I shall not follow my hon. friend from Guysborough in offering insults to the bench, nor do I think it necessary to follow him in his allusions to a gentleman who was expelled from the British House of Commons after he had been convicted there by the court. I hope he does not go the length of saying that after a man has been convicted of felony or murder, because he happens to be a member of Parliament therefore he should retain his seat. I do not know that I have any further information to give that hon. gentleman. I know he has an ardent love for information, and I know how difficult it is for hon. gentlemen over there, some times, to find out the truth; I know that, beclouded as that hon. gentleman is, he would be unable to peer through the deep mists of error that have surrounded his party for the last 13 or 14 years. Day after day they seem to get deeper and deeper into the internal abyss. There may be a multitude of counsellors in their party, but there is precious little wisdom. When an offer is made to facilitate enquiry into charges which are made, instead of meeting it in the spirit in which it should be met, instead of aiding the Government in their desire to secure an impartial tribunal, every obstacle is thrown in the way, every step is taken that can retard justice. Sir, we are determined that *coûte que coûte* we shall mete out justice to every one, be he high or low. We are trusted by the country. We have the confidence of the people; but when hon. gentlemen opposite ask us to try 81 elections over again they are perpetrating an absurdity that be must apparent, almost, to the weakest understanding among the electorate. Why, Sir, life is short, parliamentary life is unfortunately still shorter. I do not think, looking at all the chances, that if we were to grant the request of gentlemen opposite and put in paragraph 10 and send it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, we should be able to leave this House within the next twelve months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman might reconsider his decision, because it is almost impossible that we should finish this debate to-night. It can go on to-morrow, and might be concluded to-morrow by mutual consent, I presume.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I should like very much to oblige our friend, but I am informed that it would be a great inconvenience to a large number of members if the debate were not closed to-night.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have three volumes of *Hansard* to read by way of illustration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I have already spoken on the main motion, I do not propose to speak at length on this occasion. At the same time I am not disposed to allow the remarks of the Minister of Militia to pass without a few comments from myself, more particularly as he has referred to my own language on the occasion of the introduction of the motion of my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). I think, also, it is extremely important that the proposition which is now before us, should be clearly and distinctly placed before the country as well as before the House. I may add that it is a most remarkable proceeding on the part of the Government to formulate a set of charges, 10 in number, and expect this House to pronounce an intelligent judgment upon them before we have had an opportunity of seeing them in print. It is a very extraordinary proceeding, and one which I think under the ordinary practice of a court of justice could scarcely be tolerated or recognized. One thing is very clear, at all events, and that is the pitiable position to which Ministers have been reduced on the present occasion. It is perfectly plain and obvious that those hon. gentlemen would balk the investigation if they dare.

They made that perfectly clear and evident in the speech of the Minister of Justice and his colleagues on the occasion when my hon. friend's motion was presented. Since that time they have found, perhaps through pressure from their supporters, much more probably from the evidence of the mode in which the country was regarding the attempt to suppress all examination into these charges, and because their political existence and that of their followers, too, would be imperilled by the refusal, and to that, and not to any new-born desire on their part to aid my hon. friend in his investigation, is due the change of front which we witnessed this afternoon. What is the proposal which hon. gentlemen have made to us? I propose to consider it very briefly; I propose also to consider the objections which lie to it in the matter of principle, and objections in the way of practice and convenience, and in the last place, I desire to call the special attention of members on both sides to the extent to which the past established rights and privileges of Parliament are proposed to be violated by the proposal. Sir, this proposal made to us is a very remarkable one, and a very curious sample of the new evolutions of doctrine at which the Minister of Justice has been gradually arriving. I think this is the first time in which it has been gravely proposed by an hon. gentleman who once sat on the bench of Canada that the accused party should be allowed to draw the indictment against himself and select his own judge. It is a most extraordinary development, and if the hon. gentleman's name lives for nothing else it will be owing to the fact that he was the first judge who deemed it right and proper that the man who is accused should at his own will and pleasure substitute an entirely new set of charges from those originally preferred against him. Sir, I must say that I think this would be held as a new gospel, as tidings of great joy by the criminal classes generally if the Minister of Justice proposed that it should apply in the ordinary course of law. I doubt whether any of those unfortunate and misguided people who now inhabit the Dominion penitentiaries would have found their way there if the same privileges had been accorded to them, if they had been allowed to select their own judges, and even their own prosecutor, because that is one of the incidents which, as I shall presently show, will probably result from the adoption of this proposition. The conduct of the hon. gentleman and of his colleagues remind me exceedingly of that well-known Irish delinquent, who on one occasion being promised a fair trial, replied that a fair trial was the very thing he did not want. I do not pretend to say that I have always the very extremest respect for the precedents that may have been established at various times. I do not pretend to say that no occasion can arise when Parliament may not proceed to make a precedent for itself; but as a mere matter of curiosity, as a mere matter of general information, I should like to know from our exceedingly well-informed friend from Toronto, or from the Minister of Justice himself, where in British history, where, in our own history, he will find a single precedent for the extraordinary course which the Minister of Militia has recommended to this House? Where will he find a precedent for the accused party changing the verbiage and meaning of every charge brought against him, and then as I have said, selecting his own judge to boot? Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive any proposition which is more utterly contrary to common sense, natural justice, law and equity than the proposal now submitted to us. I do not want to blunt the natural and wholesome feeling of indignation which not only every honest man in this House must feel, and but for party trammels would feel, at the monstrous innovation, but which every honest man throughout Canada will feel when the intelligence reaches them to-morrow of the mode in which hon. gentlemen opposite propose to comply with the demand made by my hon. friend for an investigation. I will place before the House before I sit down the thing in a few clear and broad words on which hon. gentlemen shall have an opportunity of passing sentence. The only case at all of similar importance in which any proceeding in the slightest degree resembling this was had recourse to in our Parliament, was on the memorable occasion when Mr. Huntington in his place formulated certain charges against Sir John A. Macdonald, and it is well remembered by all who had seats in the House at that time that Sir John A. Macdonald although he refused the committee asked by Mr. Huntington, immediately thereafter of his own motion, or of his own alleged motion, granted a committee, and did not attempt in the slightest degree to vary or alter the charges made by Mr. Huntington. Nor even at a later date, when the matter was referred to a Royal Commission, did Sir John Macdonald vary the charges formulated by Mr. Huntington in his place. That commission proceeded to investigate the charges as they were presented; and if hon. gentlemen here desire to shield themselves under that example, the very least they could have done, although as I shall show even that would not have been satisfactory, would have been to have taken the charges precisely, literally and verbatim as they were preferred. Let us understand the practical results of this proposal. As to the principle, I have shown how utterly and entirely erroneous it is of necessity. But let us consider what are the practical results. Is the commission going to sit while the House is in session? Is it proposed that a commission should be appointed, forsooth, and members of the House be required to desert their proper duties in this House to appear before a commission appointed by the Government of the day? Or, is it proposed that we shall wait months until this House has risen, and that then this commisson is to sit, and then my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen, at their own proper cost and charges, at great expenditure of money, for the purpose of securing witnesses and evidence, are to be called upon at the close of this session to dance attendance at the beck and call of a commission appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite? Sir, it is perfectly clear if that kind of thing is adopted, the delay and confusion will be simply intolerable. What right have hon. gentlemen opposite to dare to call any hon. member to account before their nominees, before a commission appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of those hon. gentlemen? What right have they to call them to account for anything that we may choose to say or do in this House? The members in this House speaking in their places in Parliament are responsible to this House and are responsible to this House alone. That, Sir, is the well understood and thoroughly

established parliamentary practice for 300 years in the mother country, and we, I trust, are not going to be the first to interfere with it. It is perfectly clear that wholly and entirely apart from the utter change which has been made in the charges preferred by my hon. friend, it is perfectly plain that the investigation would be crippled at all points. It is not true at all that that investigation could be conducted with as free a hand or as thoroughly before a Government Commission, as it could be in this House? The tribunal my hon. friend proposes to appeal to is one before which he can summon witnesses and require them to appear and give evidence without involving himself in all the intolerable toil, and delay, and expense, which would be consequent upon its proceedings if he were obliged to appear before a commission such as the Minister of Militia proposes. But, Sir, before and above all that there comes up the question of the rights and privileges of this House. I repeat, Sir, are we to account to the nominee of this Government, are we to account to the nominee of the Privy Council for our doings and sayings here? I will tell the hon. gentleman that I for one utterly and entirely refuse, as our friends on the occasion of Mr. Huntington's charges entirely refused, to recognize the authority of any such Royal Commission or to appear before it. It is for my hon. friend here to say what course he will take, but so far as I can see and judge, I do not think that he would be justified either, in appearing before any commission to answer for one word which has been stated by him in his place in Parliament. I cannot believe, Sir—although we have seen a great deal which might lead us to think that the hon. gentlemen have measured too well the sycophancy of their followers and the servility of a great number of their supporters in the country—I cannot for my part believe that the people of Canada have sunk so low or that they are so entirely false to all the traditions of parliamentary government well known and well established for hundreds of years, that they will support such an outrageous interference with the prerogatives of the representatives of the people as is proposed in the motion of the Minister of Militia. But, Mr. Speaker, that there shall be no mistake, that these hon. gentlemen shall not be allowed to shirk the direct issue, I propose to move an amendment to this amendment, and I will do it in the following words :—

That all the words of the amendment be left out and the following words be added to the original motion :—

That this House refuses to allow the investigation into the charges preferred by Mr. J. D. Edgar, a member of this House, in his place in the House against Sir Adolphe Caron, also a member thereof, to be removed from the control of Parliament, and to be committed to one or more commissioners appointed on the recommendation of the said Sir Adolphe Caron and his colleagues.

That this House views with repugnance the proposition to permit the person accused to vary and alter the charges preferred against him, and instead thereof to substitute a new set of charges drawn up by himself or his colleagues; and that such a demand, not less than the proposal that the said charges should likewise be investigated by persons to be appointed by himself and his colleagues, is entirely unprecedented and is opposed to parliamentary law and usage as settled by the practice of the mother country; is a violation of the privileges of the members of this House, and is designed to elude and defeat the ends of justice.

Mr. EDGAR. I was prepared for a good many curious results of this discussion, but I certainly was hardly prepared to hear the resolution as moved by the Minister of Militia to-day. I thought it was possible that the Government might undertake to refer the charges I had made to a Royal Commission. That would have been a course exceedingly objectionable on many grounds, but they have, to a certain extent, a precedent for that in this House on a former occasion. In the Huntington case, the charges made by Mr. Huntington, which, I think, were not nearly as definite as these, were referred to a Royal Commission for investigation, but only on certain grounds which I will state. As you, Mr. Speaker, will remember, the charges were referred to a parliamentary committee first; that parliamentary committee held its meetings and decided that it was desirable to examine witnesses under oath, and it was necessary to obtain an Imperial Act of Parliament to grant that power to the committees of this House. Very well, Sir. These charges were very serious indeed, and the Governor General, under the advice of his Ministers, decided that, in order to have them investigated under oath, a Royal Commission should be appointed for that purpose, and there was no other excuse attempted to be given for the appointment of a Royal Commission in that case except the one I have mentioned, namely, that parliamentary committees had no power to take evidence under oath. Well, Sir, that power has since been invested in the committees of this Parliament. It is continually exercised by committees of this Parliament. I propose to refer this resolution of mine to the most important committee of this Parliament to investigate it under oath—a committee composed two to one of the supporters and followers of the Ministry; and yet, Sir, they are afraid to face that tribunal with these charges. Not only do they take this investigation out of the hands of Parliament—a Minister afraid to meet his peers and to be tried by his peers—but they have taken my charges and emasculated them, weakened them and destroyed them, and made them just to suit the views of the accused Minister himself. I am not in the confidence of the Ministers; but I would almost be suspected of being in their confidence, because a week ago I told the House exactly what the accused Minister would like to have done in this case, and I will quote to the House the language I used. I said :

"Perhaps I had better allow the Postmaster General to draw up these charges himself and let him have them just as he would like them to be. I do not know how else I can satisfy hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I dare say if the Postmaster General had the drawing of these charges he would limit them for instance, to the charge that he received from the Lake St. John Railway Company so much money out of the subsidies, and another charge, that he received from the Temiscouata Railway Company so much money out of the subsidies, and then he would valiantly disprove those charges. I imagine that these are the charges he would like to see there, from the fact that although there is not a syllable of allegation in the charge from beginning to end that he received money from either of these corporations as corporations, still, when he got up he told us with a great flourish of trumpets that he had voluntarily received telegrams or letters from the managers of those two companies saying that he had never received any moneys from those companies. Why, Mr. Speaker, nobody said he did. Does he imagine that anybody would think or believe that a railway corporation like that of the Lake St. John Railway, with a board formed, for instance, of representatives of the city of Quebec, would calmly sit down at their board meeting and pass a formal resolution, or that a meeting of shareholders would pass a resolution to pay so much money out of their subsidy to the hon. Postmaster General for himself or his elections? No, Sir, it is absurd, and the hon. Postmaster General when he made that declaration was simply setting up a man of straw and knocking him down again."

Why, Sir, I was prophetic on that occasion. They have done exactly what I anticipated, but hardly believed would ever be possible. I have examined carefully the amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Militia, although, of course, I am sure he did not draw it. I suppose it was drawn by the Minister of Justice and the Postmaster General. What have they done with my charges? In the first place, in the recital of what my charges are, they unfairly omit entirely clause 10. They do not even state on the face of the document that I have made that charge, but drop it out absolutely and entirely. Why is that? Are they so afraid of that charge? Is it not one of great importance? Why, Sir, they know that I can prove that charge. The Postmaster General must have told the Minister of Justice that I could prove that charge, and that is why he ignores it absolutely, even in the recital. I do not consider that this is treating Parliament fairly. I do not think it is making the parliamentary record fair, that record that will be appealed to as a matter of precedent and law in future years. I was amused at the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) with his gravity, his wisdom and his stentorian voice. He began by saying that in clause 10, I was going into the trial of twenty-two elections; then he got the number up to sixty-six, and before he sat down he got it up to eighty-one election cases which I was going to try. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman cannot have read this amendment at all, from the way he talked about it. If he has read this section 10—and I would recommend him to read it before he speaks again—does he not know that in clause 10 I propose to try only the Postmaster General? In that charge I say:

"That the said sums of money hereinbefore mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 9, as paid and contributed for election purposes, were so used, together with other sums contributed by public contractors with the Dominion Government, and were controlled and distributed by the direct authority and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, in lavish and illegal amounts for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors, and in the general election of 1887 alone upwards of $100,000 of moneys so contributed were so used for the purpose of corruptly influencing the electors in the following electoral districts."

Mr. COCKBURN. That is trying an election.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman said he was a simple layman. Well, he is a very simple layman indeed if he says that that is trying an election. As he is a simple layman, I will let him off, and will not try to get that into his head. What else have they done? In their reference to the Royal Commission, they have absolutely omitted clause 2 and clause 4, which involve matters of considerable importance. For instance, the hon. member for Centre Toronto told us just now that the charge that the Postmaster General was a member of the Construction Company which received subsidies was a very important one. Why, Sir, I know that the hon. gentleman had not read the charges, because both of these charges have been struck out absolutely by the Government. Every word relating to the Construction Company in these two charges has been struck out.

Mr. COCKBURN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain? I am a layman, but the hon. gentleman will perhaps understand that I was dealing with his charges, the charges which I have before me, and therefore I deal with paragraph 10, and all the crudities in it, and also with the other paragraphs. I was not dealing with the matter which was brought before us to-day by the Government; but I was dealing with the charges which the hon. member for West Ontario brought up, and showing the absurdity of them.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman evidently admits that he did not know anything about the new charges of the hon. Minister of Militia. He was only dealing with my charges, and he thought it important that the connection of the Postmaster General with the Construction Company should be tried; but I tell him now that that is not to be tried at all. It is absolutely struck out in the amendment. Let him reflect over that, and see how he will like it and how his constituents will like it after his speech. I would also draw his attention to something else that perhaps he is not aware of. There is a charge 5 in my charges, and I hope he has considered that there is something serious in that charge. And what is that charge?

"That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies and from moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same."

They have quietly left that out too in their reference to the Royal Commission. What does the hon. member for Centre Toronto think of that in his calm moments when he knows it for the first time? Then how do they treat the rest of it? They go on, and in their clause No. 3, which seems to be intended to take the place of No. 6 in my charge, what do they do? Just as I said a week ago they would. They charged that these moneys were recived from the said railway companies, the Lake St. John Railway Company, or from the Construction Company, neither of which was charged in my charge, because I knew, as I explained a week ago, that that was not a charge which could be sustained or proved. So, of course, especially after I had explained that a week ago, they take great care to make that the greatest and most important of their charges. I find that in the latter part of that charge they speak again of the receipts being from the said companies or one of them. Well, I dare say they will be able to prove that there were no receipts from those companies or one of them. Then another clause, new, clause 5, seems to embrace clauses 7, 8 and part of 9 in my charges. They also say that these payments were from the said companies or made by the company and so on, until we come to the final wind-up of their charge 10, to which I will draw the attention of the hon. member for Centre Toronto. The wind-up of the whole charge is this: "That the said A. P. Caron, by virtue of the fact so alleged, entered into a corrupt conspiracy"—with whom, Mr. Speaker—"with the said companies, or one or more of them." Why, of course, that is the only charge for a Minister of Justice, as the guardian and responsible trustee for the administration of justice, to put forward against his colleague. But he knows perfectly well, when he makes that charge, as everybody in the House and the country knows, that it is not a proper administration of justice, but is tampering with justice on behalf of his colleagues. And they suppose I am going to be dragged before a commission of their appointment to sustain such a trifling charge as that. No; I

would be lost to all respect for myself as a member of this House and a citizen of Canada if I would do so. That is just the position they want. I see the hon. Minister of Railways pleasantly smiling. He thinks it is a neater way of getting out of a scrape than the way he got out last session. They affect a little anxiety to investigate matters, and then, after altering the charge and taking it away from the committee of the House, they get the person who makes the charge to say that he will not go on with it in the shape they put it. It is very clever, but it is too thin and the people will understand it. The members of this House before very long will understand it. I am glad to see the hon. member for Centre Toronto conferred with the hon. members for Albert and St. John, and I hope before the vote that they will find out how they have been bamboozled, as the hon. member for Assiniboia in his blatant and turgid eloquence stated earlier in the day. The Minister of Militia to-day, and the hon. member for Montreal the other day, quoted a precedent for this course of action, not as to the reference to a commission, but as to the changing charges in the House. They quote the case of Mr. E. B. Wood in the Ontario Legislature in 1872. Now, Sir, that case was one which I wish they had followed here. I would not have found the slightest fault if they had. I tried to follow it myself, and I think I did follow it in the amended form, as amended by Mr. Blake. What was the original charge? What was the amendment? Did Mr. Cameron make a charge? No; he took no responsibility as a member of the House of making a charge, but he started a distinct fishing expedition, without making any charge. That is not what I propose to do here, and it is not what I would ever do, I hope. I take the responsibility, whatever it may be. Mr. Cameron moved that a select committee be appointed to enquire whether any, and if any, what corrupt inducements had been offered Mr. E. B. Wood to leave the Ministry. An amendment was naturally proposed to that as follows:—

"That a member of this House, having stated in his place, that a corrupt inducement or offer was made to E. B. Wood, it should be investigated."

And that is what I did. I stated it in my place, and I got a motion brought forward based on that, with a great deal of difficulty, and in the face of every objection that could possibly be thrown in the way by the gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Then what else did Mr. Blake propose to amend in that? Why, the charge was this:

"That a committee be appointed to enquire whether the Hon. E. Blake or any other member of the present Administration made these corrupt offers."

Well, the amendment was to enquire whether the Hon. E. Blake made these corrupt offers. No other name was mentioned, and, therefore, the other members of the Administration were struck out. Why, if I had made no charges at all but simply moved for a committee to enquire whether any improper conduct had been indulged in or not, and if I had got up and said that Sir Adolphe Caron or some other members of the Administration had done so and so, I would have been liable to be checked and corrected, but I did not say that. I took the responsibility myself of making the charges, and I named the Minister who, I claim, was responsible; and that is exactly what Mr. Blake did by his amendment in the case referred to. Even then, with such a slight change as that, such a change as to bring it in conformity with the plan I have adopted, even in the face of that, was there not a great deal of objection made by Mr. Cameron? The leader of the Conservative party said he must oppose the amendment with his utmost endeavour because it did not provide for a full enquiry, and he charged the mover with being desirous to stifle enquiry. I am not going to detain the House any longer. I have no doubt the discussion may be continued a little further. This question is so important that I am surprised we did not hear from any members on the Treasury benches. We have not heard anything in defence of the rather weak statement, if he will permit me to say so, of the Minister of Militia, and we have heard nothing in reply to the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). If the other side are satisfied, I think we ought to be satisfied from a political point of view, and I desire to repeat in my place in the House that, if I am given a committee of this House, I am prepared absolutely to prove under oath every word that I alleged in that charge, and, if the Ministers of the Crown take the responsibility of refusing that, it is not my fault.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). This is an important question because it involves the character of one of the members of the Government. It is an important question, because it involves the expenditure of a large sum of money belonging to the people of this country, and, therefore, I think it is the duty of every hon. gentleman to look this question fairly in the face. I know it is a serious thing to bring a charge against an hon. member in this House, and the gentleman who does it assumes a great responsibility in so doing, and nothing short of the public interest could induce any man to bring a charge against a fellow member. I am sure that the member for West Ontario did not bring this motion before the House in order to gratify any personal interest, but simply in the interest of the people who are said to have lost a large sum of money through the action of this particular individual, the Postmaster General. I think this motion has been brought in largely in the interests of the Postmaster General himself, for, if he is innocent, he should be the first to urge, yea, to demand, an opportunity of defending himself before a committee. He has stated from his place that he is innocent, that he never received one dollar of the money he is said to have received nor did he spend one dollar of that money he is said by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) to have received; therefore, he cannot neglect for a moment to urge upon the Government that the charges against him should be investigated. It appears to me, however, that he has pressed on the Government that they should refuse to grant a committee to investigate those charges, for, otherwise, they would not have refused. This motion is not only in the interests of the Minister, but also in the interests of the Government. No Government can afford to have within its ranks a member who is alleged to have received public moneys and spent them for election purposes. When we consider the statements which have been made by various members through the country and on the floor of Parliament, we are led to suppose that they had decided to purge the Government and the Civil Service of offences of

this character. Last year the Premier in the Senate invited the assistance of the Opposition in cleaning out dishonest officials in the various departments of Government as well as the Government itself, and I will read the words used by the Premier on that occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dispense.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentlemen opposite would like to dispense because they do not like to hear the statements of the Premier, as they are about to vote in direct contradiction of the statements he made. The following was the statement of the Premier :—

"I would ask the hon. gentlemen opposite to join with us in trying to find out what the facts are about this alleged rascality. We ask them to give us the benefit of their experience in this enquiry, to assist us in ascertaining the facts and placing them before the public, in order that they may be dealt with properly, and, if found guilty, that summary vengeance may be exercised on those who are found guilty of appropriating public money, stealing, whether high or low. That is the determination of the Government."

If it was the determination of the Government to find out where any misappropriation of public money or stealing had taken place, they should accept this motion when it is made on the responsibility of a member of this House who has stated positively that he has evidence to establish every charge he has made. The charge is very definite in my opinion. I would not like to have a charge brought against me for dishonesty so definite as that. The hon. member charges the Postmaster General with receiving moneys out of the subsidies granted for the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, not only as a member of the Construction Company, but corruptly. Then there must be an arrangement between him and the party who gave him the money, and they both must act together. But not only did the hon. gentleman receive money corruptly, but he is said to have expended the money corruptly. It was stated the other night that the hon. gentleman realized no personal advantage, but the charge says he did, because he used a portion of this money in carrying his own election, so that he received direct personal advantage from the use of this money. It must be remembered by the Government that, as soon as they voted subsidies to railways, if they discharge their duty properly, they must see that the money is not diverted from the purposes for which it was voted. Their responsibility does not cease when they have voted the subsidies. The Minister told us the other night that, if we had any fault to find with the voting of the subsidies, we should bring on our charges. We have no fault to find with the voting of the subsidies, but what we find fault with is the diversion of the money to other purposes than those for which they were voted. The public moneys belonged to the people of the country, and it was the duty of the Government to see that they were spent in the construction of the work for which they were voted. And if a charge is brought against a member of the House or a member of the Government that he received those subsidies so voted and used them for his own personal advantage, or for corrupting the electorate, I say the Government is standing in their own light and against the interest of this country when they refuse the Opposition an opportunity to bring home the charge to the party if he is guilty, or allow him an opportunity to vindicate his character if he is innocent. The Minister of Justice will remember that last fall he and seven or eight others went up to the town of Perth, and the Minister of Justice there discussed the scandals and said that the policy of the Opposition at that time was mud-throwing. Now, he knows very well that the scandals which were investigated last summer did not originate by the Opposition; the information upon which those investigations were based came from a friend of their own party, a man who had worked for them for a number of years, who had conducted a Conservative newspaper for many years, and who understood the secrets of their operations; I say that the country believe to-day that he was justified in bringing that charge, and the evidence was so strong against the parties accused that the late Minister of Public Works actually felt that he was no longer of any use in the Government, and he resigned; and another member of Parliament was expelled. But what did the Minister of Justice say in Perth in regard to these scandals? Let me read what he said as he is reported by the *Empire*:

"The Government's policy in regard to irregularities and improprieties in the public service, was to root out those committing them. The best proof of this had been given by the Government's action last session. In purifying public life the Government was not only willing to submit to, but asked the aid of, every religious teacher in the country. In the discharge of the duty which had fallen on the Government, they were ready to submit their action to the keenest criticisms of the press, the pulpit and the platform, but in saying this he asked the clergy and others to judge fairly and not condemn without reading the evidence."

So he not only invited the members of the Opposition, but he invited the pulpit, the press and the platform to criticise and to assist them in vindicating the position they had taken, and to assist them to punish every one that was guilty of any irregularity. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are here for the purpose of accepting his invitation; we are here for the purpose of pledging ourselves that we are in possession of evidence that will show that within their own ranks, the 13 or 14 members constituting the Government, there is a man who should not be there if the charges alleged against him are true; and the hon. member for West Ontario has pledged his honour that he will, if that opportunity is given him, prove conclusively to the people of this country that the Postmaster General is unfit to hold the seat he occupies. Now, in answer to the invitation of the Minister of Justice the pulpit has spoken, and I will read from an address of a prominent minister of this country who belongs to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me read what Dean Carmichael, of Montreal, has said :

"Was there no need to-day to rise to a higher idea of our duty to God and to our country? Had not recent events brought the blush of shame to every cheek of every honest and God-fearing lover of his country? We need to strike out afresh and take as the ruling principle that the laws of God must be respected. Government by party we must have, but away with those that tolerated boastful chicanery and the plundering of the public purse. He was not there as the agent or spokesman of any party, but what could be said of those who pleaded: 'I did not use one coin of money for myself, it all went for political purposes.' What an insult to the magnificent freedom the mother land has given us to govern ourselves; what an example to the uprising generation. But the sins of public men were not the sins of the nation, if the nation disowned them for their wrong-doing. As long as the country recognized the need of a healthy public opinion, there was hope. The cry must be, and was, he believed

for further probing into the iniquities, for more justice and greater punishments upon the criminal, and that cry must be prolonged until the purest body is the governing power. Surely the day had not gone by for such a change."

Now, Sir, that is the opinion expressed by one of the ministers upon whom the Minister of Justice had called to criticise the action of the Government. I would confirm his cry for more investigation into the corruption and dishonesty that have characterized the public affairs of this country for many years; for all must know that there has been corruption in high places, as well as in low places, in the Conservative party during the last ten or twelve years, that has become a by-word and a reproach to this country, and has given to Canada a lower moral standard than that occupied by many other countries. Now, I say that the resolution brought before the House this afternoon was a perfect humbug. As has been pointed out by the member for West Ontario, it departs entirely from the charges made by him. The idea that the party accused is to formulate the charges against himself in the way most favourable to him, and then ask Parliament to appoint a commission favourable to himself for the purpose of trying him on those charges—why, the thing is utterly preposterous, and no sensible person in this country, looking at the whole matter, in view of the political influences and the political bias, will for one moment come to the conclusion that the Government is acting just in the interest of the country. It is time to bestir ourselves when we know that on the right and on the left of us, thousands and millions of public money have been squandered by dishonest politicians, and the Government, for their own reputation and their own standing in this country, ought to accept the proposition made from this side of the House, and appoint a committee before which this trial may take place. What has the accused to fear? If he goes before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, does he stand there before a majority of men who are opposed to him? No; two-thirds of that committee are friends of his own, and when they report the case back to this House it is adjudicated upon by a House containing sixty of a majority of his own friends. Why, then, should he fear to go before a committee of that kind? Sir, he knows very well there is evidence behind; he knows very well, no doubt, in his own mind, that if an opportunity were given the member for West Ontario to prove his charges, he would be condemned before the eyes, not only of the committee, but of the country at large, and the verdict would go abroad that he was unfit to associate with the other gentlemen of the Government, and he would have to leave public life and retire as his predecessor did. Now, the matter has been discussed *pro* and *con* for the last few days from various standpoints, and I am satisfied that the Government will suffer at the hands of the electorate if they do not permit this matter to be fully and efficiently examined before a proper tribunal. I tell them as sure as they are sitting there to-night, that when the electorate get an opportunity of expressing an opinion on this matter at the polls, they will do so in such a way as will give these gentlemen to understand that they are going too far in playing with the interests of the people, in giving an opportunity to their friends of stealing from the public funds and appropriating the money to their own private ends. Rest assured, therefore, the day of reckoning is coming, when the people of this country will bring such a tornado of influence upon hon. gentlemen opposite that will sweep them from power, and allow other and better men to occupy the position in which they are to guide the affairs of this country in a more honest, upright, candid and more prosperous way than the hon. gentlemen opposite have done during the last 12 years they have been in power.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I ask the hon. leader of the House whether, in view of the statement made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and in view of the complicated character of the resolution, the amendment which has been moved, and the vast importance of the issue involved in it, whether it will not be in the interests of both sides of the House and of justice itself, that the debate should be adjourned until to-morrow, and then proceeded with, when all parties will have an opportunity of seeing the amendments in print and of judging whether the serious charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) as to the changes made are correct or not. Many hon. members have not had an opportunity of examining the amendment very closely, and I would suggest that at this hour (2 a. m.) it would be prudent and reasonable that an adjournment should be taken until to-morrow when the debate could proceed and close.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. This matter has been before the House for weeks, and if the matter is to be proceeded with at all, it is time it was disposed of. I do not think the observations of the hon. member for West Ontario with respect to suggested alterations in the charges are entitled to any weight. I do not agree with him that the charges have been altered.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Nothing but the very serious nature of the charges before the House would justify me at this late hour in rising to say one word on this matter; but I cannot allow the question to be put without recalling the attention of hon. members to the extraordinary and anomalous position in which we stand here to-night. It is acknowledged by all that the charges made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) are so grave and serious in their character that, if they should be sustained, the Postmaster General would have not only to resign his position from the Government, but would probably lose his seat in this House. At all events, that is acknowledged to-night; it was not acknowledged the other night. We are standing entirely on new ground; that is to say, the Government have taken an entirely new departure on this matter. We would be prepared to discuss and vote upon the resolution proposed from this side of the House, and discussed by the leader of the House and his supporters before. But the matter has very materially changed, and those hon. gentlemen who the other day contended that this matter should not be referred to a committee on two grounds, now turn round and say it should be referred to some tribunal, but not to a committee of this House. A charge has been made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), that while hon. members opposite have withdrawn from their original position and are willing to have an investigation, they have deliberately and shamefully emasculated and destroyed the character of his charges, and

they are now about to deceive the House and the country by pretending to refer to a tribunal which they themselves have constituted, charges which they will leave the people to imagine were preferred by the member for Ontario, when as a matter of truth and fact they are charges entirely different. We understand that the Ministers are not responsible collectively for the malfeasance of one of their number, provided always when that member is charged with a malfeasance, they repudiate his conduct and dissever themselves from him. But if they refuse to dissever themselves from the Minister charged with malfeasance and endorse his conduct, they themselves are directly responsible. What do we find to-night? First, a few words as to whether the matter should be referred to a committee, and then a few words as to what I consider to be a foul outrage, if the statements of the hon. gentleman be true, which is about to be committed on this House and the country. With respect to the right of this House to consider charges of malfeasance against any of its members, I desire to say that the hon. gentleman in question is not only a member of the House, but a member of a committee of the House, which constitutes the Government. If there is one right of the House that should be preserved intact and inviolate, it is the right to retain control over the moneys of the country, expended by Government. I think the House must have degraded very much from the House which preceded it, if we are prepared to surrender rights which our predecessors held sacred--the right to control the expenditure of money, the right to control the manner of that expenditure, the right to enquire whether the expenditure has been misapplied or misappropriated. The hon. Minister of Justice has announced that the Government will not refer the charge to a committee of this House, but he is willing to refer it to gentlemen to be appointed by the Government. I will not repeat what has been so well said, that as this tribunal is to be appointed by the man who is incriminated, it is on its face an unjust and unfair proposal. Is it constitutional? If we are to take the authority of Todd we find it is unconstitutional to refer to a Royal Commission subjects connected with the ordinary duties of the Executive Government and with its relations to Parliament; that it is unconstitutional to refer to a Royal Commission an enquiry as to the acts of misconduct which may have been committed by a judge or by a Minister of State. That is the law as laid down by Todd, to whose authority there has been no exception taken heretofore. Yet, hon. gentlemen are asking their followers to adopt the course which is distinctly laid down as an unconstitutional course, in order that they may evade, and, if possible, postpone, to a future day, an exposure which, if allowed to go to a committee, they feel is inevitable. The hon. gentleman came before us last year in the character of a public moralist and as a vindicator of public justice, and he declared that he was prepared to investigate every charge made against a Minister of the Crown or a private member, be he high or low. The hon. gentleman went through the provinces. He went down to Nova Scotia, he had his own organ publish his challenge to the people to come forward with their charges, and his journal announced in bold heading that the Minister was prepared to push any charges against private members or Ministers. Then the hon. Minister, after his organ had published these headlines, had a notice issued that if anybody had any charge to make against any member of Parliament, or Minister of the Crown, of boodling in regard to public works, or with the money voted by Parliament, he should bring it forward. He pledged his public honour to his constituents and to the people of Halifax that he would have them fully investigated. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman stands charged to-day by the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) with violating that pledge, with deliberately penning an amendment to prevent the charge being investigated either here or elsewhere; and when he is solemnly charged by that member with twisting and destroying and perverting the resolution, so that the substantial charges in it will never be investigated by any commission, the hon. leader of the House in the face of this pledge remains dumb and has not a word to say. He heard the statement made here that the charges the hon. gentleman for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) had preferred and which he was prepared to prove, have been deliberately and designedly emasculated for the purpose of preventing the conduct of the associate of the hon. gentleman from being enquired into. The Minister, therefore, stands to-day charged with almost as serious an offence as the Postmaster General. Sir, he stated here the other day that he opposed this resolution being referred to a committee at all and that there were no charges in it. He induced numbers of his followers to believe that the charges were too vague. He said the charge of misconduct against the Postmaster General was not made against him in his character as a member, and that there was no allegation of public money having been misappropriated or maladministered. The hon. gentleman found that even his own followers behind him would not stand that argument. He found that when he could not catch a division on the spur of the moment, and when the more independent members came to read the charge they found that his construction of that resolution would not bear a moment's consideration, and then he brings in this new resolution which I am bound to say the Minister of Militia had the decency to move almost without a word of comment. Let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman for one moment to the charge which he said was so vague that it ought not to be investigated. Here is the charge:

"That during certain periods certain moneys had been voted to certain railway companies. That arrangements were entered into by the said railway company whereby the expenditure of said subsidies was made by a construction company through, or in conjunction with, one H. J. Beemer, a contractor—and the said Beemer and those who assisted him in financing for the said railway works, received the benefit of the said subsidies."

Now, Sir, that charge, which was made and framed in a legal and proper way, has designedly and deliberately been omitted from the amendment. Why, and for what purpose? Does the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) say that he desires this investigated? He said so to-night. He said he had read the charges and came to the conclusion that they were not vague, but were perfectly clear and straight, and should be, and ought to be, investigated. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to support a resolution leaving out that important charge in section 2?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, he is prepared.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He may be, but I want to call his attention to the fact that my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has already stated that the entire charge made in sub-section 2 of the resolution has been omitted in the amendment, and designedly omitted. The hon. member from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was careful to charge that this corruption and this diversion of public funds from the purposes for which Parliament had voted them, to private and corrupt purposes, was not made by either the original company to which it was voted or by the Construction Company which had the expenditure of the money. The men who were parties to this gross fraud upon the public were too shrewd to have, as he said, the moneys voted in a formal way by the original company or by the Construction Company, but they had it voted in an underhand way and the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) explains how and why, and gave the name of the man through whom this money was paid. But the amended resolution which the Government propose to refer to a commission of their own nominating, deliberately and for the purpose of burking that enquiry, omits that clause of the charge? Then, Sir, it refers to a commission to enquire whether moneys were not corruptly paid to the Postmaster General by the Lake St. John or Temiscouata Railway Company, or by the construction companies formed under them, when no man ever charged that such moneys were paid by either the original company or the Construction Company. If that commission sits with this charge and this indictment under the judge's nose, and the hon. gentleman chooses to go before it with the evidence which he says he has to prove that the Postmaster General having voted these moneys here in the House corruptly bargained and obtained a large portion of them for private purposes, what will he be met with? He will be told: Unless you can prove that they were paid by one of these two companies I cannot hear your evidence. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) never said that they were paid by the companies. He anticipated in his speech something of this kind. He pointed out carefully and clearly that this had been done in an underhand way, not by the company, but through parties then beneficially interested in the subsidies. Yet the hon. gentleman opposite not only leaves out section 2 of the charges, not only directly inserts the words "charging two companies" as having paid the money but deliberately and for the purpose of defeating enquiry omits the words that they were paid by parties beneficially interested in the subsidies. Therefore every clause of the charge which my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) made, and which he was prepared to prove, as he says, by evidence which could not be resisted, even by a committee of this House composed of a large majority of the Postmaster General's own friends, has been designedly omitted from this resolution and we are going before a commission to try what? Who is the father or the sponsor of the charges contained in the amendment moved by the Minister of Militia? Is the Minister of Militia going to prove these charges? Nobody else ever made them; the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) never made them; he cannot prove them. He says he cannot prove them, he told you a week ago that he could not prove such charges; he told you he did not make them in that form because he was aware of the *modus operandi* when this fraudulent appropriation was made, and he carefully avoided stating that the money was paid by or through either of the companies. He stated they were paid either out of the subsidies or out of money raised upon the subsidies. Does it matter to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) whether this was done by a sleight-of-hand trick, if substantially the public moneys of this country have been stolen and diverted from the purpose for which this House voted them? Sir, I say that the action of the Postmaster General in taking these moneys from the company has been defended by the Minister of Public Works as right; but wrong as it is in my opinion, and wrong as it is in the opinion of most hon. members in their hearts, it is no worse than the action of the Government in attempting to foist a false resolution upon the House, attempting to refer charges as if they were the charges of the hon. member when they are different charges altogether; referring charges which the hon. gentleman says he never made, which he cannot prove and does not intend to prove, and then going out to the country, and saying that he has kept his plighted word and honour that any man who brought a charge against a Minister of the Crown would have it investigated. Sir, the Ministry stand charged to-night before this House and this country with deliberately burking an enquiry because they know that we can prove what we charge. There is no escape from this position. When these charges were made, the Postmaster General came before the House and he did not say that they were vague. He acknowledged that they were specific enough. They charged him with corruptly receiving out of the moneys voted by Parliament for the construction of the Lake St. John Railway a portion of those moneys and appropriating them in two ways. One of these charges amounted to this, that he had got the money for his personal use; at any rate, it did not say what became of it. One of the charges was:

"That the said Sir A. P. Caron was, during the whole, or the greater part of the said period, one of the members of the said construction company, and thus had means of knowledge of, and did know of the dealings with the said subsidies and their destination after they were paid over by the Government to the said railway company.

"That during the said period and while the said railway was being constructed in part by means of said subsidies, the said Sir A. P. Caron corruptly received large sums of money out of the said subsidies, and from moneys raised upon the credit of the same, and from parties beneficially interested in the same."

There is nothing here about elections. It is simply a charge that a Minister of the Crown, having recommended His Excellency that certain grants should be recommended to Parliament and be passed by Parliament, and having succeeded in getting those grants through Parliament, became a member of the Construction Company receiving them, and succeeded in obtaining a portion of those subsidies. The charge was specific, and from my experience as a lawyer I would defy the Minister of Justice or anybody else on that side of the House to draw an indictment couched in more specific, clear or distinct terms. Nothing was wanted, the corrupt motive, the payment of the moneys, the parties by whom they were paid, the source from which they came, the person to whom they were paid; every essential ingredient to prove a corrupt

receipt of public moneys voted for a public purpose was set out in black and white. After that was done, another charge was made that, in addition to these moneys, the Minister received other moneys which went for electoral purposes. Did the Postmaster General say that these charges were too vague? Did he say that as they did not charge him as a member of the House with having received them, he was not responsible to the House? No, Sir; the Postmaster General came before the House and said that in every particular the charges made by the hon. member were false. So a distinct issue was raised. A distinct charge was made, a distinct denial was given; a distinct issue was before the country. Who was telling the truth? Where do the facts lie? Have public moneys been misappropriated, been stolen, been diverted from the purpose for which Parliament voted them and this by a Minister of the Crown, or have they not? The hon. Minister of Justice was asked to refer the trial of the issue to a committee composed of his own supporters. He refused the challenge, and in doing so he did not scruple to shelter himself behind one of the most contemptible quibbles ever used by a public man, His own followers were ashamed of it. He argued that the hon. Postmaster General was not a member of Parliament during the whole time; there was a particular space of time, he said, when Parliament was not in session, during which the Postmaster General was not a member of Parliament; and the hon. gentleman sheltering himself behind that quibble, denied that Parliament had the constitutional right to enquire into the misappropriation of public moneys voted for a specific purpose. But when the influence of some independent members around him drove him from a position which was untenable, he turned around and drew a resolution referring, not to the charge, but another charge which he makes himself, which he knows will not be sustained, which was not made on this side of the House, which he knows is not true; and he tries to foist this on the country as a fulfilment of the simple pledge of his honour which he gave to the House and country last session. Did anybody ever see a Government placed in a more pitiable or contemptible position than this Government is in to-day? In trying to shelter their colleague they are prepared to vote down a specific charge made, and when their independent followers will not allow that, when the pill is too large for them to swallow, they turn around and recast the charge, omitting from it all those elements and facts which the hon. member for West Ontario could prove, and substituting others which he cannot prove, and then saying, we are ready to leave this to a commission. As the hon. gentleman says, it would be bad enough if they withdrew from Parliament the control of charges made by an hon. member here on his responsibility. That would be constitutionally improper; but to refer not the charges made, but other charges which were not made, is an act of indecency seldom if ever witnessed in this House. Sir, I remember last year when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was closing the speech he made in this House, he said: "If ever this young country is to be snatched from the maelstrom of corruption into which it appears to be drifting, it must be by the votes and voice of the independent members, free from the trammels of party, and by young men coming forward and showing that party ties are not too strong to destroy public patriotism." Sir, is the hon. gentleman, holding the high legal position which he holds in this country, prepared to accept this elaborate amendment which has neither father nor sponsor? Is he prepared to adopt this course and recommend his followers in this House to adopt it? No one in this House has a shrewder and more acute mind than he has. He knows well that by twisting and turning the phraseology of this resolution, by confining the payments to the companies, by omitting the words stating that the payments have been made by those beneficially interested in the companies, the whole gist of the charges has been destroyed, and that if the hon. member for West Ontario went before the commission, he would be told that his proofs did not come within the words of the indictment. I fear that the hon. member will have to do yet what he promised he would do if his original resolution were voted down. He will have to appeal to a fairer tribunal than this House—a tribunal not controlled by the trammels of party to the extent that hon. gentlemen opposite are. He will have to appeal to the press of the country and the electorate of the country, and if he cannot succeed in getting a committee here to receive the evidence which he is prepared to offer in proof of his charges, he will have to lay them before the electorate of the country through the recognized press of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CASEY. I think the House is not ready for the question yet; and until the real author of the amendment which was first proposed to the motion of my hon. friend from West Ontario has had the courage to come before the House and defend that which he has drawn and asked somebody else to move the House is not ready for the question; but the cowards on the Ministerial benches will not defend with argument what they have laid before the House without arguments. The Minister of Militia has moved the resolution in question, but there is in that hon. gentleman something which prevented him from urging arguments in favour of the amendment he was compelled by circumstances to propose. The amendment, the whole course of the debate on the other side previous to the amendment, bears one character. The trail of the Minister of Justice is over it all. The quasi defence, the defence so called, for I cannot call it a real defence of the Postmaster General, has been committed to his attorney who holds the brief. It has been a defence by a man who holds a brief for somebody else. It has not been such a defence as should be put forward by a Minister of the Crown on the floor of this House. The Minister of Justice, when he was discovered by the late leader of the Conservative party and introduced to this House, was unknown to the most of us. For a time he succeeded in impressing, not only his own side but many on this side, with the opinion that his judicial manner of speaking was a true index to his sentiments and to his individuality. But since the latter end of last session, we have discovered that this hon. gentleman, so much prized by his own side of the House, so much esteemed for a time by those who do not belong to that party, is really a man with a mask. We have discovered that his

face is his fortune. Nobody could possibly look more honest, more impartial, more judicial than the Minister of Justice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I wish I could return the compliment.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman evidently feels hurt by the assertion that his face and manner are judicial, and says he wishes he could return the compliment. I never pretended to have a judicial manner and face or judicial way of speaking. I never pretended to have anything more than what everybody knows I have, but the hon. gentleman has been *par excellence* the man put forward as the judicial, impartial, non-partisan critic of the other side of the House. And yet his conduct has been such as I cannot describe in parliamentary language. Nobody could look more impartial, more honest, more calm, more unpartisan than he, and nobody could act more in the opposite direction. I say that the whole conduct of the defence in this debate has been inspired and dictated under his auspices. In the first place, the disloyal, false pretension was put forward that these charges were not specific and not sufficiently particularized. There is no need to inform the House now that these are specific and particularized. There is no need to say the charges formulated in the amendment moved by the Minister of Militia, to take the place of the actual charges made on a member's responsibility, are still more vague, still less particularized than those brought before the House. The point was taken that we were invading the sphere of election courts. Everybody must know how little that pretension has to support it. We are not proposing to usurp the functions of the election courts. Nobody pretends to believe that we were proposing to put in jeopardy the seat of any member whose election had been carried by the corrupt expenditure of money. We know that is out of our sphere, and nobody proposed anything of the sort. But we were impeaching a Minister, we were charging that a member of the Cabinet, a member of the Privy Council, had been untrue to his charge, untrue to his oath, had violated his trust to the country by corrupt political dealings with those to whom subsidies had been granted on the advice of the Ministry to which he belonged. The hon. Minister of Justice comes before us, and acting as the defendant's attorney, takes advantage of all his legal subtlety, the possession of which we do not deny, takes advantage of his inexpressive countenance, takes advantage of the limberness of his backbone and the slipperiness of his conscience, to back up the shallow defence put up against these charges. In what respect are these charges less particularized than those to the investigation of which he gave his consent last year? Are they more vague than the charges against the Minister of Public Works and against the late member for Quebec West (Mr. McGreevy) which were referred to a committee last year, and which resulted in the dismissal of the one from the Cabinet and in the expulsion of the other from the House? These charges are more particularized, more specific, less vague than those I have just referred to, which were referred to a committee last year. Why should the late Minister of Public Works have been subjected to the inquisition of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, when the Postmaster General is to be free from that inquisition? Why should Thomas McGreevy, Rykert, and the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) have been subjected to an enquiry last year when this particular Minister must be exempted from enquiry before that committee? Why was there no objection to an inquisition held in the Public Accounts Committee in connection with the Langevin Block? Why was it that a charge made in the latter end of last session against the Minister of Railways was not investigated? We have the answer in the unfortunate words of the Minister of Militia when in moving this resolution this afternoon, he said: We have had enough of enquiries before committees of Parliament. The Minister of Justice found that out before the end of last session. I do him the justice to believe that he would prefer to do what is right and constitutional, but he found out before the end of last session that that did not pay; and when it came to a question as to whether the present Minister of Railways was interested as a partner in the contract for Section B of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he had to go down and eat that proverbial peck of dirt which everybody is supposed to eat sometime in a lifetime. The Minister of Justice eats his peck of dirt. I do not think he likes it but he has got to eat it. He began on the occasion to which I refer, and it does not seem to cost him much at present to take another roll in the mud and cover himself with it. It is all very well for the Minister to laugh. Ministers in his position have laughed before and have afterwards had to laugh on the wrong side of their mouths. It is all very well for the Minister to get a large vote on this question, but he has supporters behind him who have memories, and he has supporters in the country who have memories. There is the member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) who is now a supporter of the hon. gentleman, and he remembers an enquiry of a nature no more grave than the one now before the House, he remembers the making of the charges, the reference of those charges to a committee, and the reasons why those charges had to be referred ultimately to a Royal Commission. He remembers the course he took in consequence of the finding of that Royal Commission and what language he had to endure, what language was addressed to him in the corridors of this House by the then leader of that side of the House, and the abuse he received from the Conservative press throughout the country, but he had the uprightness and the honour to stand by his convictions and vote according to his opinions after hearing the report of that commission. There are many more of the supporters of the Minister of Justice who have consciences not completely made of India rubber as some people's consciences seem to be, who will reflect on this matter afterwards. It is quite unnecessary, after all that has been said, to go into detail to prove that the proposed action is unconstitutional. If you will take your May on Constitutional Government in England, or your Todd on Constitutional Government in the Colonies, or your Bourinot, any work you like on constitutional government, you will find nowhere a precedent for the reference to a Royal Commission of any charge against a Minister or a member of the House, which the House or its committees were capable of enquiring into. The only seeming exception is the one to which I have referred, the Pacific Scandal, which was not really an exception, because the House had not then the power to examine

into that matter under oath. It is laid down in these books that it is a gross breach of the privileges of Parliament to take any enquiry of this kind out of its hands. As I heard the amendment this afternoon, I understood that it referred to the statute in reference to the appointment of Royal Commissions, and that it proposes that this commission shall be appointed under that statute. There is no statute of this House providing for royal commissions to investigate charges against Ministers or members of the House. There could be none limiting the powers of this House. This House has, and the Governor General has not the power to enquire into matters of this nature. The course which the hon. Minister, nominally of Justice, proposes is one directly opposed to the constitution of the country. But there is something worse to it than that. We have heard a great deal of talk on the other side of the House about speeches we made on this side which they criticised as blue ruin speeches. I charge that this one transaction, this one resolution, contains more of the nature of blue-ruin than all the pessimistic speeches that could be made, but have not been made, by anybody else in the country. There is nothing that indicates so much the utter ruin, the decadence, the rottennes of the country, as to find that he who is supposed to be the guardian of public morality and of justice in this country is willing, without any ground which he is able to defend on the floor of this House, to refuse to properly investigate a charge of rottenness and corruption on the part of a Minister of the Crown. I do not say that the accused Minister was guilty of rottenness and corruption, because it is only a charge so far, and we only ask the opportunity to prove it, but the charges are such that, if they should be found to be true, the Minister has been guilty of rottenness and corruption, and practically of treason to that country for whose interests and for whose moneys he has been a trustee for so many years. I say that the Minister of Justice has given the aid of his versatile conscience and his legal subtlety to burke that enquiry. What will be the result with the country? Will it save them with the country? Will it save the reputation of the Postmaster General?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I hear an hon. gentleman who lives in Peterborough say, "Yes," and I am sorry for the lack of acumen he displays in that respect. If the hon. gentleman who now leads this House, when he sat on the bench, had an accused man brought before him who said; I will not be tried on that indictment, I will not admit that you mean what your charges signify when you say I have done so and so because you mean that I have done something else. I will not be tried on that indictment nor will I be tried by you, my lord. I will choose my own judge and frame my own indictment, and after hearing the counsel for the prosecution and finding out what they have to say, I will frame the indictment against myself and I will so frame it that it shall contain nothing which they say they can prove—if a criminal had come before Judge Thompson and had spoken in that way, he would have been set down as a lunatic. It would have been utterly incomprehensible that an accused person should be allowed to frame the indictment against himself, to choose the judge to try him, to pay the judge who tried him, to say what evidence should be admitted against him, and to control the whole affairs of the prosecution; and yet that is the course which the hon. gentleman, who was Judge Thompson, is taking before the country. He says: "We will not stand a trial on the accusations made against us. We know from what the prosecutor has said that he thinks he can prove certain things, and is not sure that he can prove other things. We will only be tried on what you say you cannot prove, and we will choose the men who are to try us." It might be Judge Elliott, or dear knows who. It was a commission of County Court judges who tried Sir John Macdonald at the time of the Pacific Scandal, and this might be another commission of County Court judges.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who says "no" had better look up what no doubt to him is ancient history. It may be a commission of a county judge, it may be a commission by Judge Elliott, it may be a commission of dear knows who. The amendment does not say it shall be composed of judges at all. They may choose anybody they please according to the terms of the amendment. I do not know whether they have the cheek to do that. Some people have cheek enough for anything. Certainly one of the members for Toronto who sits at the present moment in the front bench (Mr. Coatsworth), and the Minister of Justice, are not behind in that respect. But I say they have left themselves free to choose their own judge; and you may depend upon it that he, if there is to be only one judge, will not be a man unfriendly to the Government, he will not be a man impartial between the Government and the accused. If they choose one commissioner only, he will, as a matter of certainty, be known for his favour towards the Government. But they may do as they like; the country will know by their refusal to be tried on the charges laid before the House, by the unheard-of and unprecedented refusal to accept a trial on the charges made on the responsibility of a member—the country will know that they confess their guilt. As I said before, if a man accused of crime came before the judge and wished to frame his own indictment, and choose his own judge it would be a confession of guilt. This is a confession of guilt, a cowardly confession of guilt; I will say a doubly cowardly confession of guilt, and I will tell you why. They were afraid, in the first place, of trial on the charges presented to the House. The Minister of Justice made a speech which meant that they refused to be tried on any charges of this kind. Subsequently he found that he had to be afraid of his own followers also, having first been afraid of the Opposition; he had reason to fear a revolt on the part of his own followers, and he has patched up an unconstitutional compromise which he asks the House to accept. I was astonished at the attitude of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) in regard to this. He has been saying for some time back that there must be an investigation into the charges brought forward by the member for West Ontario; he has said that to members of the Opposition as well as to his own friends, and he has to-night given assent by his speech to a proposal which means that there shall not be an enquiry

into those charges, that there shall be an enquiry into cooked charges, cooked by the Minister of Justice and put in the mouth of the Minister of Militia. That hon. member for Toronto last year was the chief mover in securing an enquiry in another place in regard to a question which was not before that legislative body at all, an enquiry into alleged political corruption, in the course of the discussion of a private Bill. The hon. member for Centre Toronto, in the alleged interests of a bank, was the chief mover in an enquiry into an alleged political corruption in the case of a provincial legislature, before a committee which had nothing to do with it in the world. He insisted that that committee should enquire into the expenditure of provincial subsidies, and as to whether provincial Ministers had not had a share of those subsidies; now he comes before this House and refuses to enquire as to whether a Minister of this House has corruptly shared in the distribution of subsidies granted by this House, although the charge is made upon the responsibility of a member of the House. It will be a difficult task for the member for Centre Toronto to reconcile his present action and his late action before the electors of his constituency. Their conclusion will undoubtedly be that to which the whole country must come, in view of the course of the Government throughout this debate. The conclusion will be that they refuse an enquiry into certain specific charges made by the member for West Ontario because they knew those charges were true, and they dare not have them proved. We all know that the particular Minister charged is not the most popular Minister on that side of the House; we all know that if it were a mere question of his head falling, perhaps all this discussion might not have taken place at all. But we do not know, and the Minister of Justice does not know, if an enquiry began here, where it might end, and therefore the committee is refused. The Government have gerrymandered the charges against the accused Minister, and are asking power to refer them to a partial commission of their own choosing. The report of the commission will have no weight whatever with the country. The plea of guilty practically entered by their action in the matter will be believed by the whole country, and I warn the Government that in this case, as in a former case, the verdict of the country will be the same as it was after the Pacific Scandal of 1873.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have patiently waited to hear some interesting speeches from some hon. gentlemen opposite who have not yet favoured the House with their views on this all-important question. I refer more particularly to the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who has occupied a very prominent position in this country for a great many years, both as a constitutional lawyer and as a member of Parliament; and surely the House and the country have a right to get the benefit of his opinion on this important issue. We can remember when that hon. gentleman was known as the brains of the Conservative party. He was called that by the leader who is now no more, but he appears to have lost that position since the Minister of Justice has taken the place that he now occupies. He is no more credited with being the brains of the party, and he appears to be willing to follow the lead of the Minister of Justice, and is willing to-night to accept the amendment proposed to the motion now before the House. Now, I was rather amused at the remarks that dropped from the Minister of War. He said the Opposition did not want an investigation. Now, I do not think the Opposition could express their desire for an investigation in any plainer way than by the resolution offered by the member for West Ontario. He has clearly and explicitly declared his readiness to go before a committee of this House and prove the charges he has presented. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to give him an opportunity of proving those charges before a committee of the House, but they want to appoint a Royal Commission in order to deprive this House of the right of investigating this important charge. Last year we had an opportunity of investigating charges before a committee of this House, and acting upon past experience the Government deem it imprudent to subject themselves to more investigation. After the investigation that took place last year a member of the Government had to resign his position, and is now obliged to occupy the humble position of a simple member of this House. It is rather amusing to take the history of hon. gentlemen opposite from the time of the Pacific Scandal down to the present time. One period after another has been characterized by acts of political corruption. During the last few years we may fairly say, considering not only the members of the Government but a great many of their friends, that the political head is sick and the heart faint; from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot they have shown evidence of corruption. We all remember the introduction of the system of railway subsidies, and these subsides were introduced for a purpose. Sir Charles Tupper brought into existence the plan by which grants were given to local railways in different provinces, and from the inception of that scheme subsidies to local railways have been utilized in that way, but the men who held the charters and carried through the schemes have contributed unquestionably to the support of and political existence of hon. gentlemen opposite. It will be remembered that we had an exposure with respect to the Caraquet Railway, which was controlled by a member of the House. We had the representative of the Cape Breton Railway stating that the road would not pay running expenses the first year.

Mr. CAMERON. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. The whole of the transactions with respect to subsidizing railways have been used directly or indirectly for political purposes, and it has been clearly shown that corruption is rife in all directions. I do not know why we are not permitted to investigate these matters. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not want us to obtain a roving or fishing commission. I do not wonder, because a very fishy lot of men have been connected with the railway subsidies. If we had commenced with investigating railways some years ago we should have had some remarkable revelations. We all remember the Northern Pacific Junction Railway. That scheme received $12,000 per mile, and bonds were issued for $20,000 per mile, or $32,000 altogether; but it never cost over $20,000 per mile, and over $12,000 per mile went into somebody's pocket. Some hon. members of this House could explain where the money went. That was the commencement, but the whole

scheme in connection with railway subsidies went into effect later. Why did not the Senate ask the appointment of a Royal Commission, or even the member for Toronto, respecting the Baie des Chaleurs matter? but it went before a committee of the Senate. The evidence that has been shown by the silence of hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly some men who occupy prominent positions in the ranks of the party, clearly demonstrates that they are getting sick and tired of the whole exhibition made by the Government on this matter.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright to amendment of Mr. Bowell:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Landerkin,
Armstrong,	Langelier,
Bain (Wentworth),	Laurier,
Béchard,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bernier,	Legris,
Bourassa,	Lister,
Bowers,	Livingston,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brown,	McGregor,
Bruneau,	McMillan (Huron),
Campbell,	McMullen,
Carroll,	Mignault,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mills (Bothwell),
Casey,	Monet,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perry,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Devlin,	Rider,
Edgar,	Rinfret,
Edwards,	Rowand,
Featherston,	Sanborn,
Flint,	Scriver,
Forbes,	Semple,
Fraser,	Somerville,
Frémont,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Vaillancourt,
Gibson,	Watson, and
Guay,	Yeo.—63.
Innes,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adams,	Lépine,
Amyot,	Lippé,
Bain (Soulanges),	Macdonald (King's),
Baker,	Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Barnard,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bennett,	Mackintosh,
Bergeron,	McAlister,
Bowell,	McCarthy,
Boyle,	McDonald (Victoria),
Burnham,	McDougald (Pictou),
Burns,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Cameron,	McKay,
Cargill,	McLean,
Carignan,	McLennan,
Carling,	McLeod,
Carpenter,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Cleveland,	McNeill,
Coatsworth,	Madill,
Cochrane,	Mara,
Cockburn,	Marshall,
Corbould,	Masson,
Corby,	Miller,
Costigan,	Mills (Annapolis),
Craig,	Moncrieff,
Curran,	Montague,
Daly,	Northrup,
Davin,	O'Brien,
Davis,	Ouimet,
Denison,	Patterson (Colchester),
Desaulniers,	Patterson (Huron),
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Pelletier,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Pope,
Dewdney,	Pridham,
Dickey,	Prior,
Dugas,	Putnam,
Dupont,	Reid,
Dyer,	Robillard,
Earle,	Roome,
Fairbairn,	Ross (Dundas),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	Ross (Lisgar),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Ryckman,
Foster,	Savard,
Fréchette,	Simard,
Gillies,	Skinner,
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Smith (Ontario),
Gordon,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Grandbois,	Sproule,
Guillet,	Stairs,
Haggart,	Stevenson,
Hazen,	Taylor,
Hearn,	Thompson (Sir John),
Henderson,	Tisdale,
Hodgins,	Tupper,
Hughes,	Turcotte,
Hutchins,	Tyrwhitt,
Ingram,	Wallace,
Ives,	Weldon,
Joncas,	White (Cardwell),
Kaulbach,	White (Shelbourne),
Kenny,	Wilmot,
Kirkpatrick,	Wilson, and
Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (Brockville).—125.
LaRivière,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Temple,	Mr. Gilmour,
Mr. Bergin,	Mr. Charlton,
Mr. Wood (Westmoreland),	Mr. Walsh,
Mr. Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mr. Préfontaine.
Mr. Chapleau,	Mr. Delisle,
Mr. Rosamond.	Mr. Bowman.

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Bowell) agreed to on the same division reversed.

Mr. McCARTHY moved:

That the resolution as amended be further amended by adding the following words:—"That the names of the said Commissioner or Commissioners be submitted for the approval of this House before his or their appointment."

Mr. LAURIER. What do the Government say to that?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Carried.

Motion (Mr. McCarthy) agreed to on division.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to on the same division.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3.45 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 5th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

STANLEY OF PRESTON.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a despatch from the Right Honourable Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 11th April, 1892, respecting the Addresses of sympathy from the Senate and House of Commons of Canada and from the Legislature of Ontario, on the occasion of

the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Clarence and Avondale.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA. 4th May, 1892.

(P.C. 1168—H.)

(*Copy.*)

Canada.—No. 92.

Colonial Office to the Governor General.

DOWNING STREET, 11th April, 1892.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatches Nos. 80 and 91 of the 11th and 21st of March, and to acquaint you that I have laid before the Queen the Addresses of sympathy which accompanied them from the Senate and House of Commons of Canada and from the Legislature of Ontario, on the death of H.R.H. the Duke of Clarence and Avondale.

Her Majesty has commanded me to request that you will convey to the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, and to the Legislature of Ontario, respectively, her best thanks for these expressions of loyalty and sympathy on their part, which have been an additional solace to her in her bereavement.

I have, &c.,
(Sgd.) KNUTSFORD.

Governor General,
&c., &c., &c.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Montreal and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BERGIN moved:

That the Fifth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be amended as follows:—

2nd paragraph, line 2.—Leave out the words "or a cabinet."

3rd paragraph, line 3.—Leave out the words "to the Clerk of this Committee, and."

3rd paragraph, line 11.—Leave out the words "from time to time," and also the words "as has been the custom hitherto."

Leave out the whole of the fourth paragraph.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps the hon. member will explain to the House what the effect of his amendment will be. We cannot possibly understand it from hearing it read.

Mr. BERGIN. It merely strikes out the words, "or a cabinet"—not this cabinet.

Report, as amended, concurred in.

ROUND HILL SHEAR DAM.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis) asked, Who tendered for the construction of the shear dam at Round Hill, Annapolis County, N. S.? What was the amount of each tender? Who is the contractor?

Mr. OUIMET. The following gentlemen tendered for the said work: William J. Loughran, Ottawa, $4,750; J. H. Healy and W. M. Baily, Round Hill, $5,200; John T. McKinnon, New Glasgow, $6,200; Ralph Jones, Ottawa, $7,200; Heney & Smith, Ottawa, $7,850; and W. J. Bell, Digby, $4,650. The lowest tender was from W. J. Bell, namely, $4,650. His tender was only received in the department on the 23rd of November, and the date for receiving the same was the 20th. The next lowest, that of W. J. Loughran, was awarded the contract.

LOCK IN THE RIVER YAMASKA.

Mr. MONETTE (for Mr. MIGNAULT) (Translation) asked, How many steamboats, or other vessels, have passed through the lock in the River Yamaska, from the time of its construction until the closing of navigation in the year 1891? Has the Government received tolls for the use of the said lock? If so, what is the annual amount collected therefrom?

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation.) The lock in the River Yamaska was completed in 1886. From April, 1886, to the end of May, 1889, the lock was opened 1,310 times to allow vessels to pass. The figures are not in for 1890 and 1891. No toll was charged for the use of the lock. The intention is to collect toll in the future.

COMMISSION ON THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Who are the members of the Royal Commission appointed to investigate "The Effects of the Liquor Traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada," &c., under authority of the vote of this House of 24th June, 1891? 2. Who is the chairman of the said commission? 3. What length of time has the said commission been engaged in prosecuting its investigations, and has it visited foreign countries for that purpose? 4. Has the Government information as to when the report of the said commission is likely to be made?

Mr. FOSTER. The members of the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the effects of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada, &c., are Sir Joseph Hickson, Montreal; E. F. Clarke, Esq., Toronto; Judge McDonald, Brockville; Rev. Dr. McLeod, Fredericton, N.B.; and George J. Gigault, Esq., Rouville, Que. The chairman of the said commission is Sir Joseph Hickson. The commission has had two meetings of short duration. Its third meeting is to take place in May. It has not visited foreign countries. The Government has no information as to when the report of the said commission is likely to be made.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I enquired the other day as to when the return I moved for as to the number of Royal Commissions issued since Confederation will be brought down. I would like to know when I may expect that return?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will enquire and inform the hon. gentleman later.

Mr. EDGAR. About a month ago a motion was carried, which I moved, for a return of papers granting letters patent to two cotton companies. I do not think it should have taken a whole month to get those papers ready. I should be glad to know when they will be brought down.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the return is ready. Both these matters are in charge of the Secretary of State, and I will send it to him.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 71) to further amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

REPORT.

Summary Report of the Geological Survey Department, for the year 1891.—(Mr. Dewdney.)

THE FISHERIES ACT.

Mr. TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 9) further to amend the Fisheries Act. He said: The main provisions of the Bill have to do with lobster fishing. It has been deemed necessary to make regulations concerning this most important industry on many occasions in the last ten or fifteen years. It was thought at the outset that by taking a close season covering a period when lobsters were spawning, or in the condition known as berried, the species would be preserved, and the industry be made a permanent one in Canada. Various close seasons were adopted, but with very little effect. The injury to the fisheries became apparent by the very best sign, and that is the decrease in the size of the lobsters caught each season. A commission was appointed some years back, which made an extensive enquiry into the matter; and on their report, the present districts were established, with close seasons and regulations as to the size limit. I may say, to give the House some idea of the importance of this industry, that the number of lobsters preserved in cans or sold alive during the season of 1890 amounted to 11,566,732 lbs. weight, representing a value of $1,648,344. It might seem a very healthy sign in connection with the fishery, that twenty years ago it produced nothing at all in comparison with what it does now; but while ten years ago two or three lobsters were sufficient to fill a can, six or seven are required at present, showing how the fish have decreased in size. I may, as this is very important, refer to the investigation by the commission appointed in 1886. A large amount of evidence was taken, and I particularly refer to the evidence taken in Prince Edward Island, where there is, perhaps, a more noticeable falling off in size in certain districts than in most of the other districts in Canada; but even there at that time, lobster packers and men engaged in the business favoured a regulation size of lobsters as high as ten and a half inches. Various witnesses were called by the commission, who mentioned that as about the legal standard of size which they would not object to. I may refer to the evidence of Mr. Grant, a lobster packer of Charlottetown, and to that of Mr. Lance who is still in the business, and who stated he would not object if the legal standard of size were raised to ten and a half inches. And Mr. Prowse, now, I believe, a member of the Senate, and conversant with this business, stated he was convinced that the closing of all the factories in the Dominion for at least three years was necessary to put the fisheries on a good footing. I wish to call attention also to the opinion of a predecessor of mine in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, who was very conversant with the requirements of this industry, and who introduced practically into Canada this regulation as to size as far back as 1879, when the regulation was adopted by Order in Council, upon his report, making the standard size nine inches, and also providing for a close season. It also provided against lobsters being taken in their berry condition. After this enquiry by the commission, the season was limited to a very brief period, in the face of bitter complaint on the part of the fishermen, who considered that the Government were unduly interfering with their means of livelihood, and in the face of bitter opposition by many packers who thought it would work to their detriment. But it is satisfactory to know to-day that these regulations are practically unimpeached or not attacked in any serious degree in any of the localities in Canada. On the contrary, representations from Prince Edward Island, to which I again allude because there the subject has been very much discussed and there the reports seem to show that the lobsters are of a smaller size to-day, are to the effect that the result of that long close season limit has been so beneficial that the department asked the Government that Parliament should stop there and allow the fisheries to be operated unembarrassed by other regulations, and suggested a regulation prohibiting the catch of lobsters under nine inches as at present, the regulation having been lowered from what it was a year or so back, nine and a half inches. I think that these hon. gentlemen should look into the facts and into the statements and into the recommendations and regulations, and they will see that the statement I started out with is correct, that there has been a serious diminution in the size of lobsters caught on the coasts of Canada, and that is to all fishery experts or authorities a sure sign of a failing fishery. I will call the attention of the House to some statistics showing the condition of the trade in this respect for some years back and now, and it will be observed that, while a large amount of lobsters are still canned, the attack on that industry has been carried on with greater vigour than ever, because, when the fisherman or the packer found his time for taking these lobsters was limited, he at once proceeded to double up the gear, increase the traps and attack that fishery with far more vigour than before. And there is very good reason for this on the part of the fisherman and the packer, because it is notorious throughout the world that the lobster species are being exterminated in many places, and that the catch has been largely depleted in others. Consequently, the prices for good lobsters are very good indeed, and inducements are held out for too many men to go into the business who had not given it a thought in previous days, and so make in a limited period more than was made in the longer period that once obtained. In order to show the necessity of restricting further the fishery, of safeguarding it, I may say that in 1888, in Prince Edward Island, there were 79 canneries in existence, while in 1891 they had risen to 142 canneries, and I am told, I imagine on good authority, that this season will see a larger increase in the number of canneries in Prince Edward Island. In New Brunswick in 1888, there were 75 canneries, and in 1891, there were 143 canneries. In Quebec the number rose from 38 in 1888 to 46 in 1891. The figures are not now before me in regard to Nova Scotia, but there is this to be said, that the interests of the fishery there are such that, on a large portion of the coast, there is not the same raid made upon the lobsters as is made elsewhere, for the export of large lobsters engages a great deal of the attention of the people of these districts, and, their market being in the United States where the limit is 10 inches or 10½ inches, they are required to get large lobsters; so that the American regulations practically protect the interest of the fishery in Nova Scotia. Then take the number of traps. In 1888, there were in New Brunswick, 84,000 traps. In 1891, there were 140,000 traps. Then, if we take the yield and value of the lobster

fishery as a whole, we find that in 1869 it amounted to 61,000 pounds of the value of $15,000, in 1874 it had risen to 8,000,000 pounds, with a value of $2,000,000, and in 1891 there was a yield of 26,000,000 pounds, the value, however, being very little different from that in 1874. There are many reasons for that, and I do not wish to rest on the argument that it is simply because of the decrease in size, though I think much might be said on that score, that a great many of the lobsters canned and put on the market cannot bring the value which the lobsters did when the run was admittedly so much longer, and the canner or packer did not gain a benefit from putting in a poor article. That a poor article is now packed and canned is too true, and that affects the trade very largely and very seriously in the English market, the moment the character of these goods is depreciated in that way. Another comparison I might take is the statement showing the value and yield of lobsters in Prince Edward Island. In 1881, 6,000,000 one-pound cans brought over $1,000,000, whereas in 1891, they had 3,000,000 one-pound cans which represented a value of $513,000. The House will be interested in having a statement corroborative of that made by me as to the decrease of this fishery everywhere in consequence of the tremendous drain upon it. I saw a few days ago in the *Fishing Gazette*, a paper which is published in New York in the interest of the fish and oyster trades, a reference to this effect. The editor states:

"During the past ten years there has been a great falling off in the supply of lobsters, until the price has increased fully 100 per cent. This applies alike to the New York market, to the waters along the New England coast and in Canada and Newfoundland, where lobster fishing and canning is an important industry."

And the head of the fishery bureau or department in Washington, who is now the head of the United States Fish Commission, Marshall McDonald, says:

"I have always felt that the maintenance of the lobster fishery rested more essentially upon proper regulation of the matter by the states than upon any efforts in the way of artificial propagation. The most usual regulation is that prohibiting the sale of lobsters below certain dimensions; the minimum limit, though varying with the different states, being smallest in Massachusetts. In Maine, where the law is enforced and the minimum fixed, I believe, at ten inches, the result has been a marked improvement in the lobster fisheries during the recent years."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Can the hon. gentleman tell me when that was changed, because, in looking up the matter, I discovered that the regulation in Maine by the law of 1884 referred to less than nine inches?

Mr. TUPPER. I have here the statute of 1887, and there it is ten inches.

Mr. BOWERS. I think it is ten and a half inches.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) is right, but we know that the Legislatures of the States of Maine and Massachusetts unfortunately introduced that drastic legislation after their fishery was practically ruined, but fortunately in Canada this Parliament has interfered with some success, notwithstanding what I have said with reference to the diminution in size, before the fishery was ruined. Taking the reports that come before me and the statements which are made by those conversant with the business, I am led to the opinion that our regulations are not what they should be, and that there is room for marked improvement, and I recognize the difficulty we all have to meet with in making these regulations. We come in contact with an enormous body of population in the Maritime Provinces which have a very hard time indeed to earn their livelihood and I would interfere as little as possible with them when dealing with the business out of which they earn so much of their annual income. But while I approach that duty with great difficulty, I none the less think that it is necessary in their interest to interfere. Now, although we may have to come into collision with them, to an extent, I believe the result will be, in all probability, in the future, that we shall not only secure their welfare, but obtain their gratitude. I mentioned that the packers themselves are fiercely opposed to the regulations touching the close season, and sent in statement after statement to my officers and to the department not to make any relaxation. Indeed, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will recollect that he censured the Government and censured myself, last year, for having extended the season, and not having adhered to it. He knows that no one, a few years before, would have objected in any part of Canada to an extension of that season for a few months. But they appreciate that, and I think in Prince Edward Island where this subject has been entirely canvassed and discussed in meetings, they have put themselves on record in support of the policy of the department so far as the close season is concerned, and there they ask us to stop. I do not think, and I am endeavouring to show why, we can stop there. I would ask the House to grant me some indulgence from the fact that on this subject only a portion of Parliament are actually or directly interested, as the lobster fishery, unfortunately, does not concern all the various portions of this great country. To show the result of over-fishing, I have mentioned that not only is a sign of it in Canada, but in other countries, that is equally true. In Scotland there are distinguished marine biologists who are employed by the Government to study this question, and Professor Ewing, for instance, of Edinburgh, recommends the closure of the lobster fishery for a season, as the only thing that can put that fishery in a good condition, stating that the regulations as to the close season have been a failure. Now that I mention by the way, and I would like to give the House some further evidence as to the signs of a diminution in the fishery, notwithstanding the very large and valuable catch that was made last year. But let me point out to the House why it is that in the face of some healthy signs in the lobster fishery now, owing to the close season, I am asking Parliament to make these careful regulations restricting to some extent that fishery; it is for that reason, and those from the districts concerned will understand it, that when the fishery failed, as it undoubtedly did to some extent, there was such a falling off that it became unremunerative for many packers to continue business. When we started out with this close season they went out of the business, and the statistics will show a sudden falling off of the canneries then in operation. Now, the danger is this, that having seen the wants of commerce and observing the prices in the general market, they are going into the business again. I make that statement with absolute certainty of its correctness. My officers tell me that even in Prince Edward Island, there will be

this season a larger number of canneries in operation than ever before in the history of the Island. Now, that is the danger. Provided that a certain number of men and a certain number of traps only had been kept in the business, much might be said for a close season; but we cannot say to one man that he may go into the business, and that some other enterprising man shall be kept out. We cannot take that course, no one advocates it. I think we are doubly bound to make such provisions that, while allowing all who care to go into the business, to do so, will throw the best possible safeguards around that industry. Some ten or twelve years ago it would take, as I have already said, two or three lobsters to fill a can. Now it requires six or seven, and some of my officers even report that it will take eight to fill a can. I have known myself as to what packers will do; I have known of several hundred lobsters taken and put in the boilers for the purpose of canning, and they are only four inches from the tip of the beak to the middle end of the last flipper of the tail: and any man from the lobster district will know that that lobster had very little meat in it, and that any meat that could be got from a lobster of that size was absolutely worthless. I mention that, therefore, to show that regulations certainly are necessary, not merely as to a close season, but also touching the size. Taking several hundreds of thousands of those, it will be apparent at once what an enormous injury is done to the whole species when not one of them have had a chance of reproducing, and when each lobster is capable, if it is given an opportunity of reproducing but once, of reproducing thousands upon thousands of its species. Before going on with some authorities in support of my position, I would also point out that it is admitted by students of this question, even by Professor Ewing himself, that one great reason for the necessity of protection of the lobster species, is that the lobster is not a migratory fish, in this sense, that while he can travel quickly and travel a good deal, he is confined to zones, and the Island packers evidently have ascertained that, because they speak constantly of there being a run of a smaller lobster in the district in its best condition, than in many other districts of Canada. But, nevertheless, their experience is in accordance with the statements of scientists who point out the ease with which men can destroy that fishery in a particular district, and have destroyed it, as I have shown, in other districts of the world. They say that the lobster is confined to a certain zone, and when that zone is over-fished, the lobster disappears entirely and none others come to take his place. Now, we have the reports of our officers from Gloucester and Kent Counties in New Brunswick, for instance, and from the counties on the Northumberland Straits, showing that the lobsters are getting scarcer and smaller from this extraordinary increase in the number of traps, statistics of which I have given the House. They also support the statement as to the larger number now required to fill these one-pound cans. So we have much evidence from packers who admit that, and for that reason are all the more anxious that at least this close season shall be strictly adhered to. The reports of inspectors of fisheries for England and Wales for 1886-87, for instance, speak of an alarming decrease in the size of lobsters in Great Britain. So the official reports of the fisheries and fishing interests in the United States in 1887 show that the fishing grounds on the coast of Maine are now completely exhausted, that there are no fish, and that the grounds are not worth fishing over. I again remind the House that this occurred before these regulations were adopted, that are now spoken of, and that is one reason for entertaining the belief that it will take a very long time before these grounds are recuperated. The decrease in the United States is most marked on the New England coast; but there it is due, as every one knows, to over-fishing. One of the United States commissioners reports:

"Cape Cod used to be a famous fishing ground; a large trade was started with New York. Each lobster pot caught 100 to 200 every night. Since 1885, a rapid decrease has been noticed. In 1880 only eight men were engaged in this fishing, and although they used the most improved appliances, their annual gross earnings did not exceed $60 each."

That is in a district where at one time there was most remunerative fishing carried on.—

"On the coast of Maine, although this fishing is of much more recent date, it has already exhibited alarming signs of decay, while the average size of individuals is generally decreasing. The shore fisheries are completely exhausted and fishermen are compelled to resort to distant grounds."

The commissioner mentioned different districts, which it is unnecessary for me to enumerate. He speaks of New Hampshire, where the decrease for the last 20 years is said to have been from 50 to 75 per cent; and he also speaks of Rhode Island and Connecticut, where there has already been a considerable falling off in the number and size. Coming to Canada, I will refer at the outset to the Baie des Chaleurs. Dr. Lavoie, then in command of the Gulf Fishing Divisions, reported in 1875 to the Government that:

"The apprehensions entertained in 1872 from the result of previous excessive fishing will fully reach last season, so far as Baie des Chaleurs is concerned, where barely 9,315 pounds of lobsters were prepared against 216,432 pounds last year."

In his report of 1876 he also says:

"The ruin of the lobster fishery on the shores of the United States ought to warn and at the same time teach us a lesson, which we should take advantage of; that is to regulate, with as little delay as possible, the mode of carrying on this fishery; if we would not suffer the same results as are already experienced at Carleton and Maria and other places on the shores of Baie des Chaleurs. The fishing grounds of Maria, Carleton and New Richmond will require several years rest before they will become as valuable as formerly."

Dr. Wakeham, his successor, draws attention to the tremendous drain annually made on this fishery and the signs of diminution in size, and, therefore, diminution of the species in so many places. The inspector at Prince Edward Island has always held a very strong position on this point, and, notwithstanding that he has been in constant communication with those interested in the business, who insist on a close season, he has been most persistent in his arguments in support of the absolute necessity of restricting packers and fishermen from taking immature lobsters or lobsters of a size below that at which they are supposed to be capable of reproducing themselves. He has advised, under the present regulations, the adoption of the 9-inch limitation regulation. He reported, in 1887, that lobsters were so small and scarce that year that several packers had to close their factories early in the season and not a few of them were driven into bankruptcy. This part of the case naturally brings me to a consideration of what is a proper size limit,

if a regulation is necessary, as I believe it is, in addition to the close season. The late Hon. Mr. Pope, who was familiar, I take it, with the condition of the fisheries in Prince Edward Island, was of that opinion as far back as 1879. He then advocated the limit of nine inches. The commissioners to whose report I have referred, recommended, I think, nine and a half or ten inches, I forget which, certainly over nine, and the witnesses who gave testimony on that point expressed various opinions, all, I think, in favour of a regulation of nine inches. In England and in Scotland a regulation prevails as to the size at which lobsters shall be taken, or rather under which lobsters shall not be taken. In Denmark and Norway, from which countries there is an enormous export of lobsters to the English market, they have also a size limit. In those regulations, except in England and Scotland, where the limit is below nine inches, the limit is over nine inches.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman does not mean to say that in Norway the limit is below nine inches?

Mr. TUPPER. What I should say is that all countries on this side of the ocean have no limit as low as the one in Canada; we have at present the shortest limit, nine inches. In Newfoundland the limit is ten inches in one part and ten and a half in another, and in the United States there is no size limit under ten inches. But it is admitted that in Europe the lobster in its normal condition is much smaller than in this country, and in England it is smaller than in Scotland, and so the limit in England is seven inches and in Scotland eight inches. As there is much argument used to the fact that we are needlessly hampering the lobster business by paying attention to the size at which a lobster should be caught, I will refer to one of the best known authorities on the subject, the late Professor Buckland, who was chief commissioner of fisheries in England, up to the time of his death. He made a special investigation into this question when examining into the fisheries of Norfolk in 1875. I suppose that will be about the date at which the size regulation was made in England, but I am not aware of that point.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was in 1878.

Mr. TUPPER. In 1875 Professor Buckland made a very interesting report on this subject, and it will be found in the reports of the commissioners for 1875, vol. 17, page 175. He speaks on this subject that interests us in considering the lobster question, and I will briefly refer to some of his observations. He called attention to the reason of the scarcity of the lobsters on that coast, the object of his mission being to ascertain the cause of the falling off and to make recommendations as to the best manner in which the fisheries could be resuscitated. He says:

"The lobsters on the above-mentioned grounds have been getting very scarce during the last ten or twelve years; the average size has also been very much diminished."

In a foot-note he mentioned that Mr. Bayfield writes:

"Lobsters are very scarce now. No lobsters should be sold under eight inches and they ought to have a proper time in spawning season."

Professor Buckland goes on to say:

"That lobsters carrying spawn when caught, are sold spawn and all, and that lobsters of all sizes are sent to market for the last ten years: numbers of lobsters as small as three inches are sent to the market. Lobster are sold by the pound; the proposed legal lobsters should be seven inches or three to the pound."

Apparently the lobsters which it refers to are larger lobsters than ours as three of these will go to the pound. He gives them the life size of the lobster of 6¾ inches in length, the proposed standard being 7 inches, and I find on examination that for the purpose of comparison their measurement is the same as the measurement adopted in Canada, measuring, for instance, from the end of the tail, as he calls it, to the tip of the beak. The regulation in England even under this report, or afterwards, did not, I admit, contain as wise a provision as the existing regulations in Canada do, because our season is, I fancy, shorter than the seasons in any of the places to which I refer, and there is a great difficulty experienced from that. I will not weary the House just now with many of the authorities I could give, or the extracts from reports showing that I have not drawn too alarming a condition of the fisheries in Canada, but those who care to look through the fishery reports will see that there is a great unanimity of opinion on the part of those who are not in the business, but who are watching it, and who have no reason to embarrass in any way this industry. Now, *apropos* of that and having these various reports before me, I had convened a meeting of the inspectors of the Department of Fisheries sometime ago, and they drew up a scheme for the better protection of the fisheries and a scheme which was considered not to unduly interfere with the operations of the fishermen. I went over that scheme and drafted the proposed regulations a copy of which were laid on the Table of the House, and I endeavored to ascertain to what extent I could expect the co-operation of those engaged practically in the business, if I attempted to carry out the proposal which found its existence in the minds of the various fishery officers. I was disappointed in this to some extent, though, as I stated to the House in introducing the Bill, which in its first form was the result of their deliberations, I had sufficient evidence to show that the outline of these regulations would be acceptable to a large portion of the people interested in the business. However, it was represented most strongly to me by various gentlemen in the House who are far more conversant with the actual working of these methods than I am, that the proposal was too radical and entirely too severe upon the people who make a livelihood to some extent out of the industry, and after frequent consultations with many of these hon. gentlemen who discussed the subject with me I remodelled the Bill and put it in its present shape. The people of Newfoundland have had occasion to pay a great deal of attention to this subject. It is a most valuable industry to them, it has been even a greater industry there than it is at present, and having had the advantage of the services of a very eminent man, Mr. Neilsen, who is an expert in fishery matters, he has gone into the question, and his report, which I also laid on the Table, goes to show that some new regulations are necessary on that island. I have taken advantage of his opinions in the consideration of this Bill, and I have largely, if not altogether, adopted the principle which he advocates in his report. That is, not merely a proper close season, but, perhaps,

more than to anything else he attaches a great deal of importance to the size limit, and he has concluded that our regulation and the regulation of Newfoundland in that connection are faulty on account of the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of a general enforcement of it. At present we say that to ascertain the size, the lobster shall be measured, and the law says that the fishermen must put back the lobsters which are under 9 inches in length. In practice, however, this is not done, and Mr. Neilsen, and Professor Beck, of Norway, are authorities to show that it is impossible to expect that that regulation can be carried out. Nevertheless, they adhere to the principle of it, but they say that we must obtain the correct size somewhat in the way we guard the taking of other fish by nets, and that is, to adopt the principle of limitation of the size of the mesh. Mr. Neilsen has suggested a scheme which, I am sure, will be universally popular in Canada. It is said that it is already popular after being tried one season in Newfoundland, and I am quite satisfied that our own fishermen will much prefer it to the present regulation for ascertaining the size. That scheme is : to regulate the space or distance that should be between the laths of the traps in which the lobster is taken, so that the small or immature lobsters will be able to get out and the large lobsters be retained. I have discussed that subject with hon. gentlemen, notably again from Prince Edward Island, and my frequent reference to that island is that the chief objection to our regulations comes from that quarter owing to the admitted decrease in the size of lobsters. Whether they were or were not originally smaller, it is certain that any regulation touching the size limit affects that district more severely than any other place. Mr. Neilsen made some experiments in the presence of the Hon. Mr. Harvey, chairman of the commission and a member of the Newfoundland Government, as to the distance between these laths in the traps, and on pages 76 and 77 of the report he gives the result of his enquiry. Therefore, I provided in the present Bill that the width between the two lowest laths or slats should be 1¾ inches apart. Some hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island expressed the opinion that Mr. Neilsen's experiment would not be verified by experiments on our lobsters—why, they did not know, or did not undertake to say. But having made an experiment with a dead lobster in this city, they were confident that that space would be too great, and would allow a larger lobster than he had supposed to pass through. Consequently I had that matter enquired into on the spot, and I am of opinion that what they say is largely the case, whether it is on account of the difference between the lobster taken in the straits and the lobster in Newfoundland I do not care to enquire. But I am willing to accept their statement and to adopt the result of the experiment in our own country, and we find that 1½ instead of 1¾ inches space will stop an 8-inch lobster. That is a considerable concession to the views of those who think that the size limit in Canada at present, 9 inches, is too large. Now, to show that I am not departing from the principle which I believe to be of such great importance, I want to point out that though the . duction in size is made, we are giving up a regulation which, while beneficial, is only effective at a certain portion of the season in the main ; that is to say, while we now impose penalties for catching lobsters under 9 inches, we know as a matter of fact that that regulation is violated time and again, that there is an uneven administration of the penalties, that many escape, and that even those fined willingly pay the fine for the privilege they get during the larger portion of the season for taking lobsters. I mentioned the case where 300 lobsters were found in one factory only four inches long. It was a positive crime that those lobsters should have been killed and kept. At any rate that regulation is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. But we adhere to it for this reason, that with our present machinery it is absolutely necessary, because at the end of the season in the month of July, there comes so small a run of lobsters that even with the laws in force it does not pay the packer to run the risk. Therefore, although the regulation has been productive of a limited amount of good, we can safely come down to 1½ inches, stopping at a length of 8 inches, in view of that slow season, which is longer, I believe, with us than with any of the other countries to which I have referred. Then, I have a justification from the evidence as to when a lobster does mature. I have given some authorities to show the idea that was in the minds of many of the officers who studied the subject. But to come down to that very question, it is the experience of Dr. Wakeham, an officer who has been up and down the gulf for many years in charge of the Canadian fishery service, that a lobster under 8½ inches was seldom found capable of reproducing. But I had an opportunity of speaking to him recently, and he confines that opinion largely to the medium waters with which he is most familiar. He admits that with regard to the waters of the Straits of Northumberland that would not be a correct statement, but that there the size would be somewhat smaller. Mr. Wilmot, in a limited time, made some experiments in the Straits of Northumberland when at Pictou, and the result of his enquiries is contained in his report of 1890, page 25. He concludes that a lobster capable of reproducing would be, on the average, about 8½ inches long, though smaller lobsters are found with eggs. Mr. Neilsen's experiments show that they are seldom found under 8 inches capable of reproducing, and that in Newfoundland they are more often over 8 inches than under. I have alluded to Professor Buckland's report on that point. Prof. Beck in Norway is of opinion that lobsters are capable of spawning when they are three years old and reach the length of 8 inches ; lobsters less than 8 inches long are seldom found with ova. Mr. Ogden, who has had a great deal of experience on the Atlantic coast, and who was engaged in business not only on the Canadian coast but in the United States when packing was carried on there, has followed this question very carefully, and he reports that in the Northumberland Straits 90 per cent of 8-inch lobsters are capable of reproducing, and he has noticed exuded eggs on smaller lobsters, even on some under 7 inches. Mr. Johnson, who has lectured on this subject, and who is, I believe, an authority in the States, expresses the opinion that 10½ inches was necessary under the Massachusetts regulations, because that was the size at which the lobsters there became capable of reproducing. I did not lay Mr. Ogden's report on the Table the other day, because I wished to ascertain more definitely than

he stated how his measurements were made, because it conflicted with those made by Mr. Neilsen; and I have ascertained since that they were made just as Mr. Neilsen's were, from the beak to the end of the middle flipper of the tail; so that there must be some difference in the shape of the lobsters to account for the ease with which the larger ones pass through these laths. On that point again there is this advantage, possibly this danger, to the packer, who wishes to take a smaller lobster than we contemplate, namely, that every time a trap is picked up, at that particular moment the smallest lobster in the trap must be caught, because the force of the water and the rapidity with which the trap is pulled up prevents it going through the bars. There is another advantage, that the ballast of the trap will cover a great deal of space at the bottom, where the lobsters are found. But, notwithstanding that, I yield to the force of the arguments which have been put before me, in coming to the conclusion that while to that extent there will be many small lobsters taken, there will not be half so many as are now taken in spite of the regulation. This regulation was extremely unpopular in certain districts, and unpopular for another reason that it is almost impossible for an honest packer to comply with it. The quickness of despatch required in taking lobsters from the bed and putting them into the boiling pots prevents that careful sorting necessary to strictly obey such a regulation. Again, the advantages will be that we will be proceeding on, perhaps, a more correct principle in forming checks or preventives against the catching of immature fish, and I think in that connection it is not necessary for me to say anything more. In one section of the Island, it has been represented that even one and a half inch reduction there, limiting the size practically to eight inches, will embarrass the business, so as to make it almost unprofitable for the fisheries in that particular section. I will not make any stipulation with reference to that particular district, but will say that while we gain so much from this limited fishing season, if it is more agreeable to the people concerned in that district, if we can get their co-operation and accomplish our purpose working in unison with them instead of against them, as to a large extent we do to-day,—if they will give up, say, ten days at the end of the present open season, I would recommend the passing of an Order in Council, under the Fisheries Act, to reduce that to a one and a quarter space. Speaking from Mr. Ogden's report, that will stop lobsters of seven and a half inches. I have taken rather long time in referring to this question, but I believed it was absolutely necessary that I should do it, and I have referred to these authorities in order to convince the House that these regulations are made eminently in the interests of the fishermen, and I believe they will be popular, and that is a great point with most of those engaged in the industry. I have not alluded to another and a very important point, and that is the proposal made in this Bill that every packer or every person who preserves or cures lobsters shall take out a license. On the Atlantic coast, the license system does not generally prevail as it does in the interior, and there has not been the same reason for its extension, because in most of the sea fisheries it is the general theory that the lack of this system does very little harm to the different species of fish compared with what may be done on limited or inland waters; but in connection with the lobster fishery, I have shown that it is a limited fishery, that the lobsters are confined to certain districts, and in the interests of the honest packer and of those who wish to put up a good article and carry on the business on a systematic basis, as well as in the interest of a uniform administration of the law, the license system is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary. The fee proposed is nominal, and for that fee we give back full value. In the opinion of many packers, the certificate of the officer or the stencilling will be of considerable commercial value; but whether it be or not, my experience in these regulations has been that a great deal of complaint has come from the bulk of those engaged in the business because when they obey the rules and close their factories, they find, to their detriment and the injury of the fisheries, that all over the coast little canneries or something of the kind spring up. With this license system, our police can more effectively control persons, and see that the regulations are complied with. That advantage we have in view, and making the fee nominal, as we do, I think the regulation will be a wise and also a popular one. There is an amendment I would ask to be made by the Committee in committee to 10*a* or the second clause. It has not been printed but is in my draft. It is not proposed that the fishermen shall take out a license, or that fishermen who keep them alive in ponds or other places during the open season, as one would imagine in the first place, shall take out the license that is provided in section 10. Where vessels come down to some parts of the coast to collect lobsters, they do not take the lobsters from the pots but from ponds where the lobsters are kept after being taken out of the pots by the fishermen. I do not propose that those people shall take out a license; but they may, if they wish, keep them during the close season in ponds, which is quite a business, for instance in Yarmouth, the lobsters being caught in the open season and kept in ponds until the markets in the States are favourable for shipment. That would not lead to an abuse, as it easily would if there was no license and no check of that kind on parties taking lobsters in close as well as open seasons.

Mr. PERRY. What did the hon. gentleman say with reference to space between the laths?

Mr. TUPPER. The regulation in general under that clause will be that there must be a space of 1½ inches between the two lowest slats on the side of every trap, box or cage. I stated that I wished the House to understand that in consequence of representations made touching certain districts, that where the fisheries are in so bad a condition that the run will become so small as to prevent their carrying on the business, rather than prohibit the fishery there altogether, which we do not propose to do, and which is the alternative which has been suggested in Scotland, if those districts will give up the ten days of the season, as I understand one district is willing to do, and that is why I allude to Prince Edward Island, I would rather change the season for them. Discovering that, I would by Order in Council change the season for that district and change the regulations for it. That is the proposal I make, and, if that does not meet with general acceptation, it can be reconsidered. I give

in this way to two districts the benefit of 1 or 1½ inches.

Mr. McLEAN. I have no doubt that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in framing this Bill has had at heart the best interests of those engaged in the lobster business, and the Bill as now presented to the House does not call for that objection on my part that it would have done if it had been introduced in its first form, or according to the existing regulations. It is necessary, in regard to the lobster industry, to make a distinction between the fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and that of the Atlantic coast and of the coast of Newfoundland. I might at first correct a misapprehension the Minister of Marine is under regarding the law in the State of Maine. I have taken from the American fisheries report of the year 1887, an extract of the state laws for the different states of the Union, and I find that the law in the State of Maine in 1879 prohibited the canning and preserving of lobsters and the capture and sale of individual lobsters under 10½ inches long, between the 1st August and the 1st April, but no restrictions were placed on the fishery between the 1st April and the 1st August. In 1883, that law was amended so that the close season extended from the 15th August to the 15th November, and the capture or sale of females with spawn and of lobsters under nine inches long was prohibited from the 1st April to the 1st August.

Mr. TUPPER. What clause was that?

Mr. McLEAN. That was in the law of 1883. I did not take the number of the clause.

Mr. TUPPER. Section 5 of the law of 1887 says it shall be unlawful to buy, sell or possess any female, or any lobster less than 10½ inches.

Mr. McLEAN. In this Act the taking of lobsters over 9 inches long, except females with spawn, is permitted in the canning season. I call the attention of the House to this because in the New England States the fishing is very much overdone, for two reasons. In addition to the canning season, lobsters are taken there nearly the whole year round, whereas, as far as the Gulf of St. Lawrence is concerned, though we have by law from the 1st January to the 15th July, still in reality, owing to the fact that the Gulf is frozen over for a great portion of that time, the actual fishing season is from about the 15th or the 20th May to the 15th July, or about 45 days in the year is all the time that the lobster fishing is carried on in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, taking out stormy days when the fishermen cannot go out, and holidays and Sundays. This year the lobster fishing season commenced about the 1st of May, which is the earliest season I have known since I engaged in the fishery fourteen years ago. As to the statement that lobsters are scarcer now than they were when the factories were first started, it is true to a certain extent, but the actual value of the fish taken last year was pretty nearly equal to that in the best season we ever had, which was either 1882 or 1883. If we refer to the reports of the inspectors, we will find that in 1883 lobsters were about $4 a case, and 130,000 cases, representing a value of $520,000, had been taken, $1 representing the value of the case and the cans; whereas last year, though not so many lobsters were taken, and not so many cases were packed, they represented a value of $750,000, or about $7.50 a case. Deducting $130,000 for the cases leaves the value of the lobsters packed in 1883, $390,000. Last season 100,000 cases were packed. Deducting $100,000 for cases, we have the actual value of the lobsters packed, $600,000. So I take it that the value of the lobster fishery in Prince Edward Island, though the quantity taken may not have been so large, was as valuable as in any other season. The reports do not show these particulars, because the inspectors put about the same value on the lobster from season to season. As regards the change proposed by the Minister of Marine as to the widths between the slats in the traps, I may say that the regulations as proposed or which were in force under the Order in Council have been admitted by the inspectors and by Commander Gordon to be impracticable and impossible to carry out, if the industry was to be profitable. I will read Commander Gordon's report upon this question, in regard to which no man is more competent to speak. He says:

"The present regulations in regard to size limit and the destruction of females carrying exuded ova are intended as protective measures, and are without doubt protective enactments, but the question arises how far the enforcement of these enactments is possible with the existing means at the command of the department, and the still wider question of whether the enforcement of the regulation is compatible with the existence of the industry. I consider the fact undeniable, that taking the Gulf of St. Lawrence district, if the above quoted regulations were strictly enforced, not one single packing factory could run for one single day; and if the packers whose interest and desire it undoubtedly is to maintain this fishery were to attempt to enforce the law; the fishermen would directly reply that they could not make a living at fishing with adherence to those regulations, and therefore could not fish for the packers."

That was the state of affairs at that time, and that has continued, notwithstanding any reports to the contrary made by the inspectors that the law was complied with. I know Commander Gordon. He called upon me when he got his commission for the protection of the lobster fisheries, and after he was sworn in he told me he was going to carry out the regulations to the letter. I told him that in that case he had better fine every factory as he went along because it was impossible to carry out the regulations. We had to close up, and, as a matter of fact, every factory that he did visit was fined. I contend now, and I have always contended, that the actual close season has never been fairly tested. From one season to another there have been extensions of time which have made the close seasons practically untested up to the present time. I would like, myself, to see the close season strictly adhered to, and, if it was necessary for further protection for the lobster business, that the time should be shortened. I may say that my colleague and myself waited upon the Minister with reference to having these slats from the traps put closer together, especially as regards Prince Edward Island. I am speaking of Prince Edward Island alone, but I think what suits that Island will suit all parts of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, with the exception of a small portion of the Straits of Northumberland. We suggested to the Minister that from Cape Traverse pier, around south to Cape Bear, and around East Point to North Cape, the traps be allowed to be 1¼ inches between the slats, and in consideration of his extending that favour, we would be willing to allow a shortening of the season until the 5th July. But owing to the fact that on Egmont Bay and in

certain portions of the western part of the Island, the lobsters do not strike in as early as in some other portions, we suggested that from Cape Traverse pier to North Cape, the time be made from the 1st May till the 15th July. I think that while a great many fishermen will object to that regulation altogether, still, if it is found necessary by the department that further protection than the close season affords should be had, taking that part of the Island from East Point and around the North Side up as far in the Straits of Northumberland as Cape Traverse, if the regulation was made of 1¼ inches between the slats, and the time shortened to the 5th July, the fishermen would be fairly well satisfied, better satisfied than they would be if the slats were retained 1½ inches apart, although the time was allowed to remain up to the 15th July as at present. I might say that I think it is unfair to make a comparison of the Straits of Northumberland and the Gulf of St. Lawrence with the coast of Newfoundland, or the Atlantic coast, or even the coasts of Great Britain and of Norway and Sweden. We know that for 21 years, I think it is now, the lobster industry has been prosecuted in Prince Edward Island, and the fact has been quoted that people have become bankrupt and that the fishing industry is not as profitable as it appears to be. But the business varies. In some years, after a great scarcity of lobsters, we will have an abundant catch. That was the case last year, and on that account this year, and owing to the high prices of lobsters last year, a great many men have gone into the industry, and I have no doubt a great many will overdo the business. But the business will regulate itself because next year there will not be so many men going into it. The Straits of Northumberland and the Gulf of St. Lawrence are looked upon as being the actual breeding ground for the lobsters, more so than either the Atlantic coast or that of Newfoundland, and in proof thereof, if the Minister of Marine wants proof, I have only to quote this fact, which will be borne out by every member from Prince Edward Island, that five or six years ago, when the Hon. Daniel Davies went to great expense and removed some lobster factories to the coast of Newfoundland, after four years he had exhausted that fishery and came back and put his plant where he had been fishing on Prince Edward Island for 20 years before; and last year I understand that in each of his factories he put up 1,600 or 1,700 cases of lobsters. I attribute that to the fact that we find in all rocky bottoms, say, for instance, at East Point on Prince Edward Island, at the North Cape, and at all other places where there are rocky bottoms, the lobsters are larger in size and scarcer than on the great level parts of the Island. I think, also, that the coast of Newfoundland is not a breeding ground for lobsters at all, owing to the fact of the water being so very deep and the space of ground they have to fish over is very much less than it is elsewhere, because on the coasts of Prince Edward Island or the Magdalen Islands there are not over eight or ten fathoms of water. The lobsters, I believe, are extending all over that coast, and just move in at certain seasons. So far as shortening the season is concerned, I have found in my experience that lobsters do not commence to fall off in size until about the 1st or 5th of July, when we have an ordinary season. Now, take this season, when the lobster season commences about the 1st of May; if we should have a warm summer the probability is that we would have a great many small lobsters, perhaps soft-shell lobsters, about the 1st of July. I know thatthe fishermen on the Island would rather make a concession in the way of shortening the season than to have any restrictions which would make the business unprofitable for the time in which they are fishing. To show that I am not alone in this opinion, that Prince Edward Island and the Gulf of St. Lawrence are differently situated, so far as fishing and the means of exhausting fisheries are concerned, I will just read a report from the fisheries of Great Britain, and it is taken out of the report of the Fishery Commission of the United States. It reads as follows:—

"The Fishery Commissioners in England in the years 1875 and 1876 made a thorough inspection of the crab and lobster fisheries of the English and Scottish coasts. All the principal fishing stations were visited, and from personal observations and the testimony of fishermen and dealers a very elaborate report, embodying every detail of their investigations, was prepared and published in 1877. The conclusions at which they arrived regarding the state of the fishery, and the suggestions made for its improvement are contained in the following extract from their report."

It goes on to speak of the different sections, and the condition of the fish in the different sections. It says:

"It is no easy matter, therefore, to compare the results of the fishing now with those which were experienced fifty or twenty-five years ago. The take now is divided among a greater number of fishermen. The area of the fishery has been greatly extended. On the whole, however, we believe that we are in the right in concluding that in small fisheries, or fisheries in confined areas, there has been in every case a marked decrease of fish; while in large and exposed fisheries there has been no decrease whatever. Take, for example, the fisheries of the Land's End, the Lizard and the Start. All these fisheries comprise large areas of sea bottom, all of them in exposed situations, and the powers of man have been hitherto incapable of exhausting them. But there are other fisheries in an exactly opposite position. A description will be found, for instance, in the evidence which we received at Wembury, relating to a small fishery off the Eddystone Rocks. The fishery is contained in a few acres, and, although the situation is exposed, the area is so small that the fishermen have been able to exhaust it. The same conclusion is true of the fisheries which are situated in confined bays, such, for instance, as that at Falmouth. The fishermen there, exposed to no bad weather, are able to pursue the fishery at every season of the year. High prices have induced them to increase the efficiency of their gear, and the gradual decay of the fishery, which over-fishing has occasioned, has compelled them to fish harder and harder to earn a livelihood."

I claim that this goes to prove that in considering a coast like that of Newfoundland the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be very careful before he accepts even an expert's testimony on the subject, when the conditions are altogether different than those which prevailed in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. That is why I have no faith in Mr. Neilsen's report, for although his remarks may be perfectly correct as regards Newfoundland, they do not apply to the Gulf. If there had been in Newfoundland during the past twenty years the same number of traps on the coast as there have been at Prince Edward Island and other places on the Gulf, lobster fishing in Newfoundland would have ceased altogether. This matter connected with the lobster fishing industry is of very great importance to the people of Prince Edward Island, and, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated, it has received a great deal of attention from them, and no regulations can be issued by the department without eliciting great interest among the people.

The industry possesses as much interest to Prince Edward Island as one involving $30,000,000 would to the whole Dominion, and the House will readily understand that any action taken by the department is closely watched by our people. When the Bill was first introduced I, and those interested in this industry, strongly protested against it, because we felt that the industry could not be prosecuted with profit any longer; and when the House comes to consider the value of an industry amounting to $750,000 annually to a small province like Prince Edward Island, it is obvious that any measure that would make it unprofitable for packers and fishermen to continue the industry would be doing serious injustice to the parties, especially if the Government regulations proposed were not such as were in the interest of the business. When the report came that Mr. Neilsen had ascertained that a lobster of 10 inches could get through a trap 2¼ inches in width between the bars, we were surprised, and my own experience has not fully carried out this view. But not having tested the matter I could not state positively at the time, and accordingly I requested the Minister to allow the matter to stand over until a test could be made. I found on purchasing a dead lobster in the city that a 9½ inch lobster could go out of a trap with slats 1¼ inches in width: that is to say, it could be pushed through such spaces. I claim that a live lobster will go through a smaller space than you can press a dead one through. When a great many lobsters get into a trap, the large ones drive the small ones out. I am not able to say that the results of the tests with live lobsters are as stated, although I understand they have been carried out by Mr. Ogden.

Mr. TUPPER. I stated to the contrary. Mr. Neilsen's tests were not borne out.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Ogden's tests bore out what I was saying. If the Minister would say that he is prepared to establish for the Island the size 1¼ inches between the bars, taking the section I spoke of, I think the fishermen would meet him half way; and if the Minister would make the regulation now so as to meet the approbation of the fishermen and packers, it would be strictly enforced, and they would adhere rigidly to the close season. They always have been anxious that the Minister should make it imperative that the close season should be adhered to. That is a matter which the packers and all those engaged in the factories have been anxious should be carried out for the last four or five years. I might go on to show that the close season is of great benefit to the lobster fishery, and that the very months we have the close season are the months which, in my opinion, are the best for lobsters to be protected, that is to say from 15th July, in an ordinary season, to 1st October. In all countries they are protected at that time. That being the case, and the lobster packers and fishermen knowing that in July lobsters cast their shells, and that this is the principal breeding season, and that during this period the lobsters on the coast are smaller and fall off in quality, they are satisfied to even shorten the season to secure the other concessions. If the Minister makes the trap 1½ inches between the lower bars, so as to allow 8-inch lobsters to escape, I do not think the industry can be carried on at a profit during our present short season, especially in view of the fact that the reports of the factories in the Gulf, as well as in Prince Edward Island show that 55 per cent of the lobsters taken for the factories were 9 inches and under. So if you take 30 per cent off the receipts of the factory, which would be the case if 8-inch lobsters were allowed to escape, the factory being in operation about 45 days in a year, the business would become unprofitable, and when it became unprofitable to the packers, it would certainly be unprofitable to the fishermen. I might also point out, as regards the fishing in the Gulf, that, owing to the absence of a market for fresh lobsters, it is impossible to exhaust the supply in that section. It must be remembered that no factories can be run unless 4,000 lobsters are landed daily, and when the supply falls below that number, the factory must be closed. This would afford a groundwork for the department to build up the industry by stopping packing altogether, and allowing the fishery to increase from year to year until it has become profitable again. It is different where fresh fishing is carried out all the year round. We have two months in the year during which lobsters are packed, but in Maine fresh fishing goes on during the balance of the year, and for that fishing the largest and best lobsters are taken to market. I believe these departmental regulations, if carried out in the way I have indicated, will be satisfactory, while at the same time the packers and fishermen believe that nothing but a shortening of the season is necessary. Coming now to the question of those engaged in this business being obliged to take out licenses, I may say that much dissatisfaction was expressed at the meeting of packers held in Charlottetown last spring, when they learned that they would have to pay for licenses to catch lobsters, for in their opinion lobster-fishing should be as open as any other fishing. Of course the license fee being so small, if the other concessions were made, I do not think that the packers or the fishermen would very strongly object. I wish to point out some suggestions to the Minister with reference to the label. What the hon. gentleman expects to do by having a label is to detect those who pack out of season, and that no man would be furnished with labels to put on his cases who packs after the 15th July. While it may serve that purpose I believe it will be an injury in another way. At present every man who has been packing lobsters for any length of time has his brand pretty well established either in the American or English market, and now when these labels will be put on all these cases in the future, dealers on the other side will look upon it that these lobsters have been packed under the inspection of the Dominion Government, and they will all be put in the same category and all be judged alike. I do not wish to detain the House longer now, but I will have something to say on the Bill in committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the House goes into committee on this Bill I wish to say a few words. I listened to the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries very carefully, and he gave us some very interesting information, and so far as some portions of his Bill are concerned I think they will meet with universal approval. So far as other portions are concerned I wish to submit to him that, perhaps, we are legislating unwisely, and we are certainly legislating somewhat in the dark.

His proposition is based, in the first place, upon the assumption that the lobster fisheries are being depleted in the Maritime Provinces and that they require the protection which is proposed, the system of licenses and the close season. Of course it is necessary for us to ascertain whether that fact is correct. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to lay some statistics on the Table showing the yield of lobsters, and my hon. friend from King's (Mr. McLean) referred to the yield so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. I did not understand, however, that he referred to the yield of 1891. As a matter of fact I find that for the last five or six years, the year 1891 has shown a larger take than any of the previous five years in the whole Maritime Provinces. And speaking with special reference to Prince Edward Island, I find that there were in the year 1891, 3,670,000 one-pound cans packed at a value of $513,000, which was larger than for the years 1890, 1889, 1888, 1887 and 1886, and as large as in the years 1884 and 1883. Therefore, taking that period from 1883 to 1891 the returns go to show that the fisheries there are not being depleted, and the same would appear from the total yield of the provinces. If we take the total yield in value of the lobster fisheries since 1885, we find that in 1891 the number of pounds of lobsters taken was 27,000,000, valued at $2,252,000, which was larger than in the year 1890, 1889 or 1888. The catch in 1885 was about the same as in 1891. There are nothing in the figures from 1885 to 1891, so far as the yield of the whole Maritime Provinces, or the special yield of Prince Edward Island is concerned, to show that the fishery is being in any way depleted. If that is the fact I wish to impress upon the hon. gentleman this point: In my humble opinion, we should interfere just as little with this trade as is absolutely necessary. Leave the trade alone, it will regulate itself, those who have the money invested in it will take care not to use their fishery in such a way as to destroy the goose that lays the golden egg. It is only when you establish the position that the fishery is depleted that you justify legislative interference with this industry.

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That being the case let us see what the remedy has been. The hon. gentleman sees that in Prince Edward Island greater attention is paid to this question than in, perhaps, any other province.

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman would go further than these figures he has quoted and say, that in his own opinion there was no depletion of the lobster fishery and that it is in as good condition to-day as ever?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). There has been, but as my hon. friend from King's (Mr. McLean) points out, there is no fixed depletion from year to year. Some years they increase, and other years they are less. It depends upon circumstances which the hon. gentleman does not know, and which the scientists have not yet discovered. I will acknowledge, however, that the size of the lobsters has decreased very much. As regards the close season the hon. gentleman knows that in no part of the Dominion is there such a consensus of opinion in favour of the close season as in Prince Edward Island. The people there have been asking for it for years, and the contention they have submitted to the Minister year after year is this: That the elastic close season which enables the Minister from time to time to extend it a week or a fortnight or 20 days has been the curse of the fisheries. The people of Prince Edward Island are at one with him in his proposition to have a close season, and to have an arbitrary time fixed which the discretion of the Minister shall not enlarge or diminish. So far as the Bill lays down that arbitrary time we are in perfect unison with the Minister. Personally, I cannot speak as to the dates mentioned in the Bill, but I believe that they commend themselves to those interested in the business. That being the case, I want to submit to the consideration of the hon. gentleman the following facts. Mr. Neilsen is a gentleman who is giving his time and attention to this business and whose opinions are worthy of very great weight. But neither Mr. Neilsen nor anybody else has yet been able to master this subject so that his conclusion should be embodied in an Act of Parliament. The fishermen themselves cannot tell you what is the reason of the increase or decrease from year to year. We are now only in the experimental stage of this science, and I submit that we should be very careful in our legislation, and not legislate beyond our knowledge. I submit to the hon. gentleman that if he passes his law this year in enacting an arbitrary close season, and gives that a chance, and sees what the result of that arbitrary close season will be; if he finds that at the end of one or two seasons it is not sufficient, that the lobsters are being destroyed, and that further legislation is necessary, if he comes down to the House I am sure there will be a unanimous desire to strengthen his hands in any proper direction. I do not think it is desirable that this industry should be hampered by those engaged in it being obliged to take out licenses and being placed more or less in the hands of local officers, and liable to fine and penalty, and having their business interfered with in the manner suggested, until the Minister or his officers have so mastered the subject that we will know exactly what we are legislating about. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to give us the opinions of some scientific men in other parts of the world on this subject. He read us the opinion of that eminent pisciculturist, Prof. Buckland, of England, who was appointed a commissioner on the crab and lobster fisheries of Norway in 1885. The hon. gentleman will remember that the same gentleman was appointed, in 1887, to enquire into the lobster fisheries of Norway and England. Associated with him was Spencer Walpole, Esq., and they submitted a joint report, in which they held that while the land-lock bays and harbours were depleted by overfishing, there was no evidence to show that the sea coast fisheries were being depleted at all. At page 11 of this report, they say:

"The whole of the Cornish evidence may, in fact, be summed up in the sentence that the fisheries in bays require protection, but that the large fisheries off headlands or in deep water need no protection from the legislature."

Then, on page 12, the report goes on:

"In a great many cases it is not very easy to conclude whether the fishery is falling off or not. The increase in price is certainly in almost every case greater than the decrease in the supply. The take in many cases is not so large as it used to be, but in nearly every place it is more valuable. The increased price, and the greater facilities

which railways have afforded for bringing the fish to market, have attracted more fishermen to the pursuit, and have induced them to follow the crabs and lobsters into much deeper water than formerly. It is no very easy matter, therefore, to compare the results of the fishing now with those which were experienced 50 or 25 years ago. The take now is divided among a greater number of fishermen. The area of the fishery has been largely extended. On the whole, however, we believe that we are in the right in concluding that in small fisheries, or fisheries in confined areas, there has been in every case a marked decrease of fish: while in large and exposed fisheries there has been no decrease whatever. Take, for example, the fisheries off the Land's End, the Lizard, and the Start. All these fisheries comprise large areas of sea bottom, all of them are in exposed situations, and the powers of man have been hitherto incapable of exhausting them."

This report is from one of the most distinguished men in this branch of pisciculture, and it is made after a great deal of labour and the taking of a great deal of evidence. He shows that, while it is easy to fish out the small bays or harbours in two or three seasons, the shoals of lobsters come from deep water, and it does not seem probable at all that they can be exhausted. He goes on to speak of suggestions for improvement, and, at page 13, says:

"As regards the lobster fishery, three suggestions have been made to us for its improvement, viz., the institution of a gauge, the enactment of a close season, and the prohibition of the sale of berried lobsters, but the suggestion which has found most universal favour is the institution of a gauge. In Cornwall and Devonshire, in Yorkshire and Northumberland, the fishermen have, almost without exception, suggested that no lobster should be sold under a length of about 8 inches. The same recommendation was made to us by the great fish merchants who are established at Hamble, and by the great salesmen in Billingsgate market. The lobster, it must be stated, is not measured in the same way in all parts of the country. On the north-east coast it is usual to measure it from the tip of the beak to the end of the body or 'barrel.' At Billingsgate, at Hamble and on the whole of the coasts of Devonshire and Cornwall the lobster is measured from the tip of the beak to the end of the tail. On the north-east coast of England it was suggested to us that no lobster should be taken under 4 inches in the barrel. In the rest of England the almost unanimous recommendation was that no lobster should be taken under 8 inches in length."

He speaks of the causes which in some parts of England have led to a decrease in the fisheries, and points out what these causes are, none of which exist in Canada. Large quantities of the ova of lobsters are used there for culinary purposes, and of course nothing of that kind exists in Canada. Leaving the lobster fisheries of England, he turns his attention to those of Norway; and let us see what has been the course of legislation in that country. On page 15 he says:

"The matter, in fact, has been before the Norwegian Parliament for three years running. 'During the last session of the Storthing,' Mr. Jones writes, 'a royal proposition was laid before it,' that it should 'be unlawful at any time to possess, sell, buy or receive lobsters under 8 inches in length, as well as lobsters in spawn.' The rejection of this amendment was, however, recommended by the committee appointed to report upon it, on the ground that those best acquainted with the subject failed to recognize its necessity, and, further, that the enforcement of the provisions of the proposed amendment would be attended with much difficulty; that from the statistical facts before the committee there was no evidence of a diminution of the supply of lobsters of late, and that consequently the circumstances did not warrant the adoption of the extraordinary regulation proposed, which would be justifiable only when there was a prospect that without such restrictions the fishery in question would materially suffer."

I think that is a very good conclusion, and it is based on very good reasons; and if the same facts exist here, I think we would be justified in coming to the same conclusion. The report concludes by recommending the adoption of the 8-inch gauge, and the result of this recommendation was that an Act was passed in England.

Mr. TUPPER. That is practically the suggestion here.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But they did not recommend that the lobster fisheries of England should be placed under license. They said that would be resisted by the fishermen as an unnecessary interference with their trade and business.

Mr. TUPPER. That is the law to-day, the 8-inch gauge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The gauge was enacted by Parliament. The Imperial statute provided substantially that 8 inches in length, measured from the end of the beak to the tip of the tail when the lobster is pressed out flat, should be the gauge. That is the only regulation the British Parliament adopted. They left the fisheries entirely free, because the evidence showed that the fisheries along the deep-sea coasts were not depleted, and that the powers of man could not exhaust them; and they agreed with the conclusion of the Norway commission that unless you can prove that these fisheries are in danger of being destroyed, you are not justified in hampering those engaged in them with those unnecessary regulations. I submit that the hon. gentleman has not been able to show by experience, what size of lobsters will go through the 1½ inch space between the slats.

Mr. TUPPER. We have.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You have Mr. Neilsen's opinion obtained in Newfoundland. I do not accept that. The hon. member for King's has shown from an experiment of his own that Mr. Neilsen's opinion is erroneous; and before you enact a hard and fast regulation of this kind, which may prejudicially affect the industry, you must be absolutely sure of your facts; there can be no reason for legislating in a hurry here. We all agree that a close season should be had. Fishermen, legislators and everybody are agreed on that point, and let us adopt that, and see what its adoption will result in. But let us interfere as little with the business as possible, for business men know better how to regulate their business than do legislators. I will not discuss the details of the Bill, but the hon. gentleman must see that if he issues this license it will work very awkwardly. It places the whole industry in the hands, not of the department, because there would not be perhaps so much complaint about that, but in the hands of the local officials and subordinates who can harass, worry and annoy at their sweet will; and there is nothing a man engaged in business, and whose business is limited to a few days, dislikes so much as to be hurried and annoyed by the unnecessary interference of some petty jack in office. He wants to be left alone and ought to be left alone, except in so far as the necessities of the case absolutely require and justify the interference of Parliament. It is agreed that we should interfere to the extent of having a close season, but there is no consensus of opinion that we should interfere further. On the contrary, the large majority of business men wish to be left alone except in that one respect. I would urge on the hon. gentleman, particularly as he does not propose to bring that clause into force this year, not to press it now, but to take this season for the purpose of experimenting and ascertaining with

certainty just what length and size of fish will go through the space he proposes for these laths. We are asked to legislate on insufficient data. If the fishermen have notice of the hon. gentleman's intention to legislate in this direction at some future time, they can try experiments, and the officers of the department can try experiments during the coming summer, and then we will be in a better position to legislate next session. I would ask him not to impose these licenses, but to confine his Bill to an arbitrary close season.

Mr. KENNY. If I justly appreciate the argument of the hon. gentleman, he is satisfied with all the provisions of the Bill except that one which relates to a license. In fact, he congratulated the Minister upon the success which has attended his individual efforts, and those of his officers to protect this important industry. The license, the hon. gentleman must remember, does not concern the fishermen but the packers, and in the course of his remarks he pointed out to us that in his opinion there is no necessity for this legislation for the protection of the lobster fishery, because in the Island of Prince Edward, which is so much concerned in this matter, there has been no diminution of the fishery.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him, I said that last year's catch showed there had had been no depletion of the fishery because it was larger than the previous five years.

Mr. KENNY. The hon. gentleman went further than that. He gave us in proof of that statement the condition of the fisheries from 1883 to 1891. I desire to point out to the House that if that is the opinion which the hon. gentleman holds to-day, it was not his opinion in 1887, when the lobster fishery question was before the House. He has advised us that we should be absolutely certain about our facts before we deal with this question. I find on looking back to the *Hansard* of 1887, that Mr. Flynn, who then represented the County of Richmond, Nova Scotia, moved for certain correspondence connected with the lobster fisheries in the Province of Nova Scotia; and, as was very natural when any reference was made to the lobster fishery, the representatives of Prince Edward Island generally took part in that debate. The junior member for Queen's—I mention this to show how different the views which hon. gentlemen entertain to-day are to the opinions they entertained in 1887—is reported to have said:

"I wish to say, in my opinion, the whole fishery business ought to be put a stop to for a number of years. I speak from personal observation. I have been in a great many fisheries in Prince Edward Island and in several in New Brunswick, and I find that the lobsters are very small. Where it used to take one or two lobsters to fill a can, it now takes six or seven, and it is really disgraceful to go to one of these lobster factories and see the thousands of small fish taken out of the sea."

My hon. friend, I notice, when his colleague from Queen's just now advised us to be careful about our facts, applauded that sentiment. I wonder if he remembers what he said in 1887.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will remember that in the years 1887 and 1888 there was almost a panic among the fishermen, because the catch had fallen to about 1,446,000 lbs. from 3,670,000 lbs., which it had been in 1891, or to one-fifth in 1887 of what it was in 1891.

Mr. KENNY. That does not change the fact that 1887 was one of the years the hon. gentleman selected when he quoted the whole period from 1883 to 1891. Let me read what the hon. gentleman himself stated. He said:

"I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter to the notice of the House as it is a very important one to the Maritime Provinces. I am very glad to learn from him that the fishery is maintained as well as it is in his province, and wish I could say the same for my province. The lobster fishery in my province, which is very valuable, is gradually becoming diminished. The lobsters are becoming smaller to such an extent that some of the manufacturers do not think it worth while to keep open at all."

Yet the hon. gentleman has made the statement here this afternoon that there is no danger of a depletion of this important industry in his own province, because the statistics from 1883 to 1891, which include the very period to which I have referred, show that there is no diminution. I remember another debate which took place on this industry in the sessions of 1889-90. I remember distinctly that there was a great conflict of opinion among the representatives of the different sections of the Maritime Provinces, and I think we came to the conclusion pretty unanimously that the regulations laid down by the department, even at that day, were in the general interests of the industry. The hon. gentleman seems to draw a distinction between the position of the packers and that of the fishermen. The fisherman is charged no license to-day. The license of $5 per annum is to be imposed on the packers, and I am bound to say, from the information which has reached me, the Act of last year, in so far as it concerned the packers, was satisfactory, and they do not desire any special change in the legislation. That is the opinion I have derived from those engaged in the business.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman speak of the regulations proposed last December as being the last?

Mr. KENNY. No; I speak of the Act of last year. No change in legislation has really been asked by the packers, so far as I am informed. Now, referring to that debate of past years it was shown conclusively that a close season was necessary, that it should be strictly enforced, that the slightest deviation from it should be punished, that it was a question whether we should give the Minister in charge of the department any discretionary power, that the more strictly the regulations were adhered to, the better it would be and the more it would be in the interests of both the fishermen and the packers. I think in one of these debates it was pointed out that, in Prince Edward Island, the indications were that the fishery was diminishing, and I am glad indeed to hear such is not the case, but I think it is largely due to the fact that the regulations which were imposed by the department have been strictly and closely adhered to, and I am glad to find this afternoon that on a Bill of so much importance there is a very general consensus of opinion that it is in the interests of the fishery and of those engaged in it. The only fault which might be found with the Bill is in regard to the matter of insisting that the packers shall be subjected to a license. I am glad that the Bill receives such general assent.

Mr. WELSH. The hon. gentleman has referred to some words that I uttered in this House in 1887 in reference to this lobster business. Every

word I stated in 1887 was correct, and the hon. gentleman approved of it at the time, or at all events he never contradicted it.

Mr. TUPPER. He says it is correct now.

Mr. WELSH. It required that a close season should be strictly enforced and that has been done, and, by the returns, we find the lobster fishery is increasing and not being depleted, and until there is some evidence that the fishery is growing less I should object to any interference with the trade of the lobster packers. My hon. friend the member for King's (Mr. McLean) is fully posted in this matter, and any statement he makes on the floor of this House I am prepared to stand by. He has a great deal of experience in it, and I also agree with the remarks that have fallen from my colleague for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and would oppose any interference with the rights of the lobster packers excepting in enforcing this close season. I think the proposal to impose a license is an interference with the rights of the fishermen; and then, as to the Stamp Act, we know what has happened through Stamp Acts being enforced on the people before this. If you are going to bring that in again on our mercantile people, it will be rather dangerous. It has a tendency also to misrepresent the facts. You put a stamp on these packages, and it goes abroad at once that these lobsters were packed under the inspection of the Government of Canada and that they were all good. That is a very dangerous and a very wrong principle. If the lobster packers are to be qualified with a $5 license fee I will not object, but yet I think the Government should not impose that tax. I think the Government is quite right in enforcing the close season, but I think the heavy fine of $400 for placing the laths at 1¾ inches distance requires more consideration. I agree with my colleague that it would be well to let this matter stand over for another year that it might be better considered.

Mr. PERRY. I think the lobster industry in the lower provinces is of such importance that the House can profitably spend a few hours in discussing it. I was surprised to hear the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) declare that the senior member for Queen's County (Mr. Davies) had made a serious mistake when he spoke in 1887 in one strain in regard to the lobster fishery in Prince Edward Island and had now spoken in a different strain. I deny that. My hon. friend was quite correct. The year 1887 was the last year that showed a depletion of the lobster catch around the shores of Prince Edward Island, and since that the catch has increased, because the regulations have been enforced. As far as the fishermen themselves and the packers have been able since 1887, they have enforced the regulations which were not enforced before, and the number of lobsters caught around the shores of Prince Edward Island have consequently increased. I am not going to repeat what has been so well expressed by the member for King's County (Mr. McLean), and the member for Queen's County (Mr. Davies). The member for King's County is an expert in this matter. He thinks that an inch between these laths is sufficient, but the Minister thinks it should be an inch and a half. My opinion is that people who have hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in this industry should be the best judges. I suppose the Minister himself never went fishing for lobsters and knows nothing about it except what other people tell him. His information is gained at second hand, and is not to be compared with knowledge possessed by my hon. friend from Queen's County. There is a strong determination on the part of the packers of Prince Edward Island in favour of maintaining a close season. I do not know why there should be a difference made between the breadth of the laths on one side and on the other. I contend that the lobsters are all about the same size, so that a lobster under 9 inches on the north side of the island is no stouter and no smaller than a lobster of the same measurement on the east side of the island. I do not see the necessity for making a difference between the two, though I think they strike earlier the part of the Island from Miminegash down than they do on the east side from West Point to Cape Traverse. I think it was a step in the right direction to extend the time there. There is no comparison between the catching of small lobsters in bays and rivers and the catching of small lobsters along the Gulf shores. In bays and rivers they are in smooth water, and there is no hurry to get away from a storm, and they have time to take out any small lobster that they find in the trap and put it back in the water. There is a wide difference between that and the fishermen who are fishing on the Gulf shore. We have been told here by men of experience, we have been told by the member for King's County (Mr. Lean), we have been told by other gentlemen, that out of the two months now allowed to fish by the regulations, that is from the 15th May to the 15th July, there are only about 40 fishing days. Taking out the Sundays and the holidays, the stormy days must be included to make up the 60 days. I can tell you that on many occasions these fishermen risk their lives to go out and catch a few lobsters; they are obliged to do it, for they have no other way of living. When the boat pitches in the waves and the wind blows hard, they have no time to watch and see whether the lobster is shorter or smaller than the size prescribed. I believe that taking everything into account the fishermen have carried out the regulations, so far as size is concerned, as well as could be reasonably expected by the Government or by the department; and having done that, I think they rather deserve credit and protection than to be embarrassed by such regulations as they will not be able to carry out. Now, the fishermen are not rowdies, they are not men inclined to break the law, in fact they are a very civil class of people and they would be standing in their own light if they broke the rules or regulations. Why do you want to pass such rules and regulations as will drive the ten thousand people on the Prince Edward shore engaged in the fishing industry and helping to swell the population of this country—why do you want to shut them out and send them off to the United States? Keep them there, and the way to keep them there is to give them a chance of earning a living. Now, with respect to this license, I do not object to the amount of $5, I would not even object to $50, so far as the fee is concerned, but I object to the principle of the license. The Minister has not shown this House any reason why this fee should be paid. He wants to reserve to himself the power of saying who shall have a right to fish and who shall not. If I am not a friend of the Government, if I am not a friend of the Minister, I may not get a

license, I am altogether in his hands. Is that the way to encourage the fishing industry? I do not understand why the Minister has not shown reasons why this license should be given. Let me tell him that it requires the whole winter for a man to prepare himself to carry on the lobster fishery around those shores. Supposing he begins in January to get ready, in April has completed his sails, boats and traps, and has, perhaps, invested $5,000 or $10,000 in this industry; he then applies to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the Minister may know nothing about him, but somebody on the shore, somebody else of jealous spirit, will write to the department and say: Don't give this gentleman a license, he is a nuisance, he canvassed strongly against the Government on election days. Now, these things have been done; I know they have been carried out in a different shape, but they will be carried out in this shape. They have been carried out in the matter of the fishing bounties. I know in my own district, in the township where I live, there are 12 or 15 fishermen who made application to the department for their bounty for last year, and they have been refused, and they are all Liberals. I am not aware of one Conservative who was refused. Is that not carrying the powers given to the department a little too far? They will be carried out in the same way under this license regulation. Instead of compelling men to carry out this license regulation and throwing impediments in the way of the fishermen opening out channels that will enable them to pursue an honest livelihood, the Government ought to make their lot easier. I am totally opposed to the principle of the license. The Minister might as well ask me to pay a license for farming so many acres of land.

Mr. TUPPER. The Bill does not propose anything of the kind. We do not propose to ask the fishermen to pay $1; it is the packer.

Mr. PERRY. If the packer does not invest his money in that industry, the fisherman will not engage in fishing. I understand that well; perhaps the Minister understands it too, but he does not wish to say so. That fee of $5 must come out of the fishermen. The stamps that the packer has to pay for to put on the box, must also come out of the fishermen in the end. That is no guarantee that the lobster is of good quality, it merely goes to show that the lobster has been caught in a lawful way.

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

After Recess.

Mr. PERRY. When the House rose I was offering some remarks with respect to the license which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries proposes to impose on lobster packers. I am totally opposed to the license system, not so much as to the amount of the fee but as to the principle involved. I do not know what the hon. gentleman expects to gain by imposing licenses on packers, and I observe from the Bill that these licenses will have to be renewed from year to year. I fail to see the sense of establishing these licenses. If the hon. Minister expects to limit the number of those who will obtain permits to pack lobsters, then there will be injustice done. A person may be prepared to invest $10,000 capital in the packing business, and the Minister may come to the conclusion that there is no room for him and may refuse him a license. Surely in that case injustice would be done. If the hon. gentleman does not intend to limit the number of packers, what is the use of the license? We have not yet learned who is the person to be charged with issuing these licenses. It may be a fishery guardian or a special officer to be appointed. At all events, this Bill gives absolute power respecting fishery regulations to the Minister, or his deputy, or his officers, as to the parties who shall obtain licenses for lobster fishing. A man might be prepared to go into the business and have both boats built, stages erected, three sets of boilers, and other apparatus secured, and when all these preparations have been completed the Government might refuse him a license. The applicant could do nothing, and there would be a hardship committed. If the Minister is of the opinion that it is necessary to issue licenses in order that the number of packers might not become too numerous, he is mistaken. The people of our provinces who engage in that industry are not willing to invest capital in it with the prospect of loss, and are well aware that when the business becomes over-crowded it will be conducted at a loss. As I am a free trader in every sense of the term, I am a free trader in this matter. Instead of harassing packers by adopting a license system, we should encourage every man, who possesses courage and capital to invest his money in developing the fisheries. We know it is a risky business. We are aware that storms may sweep along the coast and destroy valuable property, including the traps and other appliances used in fishing operations. The license fee of $5 is payable every year. It must ultimately come out of the pockets of the producers, the men who catch the fish, because he will receive so much less per hundred for the lobsters than they would receive if this penalty or license fee were not imposed on the packers for whom they were fishing. Then there is to be a license fee of 2 cents on every case holding 48 one-pound cans of lobsters. The certificate to be placed on the can does not show the quality of the lobster, whether 1st, 2nd or 3rd, but it only shows that the lobster was caught lawfully. But it is well known that if the fish is not taken lawfully, the law is violated and the offender is liable to a penalty. It is useless to issue a certificate to show that it was caught lawfully and not contrary to the law. The license says:

"Such licenses shall only be granted after an application in writing has been filed with the nearest fishery officer, or collector of customs, by the owner of the traps, nets or other devices, setting forth the number and description of such traps, nets or other devices, and after the issue of the license has been authorized by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries."

This license states positively the number of traps which the man receiving the license is permitted to use. Suppose a man got a license for a thousand traps, and he subsequently had one over that number, he would be violating the regulations and would be liable to a penalty.

Mr. TUPPER. The license has nothing to do with the traps.

Mr. PERRY. I see it so stated in the Bill.

Mr. TUPPER. Not in the reprinted Bill, and the first Bill has been considerably amended. The hon. gentleman will take the statement from me

that the license only applies to packers and not to traps.

Mr. PERRY. I have only one Bill before me, and if the Bill has been reprinted it should be distributed to members. I am not in favour of the proposed license. It is not required, it will remedy no evil, and I believe it is objectionable, because it places special powers in the hands of the Minister and his department. The provision that a certificate of the value of two cents is to be placed on every box of lobsters is a farce, and can do no service. I repeat that this certificate will not be any guide as to the quality, and the penalty imposed for taking fish out of season is in itself sufficient protection. I am aware that when the lobster packers met in Charlottetown last winter, they unanimously passed strongly worded resolutions, and no people can know the requirements of the business better than those men who have their money invested therein. They were unanimously opposed to the license system, but they were earnestly in favour of a close season. Since the Minister has relaxed certain provisions of the regulations our people are carrying out strictly the close season, and since that time it has been clearly established that the quantity of lobsters has been increased and that the catch last year was better than the catch five years ago. This goes to show that instead of the packers destroying the lobster fisheries they are acting in a manner to protect them. Having done that, I say they ought to get the protection which the Government is entitled to give them, and they ought to be encouraged and supported and every facility afforded to them, instead of having every obstacle thrown in their way. I am favourable to the close season. I believe our packers and fishermen are willing to stick closely to the regulations of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in that respect. They have tried to carry out the close season as far as they could, but I think it is wrong and unjust and unfair to impose upon them rules and regulations and penalties which they are not able to comply with. I say that the license fee, small as it is, is a penalty which inflicts a hardship upon the packers, and ultimately on the catchers of the fish. I say it is not required, because under a license system the Minister shall have power to say who may engage in the industry, and he will be able to say Peter shall have a license but Paul shall not. That is an injustice, and I do not see any other object to it than to add to the number of the staff who are already representing the Government welfare there, and who are prepared to dance attendance on them at every beck. I do not say that that is the intention of the Minister, but I merely point out that these things can be done. There should be no restriction which will prevent people who wish to invest their capital in an important industry in this country. If a man is willing to invest $10,000 capital in this industry and is ready to feed two or three hundred fishermen along the shores of the Lower Provinces, he should have every facility to do so and should not need to seek a license. We know, Sir, that the lobster fishery is not even so well protected as either the cod or mackerel fishery. We know that few of the appliances which they need to carry on this industry come here duty free. They are met in the United States with a heavy duty on the can, when for want of a market elsewhere they are obliged to send their lobsters across the line. That being the case I say that if the Government is patriotic and takes a proper view of the case they will place no further obstacles in the way of the men who have their capital invested, and the hard working fishermen to make a living out of this industry. On the contrary it should be the effort of the Government to give every facility for the business and to show themselves anxious to encourage trade into this country. I contend that these regulations are an instance of another restriction which they are placing on trade, and the Bill introduced here last year to prevent seining by our people within three miles of the shore was another example. The Minister drove the thin end of the wedge in then, and now he is putting the whole wedge in and clinching it on the other side with a mallet. In my opinion, if this legislation is carried into operation a great many of the lobster packers will have to close up.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, any measure that has for its object the protection of such an important industry as the lobster fishery is one that should receive, and no doubt will receive, every consideration at the hands of this House. I have formed a very favourable opinion of the Bill as proposed to be amended, from the explanations given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I think that it has not only for its object the protection of the lobster industry, but that it also has within it the elements that will give protection to the fishermen. The opinions that I had formed of the Bill have not been in any way changed by the observations addressed to the House by the gentlemen who have spoken on the other side. What are the main features of this Bill? First, there is a proposition to license the factories, then to fix the space between the laths of the lobster traps, and next the imposition of a fee of $5. Now Sir, to my mind the placing of this fishery, so far as the packers are concerned, under a license system, will go a long way towards providing for proper supervision of the packing. The fee which it is proposed to impose is a nominal one. It is a mere trifle and cannot be regarded, as was stated by the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, in any way as a tax. Neither can the fee which it is proposed to impose for the stamp, or for stencilling the case, be considered as a tax ; rather it can be said that the payment of this nominal amount will tend to enhance the value of the products of the packers. I think it must be apparent to every person who has given the trade any thought whatever, that the value of the lobsters packed will be considerably enhanced in the markets to which they may be sent, by reason of this stamp, which will go to show that the lobsters were packed under Government supervision. The advantage which certainly would be derived, would far more than compensate for the mere nominal outlay that would be required from the packers. My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Perry) said, or he led me to suppose, that he believed there was a duty on the tin that was used by the packers. My knowledge of the tariff leads me to say that not only is the tin free, but the twine that is used in the construction of the traps is free, so that my hon. friend's argument on this score has no foundation whatever. As regards the second feature of the Bill, the proposition to regulate the space between the laths, as a matter of fact

't is proposed to make very little if any alteration n the regulations already in force. The present regulation—at all events if not established by regulation it is established by practice—is to leave 1¼ inches space which is the width of the lath.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is no regulation on that.

Mr. BURNS. I say that the actual practice is to leave a space of 1¼ inches which is the space of the lath. It is not proposed to interfere in any way with that practice by this Bill, except to the extent that if the fishermen choose to adhere to that practice they must, as stated by the hon. Minister, consent to a reduction of ten days in the time of fishing. But if, on the other hand, they wish to adopt the space provided by the Bill, that is, 1½ inches, then they can have the full period allowed for fishing under the present regulations. So that I do not see that any evil results whatever can follow from the operation of the Bill in this particular. As regards the falling off of the fishery, from my knowledge of the trade—and I speak from a New Brunswick standpoint—it is quite evident that a very serious falling off, indeed, took place for many years. Take the statistics read by the hon. Minister to the House this afternoon, and what do you find? In 1883, the number of lobster traps was something like 83,000, the catch of which was 4,000,000 cans; in 1884, the number of traps was 105,000, with a catch of 5,000,000 cans; in 1885 there were 127,000 traps, with a catch of about 5,000,000 cans. The record of those three years goes to show that the average produce of each trap was about 50 cans. In 1886, with a larger number of traps, 139,000. there was a decreased output amounting to only 4,600,000 cans. In 1887 there were 118,000 traps, while the output was decreased to 2,000,000 cans. In 1888, with 84,000 traps, it had decreased to 1,843,000 cans. Now, institute a comparison between 1883 and 1888, and you find that with practically the same number of traps in the 2 years, 82,000 in 1883, caught 4,000,000 cans, whereas 84,000 traps in 1888 caught 1,800,000 cans. In 1889 the number of traps had risen to 93,000, while the catch amounted to only 1,800,000 cans. In 1890 with 118,000 traps, the catch was 2,365,000 cans. In 1891, with 140,000 traps, the catch was 3,130,000 cans.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNS. I will tell the hon. gentleman from my knowledge of the trade the cause of the increase in 1890 and 1891. It was due to the fact that in 1887 and 1888 and previous years the fishery had become so unproductive by reason of the falling off in the catch that many people abandoned the business, and the department were under the necessity of more strictly enforcing the regulations as to close time.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) On the contrary, they enlarged the time last year.

Mr. BURNS. That was only in one district.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BURNS. The hon. gentleman must not suppose for a moment that Prince Edward Island has a monopoly of the whole lobster business. The lobster output in the Province of New Brunswick will compare very favourably, I think, with that of Prince Edward Island. Now, Sir, if owing to the increased catch and owing to the greater profitableness of the business the number of factories will be increased to the same extent as before, we shall find that unless something is done such as is now proposed, the same state of affairs that existed a number of years ago will return. The falling off of the fishery was due not only to over-fishing and to the extended open time, but also largely to the fact that small lobsters in immense numbers and also berried lobsters were caught. I do not see that this Bill will impose any hardship at all on those engaged in the industry, while it will tend to protection which is very important, and also to make the business more profitable; therefore I will support the measure. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has, I am pleased to say, shown every disposition to meet the views of those who are interested in the trade, and who spoke for the constituencies more particularly interested. As a result of the representations made to him and of the interviews had with him, he has reduced the fee of $50, at first proposed, to the nominal sum of $5. He has also made other important changes, and on the whole, speaking from a New Brunswick standpoint and from my knowledge of the trade, I am sure that this Bill, on going into operation, will be productive of very good results indeed to the lobster fishery.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I desire to express my approval of the present Bill, or at all events of the lobster clauses of it, and my appreciation of the care that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has taken in meeting the views of the fishermen as nearly as he possibly could, consistently with the protection of this very important industry. The hon. Minister stated that the value of the lobsters caught during the year 1890 was $1,648,344, which was $163,856 greater than the value of the catch in the previous year. But we also find from the reports which have been circulated by the Department of Fisheries that during that year, 1890, no less than 554,741 traps were used in the catching of these lobsters, and that the persons employed in the business of lobster fishing and canning numbered 21,445, without taking into consideration the persons who built the boats and the canneries and who prepared the traps and the cases for the lobsters. So that you will see that this is a very important industry, and one which should not be interfered with unnecessarily, and which should at the same time be protected from destruction. Now it strikes me that there cannot be very much doubt that the lobster fishery is being depleted. We find at all events that on the coast of the United States it is almost entirely destroyed, and I think that the statistics which have been presented to the House by the hon. member for Gloucester go very strongly to prove that the lobster fishery in New Brunswick, and the other provinces, are also very considerably diminished. The hon. members for Queen's (Messrs. Davies and Welsh) who appear at present to think that the lobster fishery is not being depleted, argued in 1887 exactly the contrary, and gave as evidence the fact that the lobsters were very much smaller than they had been. That was the only argument they put forward at that time to show the probable destruction of the fishery, and if it was good then it is good now. I think

that the increase in the catch of the lobsters is not at all owing to the increased quantity of the lobsters, but to the increase in the number of people employed in catching them. We must remember that the price has increased, and consequently there is a greater inducement to catch them. Hon. gentlemen have discussed this matter as if there were no regulations at all at present. I maintain that the regulations which this Act proposes to put in force are really more favourable to the lobster fishermen than those at present imposed and that they also will be more effective. The objects which this Bill aims at accomplishing and which are necessary for the protection of the fisheries are three in number. They are, first the size of the lobster, then the protection of the berried lobster, and lastly the close season. After reading the various statements sent in here by the fishery officers, by the lobster fishermen, and by the packers, it is quite clear that the present regulations with regard to the size of the lobsters have not been put in force. It is quite clear that it has been almost impossible to prevent the constant and continued violations of these regulations, and almost every speaker who supported the Bill has stated the fact that in all the districts these regulations have been set at naught. I think the suggestion made by Mr. Neilsen that the distance between the slats in the traps should be made larger so as to enable the small lobsters to escape is, perhaps, the only effective way by which we can prevent fishermen catching lobsters which are too small. With regard to the berried lobster, the present regulations, I think, impose a fine for the catching of the berried lobsters. It has been found that that regulation has been of no avail whatever. The fishermen are in the habit of scraping off the eggs from the lobster, and then carrying it to the factory, and it is almost impossible, without looking very closely, to discover whether it was a berried lobster or not. I believe, however, the Minister of Marine intends to provide that incubators shall be kept at the various establishments and that the eggs or spawn shall be preserved. Now we come to the question of a close season. In the county I have the honour to represent there is a great deal of discussion with regard to the close season. Very many maintain that a close season as contemplated by this Bill is exactly what we ought to have. In that place there are a great many lobsters caught and shipped alive to the United States, and the consequence is that the interests of those people who ship these lobsters alive and ship them during the winter is somewhat antagonistic to the interests of the packer. We find that many of the lobster fishermen are opposed to the winter fishing, while the fishermen who go to the banks and are at home during the winter are very anxious they should be allowed the privilege of catching lobsters in the winter and sending them off to the United States. There is so much difference of opinion on the subject, and that opinion is governed so much by the wishes of the different classes of fishermen engaged in the fisheries, that I think it is better the regulations should stand as they are, as embodied in this Bill. I may say that, like my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, I have had a large number of letters and telegrams on this subject, but am able to state that most of the persons engaged in the lobster fisheries as well as the packers are satisfied with the provisions of the present Act. The lobster packer expresses no objection to a license fee nor to the requirement of the cases being stamped, because the cases being stamped will show that the lobsters were caught in season, and they are much better than those caught out of season and much more healthy, and therefore it is a certificate of their good character; and I have no doubt it will enable them to get a better price in the markets of the world.

Mr. FORBES. It does seem strange that the Minister of Marine should introduce a Bill to wipe out the regulations which have been governing the lobster fisheries for the past years, and propose to enact regulations which will satisfy both packers as well as fishers. Those gentlemen who preceded me, have one and all on that side stated that the Bill as proposed is favourable to the packers as well as to the trappers. Now, the fact is that the proposition by this Bill is to do away with the regulation size of lobsters, which is now 9 inches, and to substitute a clause describing that every trap shall be constructed in such a way that it shall have between the slats a space of 1½ and in some cases 1¼ inches. The Minister has also told us that this will permit, in the case of the 1½-inch slabs, only 8-inch lobsters to pass through. It, therefore, in the interests of the trapper, will allow a smaller lobster to be caught, and in the case of the packer it will probably supply him with a smaller fish and a large quantity of smaller fish, thus tending to the depletion of the great lobster fishing industry. I fail to see how it is that any hon. gentlemen who support the Minister should advise that this Bill become law for the protection of the fisheries in one breath, and in the next breath support it because it is proposed by the Government, and that it tends to allow smaller fish to be caught. From the nature of the Bill, it cannot be accepted by those who are anxious to preserve the fisheries for future use, nor can it be said to be honest and fair to the lobster packers themselves, who thereby will be burning the candle at both ends. The Minister took pains to show us by the conclusive evidence of reports that the lobster fisheries are being depleted around our shores. He quoted a large number of authorities to show that, where it took two or three formerly to fill a one-pound can, it now takes six or seven, showing a diminution in the size of the lobster, which is a sure sign of a falling off in the catch. He went on to quote that there is great necessity for the imposition of new regulations to prevent this exhaustion of that industry, and he wound up by proposing a law which enables smaller lobsters to be caught, although they should be directly under his guidance and protection, and not allowed to be wasted as this Bill will allow them to be. The Minister must know that the statements he has made are directly at variance with those made by his own fishery inspector. We have in the report of Mr. Bertram, the inspector of fisheries for District No. 1, the following statement. I may say here by way of contradiction of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) that the decrease in this industry of packing lobsters is not due, as he says, to the using up of the fisheries by the catching and packing of small lobsters. Mr. Bertram says:

"The marked increase of 217,344 cans of lobsters over the pack of last season is the most noticeable feature of the year's fishery. The increase is due to three causes; the large number of these crustaceans found on our coast during the season. the extension of ten days' fishing granted by the department, and the increase in the number of lobster factories in operation. The increase in prices was of great advantage to large dealers more than to the fishermen, as prices advanced at the close of the season. There is a prevailing impression that this fishery is overdone to an extent which threatens its extinction: but so far as this district is concerned, and from past seasons' experience, the increased quantity taken points to an opposite conclusion. The fact that competition is increasing, consequent on an advance in prices, and that cash is paid by nearly all canners on delivery, tend to lure fishermen from other branches of fishery to that of the lobster. Having dealt with this subject in previous reports, I do not deem it necessary to discuss it here at greater length."

We have also the report of Mr. Tilton that:

"Lobsters show a slight increase, especially in fish shipped fresh alive. This increase is ascribed to favourable weather in some localities and a general improvement in the fishery."

We have further the report of the inspector for the south shore of Nova Scotia, including Shelburne and Queen's counties. He says:

"In canned lobsters there is a decrease in the output, not due to scarcity of fish but to the fact that some packers became frightened into a closer compliance with the regulations. The export of live lobsters proved a remunerative business and there are indications that this branch of trade will be prosecuted on a still larger scale next season. The lobster regulations were not well observed: the high prices obtained proving too strong a temptation to the average fishermen and packers. How to remedy this evil is a difficult problem to solve. I am inclined to suggest that the limit in size be reduced to 9 inches."

The Minister proposes to reduce it to 8 inches. So it will be seen by the Minister's own reports that the fisheries are not being depleted in consequence of the present use of them, and, unless the Minister can show some other reason, we must conclude that the lobster fishery is not being depleted, and I know that is the opinion of all those on the south shore. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. White) seems to agree whith the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) that the fishing industry is depleted because of the increased catch of lobsters. The Minister has told us that on certain portions of the shore of Prince Edward Island he adopted a measurement of 1¼ inches between these laths. Will the Minister give me his attention for a moment. I should like to know why it is proposed to give that advantage to a certain portion of Prince Edward Island and not to Nova Scotia at all. We claim that we have as much right to exercise this fishery as Prince Edward Island has. In 1890 we had 133 factories, which put up $252,480 worth and in 1891 though we had a larger number of factories, the value of what we put up was less, being $213,511. The yield has grown from 1869 to 1891, as follows:—In 1869 it was 61,100 pounds, of the value of $15,275. In 1891, the yield was 26,909,157 pounds, of the value of $2,252,421. That output has increased in a greater proportion in the Province of Nova Scotia than in any other province of the Dominion. The provisions of this Bill will operate against the small factories in Nova Scotia and in favour of the larger factories, because the tax which is imposed will operate very greatly to the disadvantage of the small factory, and, if the large factory controls the monopoly of the purchase, it will give a smaller price for the work in canning the lobsters than the smaller factories would. The smaller factories are induced to go into the canning business by reason of the large prices which are offered by the purchasers in Halifax, in England and in the United States. There are three clauses in this Bill which will operate directly against the smaller factories. Clause 10*a* prescribes a tax directly on the small factories. Clause 5 and also subsection (*a*) of section 5 impose a tax on the small factories, and section 6 is also a tax on them. Many of these factories are only able to make a fair amount by way of good wages during the season. If these small factories are crowded out, the large factories in the hands of English or other capitalists will reduce that amount that is paid to the fisher or the trapper of the fish, so that the trapper will be heavily manacled by this legislation. It is, therefore, in the interest of the larger packer and against the small packer that this legislation is directed. The lobster industry around the south shore of Nova Scotia is to a great extent carried on in regard to the delivery of fresh lobsters alive in the United States. Lobster smacks come from the United States along the south shore and get the lobsters from the trappers, who preserve them in cars or boxes alive until those smacks come along, and then they are transshipped alive to the American market. Shipments have been made of ten, and ten and a half inch lobsters to the United States, and they have realized, all expenses paid, 11½ and 12 cents. This is an industry which is not touched, I am glad to say, by the enactments of this Bill. The first Bill proposed by the Minister did directly tax that industry, but he has seen the error of his intention and has been forced to withdraw the Bill. He now proposes one that is, to a great extent, and in certain ways, perfectly harmless, although it contains the vicious principle of allowing the Minister to control the industry by license. There is nothing which prevents the Minister from raising that fee to $50 or $100. Every tax he puts upon the industry falls upon the small packers in the interest of the larger packers. We, therefore, deem it our duty, those of us who come from the fishing counties of Nova Scotia, carefully to watch every attack that may be made upon this industry by the Minister of Marine. We know he is anxious to encroach upon the rights of every class of people in order that he may have them, as it were, under his control. The Government claim a right to limit and restrict the right of the farmer to buy where he wishes, of the fishermen to sell where he wishes, and now, of the lobster-trapper to catch where he will. It is this principle which we, on this side of the House, particularly rebel against. I am glad to see that the Minister has thought fit to withdraw the obnoxious principle upon which his first Bill was based; but there are certain things in this Bill which, in committee, I trust we will be able to point out clearly enough to him to induce him to amend in the interest of the fishermen. The right to extend the close season at the will of the Minister is an obnoxious one, and I am glad it has been removed from the power of the Governor in Council. The size of the fish, as regards the provision of this Bill, is one of the features to which I object. It cannot be said by the Minister that he is honestly intending to preserve this fishing industry when he is permitting smaller sized fish to be caught by the provision for making the trap which this Act allows.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) As this question is one in which the people of the Maritime Provinces are very much interested, I will take the liberty of saying a word upon it. The importance of this industry is shown by the number of people that are employed in it, amounting to about 22,000. This industry has been built up within a few years, but owing to the excessive fishing that has taken place, the fishery is said to have become exhausted. However, I am myself of a different opinion. I cannot see that the fishing shows very much depletion. I am borne out in that view by the report of the gentlemen connected with the inspection of fisheries in the different provinces, in the reports they have sent to the department. I have always contended that all that was necessary to keep this fishery from being depleted was a strict enforcement of the close season, and I think that the result shows that my contention was correct. The fishery is steadily holding its own ; the quantities caught are yearly increasing, and the only protection, as shown by the reports of the fishery officers of the department, has been the enforcement of the close season. Of course, we all know that there has been a regulation as to the size of the fish that are to be caught, but I think I can show that that regulation has not been carried out. My colleague and myself came here with the full intention of opposing the regulations that were brought forward by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which regulations were sent down for the inspection and report of the packers in Prince Edward Island. The regulation then sent out met with the disapproval of the packers of Prince Edward Island, and we came here determined to oppose it. However, knowing that the Minister of Marine had the same object in view as the packers and fishermen, that is, the preservation of this valuable industry, we thought it our duty to lay our views before him, which we did in a letter addressed to the Minister of Marine some time ago. As it is not very long, I will take the liberty of reading it to the House:

"HON. C. H. TUPPER,
"Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

"SIR,—Referring to our letter to you of 12th March, *re* proposed Lobster Fishery Bill, we desire to submit the following suggestion for your consideration :—

"The license fee (although we object to the principle of license) to be made merely nominal, and licenses to be granted to all applicants who will agree to comply with the law. The provisions of the Bill regarding labelling and marking, to remain. The regulation as to size and sex to be entirely removed, and fishing under license to be allowed for a term of three years, from 1st May to 15th of July in each year, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This close season to be strictly adhered to, and no license to be renewed to any packer detected in the violation of it. If, at the end of three years, this is found to afford sufficient protection, the system to be continued ; if, on the contrary, the lobster fishing is found to be seriously impaired from overfishing, all the factories to be closed for one or more years. If these suggestions are accepted, the provisions of the Bill, as thus amended, to apply to this season's fishing.

"We have the honour to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servants,
"A. C. MACDONALD.
"J. McLEAN.

"March 18th, 1892."

Now, finding that it was the intention of the Minister to bring in legislation respecting this industry we thought it our duty to put the matter before him in a way we believed would be acceptable to the fishermen and packers in Prince Edward Island. We were met by the Minister in the most friendly way, and he appeared anxious to come to an arrangement that would be generally acceptable to the fishermen and packers in our province, and in the Maritime Provinces generally. Finding that he was actuated by the same spirit, that of preserving this valuable industry, we thought it our duty to put our views before him as strongly as possible. The next stage of the proceedings was the Bill submitted to this House in which the Minister proposed introducing a regulation trap which was to be one and three-quarter inches between the slats. The people of our province heretofore have entirely objected to any regulation of that kind, but finding that it was the determination of the Government to enforce a regulation trap, we thought it our duty to make a concession with that end in view, to get the most liberal measure in the interest of the fishermen, brought in by the Minister. We consented to have the distance between the slats in the regulation trap, made an inch and a-quarter apart, and he agreed to accept such a proposition. I must say that the Minister showed a desire at all times to meet our views in a most friendly way, having in view at the same time the preservation of this important industry ; and finally he consented to make the regulations one and a-quarter inch on the understanding that any section of our fisheries that would accept the regulation would be curtailed in their fishing season by ten days. We thought this was a proper and reasonable concession to make in the interest of the fisheries and the fishermen, and in order to meet the views of the Minister we consented to that proposition, and I think that the present proposal of the Minister is a reasonable one. The present Bill proposes a license. It seems the determination of the Government to enforce a license. While opposed to the principle of license on this industry, I think that as the fee as now laid down is a nominal one, it cannot be a great hardship. At the same time, I am only expressing the opinion of the fishermen generally when I say that even if the license were higher, if the Minister would only take into consideration the very great advantage that would accrue to the fisheries generally by taking steps to save the lobsters that now go into the boilers, to have incubators provided by which the eggs of the berried lobsters would be hatched out, that would solve the whole difficulty in connection with the depletion of our fisheries. We find on looking at the report of Mr. Neilsen, who is looked upon as an authority in regard to this industry, and in regard to the propagation of lobsters in Newfoundland, that he has met with extraordinary success in the propagation of cod fish and lobsters, and more particularly lobsters. I see in his report of March, 1892, that, speaking of the propagation of lobsters he says :

"Owing to the great scarcity of lobsters this year in Trinity Bay, only one factory near Dildo was in operation, and this closed about the middle of June. The only factory from which lobster ova could be obtained was in Long Harbour, Placentia Bay, and to bring them thence involved a carriage of nearly 20 miles, resulting in many of the ova perishing. This factory, too, closed on 15th July The total number of lobster ova obtained was 18,505,600; and of these 10,274,300 were hatched and planted. Last year (1890) the total collection of lobster ova at Dildo hatchery was 20,927,200; of which 72 per cent, or 15,070,800, were hatched and planted.

"The propagation of lobsters in floating incubators was carried on in this year at nineteen different stations. Last year there were fourteen stations. In Notre Dame Bay this year, 130,494,600 lobsters were hatched, as against 30,398,700 in 1890. The only place in which there was any falling off in the supply of ova was Burges, Fox

Island and Sound Island. The cause of the decline here was the prevalence of "la grippe," which prevented the fishermen from attending to the traps for a considerable time.

"These figures show that 541,190,580 lobsters have been hatched and planted at the various stations in the bays of Newfoundland, against 390,934,500 the previous year, or an excess over last season of 150,261,000. To produce this amount of young lobsters the ova from 28,369 lobsters have been taken and preserved, which otherwise would have been destroyed in the various factories, if these incubators had not been invented and used in bringing them to life. If we add the lobsters hatched at Dildo, we obtain the grand total of 551,469,800 brought to life artificially and planted in our waters. The cost of the production of these lobsters has been only 1 cent for every 2,760 lobsters. It is needless to dwell upon the beneficial effect of these operations in sustaining the stock of lobsters, and averting the deterioration or total destruction of this valuable fishery. If combined with proper protective measures, there is every reason to believe that the future of our lobster fishery is assured. If we take the very low estimate that only 10 per cent of the number of lobsters planted this season in the waters of Newfoundland should survive and come to maturity, the value of these at 8 cents per hundred, would be $441,176."

I will not detain this House by reading at greater length from the very instructive report prepared by Mr. Neilsen. Suffice it is to say that he has met with unparalleled success at very small cost. The 150 incubators only cost $800, while the working expenses of these floating incubators for hatching 750,000,000 of young lobsters only amounted to $3,000. It seems to me that we could not do better than impress on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the importance of giving attention to this particular branch of the fisheries. For my part I think Mr. Neilsen has solved the question of keeping up the supply of lobsters, and if the Minister will spend a few thousand dollars on saving the eggs of the berried lobsters that now go into the boilers of the factories, and hatching the eggs, we would more than counterbalance any depletion that could possibly take place under the most exhaustive fishing during the present very short season. If the Minister would turn his attention to this matter, even if he was necessitated to impose a much larger fee than $5 a year, the packers generally would fall into line with his views and do everything possible to assist the department in saving what now goes to destruction. With respect to the small fee of two cents proposed to be placed on each lobster case by the department, I think it will have a good effect. It will show the buyer that the lobsters have been caught in proper season and at a time when they are best fitted for food, and in that way, the fee being small, it will be more than compensated by the standard of quality introduced for our lobsters. The only protection this industry has had in the past has been the short season. I am borne out in that statement by Lieutenant Gordon, who, in his reports to the department, states that from his own experience he believes that the size regulation that has been enforced for many years past has not in any instance been carried out, and if it were carried out for one season it would close every factory; or words to that effect. I have always contended that the short season is all that is necessary. It must be borne in mind that our season is shorter than any season I have been able to find set forth by any country in any regulation; and seeing that we have adopted this short season before our fisheries have altogether been depleted, I am satisfied that it is all that is necessary to keep our fisheries from being fished out. While I do not agree with some of the regulations proposed by the hon. Minister, yet I believe that he has the best interests of the fisheries at heart, as have the the packers and fishermen themselves. I think, on the whole, that possibly the regulations that are now before the House, with a little amendment that may be made to them before they get through the committee, will meet with the approval of the packers and fishermen through the country generally, and will tend to build up and preserve this important industry.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Speaker, as this Bill now brought before the House by the hon. Minister is so much better than the previous one submitted by him, I must congratulate him upon it. I may say that I find no particular fault with the measure, except in so far as regards sub-section 4 of section 10, which regulates the space between the laths of the trap. In providing a space of 1½ inches between the laths he is taking away the only preservative to the lobsters, because, in my opinion, it would be much better if the space were fixed at 1¾ inches. This regulation is, I believe, not in the interests of the preservation of the lobster fisheries. I was in hopes that he would leave it at 1¾ inches, as I am fully convinced it must take fully that space to save the ten-inch lobsters, and that anything less than that is injurious to the lobster fishery. With reference to sub-section 3, of section 10, wherein it is proposed to make unlawful the fishing for lobsters between the 1st day of July and the 31st day of December, I must say that this is a hard law to apply to the county which I represent, and, above all other counties in the Maritime Provinces, Digby is placed in a bad position by this proposal. At present, the people of my county, on the Bay of Fundy shore, have not a chance to catch lobsters before the middle of May, and by making the close season on the 1st of July, it will be a great hardship on our fishermen. I would ask the hon. Minister to endeavour to change this provision so as to allow the people on the southern shore of the Bay of Fundy to fish until the 15th July. A petition is now in circulation in Digby county, which will arrive here in a few days, asking the Minister to make that change in the existing law. I had a letter only last week from a constituent of mine which gives his receipts and expenditure in lobster fishing last winter. His receipts were $50 and his expenditure $40, so that this shows how much money is made in the lobster fishery in that part of Digby county. He says in his letter:

"I was figuring up my receipts and expenditures for the winter's lobster fishing and the expenditures overbalance receipts: $50 expenses, receipts $40. Through the roughness of the weather we cannot work at the business, the number of traps lost will exceed fifteen hundred at the least calculation, valued at $1.000. The only chance there is to favour the poor man is to give him two more months in the summer season, and as far as protection of the lobster fishing is concerned there is none. They are allowed to sell all nine inches in length, and under that size in length are eaten by fishermen, so there is no protection whatever. I have fished all months in the year and find there is just as many spawn lobsters in the month of January as any month in the year. All the protection the lobster wants is to throw away all small lobsters."

Section 10a says that no one shall keep lobsters alive in ponds except under license from the Minister of Marine. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if a man who catches the lobsters and keeps them over for a week or ten days during the close season will be required to pay a fee of $5.

Mr. TUPPER. The proposition is that during the open season no owner of a pond for lobsters requires any license. If, however, he desires to catch the lobsters in the open season and keep them during the close season, he will be required to take out a license.

Mr. BOWERS. Why should he pay a license if he catches these lobsters in the open season and keeps them in his own car without disposing of them?

Mr. TUPPER. Simply to prevent the abuses which would follow. It would be almost impossible to detect whether the lobsters were taken in the open or close season.

Mr. BOWERS. The fishery overseers will take care that the traps are taken up on the 1st or 15th of July, or whichever time is fixed, and how could there be anything wrong in keeping these lobsters which are caught in the open season?

Mr. TUPPER. By putting down another trap.

Mr. BOWERS. But the overseer will be on the ground and he would see that the lobster traps were not allowed to be put down under a heavy penalty.

Mr. TUPPER. It is done, nevertheless.

Mr. BOWERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister, if he keeps to the space at 1½ inches, and allows the people of Prince Edward Island by putting laths at an inch and a quarter to curtail the close season, that he will allow the people of Digby to have ten or fifteen days extra by enlarging the space to 1¾ inches.

Mr. TUPPER. That is not the proposition.

Mr. BOWERS. That is a proposition that will preserve the lobster fisheries, because these small lobsters which are caught below 9 or 10 inches only bring from 1½ to 2 cents apiece; while in the course of a few months when they grow to 10½ inches, and are allowed into the Boston market, they will bring from 8 to 10 cents, and as high as 15 apiece. It would be a great financial gain to the country in every way if the lobsters were not allowed to be handled under 10, or 10½ inches. We find that the lobsters around our shores are growing smaller year after year, and we think that one of the great reasons of it is the catching of small lobsters. I would ask, in the interests of my constituents, that the time should be extended from the 1st July to the 15th July for the southern shore of the Bay of Fundy, as our people have no better chance of fishing at certain seasons of the year, than have the people of Prince Edward Island and other parts of the Province of New Brunswick.

Mr. YEO. This question has been very fully discussed, and I am sure that the hon. members who are not specially interested in it must be pretty tired of it; still, as it is a matter in which the people whom I have the honour to represent are deeply interested, I will, with the permission of the House, make a few remarks. In Prince Edward Island this is one of the most important industries that we have, and, therefore, I think the less frequently the regulations in regard to it are changed, and the less frequently legislation is adopted which tends to interfere with the industry in any way, the better. With us in Prince Edward Island there is a large amount of money invested in this industry, and very naturally the men engaged in it will not do anything calculated to destroy it. They have invested in buildings, boats, traps, and various other things which are necessary to carry on the industry, and which are altogether useless, or nearly so, for any other business. If the lobster industry is destroyed, these outfits will be a total loss to their owners, so that they will therefore do nothing which would tend to destroy it.

Mr. TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the packers on the New England coast maintained that principle?

Mr. YEO. If I am correctly informed, the sale of lobsters along the New England coast is confined principally to live lobsters. The close season there is a very short one, so that the fishermen catch lobsters nearly all the year round.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman apprehended my point. It is this: The hon. gentleman says that the packers will in their own interest fish carefully, and I mention for his consideration the fact that notwithstanding that many of the packers on our coasts packed formerly on the New England coasts, and were there interested in carrying out that principle, they fished out those districts before they came to Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia.

Mr. YEO. Well, I suppose, for the very reason I have given, that there the close season is a very short one, and the catch would be very much larger than with us. With us on Prince Edward Island, I think, perhaps forty or forty-five days each year is the full extent of our fishing season. I know that on the north side of Prince Edward Island, particularly, our fishermen very often do not put their traps out until the latter end of May, and they are obliged to take them up on the 15th of July, which makes a very short season. As I said before, I think this trade will regulate itself. Last year, I believe, the business in the Maritime Provinces was a fairly paying one, although some parties lost money. This year, there are, perhaps, more people engaged in the business than there were last, and the probabilities are that this year may be an unsuccessful one. Prices may be low, and there are many reasons why those engaged in the business may not do nearly as well as they did in the previous year; and if that is so, probably the next and some years following, there will be a great falling off in the number engaged in this business. If I understand the hon. Minister of Marine aright, it is intended that the regulation with regard to size which now obtains, is to be done away with. I think this is quite right. Anybody who is at all acquainted with this business, knows that it is impossible to carry out the law in this respect—that it is violated in every factory a number of times each day. I quite agree that it is very wise to repeal this regulation. One of the provisions proposed by the Bill is that the space between the lower laths shall be 1¾ inches. I think the hon. Minister of Marine says that he intends to change that to 1½ inches. At present the space is 1¼ inches, and from all I have learned from those engaged in the business, I believe they consider the space of 1¼ inches quite sufficient; and I think the hon. Minister must be pretty well convinced of this himself, because he has said that he will consent to make the space 1¼ inches as it is at present. I did not quite understand whether this applies to the whole coast or only to a particular part.

Mr. TUPPER. The whole coast. The Bill is general.

Mr. YEO. I hope he will embody that provision in the Bill, making the space 1¼ inches where the lobster packers consent to forego the 10 days fishing in the season. This will not apply to all parts of Prince Edward Island. On some parts of the west and south-west coast of Prince Edward Island the lobsters do not strike in until late in the year, and there the fishermen may be anxious to have the time extended to the 15th of July. On the north side they may think it an advantage to have the 1¼ inch space and forego the 10 days. The hon. Minister of Marine very kindly favoured us with some quotations from a report made by Mr. Neilsen, who is at present in Newfoundland, and I have no doubt they are very valuable. But if my information is correct Mr. Neilsen is a Norwegian, and I understand that many of the suggestions which he makes as to the preservation of lobsters in this country, have not been adopted in Norway. I am not positive whether or not this is the case, but it struck me as strange that he should propose regulations for this country which have not been carried out in his own. I have no doubt that the information he gives is valuable and worth the consideration of this House; but for my own part I would be guided much more by the opinions of one like the hon. junior member for King's (Mr. McLean), who has had practical experience in this business, and knows all about it, and I know that he would not advance any argument here which would tend in any way to injure this valuable industry. So that whilst Mr. Neilsen's opinion may be very valuable, I would prefer taking the opinion of such as the hon. member for King's. Now, with regard to the lobsters being depleted on the coast of Prince Edward Island. I do not know where this information comes from. I think it is something over twenty-one years since this industry was begun, and although the lobsters are not as large as they were in the beginning, still I do not know that there are any signs of depletion at all. I believe the catches are quite equal to what they were many years ago, and I do not think there is any great decrease in quantity. While there is not a great deal in this Bill to be found fault with, there is one part I am decidedly opposed to, and that is the provision with regard to the issuing of licenses. I do not see why those who are engaged in the packing of lobsters should have this license imposed upon them. It is true the fee asked is not a very large one. It is only $5, but it appears to me to be the entering of the thin end of the wedge. In the first Bill, it was proposed to impose a fee of $50; and although the Minister of Marine may be very generous and well disposed towards the people engaged in this industry, we do not know who may come after him. The hon. gentleman will leave this department some time, and somebody less liberally disposed towards the fishermen may take his place, and a larger fee may be imposed. I do not see why those engaged in this industry should be taxed to even this small extent while others engaged in other fish industries are not. There is no check in any way put upon other fishermen, and I do not see why this fee should be imposed on the lobster packers. If they got any advantage from this license, it would be worthy of consideration, but I cannot understand how they will be benefited in any way. It is just a license fee being imposed without anything being given in return, and I think it is calculated to bring about an increase in the fee which will bear harshly on some of the packers. There are many people who have invested their all in this industry, and if at any time in the near future a large fee should be exacted it would bear very hard on them, and, therefore, I am opposed to this proposition. Again I do not see the advantage of putting on this stamp. It is quite true the fee in this case is also small, but it seems unnecessary, and only putting on a restriction from which no possible good can arise. It is not going to enhance the value of canned goods. One hon. gentleman said it would show that the lobsters were caught in the proper season. Well, there is a great deal more than that necessary in the canning of lobsters. To have good canned lobsters, it is necessary they should be well put up and properly inspected. If anything in the shape of inspection were intended, then the stamp would be worth something, but I do not think that is the intention of the Minister, so that the label can be of no possible value. I have heard some hon. gentlemen say that in their correspondence with their constituents, who are engaged in this industry, their constituents are all in favour of the Bill. I cannot say as much for the people with whom I have been in communication, for they are opposed entirely to this license fee and also to the fee for the stamp. I do not say this in a spirit of opposition because the Bill is introduced by the Government, for the lobster fishery is a branch of industry which we cannot be too anxious to assist the Minister of Marine in protecting and improving, but I do not think protection of this kind is at all necessary. I believe the trade will regulate itself, and that the people engaged in it will not do anything that is likely to destroy this business in a very short time. People do not like these unnecessary restrictions being placed upon them. It has been said that this is not at all calculated to interfere with the fishermen, but we all know that anything which interferes with the packers must also interfere with the fishermen. Anything which injures the one will injure the other, and anything which will help the business, so far as packing is concerned, will also benefit the fishermen. I am sorry I cannot support the Bill, but I cannot see any good results which will flow from it. It will give rise to a lot of trouble without any corresponding benefit.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. TUPPER. I propose to alter this clause so as to make it read:

"No one shall in any season can, preserve, or cure lobsters, or during close season keep them alive in ponds or other places, except under license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in form A to the schedule of this Act."

Mr. FLINT. I have been unable to understand what public benefit the Minister expected to arise from this license. Most of his speech was taken up in reference to the diminution in the size of the lobster, but he has not touched upon this point.

Mr. TUPPER. This is principally for the purpose of administration. In administering any of these regulations, we are necessarily embarrassed by the extent of the territories over which these canneries extend. The extent of coast line makes it almost impossible, without an enormous grant from Parliament, for us to police these points, so that we are compelled to make periodical visits, and within the last year or two this has occurred, which is to the detriment of the regular packers, that, during the close season, the small packers will secretly and in secret places start a small boiler, sometimes in a glen or in a back building, and will put up in a rough kind of way the lobsters which they cure and pack themselves, putting them up in tins and that kind of thing so that supervision was becoming all the more difficult. Under a license system we have this protection that we can follow the violators more easily and detect the violations of the law more easily, and it is in the interests of all to have a more even administration of the law. Every licensee will be all the more careful to co-operate with the department and not to violate the law as to packing, because, if a packer persisted in extending his operations and keeping his factory open after the season, it would be possible to refuse him a renewal of his license. I think this is one of the best features of the Bill with a view to secure a uniform observance of the clause which has received almost universal support, that is, the clause in reference to the strict observance of the close season.

Mr. FLINT. I can appreciate the argument in favour of a license as a matter of routine observance, and I suppose the fee of $5 is not very large because the profits are supposed to be large ; but I think it is establishing a principle which a large number of people in the country will look upon with great disfavour. It places any parties who make a slight infraction of the law under the power, I will not say of the department, but of those who enforce the law in the various communities. It may be more serious to have a license suspended or refused than it would be to impose a fine, because a license withheld, in the opinion of the man himself arbitrarily, would result in practically ruining his business, whereas a high fine which might be imposed for the violation of the law might leave the chance to argue the matter out with the department and often to get it reduced or remitted as the case might be. This is a terrible power to accord to the department over those who exercise the powers of the department. I would call the attention of the committee to the form which the license is to take, and I think that should be amended if the committee insists on having a license at all.

Mr. TUPPER. I propose to change that, but we had better wait until we reach it.

Mr. FLINT. The Bill has been so largely reduced from the original form that a great deal of the anxiety which was felt will no doubt be somewhat allayed.

Mr. TUPPER. I have not received a single objection, though I was in communication with those interested, to the Bill and its present form. Many of my correspondents, though they were all strangers to me, objected very strongly to the first proposition, but I think the Bill in the main has been very well received by those concerned.

Mr. FLINT. I do not see here to whom the application is to be made for the license.

Mr. TUPPER. There will be no trouble in that respect, just as now the applications are made for trap licenses and they come to the fishery officers and are forwarded in due course and acted upon.

Mr. FLINT. They are not issued locally, but by the Fisheries Department ?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. I should like very well if there were no fee at all. I am opposed on principle to charging the fishermen any fee whatever.

Mr. TUPPER. No fisherman has to pay a fee.

Mr. FRASER. There are a number of fishermen who engage in canning ; two or three neighbours in some place work together, and have a cannery, so it is the fisherman after all who pays. I object to it on principle. I think when these men are only allowed to can lobsters for two short months in the year, it is too hard to charge them $5. When that section is taken in connection with sub-section 5 and section *a* of 5, it will be seen that it is quite a tax on the people. This Act does not provide for inspection. If there was an inspection, I could understand the imposition of a fee, but there is no inspection at all of these canneries. This fee is collected simply for the purpose of paying the man who goes there to get the fee. Once upon a time we had a system of inspecting fish in Nova Scotia, but that is largely, if not altogether, done away with now. Now, why should not these persons be treated like persons in any other industry ? Why should not the particular brand of a particular canner be sufficient ? You are now going to send an official there to see. Small as is this fee, it is as was well said by an hon. member from Prince Edward Island, the entering of the thin end of the wedge. Now I believe that you ought not to put any tax whatever upon an industry that is of necessity confined to a short time in the year. A man works on his farm all the year round ; manufacturers work all the year round making clothing, boots and shoes that are needed in summer and winter ; but here is a business in which a man can only work two months in a year, and you are going to exact a fee from that man. That is not treating him as you treat men in other businesses. If the purpose was to make a thorough inspection and to see that before any lobsters were canned for sale they should be inspected by an officer of the Government, then I could understand it ; but this is simply a mode of levying a tax upon these men of $5, be the cannery ever so small. In my own county there are a number of cases where a family of three or four boys and three or four girls go with the father and have a small cannery, and they do a fair business in the markets of the world, if their article is a good one. This matter ought to be judged, not from the amount a man puts up, but simply from the point of view of the character of the goods he produces. These men are restricted already, and rightly enough ; in the interest of the fisheries and in their own interest there should be restrictions as to time ; but when that is done, I do not think you should charge any fee.

Mr. JONCAS. I am a little surprised at the opposition of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr.

Fraser) against the license fee. The Bill as it is framed, seems to be acceptable to those engaged in the business. The hon. member forgets that the lobster fishery is not the only one that is subject to a license fee. Take the salmon fishery, that is subject to a fee; so is the mackerel fishery, and so is the cod fishery with traps—all are subject to a license fee. In our counties on the Gulf of St. Lawrence where we used to have the richest fisheries in the world, and where we still have, I think, the richest fisheries in the world, I think it is time for the Government to impose some fee by means of which the Department of Fisheries will be in a position to regulate those fisheries. This fee of $5 is only a nominal fee, after all; the fisherman will not suffer by it. I represent a county where we have, perhaps, 200 canneries, and I know very well that the packer alone will pay the fees, the fishermen will not suffer by it. The hon. member for Guysborough speaks of small canneries. I think that this fee should be applied also to small canneries, because the small canneries have no reputation at stake, whereas the large packers, who have a reputation will take care that the goods they put on the market are of a good quality.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will a $5 fee ensure that the small packers will put better goods on the market?

Mr. JONCAS. No, but I say that a $5 fee will subject the small canneries to an inspection by an officer of the Government.

Mr. FRASER. Not at all. There is no inspection.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no inspection as to quality, but there is inspection as to the time at which these lobsters are caught, whether they are caught at the season of the year when it is generally admitted that they are in their best condition, or whether they are caught illegally at a time when they are not in good condition. That question is settled by the certificate. I am told by men who are in the business that the inspection clause, while useful to the department for another purpose, will be in the interest of packers, because every bit of that license fee, and the inspection fee itself, will tend to give their goods a certificate that will be of greater value to them than the $5, and the graded two cents nominal fee on the cases.

Mr. FORBES. I fail to understand the remarks of the hon. member from Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) when he says that this is not a tax upon the fishermen. All along the shores of Nova Scotia, and I dare say along the shores of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick also, there are men catching these fish in what are called cages, from which they are transferred to boxes which, under this Act, are going to be called traps. That practice is followed by fishermen, and this tax of $5 will be directly imposed on them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How?

Mr. FORBES. For every box, which will hold a cage of 12 or 20 lobsters, the Minister will charge a tax of $5.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman should read the Bill before he indulges in a criticism of that kind. The fee for the license will be $5 a year; the other tax is only 2 cents for each case containing 4 dozen 1-pound cans, and 1 cent for each case containing 2 dozen 1-pound cans, according to the nature of the case.

Mr. FORBES. Under section 10 it is provided:

"No person shall, in any season, can, preserve, or cure lobsters, or keep them alive in ponds or other places, except under license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the form A in the schedule to this Act.

"A fee of five dollars shall be paid for each such license."

During the period when fish can be caught, as well as during the close season, the fishermen come together and catch fish in traps and transfer them to ponds and other places.

Mr. TUPPER. It is a custom well known to be followed by these men during the open season, and during that time vessels come along the coast and take the lobsters to the factories. We do not interfere with these operations in any respect. They did not require any license. As the Act now stands it does not affect them in the slightest degree. There is growing up another custom, notably near Yarmouth, where fishermen operating for the United States market, catch more lobsters during the open season than they can profitably dispose of, and they wish to keep them in ponds and pounds during the close season. The department, observing this close season, cannot permit those operations to proceed without some check being exercised: but as it is a legitimate operation if properly guarded, we intend to compel these parties to take out a license so that we can prevent abuses arising that would otherwise occur from fishermen keeping fish in ponds, without any officer being present, during the close season.

Mr. FORBES. I quite agree with the principle of imposing a $5 license fee. There is another practice growing up in the Counties of Queen's and Shelburne too which I wish to call the Minister's attention. The fishermen do not keep the lobsters in large ponds, for which he is going to compel the parties to take out a license, but in much smaller pounds called "cars." This "car" is a little larger than the ordinary cage in which the lobsters are caught. After they have been taken from the original trap or box, they are transferred to a "car," and are kept a few days awaiting the arrival of a sailing smack or steamer.

Mr. TUPPER. We do not interfere with those fishermen.

Mr. JONCAS. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that a little while ago, in the committee, we amended section 10 so as to read:

"No one shall fish for, catch, kill, can, preserve or cure lobsters or keep them alive in ponds or other places, during the close season, except under license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries."

The difference lies in the words "during the close season."

Mr. FORBES. Is there anything in the Bill or proposed regulations to prevent the lobsters from those "cars" being transferred out of season?

Mr. TUPPER. No.

Mr. BOWERS. Suppose a man has a thousand lobsters in one of these "cars" on the last day of the fishing season, two or three days may elapse before the vessel which is taking them away, comes round. Has he to take out a license for those two or three days?

Mr. TUPPER. That man is liable to a fine now. That is one of the frequent ways in which

the regulations are evaded, by fishermen pretending that the lobsters in the "cars" were caught during the open season.

Mr. BOWERS. A fisherman would be liable to a fine if those lobsters were in the "cars" 24 hours after the termination of the open season.

Mr. JONCAS. The hon. gentleman forgets that the season for packers ends on a certain day. The fishermen know they have no right to keep lobsters after that time, and that it is no use to keep them in "cars."

Mr. BOWERS. I am referring to fishermen who keep lobsters fresh for the United States. At the close of the season these men may have two or three hundred lobsters fresh on hand. What are they going to do? They should be allowed a few days during which to get rid of them.

Mr. TUPPER. If a fisherman has such a large stock on hand, and is waiting for a change in the market, he will have to come under the general rule applied for the protection of the fisheries, so that we may know exactly where lobsters are being kept during the close season, and prevent the stock being kept up by lobsters taken during the close season.

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) has raised a difficulty which, he says, will occur under the present Bill. How do fishermen under those circumstances act at present?

Mr. BOWERS. At the present time the Minister, through his overseers, gives the fishermen four or five days, or a week, to get clear of the lobsters they have on hand.

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the name of any overseer who gave that permission?

Mr. BOWERS. I do not like to say.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not providing for breaches of the law.

Mr. BOWERS. If a fisherman has some lobsters on hand during the last day of the open season, has he got to throw them away? At present the overseer gives three or four days to allow him to get rid of them.

Mr. TUPPER. We do not propose to change the overseer.

Mr. GILLMOR. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Bowers) here understands this question about as well as any gentleman in this House, and I think if the Minister understands it he will see the great propriety of the suggestion made by him. I know that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) is a reasonable one, and I believe if the Minister appreciated it he would try to provide for just such a case as has been mentioned. This has nothing to do with the canneries at all, but it has to do with the lobsters that are sold alive, and there must be always a small stock of lobsters in these "cars" immediately after the date when the close season commences. Now, I am sure the Minister does not wish to compel these persons to take out a license who may have a few lobsters in these "cars" at the close of the season. My hon. friend from Digby suggests that they should not be fined for having these lobsters there two or three days after the fishing season, and I believe that his suggestion is a proper one and ought to be adopted. I know that the Minister does not want to oppress or annoy or tax the fishermen, but he will do a great injustice to that class of persons if he does not provide that they shall have time to get rid of their stock without compelling them to pay a license.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is of course a free trader in everything, and I know he will admit that he has very little sympathy for any of the regulations touching the fishermen. The question raised by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) is a vital one and whatever there is in it is contrary to the spirit of a close season. Most hon. gentlemen in the committee are in favour of a close season, but the minute you allow any nibbling at the dates of the close season you interfere with the most vital principle of it. The difficulty must always remain of finding out whether these lobsters in the "cars" were caught just in the last days of the open season, or were caught during the close season. We know that lobsters have been taken during the close season, and if this is allowed it will be impossible to prevent the practice. It is most difficult to detect the illegal fishing, and I believe it must be provided that if any lobsters are left on hand, they shall come under the regulation.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think the Minister is treating the people very harshly indeed in this matter. These lobsters are taken for food and the people are allowed by law to take them up to a certain time, and won't you allow them to keep them there and eat them without paying a fee? I think that the motives of the Minister are good, but I think he is mistaken in his zeal, and his zeal is not according to knowle lge in reference to this matter. With regard to my being a free trader I may say that I do not think it is good for the business to restrict and hamper it in this sort of way. Neither do I believe that the source from which the Minister gets his information on these matters is perhaps the most correct, because these officers want to find something to do and they interfere with the men catching fish. I appreciate the Minister's motives in trying to protect these fisheries, but they have not yet become exhausted. I think, however, that he is justified in legislating so that they shall not become exhausted, but I believe that he should not hamper the business by making people to pay for a license to catch lobsters.

Mr. BOWERS. I have no objection to the principle of the Minister charging a license to keep these lobsters alive in "cars." If any one should wish to speculate in lobsters and buy them for the purpose of keeping them alive in close season, I am perfectly willing that a fee should be charged. The Minister must remember, however, that during the last three or four days of the season, the fishermen are employed in removing their traps and bringing them ashore. Suppose there has not been a vessel around to buy these lobsters for one week before the season closes, what are the fishermen to do? These lobsters are bought alive and put into smacks, and if the smack has gone to Yarmouth, or Boston, or Portland, and is not around to buy the lobsters, does the Minister want the fishermen to throw the lobsters away? I want the Minister to give some guarantee to the fishermen that if they put these lobsters into their "cars," they will not have to pay a license fee of $5 for simply keeping them until they can dispose of them.

Mr. FLINT. I think there is considerable in what has been said by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers). I do not think that there is any reasonable objection to the license fee in reference to the ponds. A great deal must be conceded to the administrative departments and the fee is not very much, and provided that the licenses cannot be made too powerful an engine for exerting pressure on those who hold them, I do not think there can be any very great objection. In regard to those who are in the position so well described by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Bowers) I think there might be some proviso made in the law to cover the few days that they may have a greater or smaller number of lobsters in these "cars" awaiting disposal. As a matter of fact those who have charge of this matter have been very moderate, I am aware, in exercising the powers which the law now gives them, and I think that they do so properly, because circumstances over which neither the overseer, nor the person having these fish, can possibly have control might prevent their disposing of them during the first few days of the close season, and as a matter of fact I think we must admit that the strict powers of the law have not been enforced against these people. But it might possibly be advisable if a few words were inserted as a proviso which would protect these people, and at the same time not leave the overseers open to the charge of winking at an open violation of the law. Before the Bill is finally passed, I think the Minister might devise some proviso to cover a week or so of the first part of the close season; so that these parties will not be compelled to take out a regular license.

Mr. BOWERS. I would like the hon. Minister to give us a little satisfaction on this point.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by satisfaction. I have given my opinion three or four times.

Mr. BOWERS. I wish the hon. Minister to enact a law that will not press too hardly on th fishermen. They have hard work enough now to make a living. They go out in storms and gales and all kinds of weather pursuing their occupation. You are going to charge them a license for keeping the very lobsters which you empower them to catch. The hon. member for Shelburne, the hon. member for Queen's, the hon. member for Yarmouth, and the hon. member for Annapolis are all interested in this matter. The fishermen along their shores are placed in the same situation as those of Digby County, and I think the hon. Minister might put a clause in this Bill that would make it more easy upon them.

Mr. FLINT. Could not the Minister allow about three days without the necessity of taking out a license?

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. gentlemen are borrowing trouble. You cannot fix a limit without incurring some difficulty. It is a very rare case in which the *bonâ fide* lobster fisherman is caught in the predicament of having the lobsters, and wanting to get rid of them in the close season. To adopt the suggestion would practically be to extend the open season and the opportunities for abuse; and as we are making no change in that regard whatever, the particular cases to which the hon. gentleman has referred are so few that they have not come up. Practically, I do not think there is any trouble.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have not intervened in the discussion of that particular part of the subject with regard to keeping lobsters in ponds during the close season, because it is not a matter of which I have any practical knowledge. But if the hon. gentleman persists in keeping this principle in his Bill, after the discussion which has taken place on the second reading, it is possible that at a future stage I may test the opinion of the House as to the propriety of taking out a license at all. In the Bill which the hon. gentleman first introduced, he provided for the manner in which the licenses must be obtained; and I will say frankly that the manner in which they can be obtained is a great deal more serious than the granting of the licenses or the fee charged. The object of the hon. gentleman, I understand, is to keep the lobster fishery more under the control of the department. So far as the department and the superior officers are concerned, I do not see that very much evil can result; but I wish to know whether these little petty jacks-in-office, who harass every Liberal engaged in the business in Prince Edward Island, are to have any control over these licenses or not?

Mr. TUPPER. None whatever.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because I may tell the hon. gentleman that we have no confidence whatever in his officials. If the license came from the department, I would be satisfied that every justice would be done to the packers, and no enquiry would be made whether a man was a Liberal or not; but these little jacks-in-office harass and worry every Liberal engaged in the business as far as they can to show their authority. I speak now from what I know, for I have fifty or sixty letters here from those engaged in the business, and many of them speak in this direction. Is an application to be made for these licenses? If so, how is it to be made, and what length of time must elapse before it can be obtained? What red tape is required in order to obtain it? The hon. gentleman professed to frame this Bill somewhat on the lines suggested by Mr. Neilsen in Newfoundland; but Mr. Neilsen proposed that these licenses should be granted free, and that any justice of the peace or sub-collector or fishery warden should be able to grant them. The object was to keep the business under the control of the department, and ensure that every honest, *bonâ fide* packer would get the license without any red-tape. I want to know in what manner these licenses shall be applied for, and what restrictions shall be possible in the way of any man applying for a license.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I must rise to protest against the aspersion which the hon. member for Queen's has passed upon the fishery overseers of Prince Edward Island. He has no right to cast any such aspersions upon them. When the packers of Prince Edward Island were fined there were as many Conservatives fined as Liberals, and when the fishery officers had to do with the giving of the bounty, as many Conservatives had to complain of not getting their bounty as Liberals.

Mr. PERRY. It is not so.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is so, and I can show

him a list of dozens of Conservatives who complained. We see these gentlemen getting up time and again and making assertions that are not borne out by the facts. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries can find returns in his office, and I can name dozens of men in my county, Conservatives as well as Liberals, who have not received the bounty because of informalities. It is all very well for the hon. members for Queen's and Prince to get up here and make assertions which are not borne out by the facts, but I could not allow them to do it without contradicting them. With respect to the clause before the House, this tu'penny ha'penny "car" business down in the western part of Nova Scotia, there is more time wasted about it than the whole thing is worth. The fact of the matter is the probabilities are that not one of these little "cars," which are very little bigger than a lobster trap, had more than fifty lobsters in it, and even if it had a hundred it is a very small trifle, and they might take the chance of letting them loose and catching them another time.

Mr. TUPPER. I have not had any serious charges with reference to the partiality of the fishery officers in the Island, but the hon. gentleman must know, for he has had great experience, that whether the Government in power be Liberal or Conservative, when a party gets into trouble with a fishery inspector he immediately jumps to the conclusion that it is because of his political leanings. But I am sure that not more in Prince Edward Island than in any other place has partiality been shown by the fishery officers. I can tell the hon. gentleman, if it will be any comfort to him, that I am individually as unpopular with the Conservatives in the Island as with the Liberals, so far as I have come in contact with them in connection with these penal laws, which are very unpleasant laws to administer. It is certainly my intention to grant every application for a canning license. I left out that clause, and the hon. gentleman naturally supposed there was an object in dropping it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not suppose anything.

Mr. TUPPER. I will explain why I did so. The clause was more essential in connection with the regulation originally drafted, but which was found, after thorough discussion, to be impracticable and unnecessary, because of so much detail being required. There will be no discrimination made in granting the licenses.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How is this to be obtained? How is a canner to get his license?

Mr. TUPPER. Just as they do all over Canada, on application. In Prince Edward Island there will be no difficulty whatever.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To whom will they apply?

Mr. TUPPER. Application naturally would go to the department, just as we get applications for all the trap net licenses issued. They apply long in advance, and there has been no trouble in connection with the issue of those. If a man wished, he could send his application to the inspector. It is for him to apply to the inspector or the head office. If the hon. gentleman thinks it wise to give direction in the Bill, I have no objection to publish in it where the application should be made.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman furnish blank forms to all the collectors of customs and fishery officers with instructions to give them to every applicant on payment of a fee? The hon. gentleman wants the canners of the Island to go to the inspector of fisheries. They have not that confidence in him, and he may live on one part of the Island and the applicant in another.

Mr. TUPPER. He need not move about.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will accept the hon. gentleman's assurance if he will tell me that these blanks will be supplied to the collectors of customs and that all applicants can obtain them from the collector or the agent of the department. How is an applicant in King's County to get to the inspector at Tignish?

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is making unnecessary trouble. No such trouble has occurred in the administering of the license system all over Canada. Most of the packers can read and write, and they can communicate with the department at Ottawa, without cost, from any point in the Island and have the answer back in a short time. If the applicant wishes to go to the inspector, he can do so, and forward his application through him. When the Bill was drafted, I supposed that, naturally, applications would go straight to the department.

Mr. BOWERS. Could the hon. gentleman not put in the Bill a clause compelling only those who keep live lobsters in "cars" containing over five hundred each or over to take out a license? A clause like that would prevent parties who have a few lobsters on hand being fined.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I understand the hon. gentleman to assure the committee that any application made will be granted without any reference to the inspector.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not make any such pledge. It would not be right for me to do so. I don't know what the hon. gentleman has against the inspector.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I am saying nothing against him.

Mr. TUPPER. Either the inspector is fit for his office or he is not. I believe he is. I believe he performs his duty well, and I will make no pledge as to whether I will refer to one officer or another. In connection with the administration of my duties, I will refer to any officer in my department in the Island or any part of Canada whenever I see fit to do so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is just what I feared, that a man is not to have the right to get a license when he applies for it, and I say that the intention was he should have the right.

Mr. TUPPER. I have said nothing to the contrary.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I only want the hon. gentleman's assurance that on applying to the department every applicant shall have the right to have the license.

Mr. TUPPER. I tell the hon. gentleman that was the intention. We do not intend to discriminate. That is not part of the Bill. We intend to grant licenses to every man who is a canner and has

a factory. That is straight and clear. But I will not say that I shall not refer to Mr. Hackett on any subject. On the contrary, having confidence in him I may very often have to refer to him.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I want to have an assurance that every applicant on forwarding his fee to the office shall have his license.

Mr. TUPPER. I have stated that several times.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a good deal of reservation about that.

Mr. TUPPER. There is no mental reservation.

Mr. PERRY. I see that this is to be signed by "A.B.," and I should like to know where he is to be found. There is no provision in that Bill showing in what way the applicant is to get his license, and my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) says that all he wants is to find out how the applicant is to get his license. It would only require a short clause to show by what means the parties applying for licenses shall get them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman intend to provide that the application is to be countersigned by the overseer of the district?

Mr. TUPPER. There is not a packer in the Dominion of Canada who would not know where to apply. If there was any question, he would write to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but there is nothing to prevent a canner applying to an overseer and having his application forwarded. There is no objection at present to an applicant for traps applying in that way, but, naturally, they know that the applications go to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BOWERS. Many applications have been made from Digby County to the fishery overseer; but the trouble is that on the southern shore of the Bay of Fundy it is very rough and they cannot fish there before the middle of May, as many traps are destroyed if they try to fish earlier. Why should not they have the right to fish up to the 15th July as well as the people of Prince Edward Island or those on the north shore of New Brunswick? The stormy weather of the early part of the season precludes the fishermen on the south shore of the Bay of Fundy from making a paying season unless they can go to the 15th July.

Mr. TUPPER. One of the best answers I can give to the hon. gentleman is to refer to the remarks he made early in the evening, when he represented that, in regard to the laths, there was a diminution in the size and in the run of lobsters in his district, and he hoped the regulation would be made more strict.

Mr. BOWERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," and that statement of his affords the best reason for not extending the season. The sense of the whole committee is evidently against him in that matter, because it is felt that the close season is the best protection we can have.

Mr. BOWERS. Elsewhere they can fish much earlier than in the Bay of Fundy, and I think the season should be extended to the 15th July.

Mr. TUPPER. It would be difficult here at this stage to discuss the metes and bounds of districts. They have stood various tests and have been carefully drawn, and it would be an unending task to attempt to change them now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that the hon. gentleman's Bill does not make provision for the issue of the license as a matter of course. If the hon. gentleman were to provide that, upon the payment of a certain fee by a person applying for a license to the fishery overseer, he should give a license or a receipt, and provide for his punishment if he refused, and that the application should be forwarded to the department and the license sent back by the department, then there would be no question of possible delay. As far as I can see, if a party were to make an application to an overseer, and the overseer delayed to forward it, the season might be over before the license would be received, and there should be some provision by which the applicant could go on with his fishing without waiting for the receipt, if his application was somewhat late. It seems to me that there is no adequate provision for the enforcement of the duties which should devolve upon the officer.

Mr. TUPPER. That affects the whole administration of the department, and it is a novel suggestion on the part of the hon. member that the officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department should be held under heavy penalties if they neglect their duties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So they should be everywhere.

Mr. TUPPER. Until that is made general, there are many objections to its being adopted in the Marine and Fisheries Department. I do not think a case has been made out, in our experience of the working of the license system elsewhere, to warrant Parliament in taking that course.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see this is not a license that operates over the entire year, and there is necessity for great promptness.

Mr. TUPPER. Certainly, the officer would be responsible. I would be responsible, I take it, constitutionally, if, through neglect of the officers, this business was embarrassed by inattention to the applications for license.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That responsibility is very remote, and would be practically of no value. The officer upon whom the duty immediately devolves and out of whose negligence the wrong might arise, is the party who would be made responsible.

Mr. TUPPER. In the provinces where canning is carried on, practical operations begin about the 1st of May. There is all winter, therefore, after the last season, to forward these applications for licenses. If the hon. gentleman had any experience with fishermen, he would know that the department is reminded very quickly if applications of that kind are not promptly attended to. I will not ask the committee to sit any longer, and I, therefore, move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 6th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MURRAY. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. An article has been published in the Ottawa *Citizen* of the 4th instant which reflects on my conduct as a member of this House, and I would claim the attention of the House for a few moments while I refer to it. That paper has made some comments on my conduct in connection with the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway Bill, of which I had charge. It says :

"Mr. Murray, the member for Pontiac, cut a sorry figure before the Railway Committee yesterday. As sponsor for the Bill authorizing an extension of time for the completion of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, he is evidently acting in direct contravention of his representative obligations, and so was obliged to acknowledge to the committee that the sentiment of the county is in favour of limiting the time for finishing the road to three years. To complete his humiliation, a resolution of the county council of Pontiac was read opposing the application for an extension of time to the railway company, and reflecting upon Mr. Murray's conduct in fathering the Bill. The council considered it a pity that Pontiac had not a member in the House qualified to voice the views of the electorate, and appointed Mr. S. McNally and Mr. J. Bryson, ex-M. P., to represent the council before the committee. Mr. Bryson justified the confidence of the council by supporting their contention in a strong and practical address. Mr. Beemer pointed out that the county's repudiation of its obligation had delayed the construction of the railway. The Bill was, however, amended to compel the company to build to Allumette Island within three years, to commence the work within one year, and to build the bridge across to Pembroke within five years."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the members of the Railway Committee who were present at the time this Bill was before that committee, to say whether this newspaper, which is supposed to be the organ of one of the political parties in this country, and to have some regard for veracity and truth and fair play, has fairly represented me. I appeared before that committee in charge of the Bill, and I stated distinctly that the sentiment of the people of the county was favourable to limiting the extension of the charter to two years, and not five years. I said that in the beginning. The council had seen fit to appoint a delegation to attend the meeting, and that delegation was present. The vice-president of the road, Mr. Beemer, was there also, and gave satisfactory reasons for the further extension of time. I was disposed, though in charge of the Bill, to limit the time to two years. The chairman will bear me out that I contended for two years, though we finally compromised at three years; and Mr. Bryson, who followed me in addressing the committee, concurred in my opinion. I do not think that any member of the present Government, whatever opinion I may have as to their political sins—I suppose they do not claim perfection—or any Conservative member of this House, would wish to see me placed in a false position as a member of this House. I am sure that I would be sorry to countenance anything of this kind reflecting on the character or reputation of any member of Parliament. With these few observations, I will not further take up the time of the House.

THE FISHERIES ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 9) further to amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Tupper.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2, paragraph 4,

Mr. FLINT. Do I understand that the Order in Council or legislation referring to the length of the fish is abrogated? Does that also stand as part of the law, together with this clause?

Mr. TUPPER. No. When this Act comes into force, all the regulations and Orders in Council as to the size of the various lobsters are repealed absolutely.

On section 2, paragraph 5,

Mr. TUPPER. I want to amend that a little. Since that was in the Bill, it has been brought to my notice that there is no provision to prevent the defeat of the object of that clause in this way: Lobsters from other countries coming into Canadian ports would not be, perhaps, subject to the provisions of this Bill, and therefore the very check we wish to have imposed on illicit packing would be defeated; and I propose to make that clear in this way so as to make the clause read as follows :—

"Every case of lobsters, canned, preserved or cured in Canada, shall be marked, labelled or stamped in such manner and by such person or persons as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may from time to time direct; and such mark, label or stamp shall state that the lobsters packed in the case so marked, labelled or stamped have been legally caught and packed; and cases of lobsters imported into Canada from other countries shall also be marked, labelled or stamped in such manner as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may from time to time direct; and such cases so marked, labelled and stamped shall state that the lobsters packed in the cases so marked, labelled or stamped are the product of the country of origin."

In that respect we will guard against the abuse of our own stamp, preventing the danger we are trying to guard against of catching lobsters in our country out of season.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When lobsters are caught at a cannery and put up and then sold by the canner to a dealer in the city, the said lobsters not being marked or stamped at the time, does the hon. gentleman propose that that shall be illegal? Does he propose that there shall be no sale or transfer of any unmarked cans, and that the mere fact of having them in possession shall be a breach of the section, or does he mean to limit it in this way, that no lobsters shall be exported without a stamp being on the case? Supposing one hundred thousand cans were caught at any station, and a dealer in Charlottetown bought them at that time when they are not stamped, would he be liable to have them confiscated?

Mr. TUPPER. We will know in the department exactly where there is a legal cannery, and we will then take measures so that we shall have an officer available to attend to the stamping and marking, and the case mentioned by the hon. gentleman would be an infraction of the regulations. We want to prevent the sale in Canada and export from a factory of unmarked cases.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Suppose a canner, who had cases of lobsters ready for export and not stamped, sold them to a dealer in the city, would he thereby break the law?

Mr. TUPPER. That is just where we are defeated. This is the trouble. In the close season there are constantly lobsters exhibited for sale. We get notice that there is a great deal of illicit packing going on in certain districts. We endeavour to watch that, but when we get the cases and have every reason to believe they were packed in the close season, we are met by the difficulty of proving that the lobsters were not caught in the regular season. The parties having them say they were caught in the regular season; and if an innocent party gets hold of them, it is all the harder because he says he did not know anything about when they were caught. What we do now is really to punish the innocent party, whereas the object of this stamping is that every person will know what he is handling, and we will be able to know if there has been any violation of the law.

Mr. FRASER. Who is going to do this work, because if the stamp is to be bought, as likely it will be, each individual packer will buy a lot and can use them to stamp cases of lobsters caught out of season? If the Government appointed an inspector under whose inspection every can would be packed, there would be security, but otherwise there will be none.

Mr. TUPPER. We do not propose to distribute the stamps. The department will look to that. There are many ways in which that difficulty can be met. We have the example of the Inland Revenue Law in regard to stamps, but for the convenience of the trade in this particular—and that is one of the reasons why the small fee is put on—the department will be enabled to keep a check on the export from the factory by the attendance of an officer.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The canner may have a thousand lobster cans in the factory for a fortnight without their being labelled. Is it intended to compel him to stamp them before they are sent out?

Mr. TUPPER. That is not the intention. It is only before they are removed.

Mr. STAIRS. Should they not be stamped before the commencement of the close season? It would not do to allow the packer to keep lobsters stored a month after the end of the open season without being stamped, because others might be put in all the time.

Mr. McALISTER. I know some difficulty may arise in consequence of a packer having several establishments along the coast and canning the lobsters in one factory and sending them to another to be put up in the cases.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It is necessary to fix with certainty the time when the canner knows that he cannot touch these lobsters without being stamped.

Mr. WELSH. I know a small factory near where I live where the man simply cans the lobsters and does not put them in cases at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I see that it is the cases that are to be stamped and not the cans, so that will meet the difficulty suggested by the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. McAlister).

Mr. McLEAN. In some cases in Prince Edward Island the shippers buy the lobsters unlabelled, and reopen the cases and put on their own labels. I do not see how this will be covered under this Bill unless the stamp is put on so as to prevent the case being opened.

Mr. TUPPER. There may be several contingencies of that kind, and that is why I proposed in clause 5 to leave several details of the working out of the measure to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The general danger I had in view is pretty well guarded against in the Act, though there are cases which may arise which I have not contemplated, and I admit that is one of them. What we want to stop is the most general illicit traffic known to the department and, I think, to the trade, that is, where the lobsters are packed in secret and shipped to the different cities and put on the market. I think such cases as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLean) has suggested could be covered by the regulations to be made as to manner and mode, but we might insert the words "before being removed from factory" in this section.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I really think we ought to try here in the House to make it definite. If we cannot do it here where there is a lot of gentlemen who understand the matter thoroughly, it will be difficult for the Minister to frame regulations afterwards. If you propose that no case shall leave the cannery without being stamped, then say so in so many words; and if you propose that it shall be an offence to transfer cans from a marked case to another one, say so in so many words. There is no offence provided in the Bill for opening a stamped case and transferring the cans to another case.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that my section covers what I have in view. The hon. gentleman's suggestion is to make the Bill more stringent than I proposed, and he may be right. That might be an additional guard to the packer. But I was aiming at the chief and most important purpose. The rehandling of a case would be an exception. This, unfortunately, is a very general practice; I want to stop that, and the provision I have there will stop it. I admit it would not stop the other, and against that I am not much concerned to guard.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not think the Minister need be much concerned about the point raised by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I think I understood him to say that he was in doubt whether it was provided that cans cannot be removed from a stamped case and packed up in a case which is not stamped. Would that be possible under the law? If they removed cans out of cases that had been stamped and put them in unstamped cases, they would then be liable to a penalty; they could not put them on the market for sale. Now, there is no provision in this Act under which they could be restamped.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I understand the hon. member for King's to say that there are some small packers who sell their goods to shippers and the shippers are anxious to take these cans out of the boxes, label them, and repack them afterwards. But it appears to me that is easily obviated by the shipper sending these labels to the packer and letting the packer put the labels on the can.

Mr. TUPPER. If the committee are of the opinion that we should guard against all these various possibilities of abuses, I shall have to recast this clause materially. I would state, however, that I accom-

plish my object by the present clause. Now, the hon. gentlemen suggest several other considerations of great importance, and they are to be worked out in some detail, that is, guarding against other abuses which I had not in mind. I think the committee would be saving time if it rose now in order to enable me carefully to recast the regulations in the direction of the suggestions that have been made; because it would be very difficult for us to do this on the spur of the moment. But I am, personally, content to stop with the present provision of this clause.

Mr. McLEAN. The Minister can see, I think, that the illegal packing takes place, as a general thing, with the smaller packers. Their factories are not large enough to enable them to get labels, because it costs more to get a small quantity, and they are the very parties, I understand, the Bill was aimed against.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension. There will be no cost for labels, nor any other cost except that 4 cent case, and the 2 cents.

Mr. McLEAN. I mean the labels of the lobsters, not the stamps.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the committee rises I would make another suggestion. As the Bill now stands the provisions seem very stringent, and, I think, may be made to operate most unjustly. It says here: "In all cases not so marked, the label or stamp shall be liable to seizure, and upon seizure shall thereby be confiscated;" so that the mere act of seizing would confiscate the property, and it may be there was no wilful offence committed at all. I think the hon. gentleman should provide in some way that they may be liable to seizure if found unstamped, and where found unstamped he must prosecute before some tribunal, and let the tribunal confiscate. It would never do to let an officer go in and seize four or five hundred cases of lobsters and have them confiscated by the mere fact of the seizure.

Mr. TUPPER. If the facts do not exist that entitle the officer to seize, then there would be no confiscation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How could you tell?

Mr. TUPPER. By the facts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If they are not labelled they will be seized. But if the officer seizes before the actual confiscation takes place, the man is deprived of his property. There ought to be a judicial determination somewhere.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY—COPYRIGHT.

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

Mr. EDGAR. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the present unsatisfactory condition, as I understand it, of the copyright laws. In May, 1888, an Act was passed by this House making important and advantageous changes in the copyright law. Although more than three years have passed since that statute was assented to, it is not in operation. There was a provision in that statute, as you will recollect, that it should not go into force until a proclamation was issued by the Governor in Council. Well, that proclamation, as I understand it, has not yet been issued, that statute has not been disallowed by the Queen, and, therefore, that statute cannot be disallowed by the English Government under our constitution. I would like to know from the leader of the House what particularly good reason he could give why that statute, which has become law, and has not been disallowed within the two years provided by the constitution for that purpose, should not be brought into force. Nobody in the House has spoken more strongly of the necessity of the Act of 1889 than the Minister of Justice himself. I know that the Government are willing, we know from published correspondence that the Government here were pressing the Home Government to either assent voluntarily to our law going into operation, or else, if they thought they could not do so legally, to cause to be enacted by the Imperial Parliament such legislation as would enable them to assent to our Act of 1889. That went on for some time. The Government were pressed upon this side of the House several times every session about it. Towards the end of last session the Government introduced and had passed an Address to the Crown, asking the English Government to take steps to have Imperial legislation on the subject, if they considered it necessary, and also to take steps to denounce the Berne Convention as to copyright in so far as it was necessary to do so to leave Canada out of its operation. We have heard nothing since as to the fate of that Address from the Minister of Justice, whose words on that occasion were unexceptional, whose statement of the position that Canada should occupy in the controversy with Downing Street was certainly unobjectionable. That has gone along a little too far. Some fruit should come from those words. I should like to have some action now. I should like the Minister of Justice to act according to his undoubted and often expressed conviction on the subject, I should like to know why he does not bring this controversy to a point by issuing a proclamation bringing that Act into force. We know that under the law as it stands Canadian publishers cannot reprint an English copyright book. The public have the benefit of the American reprints of English copyright works under the present law. It is true that does the public some good, but it does no good to the Canadian printer and publisher. One of the main objects of the legislation of 1889 was to enable Canadian publishers to reprint by license, British copyright works unless they were copyrighted here and published here within one month after the copyright in England. But I need not point out that the operation of the American Copyright Act, which came into force last year, is injurious to the Canadian public without doing any good to the Canadian publisher. Now, English authors can copyright their books in the United States, and when they do that, there can, of course, be no cheap American reprints of those copyright books. They cannot be reprinted in Canada under the law as it stands; and, therefore, the Canadian public cannot obtain such books at all. So we are suffering more than ever, both publisher and public, in that respect, and it is all the greater reason why some action of a decided character should be taken by the Govern-

ment in respect to this legislation. So much, very briefly, for our relations with the mother country on the subject of copyright, about which I hope we shall have interesting explanations from the Minister of Justice. Then, as regards our relations with the United States on the copyright question, I should like a little explanation too. I have seen by the press that there is a feeling, I do not know how far it has taken form officially, but there is a feeling evidently in the press against some rulings and decisions of the Minister of Justice in connection with the taking out of copyright in Canada by American citizens. Under the American Copyright Act, which allows foreigners to take out copyright in the United States, under certain conditions, there is the privilege granted that if the copyright book is set up from type and printed in the United States, foreigners may take out copyright there, provided "that this Act shall only apply to a citizen of a foreign state or nation when such foreign state or nation permits to citizens of the United States of America the benefit of copyright on substantially the same basis as its own citizens." I cannot understand what cause of difference should exist. I suppose Canada has been included in some way or other within the operations of this United States Act by a proclamation of the President or otherwise, and if so, I suppose Canadians have taken out copyright under these provisions in the United States. In fact, I have seen it stated in the press that Canadians have done so, and that every facility has been given them in that direction at Washington. I suppose that an American citizen can come here, and if he complies with the Canadian law, just as a Canadian himself would have to comply with it, he can get copyright here. He would have to be domiciled here more or less to comply with the law, as a Canadian has to be domiciled, and it is necessary that the book should be published and printed here under our law for a Canadian, and therefore the same rule would apply to a citizen of the United States. So far as I can see, our laws do not discriminate against the citizens of the United States in favour of Canadians. Perhaps they do; at all events, it would be very interesting if the Minister of Justice would tell us what claims have been made in the United States, if any, on that subject. It is a little curious, of course, that in Canada, in order to get a copyright, the party should be obliged both to print and publish in Canada. In England they only require that the work should be published there simultaneously with publication in any other country, and in the United States they require only that it should be printed there; they do not require publication, but we require both publication and printing, and probably that may strike the American people as being unfair to them, but still I fancy it is the same to them as it is to our citizens. On these different points I would like to hear the opinion of the Government, and I hope sincerely that they will be able to report some distinct progress after the three years that have elapsed since the passage of the Act in 1889.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to know from the observations which the hon. gentleman has just made that we are still in harmony upon this question. I have not in any way receded from any of the positions I have taken with regard to it, and my views as to what ought to be done have not changed in the least. I can give the hon. gentleman but a very short answer as to the reasons why the proclamation has not issued, and one that I am afraid will not convey very much information to him. The proclamation has not issued for the very reason why it was required by the Act of 1889. It was incumbent upon us to insert in the Act a suspensory clause for the reason that the legislation affected questions in relation to which the mother country had a distinct policy and to some extent concerned her international relations. We were obliged, therefore, to insert the clause suspending the Act until Her Majesty's pleasure should be known in regard to it, or suspending the operation of the Act until it should be proclaimed, which practically amounted to the same thing, because the object in suspending it at all was to enable the policy of Her Majesty's Government to be made known to us. The proclamation of an Act of that character is not a matter entirely within the discretion of the Executive of the Dominion, and Her Majesty's Government had to be communicated with for the purpose of ascertaining whether objection existed on their part to the Act being put into force. The proclamation has not been issued by us for the simple reason that Her Majesty's Government have not withdrawn the objections which they had to the Act being put into force. Last year both Houses of this Parliament passed an Address to Her Majesty to have any objections withdrawn, or else to have an Act passed in the Imperial Parliament ratifying the Act of this Parliament. That Address has not been definitely replied to yet by any communication which I am at liberty to lay on the Table of this House. In fact I am sorry to have to say that what has transpired since is not of a character which I am at liberty to disclose. But I have to say this: that no effort has been wanting on the part of this Government to press this matter upon the attention of Her Majesty's Government, feeling as we do, what the hon. gentleman has expressed this afternoon with reference to the wants of the Canadian trade, and the wants of the Canadian public too. As I stated to the House last session, I think that the passage of the American Act upon the subject makes our claim much stronger to have our Act of 1889 put in force; and it removes at one stroke a series of objections which were taken on the part of Her Majesty's Government to legislation of that kind down to 1889. It was always anticipated by those who advised Her Majesty's Government with regard to this particular question that there was a probability of a most liberal copyright law being passed in the United States, and we, on the other hand, represented that in all probability when such an Act would be passed it would be found to be an Act containing the very clause which we inserted in ours, with regard to printing in our own country. The result has justified our predictions. The American Act contains the home production clause, or what is known in the United States as the type-setting clause. I shall be very glad if I am able to state fully to the House what the most recent communication is upon this subject with Her Majesty's Government. With regard to the question which has arisen as regards reciprocity with the United States, I have only to say that our own Act upon the subject seemed to me to be so clear, that I was not at liberty to give any qualification at all to it by interpretation. A complaint has been made,

however, on the part of the Government of the United States that reciprocity has not been extended with regard to copyright. The communication made to Her Majesty's Government has been forwarded here, and I think has not been replied to yet but will be in due course. The matter is receiving the attention of the officers of the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of giving some details, but the provision of our statute to which I refer, and in connection with which my opinion was given, was simply one which only permits the privileges which have been claimed, and the refusal of which have been made a subject of complaint, to be given to authors or publishers in a country having a treaty arrangement with the United Kingdom.

Mr. EDGAR. There is no treaty with the United States.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No. It was claimed on the part of the United States that some conversation which had taken place between Lord Salisbury and the American Minister at London amounted to a treaty arrangement, but there was obviously no foundation for that claim at all. It was a mere statement of Lord Salisbury of what his view was of the law with regard to copyright, and inasmuch as our own statute was evidently in force and Her Majesty's Government would not dispute its validity, there would seem to be no claim on the part of the United States in this direction; and I thought the Department of Agriculture was not at liberty to reciprocate without changing the law which says:

"Any person domiciled in Canada, or in any part of the British possessions, or any citizen of any country which has an international copyright treaty with the United Kingdom who is the author of any book, map, chart, &c., shall have the sole and exclusive right of publishing."

I saw afterwards by the comments which took place in the United States upon the subject, and which were the best informed, that there could be no doubt that there was no claim on the part of the United States to demand an extension of copyright privileges under our law as it stood. I have not been disposed to alter that, or, indeed, to make any change in the copyright law until the fate of our Act of 1889 is determined, and until the negotiations with the Home Government are concluded. There are some changes which Her Majesty's Government desire with regard to the collections of imposts on foreign reprints, &c., and the answer which was returned from here substantially was that we would be disposed to consider that question in due time, but we would only consider it as an amendment to the Copyright Act of 1889, and would only consent to such amendments coming into operation when the Act of 1889 came into force. I think it is quite likely that before the close of the session I may be able to give an answer which will convey more information than I am in a position to give this afternoon.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the claim made by the American Government was, that they should get a patent for publishing here?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, I fancy not. I think they are willing to comply with these conditions, but they claim that as a result of the negotiations with Lord Salisbury they are entitled to be in the same position as if there were a treaty arrangement.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a subject of considerable importance to a large and deserving class of the residents of Ottawa and the surrounding country. Last year, as is well known, public attention was directed to certain irregularities in the Civil Service by the investigations of the Public Accounts Committee, and I have no doubt that much good has resulted from those investigations. It is claimed now, however, that too much severity is exercised against a certain portion of the employés in the public service, and I would like to call the attention of the Government to a statement which is made, I know not how correctly, in a communication to a newspaper, that when certain employés in the public service fall sick their payment is stopped. The statement is as follows:—

"The Government, not satisfied with stopping extra clerks' holidays, &c., now that la grippe has gripped many of them and laid them on beds of sickness, when they are prostrate and helpless, when doctor's bills have to be paid; when their pay is most needed, our paternal Government steps in and on 'business principles' stops their pay."

There are a good many other statements in this letter, but they are of a rather severe character, and may perhaps be unwarranted; I do not propose to refer to them. However, I think that as a matter of justice to those gentlemen who may be thus afflicted, out of consideration for themselves and their families, they should be allowed their pay. I hope that the Government will investigate the matter and see that justice is done to these gentlemen who have been struck down by sickness.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The statement which the hon. gentleman has read from the paper is too sweeping. With regard to the stoppage of pay on account of illness, that must be to a great extent left to the discretion of the heads of departments; but it is true that in many cases where persons have been employed by the day, they have lost their pay on account of absence through illness. The practice requires the deputy head to certify only for the number of days' work done by persons who are employed by the day, and he does not feel himself in a position in these cases to certify for a day's work which has not been performed. The more permanent employés do receive pay while absent through illness.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman will see that in the special cases mentioned la grippe was the ailment, and the parties were perhaps detained many days.

ASSENT OF LIEUTENANT GOVERNORS.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I desire to bring to the attention of the Government a matter of some constitutional importance which has come to my notice within the last hour or two. At the last meeting of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, a Bill was passed altering the constitution of that province, doing away with the two Houses of the Legislature, and constituting one House instead. That Bill was clearly within the purview

of the powers granted by the British North America Act to the Legislature of the province. There is not a shadow of doubt about that, and the Legislature passed it by a good majority. Instead of giving his assent to the Bill, the Lieutenant Governor has reserved it for the consideration of the Governor General. The right of a Lieutenant Governor to reserve Bills which are within the competence of the Legislature to pass, has been time and again under the consideration of the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice has laid down the rules from time to time which should guide the conduct of Lieutenant Governors, and which are so clear and distinct, that no Lieutenant Governor ought to go astray. Dr. Bourinot, in his book, says on this subject :

"Section 55 of the British North America Act now applies expressly to the provinces of the Dominion, and consequently in reserving, or withholding the assent from Bills the Lieutenant Governors are to act not merely on their own 'discretion,' but 'subject to instructions' which must necessarily emanate from the Governor General in Council, since these high officials now occupy the same relation towards the Dominion Government that the Governor General occupies towards the Imperial authorities. In the absence of these instructions they are thrown on their own discretion and forced to come to a conclusion on such matters with the assistance of any advice that their Ministry may give them under the circumstances."

Now, in the case which I am bringing to the notice of the House, the Bill was introduced by the Government, and passed by the Government, and they are responsible for it. The Lieutenant Governor was advised by them to assent to the Bill. He would not assent to it, but reserved it for the consideration of the Governor General. In 1873, a similar course was taken by the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario. The matter was referred to the late Sir John Macdonald, who was then Minister of Justice, and he made his report upon that Bill—it was an Act to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of Eastern Ontario,—in the following words :—

"That these Acts purport to incorporate two provincial associations. That the only object of these associations appearing on the face of the Acts, is the holding of property, real and personal. That this being a provincial object, the Acts are within the competence and jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature.

"Such being the case, in the opinion of the undersigned, the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario ought not to have reserved these Acts for Your Excellency's assent, but should have given his assent to them as Lieutenant Governor.

"Under the system of government that obtains in England as well as in the Dominion and its several provinces, it is the duty of the advisers of the Executive to recommend every measure that has passed the Legislature for the executive assent.

"The provision in the British North America Act, 1867, 'That Your Excellency may reserve a Bill for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure,' was solely made with a view to protection of Imperial interests, and the maintenance of Imperial policy, and in case Your Excellency should exercise the power of reservation conferred on you, you would do so in your capacity as an Imperial officer and under royal instructions.

"So in any province the Lieutenant Governor should only reserve a Bill in his capacity as an officer of the Dominion and under instructions from the Governor General."

The correctness of that rule was brought under review in the year 1882 when the present Chief Justice of Nova Scotia filled the position of Minister of Justice, and he adopted the language of Sir John Macdonald, and recommended that a Bill which had been reserved for the assent of the Governor General should be returned to the Lieutenant Governor, with the quotation which I have made, showing that he had been acting beyond his duty in reserving any Bill for the assent of the Governor General, except under instructions from the Governor General. In all these cases, the rule laid down by the department and acted on ever since, has been followed by the Lieutenant Governors, and it would be a very serious matter, indeed, if the Lieutenant Governor of any province should attempt to exercise personal discretion against the advice of his constitutional advisers, and withhold or reserve Bills for the signification of the Governor General's assent at Ottawa. It would give rise to very serious complications ; it would introduce into this House matters which should be left entirely to the Provincial Legislatures, and result in very grave inconvenience. I, therefore, desire, at the present time, not so much to discuss the whole matter as to call the attention of the Government to it, and to ask whether general instructions have been issued from the department for the guidance of Lieutenant Governors, whether any special instructions have been given to the Lieutenant Governor in this case, or whether, so far as the hon. Minister of Justice knows, the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island has acted unconstitutionally on his own discretion and against the advice of his Ministers in the course he has taken with respect to this Bill ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has asked me three questions, and if I can remember them consecutively, I will answer them so. I think the first question was whether any general instructions are given to Lieutenant Governors. I reply that under the system which was adopted three or four years ago, instructions are annexed to the commissions of Lieutenant Governors. I would not like to say positively what the text of those instructions is on the subject of the Royal assent being given to the Bills, but I am sure they are not in conflict with the doctrines laid down by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. James Macdonald, when Ministers of Justice. That doctrine I adhere to. I think the second question was whether instructions were given the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island with regard to this particular Bill. I beg to reply that no instructions were given. I have had no communication with the Lieutenant Governor on the subject, and am confident that no member of the Government has had, because I had no intimation that the Bill had been reserved, or was likely to be reserved, until the hon. gentleman mentioned it in his place a moment ago. With regard to the constitutionality of the conduct of the Lieutenant Governor, if the hon. gentleman's information is correct as to the Bill having been reserved, I can only say that I cannot think he was correctly informed in being informed that His Honour had done anything contrary to the advice, or without the advice, of his executive council ; and I presume, and certainly will presume until the contrary is made apparent, that whatever he has done with regard to any Bill has been with the advice of his executive officers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) My information is a telegram received from the Attorney General himself.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure the Attorney General would not state what advice he had given to His Honour. I presume it is a matter of inference from the Attorney General's question, and

I can only repeat that no instructions have been given.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not surprised, but, at the same time, am very glad to hear the language of the hon. gentleman on this question. I am glad to hear that he adheres to the doctrine laid down many years ago as to the duties of Lieutenant Governors, that they are to act strictly in conformity with the advice given them by their constitutional advisers, and I expected this from the well-known views of the hon. gentleman, but if the statement made by my hon. friend is correct, that the Lieutenant Governor has chosen to refuse his sanction to a Bill passed by two branches of the Legislature of his province, the question is a very serious one and one which will have to engage our very serious attention at an early day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Minister of Justice, without further notice, lay on the Table a copy of the instructions accompanying the commission?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sault Ste. Marie Canal.....$430,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be glad to have from the Minister of Canals a somewhat full statement as to the position of these works and as to the sum likely to be expended on their completion, and when they will be completed. If I remember aright there has been a good deal of discussion in this House on the various subjects connected with the canal, and in particular with respect to the size of the locks which have been altered, I think, two or three times over. I want to know exactly what position the whole work is in just now.

Mr. HAGGART. The estimated cost of the Sault Canal is $4,000,000. The total expenditure up to the 30th June, 1889, is $544,068, leaving $3,455,922 to be expended. There was expended down to the 31st of December, 1891, $175,736, the estimated expenditure to the 30th June, 1892, from the 1st of January, 1891, is $327,269, making a total sum of $505,000. This leaves a revote of $430,000 to be voted from the amount appropriated last year, which was $935,430. That is the amount we ask for next year. The work on the Sault Canal comprises three sections:—The lower entrance, Hugh Ryan & Co., contractors; the canal and lock, that is the second section, Hugh Ryan & Co., contractors; and the upper entrance, Allan & Fleming, contractors. The plans on which these contracts were let provided for a 16 feet navigation with a lock 600 by 85 but only 60 feet wide at gates. The cost of this work, including lock gates, machinery, &c., was estimated at $3,000,000. There was a full statement of that at the time it was introduced in the House by Sir John Macdonald. The contract with Hugh Ryan & Co., for the second section, the canal and lock, has been twice modified by changing the dimensions of the lock, which, as now proposed, is to be 900 by 60 feet and the same width throughout. The depth of water on the sills is the same as that adopted now for the new American lock, 21 feet at medium low water, 20½ at extreme low water. No arrangement has been made as yet to increase the depth of the canal and the approaches to a greater depth than stated at the time the contracts were let. The total cost of complating the canal and approaches to the same depth as the new American canal is estimated at $4,000,000, so from the increased cost caused by the alteration from 16 feet to 20 feet at lowest water is estimated at $1,000,000. The Sault Canal has been divided into three sections, the lower entrance, the upper entrance, and the canal and lift lock. Lower entrance section, the entrance was let, No. 9643, the 30th of June, 1889. It comprises dredging, pier work, and a beacon, and was awarded to Hugh Ryan & Co., to be completed 10th of April, 1892. The contract price was $299,813. That of course contemplates 16 feet navigation. The upper entrance section, contract No. 9645, comprised dregging, pier work and a beacon, and was awarded to Allan & Fleming on the 26th March, 1889, to be completed 10th April, 1892, and the amount of the contract is $325,926.

The canal and lift lock section, 3,500 feet long, contract No. 9,594, dated 20th November, 1828, comprising the lock masonry, side walls, excavation, &c., was awarded to Hugh Ryan & Co., to be completed 10th May, 1892. By agreement of 19th June, 1891, the time was extended one year. By a further agreement the time for the completion of this work has been extended to 31st December, 1891.

Amount of original contract.....	$1,282,567
Saving by changes in details.....	72,700
	$1,209,867
Under date of 19th June, 1891, and under provisions of the contract ratified by the contractors and Orders in Council, the lock was to be deepened and widened and made os the same depth as the new American lock, at an additional cost of.....	219,000
By a third agreement the lock was lengthened and made of a uniform width throughout. The additional cost incurred by this change is	339,000
The sum of the three agreements with H. Ryan & Co. for this section is, therefore.....	1,768,767

The estimated total cost of canal for work to be executed by Hugh Ryan & Co., on canal and lock, is as follows:—

Amount of first contract, 16 feet draught.....		1,209,867
Second contract, 19th June, 1889..		219,000
Third agreement.....		339,000
		$1,768,767
Culverts, gates and machinery, (not under contract).....		300,000
		$2,068,767
Amount of H. Ryan & Co's contract for lower entrance, 16 feet draught..	$299,313	
Amount to be added to deepen for 20 feet draught (not under contract).....	192,000	
		491,344
Amount of Allan & Fleming's contract for upper entrance 16 feet draught.	$325,926	
Amount to be added to deepen for 20 feet draught (not under contract)....	276,600	
		601,926
		$8,262,006
Engineering and contingencies....		737,994
		$4,000,000

The amounts to be added to the present contracts to obtain the cost of deepening the Sault Ste. Marie Canal

and approaches for 20 feet navigation (which amounts represent work not now under contract) are, therefore :

Canal and lock	$	100,000
Lower entrance		192,000
Upper entrance		276,000
	$	568,000
Culverts, gates and machinery		300,000
	$	868,000
The United States Government is now excavating a 20 feet channel (largely in their own territory). This channel when finished could be used by Canadian vessels, but if at any time it should be desirable to improve the North (Canadian) channel of the River Ste. Marie between the Canal and Lake Huron so as to have a navigation of 20 feet in Canadian waters throughout, the cost of this improvement as estimated by Mr. W. G. Thompson (from Capt. Bayfield's survey) would be.	$	775,000
To complete the scheme of establishing a 20 feet navigation it would be necessary to deepen Port Arthur and Owen Sound. Mr. Thompson gives the following approximate estimate of the cost of these improvements:—		
Deepening harbour of Port Arthur.		300,000
do do Owen Sound.		200,000
		$1,275,000

The hon. gentleman has asked for the details of the three different changes in the dimensions of the lock. On the 20th November, 1888, a contract was entered into with Hugh Ryan & Co., for the construction of a lock and canal at Sault Ste. Marie. The dimensions of the lock were :

Length of chamber	600 feet.
Width of chamber	85 "
Gate width	60 "
Depth of water on sills	19½ "

By an agreement dated 19th June, 1891, the dimensions of the lock were changed to the following :—

Length of chamber	650 feet.
Width of chamber	100 "
Gate width	60 "
Depth of water on sills	19½ "

By a further agreement the plan of the lock was again changed, and the dimensions now adopted are as follows :—

Length of chamber	900 feet.
Width of chamber	60 "
Gate width	60 "
Depth of water on sills	20½ "

On the American side a new lock is being built of the following dimensions :—

Length of chamber	800 feet.
Width of chamber	100 "
Gate width	100 "
Depth on sills same as Canadian side, 21 feet at medium or 20½ feet at extreme low water.	

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I followed the hon. gentleman correctly, in the first place the width was 85 feet, then it was increased to 100 feet and finally was diminished to 60 feet. That seems to be a very wide deviation from the original plan, and a width of 60 feet for a lock of 900 feet length seems disproportionately narrow. What were the reasons for these changes ?

Mr. HAGGART. Originally it was intended that vessels should lie side by side in the lock as they do on the American side, but afterwards it was thought that it would delay locking and that the present dimensions are sufficient to accommodate all the vessels.

Mr. HAGGART.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does it affect the expenditure, lengthening it and reducing the breadth ?

Mr. HAGGART. I have given the figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I mean is, when you construct a lock of 900 feet by 60, I presume that the cost is very considerably in excess of one of 650 feet by 100. But it looks a little curious that at so late as the 19th June, 1891, the engineers should have advised the construction of a lock of 650 by 100, and then should have suddenly wheeled around and altered their plan to one of 900 by 60. I think we ought to have some explanation of the reason.

Mr. HAGGART. I am following the American engineers. The first lock which was contemplated was an exact copy of the one they had on the American side ; the second one, I think, was a copy of a contemplated American lock, and I think the American engineers changed their plan, and ours followed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Without any particular enquiry, other than the Americans had changed ?

Mr. HAGGART. The third change was not exactly the same as the American engineers. Theirs is a lock of 800 feet long and 100 feet wide ; ours is one of 900 feet long and 60 feet wide, about one-half the dimensions of the American lock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What strikes one as curious is that within so very short a time the engineers should have vitally altered the scheme of construction. If I took down the hon. gentleman's figures correctly, this first contract was given on the 20th November, 1888 ; on the 17th June, 1891, it was modified to a lock of 650 by 100 feet. On the 30th March following they entirely reverse their previous decision, and go for a lock of 900 feet by 60. Were the parties who reported, the same ?

Mr. HAGGART. No, I think not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In a matter of this consequence, involving an expenditure of four millions, it certainly does shake one's faith in the engineers employed by the Government, to find so extraordinary a change made in so very short a time. My recollection of this matter is that the original cost was estimated at a good deal less than the hon. gentleman has stated. I myself believed it would cost a good deal more, but I think the original statement made to us was that the cost would be about one million and a half, or one million and a quarter. But I am speaking from recollection, and if the statement before the Minister is that the original estimate was three millions, I suppose that is correct. Still, I remember a discussion which took place in this House in which the late member for Glengarry (Mr. Purcell) took part, and in which he pointed out that the estimate laid before us was vastly below what the cost of the work would probably come to. It is quite clear that Mr. Purcell has been proved to be correct.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister was then speaking entirely of the cost of the lock, which he thought would be about $1,500,000. As a fact, the contract was let for $1,209,000. He stated afterwards what the total cost would be—I think it was three millions ; he stated that in a debate in the House. But the lock itself, at contract price, was about $250,000 less than what was stated at the time,

one million and a half. All the rest comes in in the channel above and below.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What length above and below do you require to deepen?

Mr. HAGGART. The total length of the canal and approaches is 18,100 feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much below and how much above?

Mr. HAGGART. The report does not say. But from the amount of work to be done on the approaches above and below, if there was an equal depth to be excavated, it would be $209,313 for debouching into the lock below; above, it is $325,000. The work to be completed above and below is very nearly alike.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the estimate of the total cost for the 18,100 feet?

Mr. HAGGART. The actual contract price of H. Ryan & Co., for the part below, is $209,313; the amount of the other section is $325,936. Of course that is exclusive of superintendence and engineering, and it only contemplates a depth of 16 feet of water in the channel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would make $625,000 added to an original cost of a million and a quarter for the first contract?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I understand correctly, the original contract first let for the lock was $1,279,000?

Mr. HAGGART, $1,209,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $1,200,000 in round numbers. Then the cost of the approaches amounts to $625,000. That makes up $1,825,000?

Mr. HAGGART. Then there are $737,000 for engineering and contingencies, including such items as the electric light, and all the machinery and apparatus for working.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Now, this four millions estimate—is that supposed to provide for the whole work, or is there to be a further addition made to that for the extra deepening from 16 feet to 20?

Mr. HAGGART. That includes the whole work. That includes H. Ryan & Co.'s contract, the deepening of the approaches, the short distance above and below the lock, which would make $2,168,767. Then that includes an extra amount for deepening from 16 to 20 feet, of $192,000; that is on H. Ryan & Co.'s lower contract; and an extra amount to Allan & Fleming for deepening to 20 feet above, $276,000, and it includes engineering and contingencies, $737,000. That makes $4,000,000 exactly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will not be completed until 1895.

Mr. HAGGART. December 31st, 1894, as at present contemplated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is, of course, independent of any work that may hereafter be undertaken for the purpose of giving us a 20 foot channel in St. Mary's River?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That, I suppose, will be unnecessary under any circumstances, because, unless I am entirely in error, a considerable portion of the channel now used by the Americans on the St. Clair flats is undoubtedly within our territory, and they are not likely to interfere with our use of the channel unless we interfere with their use of the St. Clair channel, I presume. Has any correspondence been going on with the authorities at Washington as respects these channels?

Mr. HAGGART. No, none that I am aware of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know whether any of the Ministers are aware of the fact; possibly the late Minister of Customs might know.

Mr. HAGGART. A long time ago there was correspondence in regard to excavations near the lime kilns on the St. Clair flats.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know if there is any sort of risk of this navigation being interfered with. I should imagine there would be very little difficulty in coming to an understanding with the authorities at Washington; they would, no doubt, give us free access to the channel there if we gave them free access to the channel in Detroit River; but it would be very desirable to have this matter looked into and attended to. If there is any risk of our having to spend nearly $1,000,000, and perhaps more, because estimates of engineers are generally exceeded, in deepening our channel below Sault Ste. Marie, itis desirable that we should know it.

Mr. McGREGOR. The canal at St. Clair flats was placed in Canadian waters at the time of building, but an agreement was come to between the two Governments that there should be nothing said about it at the time. Some time afterwards the Dominion Government decided to take out a certain portion of the rock in the Detroit River at the lime kilns. Then the United States Government appropriated $25,000 to assist in taking the boulders out of the river, and afterwards they added to the amount half a million dollars and then a million dollars, until now we have the depth increased from 14 feet to 20 feet. It is 300 feet wide by 800 feet long, and both Governments have the use of that cut free. It is very nearly on the Canadian shore, and is a long distance from the American side and entirely out of American waters. That being the case, if our neighbours will not act with us in regard to St. Mary River, we should have the advantage in respect to this cut on which they have expended something over $2,000,000. The American Government are also deepening the St. Clair Lake to a depth of 18 feet. Last year vessels were terribly obstructed by shallow water, the depth being 14 feet or 14½ feet; indeed, the water during the last two years has been much lower than formerly, and has caused great difficulty in St. Mary River as well. There is another question which I think it proper to mention at this time. While we are speaking of lengthening the canal to 900 feet and placing its width at 60 feet, would it not be well for the engineers to consider whether it would not be well to make the width 100 feet, as has been done by our neighbours across the line? Of course this additional width would cost a great deal of money, but that important branch of industry, the carrying trade, has increased more rapidly than any other

industry in America, and cheap freights would reduce the cost of bringing grain from the great west to the great east. The bulk of grain, iron ore and lumber is carried by large steam vessels, each of which draws from one to five barges, and these proceed down the lakes. The whole tow is placed in one lock, because it is very important that they should be passed through quickly in order to save time: the lock is 600 feet long by 100 wide, or rather 60 feet wide at present. In making so large an expenditure on our proposed canal it is desirable to consider the advantage of making it wider. The principal difference in expense would be the removal of earth and rock; the cost of the gates would not be much more, the cost of mitre sills would be the same, and the expense connected with lighting and management would be the same on a small as compared with a larger lock. It would, therefore, be well, as we are about to undertake this larger expenditure, to consider whether it would not be advisable to expend a little more money and construct the lock of the same width as the American locks on the other side of the line.

Mr. HAGGART. The system contemplated will greatly increase the locking accommodation of the canal. Plans are proposed for lighting the channel with electric light, so that vessels can be put through the lock day and night. With the additional facilities provided, the capacity for trade will be five or six times that at present. The lock as proposed, together with the lock on the American side, will suffice for the trade of the country, taking the most extravagant ideas of the increase, for a large number of years to come. The Government contemplated widening the lock and placing in vessels double, as is being done on the American side; but the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will remember that one of his own friends suggested the advisability of increasing the length of the lock and making its width just sufficient for any vessel, either built or contemplated, for like navigation. We took into consideration the suggestion of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), which was a correct one, and we had the lock altered in accordance with his suggestion.

Mr. DEVLIN. I believe there are considerable rapids at Sault Ste. Marie; what is the height of the fall of water there?

Mr. HAGGART. The fall is 18 feet.

Mr. DEVLIN. And there will be only one lock?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then the fall is 18 feet from the level of Lake Superior to the level of Lake Huron?

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose there will be a slightly increased fall to the level of Lake Huron, perhaps one or two feet.

Mr. DEVLIN. How far into Lake Superior will the approach to the upper end of the canal go?

Mr. HAGGART. That is the exact question asked by the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I told him I did not know exactly, I understand from the officer here that one section is about 9,000 feet, and the other 5,000; the shorter section is the one below.

Mr. McGREGOR.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does the hon. gentleman know whether the approaches are longer or shorter on the Canadian canal than on the American canal?

Mr. HAGGART. They must be about the same, and the excavation would be about the same distance for both locks. It is nearly all rock cutting.

Mr. DEVLIN. What is the depth of the canal?

Mr. HAGGART. At present the depth is 16 feet of water in the prism, but the contemplated depth—although we have no contract for it, but we intend, at some future period, to ask for contracts for the excavation—is 18 feet, with 20 feet on the mitre sill of the lock.

Mr. DEVLIN. Was there much town property expropriated in order to construct this canal?

Mr. HAGGART. No; it was all Government property.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether the Minister or the Government generally, propose to have any kind of understanding with the United States authorities touching this question of a canal in their waters? It seems to me it would be just as well to have some distinct and definite agreement made with them, and that the opportunity is a very good one, when we are both constructing these expensive canals at Sault Ste. Marie, and when they are, as I understand, going to expend a very large additional sum in our waters in the St. Clair flats. It may save hereafter a good deal of trouble if we utilize the present opportunity to have a distinct convention with them on the subject, and I do not think there would be much trouble in coming to it: there ought not as between two business communities.

Mr. HAGGART. I will draw the attention of the Council to the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that a question was raised some time ago as to whether the changes in the size of the lock causes any increase in the total cost of the work?

Mr. HAGGART. In some cases I think it does entail increase in the particular items, and that is a subject I was very careful about. I had the matter examined carefully, and reports made by engineers outside the department, and I was fully convinced before any changes were recommended to Council that the contractor was fairly entitled to a change from some circumstances or peculiarities in the work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The reason I draw attention to this is, that our experience in the past was that payments of extras on account of changes in public works have not been of a very assuring kind. In estimating for the construction of public works, or in the planning of them, it is always well that the original plan should be adhered to. The next best thing when a change must be made is to see that it is done at the least possible cost, and to see that, unless the change involves extra cost to the contractor, there shall be no extra cost put on the work. The question I asked was: Does the change made in the dimensions of the lock add to the total cost of the work?

Mr. HAGGART. The original cost of the work as let according to the original plan would be $1,209,867. Then there was a change of the plan

which of course entailed increased quantities and increased depths, and that involved an extra cost of $219,000. Then the plans were changed again, to a 900 feet long and a 60 feet wide lock, and that entailed an increased expenditure over the second plan of $339,000, which makes the price which the lock is likely to cost now $1,768,767, as compared with the original estimate on the old plan of $1,209,867.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The increased cost is something over half a million dollars.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, $550,000 odd.

Mr. McGREGOR. As we are on the point of making some arrangement with our neighbours across the line with reference to the free use of both rivers and canals, this would be a good time for the Government to bring up this matter. The American Government have expended something like $2,500,000 at the Lime kiln Crossing, and they are now expending a large amount on Lake St. Clair, which brings them into the Canadian channel. They will also come into the St. Clair flats, which are also in Canadian waters. Now, it is impossible for our vessels to come down the Sault River without using the American shore, and before a depth of 20 feet can be used a very large amount of money must be expended in deepening and widening the channel in that river. Our neighbours are doing that and doing it quickly, while we give them all the advantages of our rivers and waterways. At Amherstburg, a very large amount of money is expended in lighting the coast. They enjoy so many advantages given by us that they would be glad to reciprocate, if the matter were properly placed before them. They would possibly be getting more from us in our waterways than we would be getting from them, though it is true they have expended a great deal of money in our waters. Therefore I would urge on the Government at once to seek a settlement that would be agreeable and advantageous to both countries. It must be remembered that there is no country growing as rapidly as that around the shores of Lake Superior. The carrying of iron ore to-day is greater than was the carrying capacity of all the vessels on our waters ten years ago, showing the growth of that industry alone, and it is only an infant yet.

Mr. DEVLIN. The channel is to be excavated to a certain extent beyond the approaches?

Mr. HAGGART. In the channel below the American locks there has been a large expenditure to increase the depth to 20 feet to connect the canal with Lake Huron. We did not contemplate making a channel for ourselves. We contemplated the use of the channel which the Americans have dredged out in the Sault Ste. Marie River down to Lake Huron.

Mr. DEVLIN. At the present moment what toll is paid by American vessels passing through the American canal?

Mr. HAGGART. They are free.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the hon. gentleman heard anything about the Americans imposing tolls on Canadian vessels going through their canal?

Mr. HAGGART. I saw that in the papers; that is all I know of it.

Lachine Canal—Building eight pairs of spare gates for old and new locks..... $19,500

Mr. CASEY. I would like to recall to the hon. Minister's memory some returns which were moved for by the hon. member for Pontiac on 4th April, and which will be necessary before we can finish the discussion of these votes for canals. Does the hon. Minister know if they are nearly ready?

Mr. HAGGART. These returns have been prepared, and they will be brought down to-morrow.

Taking down and rebuilding lock walls of the old lock, No. 1, both sides, including chamber, upper and lower wing walls..... $37,300

Mr. CASEY. In consequence of what is this rebuilding necessary?

Mr. HAGGART. It has become very old and dilapidated and not safe to use.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is this work to be done by the staff?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes; by the repair staff. There is an engineer in charge of the canal, and he hires workmen just as they are required.

Mr. CASEY. I think the Minister will agree with me it is hardly the most economical manner to carry on a work of this extent and do it by day work.

Mr. HAGGART. You will see at once why it is not done by contract. You do not know how much of the lock has to be taken down and cannot estimate exactly the amount of repairs required, so that you could not describe it sufficiently to invite tenders. It is the repairing of old work.

Mr. CASEY. This is an item for taking down and rebuilding walls of old lock No. 1, both sides, comprising the chamber and upper and lower wing walls. The work is clearly enough described in the estimates to invite tenders; and as this work has not yet been done, I will call on the Minister to ask for tenders before the money is expended.

Mr. HAGGART. It is described here as taking down and rebuilding the lock walls of old lock No. 1, both sides; but some portions of it need not be taken down at all. The description, of course, is in excess of what may be required.

Mr. CASEY. It could be done by letting the contract by quantities and not in the lump.

Mr. DEVLIN. What is the lowest depth of the Lachine Canal?

Mr. HAGGART. Fourteen feet on the mitre sills.

Rebuilding the old regulating weir at Lachine and improvement of the present drainage system on the south side of the canal..... $15,000

Mr. CASEY. That is another item quite large enough to be made a matter of contract, and the same remarks would apply to that.

Building six stationary bridges..... $5,350

Mr. CASEY. Are these new bridges?

Mr. HAGGART. No, there are twenty-five stationary bridges on the canal, and these are the ones that require to be rebuilt.

Mr. CASEY. Also by day work?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Here is something like over $75,000, all to be done by day's work. In the neighbourhood especially of a large town like Montreal, the expenditure of such a large amount of money by day's work certainly gives opening for the exercise of a little favouritism here and there, and tempts to an unnecessary expenditure of public money. Men are out of work, and their friends want to have them at work, and the Minister should see that this is done by contract.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken on three different items under discussion is evidently not a practical workman himself, or he would know perfectly well that the remarks he has made are nothing but utter bosh. In the first place, before you let a contract or call for tenders, you have to give a certain amount of quantity in the work. In these items under discussion, the quantities could not possibly be given. The foundations are doubtful, they may be quicksand, and there may be coffer dams required. For that reason it is very much better for the Government to do such work as this by day work. They know then exactly what it costs, there are no extras; and when it is done by the superintendent in charge of the work, that finishes it. A common idea prevails in Ontario that all work to be done by the Local Government should be done by day's labour, but in this House it is not satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite that similar work should be done by day's labour. But the work is entirely different. In the one case, it is the construction of roads where you can figure out the exact quantity of yards to be thrown in to construct the highway, while in this case the engineers cannot tell exactly the number of yards to be excavated and cannot tell what is necessary to be put in until a certain amount of excavation has taken place. A criticism on the Government in this case is most unfair, because any practical man will tell you, if he speaks fairly, that the Government has let that work in the best possible way.

Mr. CASEY. I am sure the Minister of Railways must be deeply obliged to his hon. friend who came to his assistance in explaining this matter. It appeared to me that the Minister had given a pretty clear statement with regard to the question I asked him. I was satisfied with the clearness of the statement, though not with the proposal to do this work by day's labour, but the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Macdonell) evidently did not think so, because he tried to make the matter clearer, and he made it as clear as mud. In the first place he told us that the engineer in charge of the department could not say what quantity had to be excavated before this work could be done. Seeing that I was speaking in regard to the rebuilding of lock walls where no excavation was needed, I do not think the member for Algoma had any idea of what I was talking about. I was also talking about the rebuilding of a weir which does not require any excavation, and I also referred to stationary bridges, which are not excavated, as a rule, but are superstructures, and not dug out of the ground. My hon. friend from Algoma is quite confident that you cannot do this work by contract because you cannot estimate the actual quantity to be excavated. I understood the Minister to say he thought it was possible to estimate the amount of work to be done, and he rather approved of the idea and would take it into his consideration. Now his supporter objects to the adoption of the contract system, unless quantities can be exactly estimated, and I might ask how a contract for dredging can be let when you cannot tell the amount of work to be done. Before the hon. gentlemen was a member of this House, I understand he had a contract for dredging at so much a yard. I do not see why the same plan should not be adopted either in regard to the building of masonry in a lock, or in regard to the excavation that might be required in any public work. On the other hand, the gentleman contends that the Ontario Government built colonization roads by day's work which could be more conveniently done by contract. I cannot assume that he does not know what he is talking about when he speaks of colonization roads, because he must have seen such once in a while, but he is not talking in a rational way when he says a colonization road can be more easily let by contract than the construction of a lock or a bridge, because it is impossible to tell when you are starting to build a road through the bush, how much timber you will have to cut, how many stumps you will have to extract, how many stumps you can cover with earth, where you will get the filling, &c., and it would be impossible with any degree of accuracy to let the building of a colonization road by contract. Whereas, in the old settled portions of the country where our canals are situated, it is quite possible to estimate the amount of the contract, and even the bridges might be built by day's work because of the uncertainty of obtaining supplies of timber and other things, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit that these bridges have been built as cheaply under the day's work system as they could be under any other system. I know some of the men who have carried on that work up there, and I know that the work has been done as cheaply as it could be.

Bridge over old lock No. 2, Welland Canal $5,700

Mr. HAGGART. The old bridge has been condemned as unsafe.

Mr. DEVLIN. Where is lock No. 2?

Mr. HAGGART. At St. Catharines.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is it proposed to build an extra bridge over the canal in the town of Welland? I heard something about that when I was in the County of Welland last week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps that was contingent on certain conditions being carried out. What did the hon. gentleman hear in Welland?

Mr. DEVLIN. I heard that a new bridge would probably be built across the canal in connection with a great many other important public works throughout the county. The bridge which is there now does very good service, but two or three years ago it was proposed to construct a new bridge on a line with the main street which the present bridge is not. I was seriously asking the Minister what he intended to do in this matter, not on account of pledges made during the election, but as a case of urgency which is felt in that town, and no doubt this bridge would

be of great assistance to the traffic and an ornament to the town.

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard of the building of that bridge before. My attention has never been called to it before.

Mr. DEVLIN. I believe this measure has been advocated very earnestly by the Welland *Telegraph* during the last month, not at all in connection with the election, but as a matter of necessity. I was on a visit to the town of Welland, having been invited there by a few friends, and I saw that the present bridge was not in the most advantageous spot, but if the new bridge were placed where it was supposed it would be, the site would be well chosen. I thought proper to call attention to this subject, because the gentleman who has been returned for that riding is not yet in his seat, or, no doubt, he would himself call attention to it. I know his opponent intended to do so.

Mr. HAGGART. The $25,000 asked for is for the reconstruction of the superstructure of the pier.

Mr. CASEY. How is it to be done?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it ought to be done by contract.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the Minister to say that he thought it would be done by contract? Has he no information on the subject?

Mr. HAGGART. I have no information on the subject. If it can be done by contract, it will be.

To repair banks damaged by high water and storm of 9th February, 1889.....$3,600

Mr. CASEY. How is it that this bank has got along for so many years, if it was damaged in 1889?

Mr. HAGGART. This is a revote. They are finishing.

Towards the construction of the culvert at Stromness.....$7,500

Mr. HAGGART. The culvert is to provide for additional drainage at Stromness, the original culvert being insufficient. The culvert can only be constructed during the winter season when navigation is closed. Therefore, no portion of the appropriation will be required till July, 1892. None of the work is commenced yet. It has been let by contract.

Towards constructing a new swing bridge between Stromness and Buffalo and Brantford Railway crossing.....$2,000

Mr. HAGGART. That is an additional bridge between Stromness and the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. DEVLIN. Have tenders been invited for the building of this bridge?

Mr. HAGGART. It is really done now. Some work has been done by the department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that take the place of an old one?

Mr. HAGGART. It was commenced about a week ago.

Restoring outlet for drainage, west side of canal at Port Colborne.....$5,000

Mr. CASEY. How did it get blocked up?

Mr. HAGGART. By the banks tumbling down and falling in.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does that interfere with the depth of the canal?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Removing shoal at north of Chippawa River.....$3,000

Mr. DEVLIN. Is this shoal in the canal or is it in the river proper?

Mr. HAGGART. It is a feeder to the Welland Canal.

Mr. DEVLIN. Does it interfere with navigation through the Welland Canal?

Mr. HAGGART. Vessels come in that way.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is there considerable traffic from the Chippawa River into the canal?

Mr. HAGGART. There is considerable traffic for small boats.

Mr. DEVLIN. What is the depth of the Chippawa Canal?

Mr. HAGGART. About the depth of the old canal, 9 to 10 feet.

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

After Recess.

ALBERTA RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

Mr. CAMERON (for Mr. CURRAN) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 39) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the House resolves itself into committee on this Bill I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this Bill and the one next on the Order Paper (Canada Atlantic Railway Company) have some peculiar features, and we should understand how far the committees of the House proceed on that line. In the report of the Railway Committee, which was presented yesterday by the chairman, and adopted by the House it was distinctly stated that in this Bill, for instance, a number of important clauses were introduced and adopted by the committee and reported to the House, of which no notice had been given, and which were not even mentioned in the petition and which had not been passed by the Standing Orders Committee. The notice is often dispensed with, as we know, by the Standing Orders Committee, but a practice has arisen this session by which, in many cases, the Standing Committees on Railways and on Banking and Commerce, too, passed clauses which have not been reported upon even by the Standing Orders Committee. We all know there are exceptions made very often by the Committee on Standing Orders in favour of clauses of which notice has not been given; but, when it comes to the Standing Orders Committee being passed over altogether, and the application made in the first instance to the Standing Committee on Railways, I really think something should be said to prevent its recurrence too often. I do not wish to raise any objection here. Possibly in these cases the reasons would have been sufficient if advanced before the Standing Orders Committee, but I think we should endeavour to impress on the committees that they should leave that part of their business to the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The subject brought up by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is one which has more than once engaged the attention of the House on reports presented by the chairman of the Standing Orders Committee and by the chairmen of other committees. The rule adopted by the Standing Orders Committee is this: where it appears from the petition which came before the committee that the power sought was one which did not appear in the notice published in accordance with the requirements of the law—not in accordance with the rule laid down by the Standing Orders Committee, but according to the law—the rule is that if public interests do not in any way suffer, if there is no opposition to the particular clause or power sought in the petition, although it does not appear in the notice, then a discretion is left to the committee, which it has always exercised in favour of the petition and in favour of the further power asked for. But in such cases the report of the Standing Orders Committee mentions particularly absence of notice, and leaves it for the House to adopt the report, and thus take the responsibility. During the past session and during every session the Railway Committee as well as the Committee on Banking and Commerce have almost invariably been confronted by Bills referred to them by this House containing clauses as to which the petition on which the Bill was based was silent. The question before the Railway Committee was this: shall we strike out this particular clause, or shall we refer it to the House and let the House retain it if it sees fit. During the present session in the deliberations of the Railway Committee the very same course has been adopted with respect to retaining any such clauses as were adopted in the case of the Standing Orders Committee, where a power or privilege was asked which does not appear in the notice. Where there is no opposition to the insertion of that particular clause before the committee, where it does not appear to be antagonistic to the public interest, and where in order to make the Bill workable that power should be given, then the committee adopt the only course that it could fairly adopt, and that is, mention the fact in the report of the Railway Committee to the House so that the House may pass upon it. I presented the committee's report on this particular Bill, the Bill for the Alberta Railway and Coal Company, where power as to irrigation was sought, in regard to which a lengthy discussion occurred in the committee. It is quite true that no power was asked for in the petition on which the Bill was based, but the Postmaster General explained that it was the intention of the Government during the present session to introduce a general clause in the Land Act dealing with the subject of this particular legislation, to which I will not say the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) objected, but to which he alluded. This clause was passed by that committee in anticipation of legislation on that subject at a very early date; but in that particular case the committee was very careful to state particularly in the report that the power had not been asked for in the petition, and they left the responsibility for passing the report to the House itself. I submit that it was the duty of my learned hon. friend to have seized that opportunity when the question was before the House as to whether it should adopt that report or not, to have then brought the question before the attention of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I presume the course which the Railway Committee have taken is the correct one under the circumstances. The other matter is one which is left for the Committee on Standing Orders to deal with, and for the House finally to deal with. I agree, however, with the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) with respect to the importance, as a general rule, of adhering more strictly to our rules on the subject of private Bills. When these Bills came before the Railway Committee they contained clauses which were of great importance and might affect great public and private interests, and they authorized interference with public rivers in the North-West Territories, and thereby, perhaps, enabled a diversion of streams upon which the fertility of vast regions might depend. I think it was a matter—I say it with all deference to other committees—with which great public and private interests were concerned. Having reached this stage, the House having referred the Bill to the Committee on Railways and Telegraph Lines, all the committee had to do was what it did, see that every clause was very carefully guarded and report the matter to the House. In regard to what was done with this particular Bill, no exception can be taken, but I, as one member of the House would feel gratified if, as regards every private Bill, our rules were more strictly adhered to, as regards the introduction and the requirements of notice and everything of that kind. I think it is very desirable, and I hope we will all agree to it, that in future sessions the rules shall be more strictly adhered to. Against that course there is the weight of a great many precedents which have been established by general concurrence on the part of the House, partly from sympathy and partly from indifference. I think in taking a new departure and in agreeing to adhere more strictly to the rules, every one of which is intended to protect both public and private rights, we shall have to disregard precedents altogether, and strike out a new course, unless we find an insistence of the rules would be a mere technical matter and that no right can possibly be infringed by the waiving of the rules. I think we should throw every presumption against persons who ask the suspension of the rules of the House as regards a private Bill, and it is very desirable we should follow that course in future sessions.

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

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Montreal and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, Hochelaga.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Chambly Canal—Taking down and rebuilding east chamber wall of lock No. 5 ..... $6,000

Mr. LISTER. What is this?

Mr. HAGGART. It forms part of the improvements which have been in progress on the Chambly Canal during the last ten years, and this vote is expected to complete them.

Mr. LISTER. Has the work been done by contract?

Mr. HAGGART. No, never. It consists in taking down old locks and repairing them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice that the superintendent on this canal receives a salary of $1,500 a year, and is also allowed $300 a year for a house. Is that usual?

Mr. HAGGART. Each superintendent is allowed a house. In this case there is no house, and he is allowed house-rent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the name of the superintendent?

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Benoit.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is he employed at any other work?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Chambly Canal—Fences on canal frontage of lands alongside of towpath on Isle Ste. Thérèse.....$2,500

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the nature of this work?

Mr. HAGGART. It is to fence 8¼ miles on each side of the canal. It is an obligation which the Government had to undertake. It was fenced before, but the fences have fallen into decay, and wire fences are to be put up.

Chambly Canal—Building dry rubble protection wall between Bridge No. 3 and Langelier Bridge.....$4,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. How is this work done?

Mr. HAGGART. By day's labour. Landslides have taken place, especially last year, along the high banks at this point, and at places there is danger to life and property.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice that on this canal a great many supplies are bought. Are these supplies, such as nails, spikes, lumber, &c., bought by contract?

Mr. HAGGART. All supplies, except the most minor ones, are bought by tender.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose there are no advertisements put in the papers calling for tenders?

Mr. HAGGART. I understand from the officer that requests are sent out to different parties asking them to send in tenders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many?

Mr. HAGGART. Eight or ten.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice a charge for 831 feet of rock elm amounting to $581.70. It seems to me that is a pretty good price.

Mr. EDGAR. There must be a great many smaller supplies called for in the same way by invitation to individuals, and I think we ought to know what is the list the Government has, to whom they send notices asking for supplies.

Mr. HAGGART. I have ordered the officer to prepare a list of those whom he asks for supplies, and I will furnish it to the House.

Mr. LISTER. There are other items besides nails and spikes. There is lumber; I suppose that is done in the same way.

Mr. HAGGART. It seems to be a very small quantity, 831 feet, and it may be a very large size. I do not think the price is high at 70 cents per cubic foot for square rock elm.

Mr. CAMPBELL. On the top of the page, there is a charge for tamarack, 1,945 feet, $935.52. That seems a large price.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think so. It may be special sizes, and perhaps 7 or 8 cents above the price. Forty cents would be paid for good-sized tamarack by the raft.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I notice that the cylinder oil is all charged at $1.25 per gallon. I have been in the habit of buying cylinder oil for a number of years, and you can get the best quality for 70 to 75 cents per gallon. You can get Kellogg's oil, New York, which is considered the best cylinder oil made, and we do not pay any more than 75 to 80 cents.

Mr. SPEAKER. In this part of the country, you cannot buy Kellogg's oil for less that $1 per wine gallon, and then you have to pay freight.

Mr. CAMPBELL. During the past year, the price has been reduced, and you can buy the best Canadian oil at 90 cents. Was all this oil bought by contract or by tender?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether these particular items were or were not, but I understand the system was introduced into the department last year of purchasing all these articles by tender.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Hardware and sundries, $844.43. No items are given to show what these are at all.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the articles were so small that the Auditor General did not think it worth while to extend them out in his account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are some rather curious items. On C-94 there is an item for breaking stone for macadam which is put at 120 toise at $12 per toise. It appears to me that is a very large figure.

Mr. HAGGART. I think, if the hon. gentleman enquires, he will find that price is very low.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have known of stone frequently broken for a very much lower price.

Mr. HAGGART. In a stone region, I suppose it would cost $3 to $4 before it is broken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not by any manner of means. My recollection is that broken stone for macadamizing purposes is furnished frequently at $4 to $5 per toise.

Mr. HAGGART. I have had experience and it costs more than that to cart it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have had that done by contract at $5 per toise, and I do not think I got it any cheaper than anybody else.

Mr. HAGGART. From $5 to $6 per toise is the price for breaking it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why should we pay $12 or $13?

Mr. HAGGART. You have to add the stone and the delivery of it. That is the breaking of it alone.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far had you to convey it? Usually speaking, in these places the stone is accessible very close.

Mr. WATSON. In this item of rock elm, 70 cents per cubic foot is $70 a thousand; that appears to be a very high price, because we find oak in smaller quantities just below is charged at 30 cents per cubic foot.

Mr. HAGGART. It depends altogether on the size of the elm, whether it is a small or a large piece. This was very likely required for lock gates, for the portion under water.

Mr. WATSON. It does strike me that 70 cents per cubic foot, or $70 per thousand feet, is an extravagant price for rock elm. Does it strike Mr. Speaker, who has some knowledge of timber himself, in that way?

Mr. CAMPBELL. What kind of coal oil is it, native or American oil?

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman.

Towards the settlement of Lamoureux Bros.' claim..... $1,600

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes it that these claims are all left over?

Mr. HAGGART. This is in anticipation of what the amount may be. It is at present before the Justice Department for decision.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year we were told that this claim had been settled.

Mr. HAGGART. I am informed that it awaits the decision of the Minister of Justice and is now before that department.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand this is for compensation to Mr. Lamoureux for land which was expropriated. What is the trouble?

Mr. HAGGART. He refuses to take the amount awarded, and it was sent to the Justice Department, I suppose, to allow him to appeal to the Exchequer Court or to have it settled in some way or other.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it before the Minister of Justice to settle what proceedings are to be taken, because, if a man refuses to accept the amount offered him, there is nothing to do except to expropriate the property.

Mr. HAGGART. The Government may take the property without anything being awarded.

Mr. LISTER. What is the amount of the award?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it was $1,200.

Mr. LISTER. Was it a matter of investigation by the official arbitrators?

Mr. HAGGART. By the official valuators in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. LISTER. Has the Minister any reason to suppose that these gentlemen will not take the amount placed in the estimates?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot answer that.

Towards the settlement of the Yule Estate claim and incidental expenses....$1,200

Mr. HAGGART. That is in a similar position to the other and is at present before the Department of Justice.

Mr. PERRY. I see that 162 musk rats have been killed, and I should like to know who killed them and what became of the skins. Certainly the skins would be worth something, and I should like to know whether we have received credit for the sale of them. This is a valuable fur, and I do not know if the department should be praised for destroying these animals. At all events they should account for them in some shape. I understood there was a bounty given for the killing of wild animals such as bears, but I did not know there was any for the killing of valuable animals like muskrats.

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard of this before, but I suppose they were killed because they were likely to do a great deal of damage to the banks of the canals.

St. Ann's Lock—Earth excavation and puddling behind walls of old lock $5,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is this for?

Mr. HAGGART. No work was done upon this last summer, and further examination has shown that the damage has attained greater proportions than we supposed.

Carillon and Grenville Canal—Towards rebuilding masonry in main walls above guard lock, Grenville..... $14,000

Mr. DEVLIN. The item is down for two years. Has the work been commenced on the Carillon and Grenville Canal?

Mr. HAGGART. Not yet, I believe.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is this work to be done by the department, or will it be let by contract?

Mr. HAGGART. I believe it is to be done by day's work. It is pulling down and rebuilding old walls and putting in coffer dams.

Mr. DEVLIN. Have the Government a special staff to do this kind of work?

Mr. HAGGART. They employ their own foremen, and the foremen get labourers wherever they can.

Mr. DEVLIN. Could the Minister tell me what is the annual revenue derived from this canal?

Mr. HAGGART. You will find it in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. DEVLIN. The revenue does not seem to amount altogether to $20,000 a year. I observe, however, that the expenditure connected with the staff amounts to $21,220.

Mr. HAGGART. The wages are $5,967 for the year on the Carillon and Grenville Canal.

Mr. DEVLIN. Of course there is a certain amount to be deducted from this $21,220, owing to the investigation which was held last year and the year before. Deducting that, I presume that the expenditure connected with the staff would be at least $20,000. Is that not rather a large expenditure to collect $18,000?

Mr. HAGGART. You will find that the staff on the Carillon and Grenville cost $14,225.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates which have been submitted to us, the details for 1892-93 for the Carillon and Grenville Canal, under the head of staff, are put down as $23,000. I do not quite understand the statement that the staff is only $5,000. On page 80, in our own Estimates, you will find $23,000 put down as the cost of staff on Carillon and Grenville.

Mr. HAGGART. That includes a good many other things.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is Mr. Starke, engineer, an officer on that canal?

Mr. HAGGART. He has left the service for over a year. He was given a year's gratuity.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It seems to me that a large number of articles used in these canals might be purchased at a great deal less than they are purchased. On every canal there is an enormous quantity of coal oil, nails, spikes, lumber and such things purchased. I should think that if a person required such a large quantity of these articles they could be furnished at a much less price than they are. Coal oil, for instance, at 29 and 30 cents, is out of all proportion.

Mr. HAGGART. There were 44 gallons at 29 cents, 84 gallons at 21 cents, 299 gallons at 17½ cents and 40 gallons at 17 cents.

Mr. WATSON. How does the Minister account for the difference in the price of coal oil?

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the 299 gallons and the 84 gallons were purchased at wholesale.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose the same principle applies here that applies in connection with the purchase of coal oil for the lighting of the barracks and grounds in the military school. I find that the high priced oil was of a quality that had to be used in lighting the grounds, and cost double the amount of the ordinary illuminating oil burned in houses.

Towards strengthening and repairing dam..... $15,000

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the nature of this work?

Mr. HAGGART. It has been ascertained that a portion of the work has given away, and this amount is required for repairs.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How is the work to be done?

Mr. HAGGART. By day's work.

To pay land damages and services of valuators..... $1,000

Mr. LISTER. What are these land damages?

Mr. HAGGART. $900 of this amount is a re-vote. The water overflowed and damages were done to the adjoining lands, and valuators had to be employed.

Rebuilding dry retaining walls, approaches to Lock No. 6, Grenville Canal..... $5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The sum total of these amounts chargeable to income is becoming an excessively heavy item. Altogether, I see the hon. gentleman requires this year $296,000 almost entirely for canals. When you add the item for staff and repairs, amounting to $551,000, it will be found that these canals are going to cost $800,000 or $900,000 a year, against a total revenue of less than $320,000. This Carillon and Grenville Canal was reconstructed a few years ago, and surely we should not be called on to defray a heavy expenditure for rebuilding, if the work was properly done. I think only last year there were very heavy claims from the contractors who built the work some years ago. Is there any special cause why these walls require to be rebuilt?

Mr. HAGGART. This expenditure is necessary to prevent the dry retaining walls at the approaches to the lock tumbling down. It is proposed to build them with a different quality of stone, and in a different manner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By the words "dry retaining walls" the hon. gentleman does not mean that the walls were built without mortar?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, they were just dry rubble walls.

Mr. DEVLIN. I suppose this work will be given out as day work. Would it not be better to give it out by contract, rather than place it in the hands of a superintendent to give out as he pleased? He may have his own favourites and he may give all the work to them, while others who were more competent were ready to do it. The public money might also be saved by adopting this course.

Mr. HAGGART. It would be impossible in this case to do anything of the kind. Wherever possible the work should be given out by contract. The Carillon dam was, however, so badly constructed that there was danger of the work being carried away. The damage is more than was expected, and it is not known in detail as to what repairs will be required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the original contractor?

Mr. HAGGART. I think Mr. McNamee was the contractor for the Carillon dam.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did it cost?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember, but it was a very large sum.

Mr. DEVLIN. Was there not a large expenditure a year ago?

Mr. HAGGART. There was an expenditure of $13,000 last year. It was in the course of that expenditure that it was found that further repairs were absolutely necessary in order to prevent the dam being carried away.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So you have had an appropriation of $15,000, and you ask for a further appropriation of $15,000, and you have spent $13,000.

Mr. HAGGART. $15,000 were voted in 1892, of which $13,000 were spent, and $15,000 more are wanted for this year.

Trent Valley Canal—Towards construction of a dredge..... $6,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What kind of a dredge are you going to get for $6,000?

Mr. HAGGART. A small dredge with a bcom that dips down only six feet. I think the water on the mitre sills there is only 5½ feet.

Mr. LISTER. Where is it to be built?

Mr. HAGGART. I think we will have to build it on the Trent River, because there is no exit or entrance to the canal there.

Rebuilding Heeley's Falls Dam.....$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is that?

Mr. HAGGART. About 15 miles from the village of Hastings. The dam has been built for about 50 years and requires rebuilding.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is this work to be done by day's labour or by contract?

Mr. HAGGART. The material will be got by tender, and I understand the cribwork is to be done under the superintendence of the officer in charge of the canal.

St. Peter's Canal—Reconstructing west wall $10,000

Mr. HAGGART. An appropriation of $37,500 was granted last year and this balance is required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This seems to be a very large expenditure for reconstructing the west wall of a single canal.

Mr. HAGGART. It is hardly a wall. I think it is rock excavation. It was a heavy clay bank or hill on the side of the canal, as I understand it, and it was faced with cribwork. It was forcing into the canal, and this vote is for the purpose of cutting down the earth slopes and refacing the lower part of it with cribwork.

Culbute Canal—Settling of claims and removal of obstructions..... $5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are these claims?

Mr. HAGGART. There were dams erected on both sides of Allumette Island for the purpose of raising water for the lock of the Culbute Canal. This, I hope, will be the end of the damages claimed by parties who allege that they were injured by these dams.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is it the intention of the Government to deepen this canal?

Mr. HAGGART. No; it is the intention of the Government at present to abandon the canal.

Mr. DEVLIN. What, then, is to become of the Ottawa River Ship Canal? I had hoped that the Government would have an announcement to make in regard to that work. There is no doubt that it would prove one of the most important canals of the country. As I understand, it would shorten the distance very much between Lake Superior and the port of Montreal, pass through a very fine country, and be of immense benefit to the whole of Canada. I will not dwell upon this subject now, but I trust next session, after I am put in possession of all the papers which I have asked for, to place the question more fully before the House.

To meet salaries of officers not on the Civil Service List.....$12,300

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Explain the object and meaning of this vote?

Mr. HAGGART. Engineers and clerks are sometimes employed at the head office, and their salaries have been charged to the particular work on which they have been engaged. I think the Auditor General has interpreted the Act to mean that their salaries cannot be charged to a particular work unless they are employed in the province where the work is going on; so that the new method adopted is to take a vote for their salaries. There are similar votes for the Public Works Department and for the Marine Department.

Surveys and Inspections—Railways....$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe here a very considerable reduction. How do you come to be able to make it?

Mr. HAGGART. There is not so many railways being constructed now, and there is not so much required.

Canadian Pacific Railway—construction.$2,000

Mr. HAGGART. This is required to pay the salaries and expenses of engineers supervising the expenditure made for the Canadian Pacific Railway on the section of the railway between Emory's Bar and Savona's Ferry, in accordance with the award of the arbitrators.

Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at Halifax $152,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this wanted for, and is it really wanted at all?

Mr. HAGGART. This is a sum recommended for terminal facilities at Halifax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There can be very little urgency for this, as it is a revote, and we have expended a really frightful sum for increased accommodation at Halifax; and, as everybody knows, the Intercolonial Railway is not in a condition to give us much return for our money at present.

Mr. HAGGART. The report of my department states that increased accommodation is required at Halifax, that the sheds are pretty well filled with freight, and the estimate for the proposed accommodation comes to a very large sum. I am taking this vote at present, but do not intend to make any expenditure on it as I am new in the department, and I want to make an enquiry on the spot myself as to what the increased accommodation will be. There are two proposed plans, either of which will require an expenditure of between $500,000 and $600,000; and under those circumstances, I think I would be justified, before making any expenditure, in making a thorough enquiry as to the requirements and probable cost.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Then the hon. gentleman's proposition is to take $152,000, though he has not made up his mind as to what extension, if any, he will make, and the amount he will expend.

Mr. HAGGART. The $152,000 will be required in any event, and perhaps a much larger sum, but I cannot speak authoritatively on the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How long will the hon. gentleman require to consider the statement?

Mr. HAGGART. I intend to go down immediately after the session and look over the

ground. I do not know what time that will be, but I suppose about December or January next.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the hon. gentleman proposes to expend even such a sum as $152,000, he must have made up his mind for what purpose it is to be expended. It is only a few years ago since we spent a very large sum in Halifax in extending the railway and building a new station. He now asks Parliament to vote $152,000, and I assume he must have made up his mind in some direction to that extent anyway. In what direction are you going to make the extension, because you may make an extension which, perforce, will compel you to expend a very much larger sum afterwards? Before we take the initiatory step, which necessarily must involve the expenditure of a very large sum of money, we ought to be informed.

Mr. TUPPER. We had quite an extended discussion on this item last session, and from the statement of the Minister of Railways I understand we are practically in the position we were then. Parliament discussed at considerable length the propriety of voting an amendment before the Government stated definitely which plan they proposed to take. The committee was informed then that there were two proposals, one involving the expropriation of a block of land or houses and the other being an extension down along the wharves. With reference to this proposition, some co-operation on the part of the city was required, and before coming to a conclusion it is proposed to make an investigation on the spot.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is hardly business-like. The department have not made up their minds as to whether there will be any extension: and it is unreasonable to ask us to vote such a sum as this until the Minister has made up his mind after examining the ground. He may then find, and his report may meet with general approval, that the extension will involve the expenditure of $100,000 or $500,000, but I am anxious that the committee should not commit itself, for if we vote $150,000 and use it in an extension which in the long run may cost $500,000, it will be too late for us to draw back.

Mr. TUPPER. The point that prevailed with the committee last session was this, that there is absolute necessity for increased accommodation. This amount of money would give us a great deal of accommodation on the property owned by the Intercolonial Railway, further away from the present terminus at Halifax, but instead of making this improvement on the Intercolonial property proper and further away from the city, we might possibly come into the city and meet the wishes of the business people there. But, in any event, increased accommodation is absolutely required.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It might be as well to leave this item stand.

Mr. TUPPER. We can go back to this subject on the other item which is allowed to stand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am speaking my own personal views, and I think it is indiscreet to ask this sum until the hon. gentleman has decided what the extension will be.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand from the officers that this amount will be absolutely necessary, but the city authorities objected to our making the expenditure even on the property we have there, as so much better accommodation can be obtained in the city; and if afterwards we decided on that, the expenditure would be made on the new property. Under those circumstances, we refuse to make expenditure on our property, hoping that some arrangement may be made by which far better terminal facilities may be afforded.

Mr. FORBES. I would suggest that that item stand. I know there is a dispute between two bodies of merchants as to where the extension shall be. There is a proposition, which I trust will be acceptable to the Government, to bring the two clashing interests together by means of a medium route down Water street over the electric railway, which it is proposed to lay along that street. The freight sheds on the wharves along that route will be easy of access from this proposed line, and the sum required from the Government by way of bonus, which will be to the great extent recouped to them from the freight along this line, will be a much less sum than is required to be voted here. The Nova Scotia Power Co. has to-day the right to go along certain streets, including Water street. They propose to build along that street, which is about being paved by the citizens of Halifax, to accommodate the merchants along the water front, and carry their freight up and down by means of their electric road or a steam dummy. They will have depots at several stations along the line from the Intercolonial Railway, and will give ample accommodation to all the freight and passenger traffic. This can be done by a grant much less than that asked for here in this item, probably one-fifth or one-sixth of this amount: and, if the proposition will be acceptable to the Government, I know it will be acceptable to many of the citizens of Halifax, and I trust an arrangement can be arrived at whereby it will be accepted by Parliament.

Mr. TUPPER. Do you propose to reduce that vote?

Mr. FORBES. Yes.

Mr. TUPPER. By how much?

Mr. FORBES. Probably one-fifth or one-sixth, if the scheme is carried through. I know that, by the scheme that I speak of, ample accommodation can be given to the citizens thereby. I suggest that this item should be allowed to stand unless the Minister will say that it is necessary for the building of sheds to hold freight.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was disappointed in not seeing any reference in the report of the Railway Department to the proposed extensions in Halifax or St. John. As there must be a long debate in reference to the Intercolonial Railway, and it will be expected that the Minister will lay down such new propositions as he will have to sumbit to the House for the future government of the railway, and as it is expected, whether rightly or not, that there will be some drastic reforms in regard to the management of the road in the future, and the House will expect to be placed in possession of the policy of the Government in reference to the whole road, I would suggest whether it would not be as well to allow this item to stand. Last year the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) submitted a proposition in reference to these Government railways being placed in the hands of a commission,

but that was not accepted by the Government. Then we understood that the Minister of Railways who is now the Minister of Militia, when he visited the Maritime Provinces formed some conclusions from what he observed, and that steps have been taken to carry out some suggestions made by him. I think, after one general discussion of this Intercolonial Railway question, the probabilities are that the several items will not occupy much time in passing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We ought to have a statement of the policy of the Government as to the management and conduct of the road, the number of men employed in various parts of the service in connection with the road, what changes are intended to be made and in what respects the staff is to be reduced, so that we may have before us an intelligible scheme. I understand that the cost of printing in connection with this road is eight or ten times as great as that in connection with the Grand Trunk, and almost as much in comparison with that of the Canadian Pacific Railway. These are serious blots on the management of the road, and in all these particulars we should have brought before us very clearly the contemplated reforms in this department.

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest that this item might stand, and the next might be passed, and we might have the general discussion when the question comes up again on Tuesday, and that, as suggested by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), the individual items might then pass without much discussion. No doubt the longest discussion will take place in regard to the general management of the railway, and what is proposed to be done and also in reference to the extensions in Halifax and St. John.

Mr. LAURIER. And the St. Charles Branch.

Mr. BOWELL. I think that is about done with, except in regard to the claims, and I am afraid, they will take to the end of the world.

Mr. HAZEN. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has made a statement in regard to the advertising on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I said nothing about the advertising.

Mr. HAZEN. Well, then, to the printing. Has he any figures to support his statement?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I simply made the statement for the information of the Minister who I understood was about to give us the plan of the management of the road in the future, and I called his attention to it so that he would be prepared to discuss the subject, but not with a view of discussing it this evening, because I understood from both sides of the House that the discussion was to stand over.

Mr. HAGGART. At the next meeting I will be prepared to give as full a report as I can as to the reduction of the number of employés, the train mileage, and so on, and I will have such general information as will give the hon. gentlemen all they desire. I think the hon. gentleman must be mistaken as to the cost of printing, as will be shown by the figures in regard to that matter which I will bring down on Tuesday next. I am informed that the cost of printing for the Grand Trunk exceeds that of the Intercolonial Railway.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 9th May, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIEUTENANT GOVERNORS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I was asked to lay on the Table the instructions appended to the Commissions to Lieutenant Governors.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the House to the rule, also, in regard to the presentation of documents. In 1889, Mr. Speaker Blanchet laid down the rule, which is also the rule in England, that no papers can be laid before Parliament except under the authority of a statute, an address, or an order of the House, and I think it would be well to have this rule followed in the future, so that these papers may appear on the Journals of the House. In England the custom has been that, where a paper is asked for, a motion may be made, if it is unopposed and it is desirable to have the return brought down when motions are called, or a motion may be made by the Minister himself when he lays the papers on the Table.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In respect of any paper of this kind being asked for by a member, I understand that I submit it here for his perusal and it is not supposed to go on the records at all. If it is desired that any document of this kind should be made part of the records, a motion should be made, but I think this was submitted formally to the House before, and is probably already on the records.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copy of the instructions appended to commission of the Lieutenant Governors of the Provinces of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Copy of the report of the engineer having in charge the blasting of rock in Cascumpeque harbour, P.E.I; also a statement showing the quantity of rock blasted, and the total amount expended in connection therewith.

He said: The Cascumpeque harbour has a sand bar at the outside and there is a soft red stone rock on the inside. In 1885, the Department of Public Works commenced operations there by blasting that rock, but they allowed a great portion of the rock to fall back into the water and did not clear it as it went. The result is that the stones accumulated on the sand bar. In 1890 they sent a dredge there which, in eleven days, removed 1,146 cubic yards of stone from the cutting. A large amount

of money has been expended with poor results. They should have the dredge there to dredge out as the blasting goes on. The Government should understand that it is absolutely necessary that the stone should be dredged out as soon as it is blasted. This is one of the most important harbours of refuge on the northern side of Prince Edward Island, and therefore it is necessary to have this harbour kept clear enough for vessels drawing nine or ten feet of water. During storms, numbers of vessels from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and also from the United States, have to find refuge in that harbour, and sometimes, through there being not water enough there, they have to shy the harbour and go somewhere else, running the risk of being lost between the North Cape and New London. I believe the return will show that there has been spent about $16,000 improperly, as the stones which were blasted were allowed to remain in the bottom, with the exception of 1,180 odd cubic feet taken out in 1890. It is the balance remaining there which causes the obstruction. Blasting is of no use unless the stones are dredged out accordingly as they are blasted. I hope the department will go on blasting, and in the meantime have the stones dredged out.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for:

Return showing: 1. The total number of acres of public lands granted in Manitoba and the Canadian North-West in aid of railway construction, up to 26th April, 1892. 2. The name of each railway company or line to which a land grant has been made; the length of each line thus aided by land grant, and the number of acres granted to each company or line. 3. The total number of acres of land in Manitoba and the Canadian North-West which have been earned up to 26th April, 1892, under provisions of grants through completion of lines or portions of lines to which land grants have been made. 4. The name of each railway company or line which has earned the whole or a portion of its land grant, with the number of acres earned by each of such lines.

He said: We are engaged in the development of a new region in this Dominion, and this matter ought to receive our earnest consideration as to the proper methods to be adopted to secure, with the least expense to the public treasury and the least cost to our public resources, the result aimed at. It is almost universally the case that where Governments have dealt with enormous areas of wild land, a certain degree of recklessness characterizes their management of this trust, at least in the earlier stages; and if we dispassionately consider the course which has been pursued by the Dominion Government with regard to the public domain in the North-West, we will find that this Government has been reckless in its management of this trust. Of course it is difficult to realize the vast possibilities of the future. When the United States first attained their independence and the nation consisted of thirteen states with a population of 3,000,000 souls, the public men in that country, in dealing with their vast domain, failed to realize that within 100 years there would be 57 additional millions of population, that the country, which was then a howling wilderness, would have large cities, 30 or 40 in number, one of them with a million inhabitants and nearly a score with over one hundred thousand inhabitants, and that trade and commerce would have made the immense progress it has in that period. In the same way we stand at the threshold of vast developments in this country. We are dealing with a public domain of enormous extent and almost inexhaustible resources, and we are dealing with it, in many respects, in a way not characterized by prudence, forethought and proper consideration of what lies before us. The Minister of the Interior last year furnished us with a statement with regard to grants of lands made in the North-West for the purpose of aiding railway construction, and I was forced to the conclusion that our policy in this regard had been a reckless one, and that our grants for the purpose of aiding railways had been very far in advance of the requirements, and very far in excess of what would be a prudent limit. The Minister of the Interior, by a statement submitted to the House, informed the country that the grants at that time, including the grants to the Canadian Pacific Road, amounted to 42,132,000 acres. Now, that is an area granted in a country which at that time had scarcely 200,000 inhabitants. It was a provision made to aid railways to the extent of 210 acres for every man, woman and child in that country, a provision to the extent of 1,050 acres for every family of five in that country. It strikes me that the bare statement of these figures is sufficient to carry conviction that the grants have been recklessly large.

The example of the United States in this matter, from whom we copied in aiding railway construction by land grants, should be instructive to us, and we should not be above taking a lesson from their experience. I find in referring to the statistics regarding United States land grants, that great as the evil in that country was—and it was admittedly an evil, every public man in the United States to-day will acknowledge that the grants made in aid of railway construction were excessively large, in a great many cases unnecessary—yet the grants in that country were small in comparison with the grants made by the Government in this country, if we take into account the relative population of the two countries. I find that the number of acres certified and patented up to 30th June, 1882, in aid of railway construction in the United States, was 46,526,000 acres. Since that time there have been selected by railways, certified and patented, land grants to the amount of 34,052,000, acres, making a total in the entire United States of 80,579,000 acres. Now, that is, estimated upon the basis of the population in the region in which these roads were constructed, a fraction over three acres granted for each inhabitant, as compared with the grant of 200 per inhabitant in our own Canadian North-West. As I have intimated, this policy has been admitted to have been an unnecessary policy, and an extravagant policy, and the system has been entirely abandoned in the United States: land grants for the purpose of promoting the construction of railways in that country are no longer made. The country in which these grants were made comprised twenty-six states and territories; the country in which our own grants, amounting to more than half the total grant in the United States, have been made, comprised one province and four territories. The country in which these grants have been made, in the United States, contained a population in 1880, of 24,960,000 souls; and in this country, before an acre had been granted, before the policy had been

inaugurated, before the first step had been taken in the direction of promoting railway construction, the country in which these grants were afterwards made, contained in round numbers a population of 5,000,000; so if we contrast our policy with theirs we must, I think, arrive at the conclusion that if their policy was objectionable, if their policy was extravagant, if their policy was unnecessary, as every public man of reputation in the United States will to-day admit was the case, then our policy is doubly unnecessary, and reckless and unjustifiable.

Now, there is one particular evil it strikes me that characterizes the policy this Government is pursuing, and that is this: The Government is engaged in the business of promoting private speculation; the Government is engaged in the business of granting speculative charters to men of straw, to companies composed of men of straw; and in the great majority of cases hitherto these railway charters could not have been based on legitimate business. They have been characterized by the same features as those which characterized a railway charter granted here some years ago, when one of the promoters of that charter then made use of the celebrated saying that "something must be saved out of the transaction for the boy;" and in the great majority of cases these charters have been granted, not only for the purpose of saving something out of the concern for the "boy," but had been granted for the benefit of the "boy" from beginning to end; and the policy has simply amounted to this, that the Government has consented to act as the agent of speculative parties for the purpose of giving them control of franchise, for the purpose of locking up great sections of land until these men could sell their charters, could make some arrangement by which they could make all that was to be made out of this transaction, and retire from the speculation. I presume that in a great number of instances, if not in a majority of instances, this feature has characterized the operations of granting charters, so far as the applicants themselves were concerned, in the North-West, and I do believe that the Government has not exercised that degree of caution and scrutiny that it ought to have exercised in this matter. I was struck by an observation made by the Minister of Militia on one occasion in this House, when, in referring to the proposition to assume the grants made by municipalities in Ontario for the promotion of railway construction, that hon. gentleman informed the House and the country that this was simply a proposition for adding millions of dollars to the public debt. Well, Sir, in the same sense every charter carrying with it a land grant, is a proposition to subtract from the public domain vast areas of land, and this policy has resulted in subtracting from that area over 42,000,000 acres. If this system is at all necessary—and it may be necessary, I do not deny that there may be circumstances that would justify the granting of land for the construction of a railway; I do not deny that a Government that pursues this policy judiciously, may be fostering and promoting public interest—but even if this policy were in any sense necessary, there can be no doubt whatever that the whole system has been grossly abused in this country. There was the case of the coal lands in Vancouver Island—I remember protesting against that grant at the time. There was a little line of railway—I passed over since—running along the sea from Victoria to Nanaimo, a distance of 70 miles, the construction of which was scarcely necessary; and to promote the construction of that railway nearly all the coal lands of the Island of Vancouver were granted to a syndicate, the greater proportion of the capital being held in San Francisco by Southern Pacific Railway magnates. I pointed out this fact at the time, but the lobby influences here, the backing here, were too strong, the grant was made, the coal lands have gone, and the other day we were informed, in discussing the militia estimates, that the reason coal was so high when purchased in Vancouver Island, was that there was a monopoly, and we ourselves created that monopoly by this grant to the Nanaimo Railway Company.

Now, I have not the slightest doubt that many branch lines have been bonused with land grants, that would have been constructed, anyway, as soon as the country required them, lines that the great railway artery that passes through that country requires for the development of its own business; and we have been giving millions of acres of land to promote the construction of branch lines that would be constructed, and must be constructed, and that it will be profitable to construct for the main line to which they act as feeders. My opinion is that we should wait before granting the charter, before making a land grant in connection with that charter, until that road was wanted; that we should consider whether it was not probable that the road would be built without public aid, and if the probability was not that it would be constructed within the time the road was wanted by the public, and when the capital would be forthcoming. The question arises whether we are properly discharging our duties to the people if we permit a charter far in advance of the time it is required to be granted, and a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile to be made to accompany that charter. We have railway charters running to Peace River, we have railways projected to Alaska, we have railways projected in every direction running back into the wilderness, and year by year in advance of the time where these roads are wanted companies are chartered and land grants made, and in every one of these instances we are simply fostering speculative enterprise, we are putting into the hands of speculators who secure those charters the power to control those undertakings and shut out legitimate enterprise and legitimate capital. When the time comes that capital is ready to construct the road these men, like the dog in the manger, stand in the way; they are in possession of the charter and the land grant and terms must be made with them, although they probably have not put $1 of capital into the work of construction. What does it mean that over 40,000,000 acres of land in the North-West have been granted to railway enterprises in a country with a population of less than 250,000, or 1,000 acres for every family? It strikes me that the policy we have been pursuing is a reckless policy, that we have been going too fast, that we must call a sharp halt in dealing with that great trust which is placed in our hands, that enormous country in the North-West, which is to be the home of future millions of people. We want to hold it, we want to keep the speculators from coming between the Government and the people, and we can most effectively carry out

that great trust by seeing that, except under circumstances which render the necessity of taking of the step an obvious one, the Government shall hold the land until they can pass it from their hands to settlers who will actually cultivate the soil. I make this motion for the purpose of calling attention to this matter. I do not know that I wish to be understood as denouncing very savagely the policy of the Government, because the policy they have pursued under the circumstances is a natural one. They have been actuated by a desire to develop the vast region that is now undeveloped: but they have been going too fast and acting without due exercise of judgment, so we had better now take stock and see how far we have gone and what action it may be necessary to take in future, and govern ourselves, not by the clamours of charter brokers, not by the clamours of men who want to get control and possession of the public domain in the North-West, but to govern ourselves by the necessities of the case and to promote the construction of railroads when they are wanted, and deal with the question in a business-like manner and grant aid in the construction of the railroads to the extent and at the time it is requested—that and no more.

Mr. DEWDNEY. There will be no objection to bringing down the return asked by the hon. gentleman, and I may add that since a similar return was brought down last year my information is that no other land grants have been given. This subject has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I think, every year I have had the honour of sitting in this House. It has been the same story, and the hon. gentleman has enunciated the same views. Before I came to this House I read the reports of the hon. gentleman's speeches made during the previous years, but they were of a very different character from those he has delivered since I became a member of this House. I have not the *Hansard* with me, but I can easily procure a copy, and it will be found that in his speeches the hon. gentleman favoured land grants and was pronounced in his views as to the construction of railways and as to how they should be built. The hon. gentleman during those early years, 1876 or 1877, not only held that land grants should be given for the construction of railways, but that they should be built prior to settlement: that we should not wait, as he suggests to-day, until the country is supposed to be in a condition to warrant expenditure on railway construction. If necessary I can send for the Debates and read the hon. gentleman's speeches which are, I think, utterly at variance with the views he now expresses on this subject. The hon. gentleman has been very harsh in regard to the charters which have been granted, and he has stated that more than two-thirds have been speculative charters. I hold a list of the charters granted. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he considers the Canadian Pacific Railway charter a speculative charter? Then there is the charter to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. That company has carried out its obligations with the Government faithfully; it has built the road, and it has carried out its obligations better, perhaps, than any other corporation building railways in the North-West. Then there is the charter to the Hudson Bay Railway. That undertaking, as hon. gentlemen know, is in a fair way of going on, and it is in the hands of responsible men, and I do not think it can be classed as a speculative charter. Then there is the Alberta Railway and Coal Company. The road has been completed, the company have received the land grant, and the country has received benefit from its construction. Then there is the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, which is now about completed. That travels through a fairly settled country, but since its construction it has added immensely to the wealth and importance of that section, and to-day settlers are flocking in from all directions. Then there is the Manitoba and South-Eastern Company, which road is now in a fair way of being constructed. Then there is the Red Deer Valley Railway, the construction of which we authorized last year, and I suppose it will be completed this year. The Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway has not yet been started, although the company has for some years possessed a charter. Altogether the acreage of land voted by Parliament amounts to 42,000,000. The hon. gentleman asks for information in regard to the quantities that have already been earned. As I have that information at hand I might as well give it now. The quantity of land already earned by railways completed, including 19,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway is 25,218,000. My impression is that several railway companies will not earn their land grants, and I think that the 25,000,000 acres with probably at most 5,000,000 acres added, will be what I expect that the Government up to the present will really feel that they are bound for.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then some 12,000,000 acres will lapse?

Mr. DEWDNEY. That is my impression. With regard to the policy adopted, I must say that I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman, and I am sure that the people who are interested and who are living in the North-West would not agree with his statements either. Of course it is well known that in this eastern country railways have been built, in a great measure, by subsidies; and the hon. gentleman will himself admit that railways must be built in that western country before settlement will go there. I hold the views that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did in 1876; I still hold the view that it was a necessity to built railways in the west ahead of settlement and for the purpose of inducing settlement to go there. We have constructed the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have the Manitoba and North-Western Railway with some 230 miles running into the territories from Winnipeg, we have the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, 190 miles running north, and the road from Calgary running south 120 miles which is nearly built. This road is completed to Edmonton, and all but some 10 or 15 miles of the southern portion is also constructed. Then we have the road running from Regina to Prince Albert 225 miles, and settlers are now taking advantage of these railways to go there. In fact if it had not been for the construction of these lines the settlers who are now coming in, especially from Dakota and the United States, would not have been induced to go into the North Saskatchewan country. My information is that most of them are tending that way. A large number of them are coming in on the Manitoba and the North-Western, and a large number are also

settling along the Calgary and Edmonton road. I think it was stated at the time these charters were granted, or when the subsidies were given, that with the completion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and these two branches, and also the branch running from Winnipeg, which will be built to the head of Lake Winnipegosis; it was thought that the country would be very well supplied with railways for some time to come. I am under that impression, and I believe there will be no necessity in the near future for any other charters or any other land grants towards the construction of railways. That is my impression. So far as we have gone, I think that the land which has been given has brought us in a good return, and I believe the hon. gentleman would think so himself if he paid a visit to that country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of the Interior says that if he had before him the speeches made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in 1877, that it would be found that the hon. gentleman expressed at that time views altogether at variance with those which he had expressed during the period which the Minister of the Interior has been a member of the Government. If the Minister examines the speeches of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, I think he will find that his statement is not strictly accurate. The hon. Minister confounds objections to land grants altogether, with objections to land grants under the policy pursued by the present Administration. The hon. gentleman made a statement to the House which shows that land grants have already been earned by railway companies which would furnish farms to 162,000 families, and grants have been made which would furnish farms to 200,000 families. Well, Sir, the objection which I make to the policy of the hon. gentleman is not at all that land is given in aid of railways; but it is that land is given in aid of railway companies without restrictions and in an improvident manner which has seriously added to the expense of settling the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman ought to know that when grants are made to half a dozen railway corporations for the construction of roads extending in various directions through a territory nearly as large as Russia in Europe, that the effect is to scatter a few thousand people over a country vastly greater than they should occupy, and that it adds to the expense of government, and adds to the cost of subsistence in the Territories. The hon. gentleman knows that if he had the people now in the North-West Territories within the limits of a single county—and they could be brought so together, and not even then have a denser population than is found in one of the western counties of Ontario—there would be far less expense for the maintenance of schools, for the maintenance of roads and bridges, and for the maintenance of churches. There are a score of ways in which the cost of living to the people would be largely diminished if the settlement was more dense. I would like to know what the country has gained in the way of settlement by the construction of so large a mileage of railways within the North-West Territories? A road of 100 miles in length which furnishes an opportunity for a few thousand families settling, is just as good as a road 1,000 miles in length so long as there is room for settlement within accessible distances. In fact it is infinitely better than a road 1,000 miles long, for the longer the road is the greater effect it has of scattering the population over an unnecessarily large territory. What I complain of in the policy which the Government have pursued, and of which the hon. gentleman is in this matter the exponent, is, that they have unnecessarily expended a large sum of money and pledged a large area of the public domain for the construction of railways beyond what the public interest requires. The Minister must know, that if you had a railway constructed in any portion of that country well suited for settlement, opening the country and making it accessible to the population that goes there, the people would not go into distant portions far away from a railway as long as there were lands fit for settlement within a reasonable distance, and when that settlement was once established there would be little difficulty in securing the settlement of other contiguous districts without pledging any portion of the public lands for railway construction. A second objection to the course pursued by the Government is that lands have been pledged for railway construction in advance of settlement, where, if settlement had been permitted to go on in the vicinity of the railways limited to the actual requirements of the country, a pledge would have been altogether unnecessary; the lands could have been held free for the use of the public and as a source of public revenue. In this improvident pledge of the public lands for the construction of railways over a vast territory beyond what will be settled for fifty years to come, the Government has limited the price of those lands to the settlers in no way whatever. The railway company may ask $10 or $20 or $30 an acre. It may hold lands for an increase in price, thinking that will be more advantageous to the company, especially where they are at a considerable distance from the railway constructed, than it would be to put them on the market at once; and so, instead of having an early settlement of the territory which would not be immediately profitable to the railway as a source of traffic, the company holds it unsettled for an indefinite period of time. If the Government had required that once the land reached a particular value, all the increment beyond that value should be public revenue instead of income to the railway company, railway companies would have had an interest in selling the lands not exceeding a maximum price. They would have had no inducement or motive to hold on to the lands for an increased price. But the rule of the Government has been to put these lands in the hands of companies, and to leave them perfectly free to deal with them precisely as a private individual deals with property which he has bought and paid for. I think that rule should not be applied to railway corporations receiving public aid in this way. The Government incorporate the company, and give it aid in the public interest solely, and therefore it is the business of Parliament and of the Government to see that proper restrictions are put upon the company so as to secure the settlement of these lands at the earliest possible moment. Now, that has not been done, and in this respect the policy of the Administration has been objectionable. The hon. gentleman tells us that some of these railway companies will prove abortive—that they will not undertake the con-

struction of the roads which they have been chartered to construct. What sort of commentary is that upon the policy of the Administration in placing a large area of the public domain at the disposal of men who are not capable of constructing the roads which they have undertaken to build? Were those roads necessary in the public interest? Did the public interest at that particular time require their construction? Why were the companies incorporated, and why was aid promised to them if they were not? The statement of the hon. gentleman goes to show that there was no pressing necessity for their incorporation, that it was not in the public interest, and that these were speculative enterprises entered upon in the interest of private parties, perhaps with a view of having a charter to sell at a profit in London or New York. Now, Sir, I think that the course pursued by the Administration with reference to the grants of public lands in the aid of railways has been an improvident course—that it has not contributed to the settlement of the country. On the contrary, it has tended to retard settlement in consequence of the facilities afforded the companies for demanding a high price for these lands: it has damaged the country by scattering the population over a territory far larger than should have been opened for settlement; and it has further operated against the public interest by adding largely to the cost of living in the North-West country, owing to the extra expenses imposed upon the population for the maintenance of schools, churches, roads, bridges, and everything else necessary to their progress and their comfort.

Mr. WATSON. It is probably a little late in the day to discuss this question now, as the Minister has told us that he does not consider that it will be necessary to give land grants to railways in future. It would have been interesting if the hon. Minister had told us, as I think he could have done honestly, that there are no more lands in Manitoba or the North-West to grant to railway companies. I think that all the lands available as grants to railway companies in the North-West have already been granted. However, when these corporations apply to this House for an extension of time, I think this House should demand some guarantee from them for the completion of the road for which they hold the land grant within a certain time. It is well known that large tracts of land have been held for years by railway corporations for speculation. It has always been contended on this side of the House that a maximum price should have been fixed on lands held by railway corporations, so that the settler would know that they were open for settlement, and the terms on which they could be obtained. I know from my experience in the North-West that settlers have gone into certain districts where railways have been chartered and grants of land given; and these people have lived there for years at great disadvantage to themselvss, expecting year after year to see the railways built. Some of these districts have been settled for the last twelve or fifteen years, the people waiting patiently for railway accommodation, but in vain, because men of straw have held the charter. In the meantime the settlers make improvements, build schools and churches, and construct roads and bridges, which improve the value of the lands held by the railway corporation; and when the corporation sees fit, or when it considers that it is going to be benefited it builds the road and sells its land all the way from $4 to $10 an acre. This shows the profitableness of building a railway in a prairie country with a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile. It should be remembered that the land granted to the Pacific Railway branches must be land fairly fit for settlement, which means that the company has its choice of the land; and I have no hesitation in saying that the Government have granted to railway corporations over half the land fit for settlement in the North-West and Manitoba. The hon. Minister mentioned a number of railways that had received land grants, and the number that had earned land grants. One mentioned was the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company. The Minister himself is, I think, fairly well acquainted with the gentlemen who have promoted that railway. They have held the charter for a number of years, and I have no hesitation in saying, judging from their past efforts to construct that road, that they are men of straw. They asked for a renewal of the charter this year, which was granted, and they have practically done nothing. They have held the land grant for 8 or 9 years, and the Railway Committee granted them an extension of the charter for the commencement and completion of that road. They are allowed to hold land grants, although they have only built some 130 odd miles in some 13 or 14 years. With the country settling up, I do not think this House should grant any railway corporation these extended powers and this extension of time for the construction of a railway. I believe when companies come to this Government and ask for a land grant or any assistance they should be in a position to give some guarantee of good faith that they will construct the road. We have a notable instance where that was necessary in the Great North-West Central. The hon. gentleman who moved for this return referred to that company and the famous telegram about wanting a little boodle for the boy, and we know what disgraceful disclosures were made in connection with the land grant given to men who absolutely had no intention of constructing a mile of road, and who held the grant locked up for years. The charter of that company was granted in 1878 or 1879 and has been held ever since. It has gone into different hands, but to-day only some 50 miles of that road are built, while this company holds a land grant for some 600 miles of that road. This is unfair to the people who have land along the proposed line of railway, and some of whom have been living there 12 or 14 years, expecting railway accommodation. I am not prepared to blame the present company who hold the charter, because I believe they forwarded a plan of survey for the extension of the road some months ago to the Government, but were not allowed to proceed with the construction of the road because the Government did not approve of the plan. Whatever interests are at variance with the construction of the road I know not, but the company cannot go on constructing beyond the 50 miles completed, until the Government approve of their plan. I do not suppose we will have the opportunity of opposing land grants being given to other railways in the North-West, because the member has told us, from what he knows of this country, that all the valuable lands that could be given to railway corporations has been given

away already; but what we should consider is whether we should renew charters held by speculators and renew a land grant to these people unless they put up some deposit and give some guarantee of their good faith to complete the railway within the time specified in the charter.

Mr. DEWDNEY. If I might be allowed to say a word with reference to a remark which fell from the hon. member for Marquette, I may say that although he believes, from what I have said, that there is no more land left for railway companies, he is mistaken. There is a good deal left available for railway companies.

Mr. WATSON. After all the grants made now are given?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes. In different parts of the North-West. The hon. gentleman will recollect that there are from 200,000,000 to 250,000,000 acres available for homestead, odd and even numbered sections.

Mr. WATSON. After the Canadian Pacific Railway collect their land grant, which is land to be fairly fit for settlement, I think I am right in stating that half the land fit for settlement in Manitoba and the North-West has been granted to railway corporations.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I do not think so. Neither the hon. member for Bothwell nor the hon. member for Norfolk made any remarks with reference to what I said regarding the policy which they enunciated in 1878.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, I did.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. member for Bothwell stated this:

"It was largely by the construction of railways that the lands of the North-West were to be made valuable; their value depended upon the facilities afforded for the transport of the products of the settler. By constructing railways through the North-West, reaching to every fertile point where a colony could be established, we would largely contribute to increase the traffic and travel over that railroad which must, for many years to come, be a single line from Winnipeg eastward to the shores of Lake Superior."

The hon. gentleman stated he proposed to build railways to every fertile point where a colony could be established.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He now finds fault with the Government for building railways in those very directions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I do not object to the Government proposing to build railways for the purpose of securing the settlement of the country; but I am pointing out to the hon. gentleman that he has proposed to open up, at once, a country as large as Russia and capable of holding 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 of people, and he scatters the population over that entire country. What it is proper to do by a succession of charters, separated by intervals of years, is a wholly different thing from a proposal to simultaneously undertake the construction of railways over the entire country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. The hon. gentleman will understand, with regard to the two points, for the purpose of building a railway to which we have given a subsidy, Edmonton district and Prince Albert, very large settlements had gone into that country before we indicated we were going to build a railway there at all: and we not only subsidized a company to build these lines for the convenience of settlers at those points, but also to help opening up the country along the line. The hon. member for Norfolk spoke much stronger in this sense in 1878, because he stated:

"It was useless to think of opening up and settling this country without furnishing it with railway facilities. Now, it had been said that the American railways were subsidized to a greater extent than necessary; perhaps that had, in some instances, been the case. Reference had been made to the Illinois Central Railway. At the time that road was projected nearly the whole interior portion of the state was a wilderness; farmers living 50 miles from Chicago were in the habit of teaming wheat to the market often, when the roads were bad, at a cost of one-half the value of the wheat. The country had a few struggling settlements in the interior, but there was no extent of population. The country would never have been opened and settled as it has been but for the construction of a system of railways of which the Central was the chief. That railway had populated the vast prairie region in the centre of the state and had contributed, in an important degree, to make Illinois the third state in the American Union, with a population of over 3,000,000. He recollected paying a visit to Iowa about 20 years ago. Then it had but a few miles of railway and but a sparse population, chiefly located along the line of the Mississippi, yet, by means of a liberal railway policy, by subsidizing several lines crossing the state from east to west, it had suddenly risen into an important state, with a population of nearly, if not quite, 1,500,000. Some of the railways had, perhaps, been subsidized more than was necessary, perhaps more land had been given than was advisable: but capitalists would not embark their money unless they had a prospect of a fair return, and it was folly to haggle with them about an unimportant difference when important interests were at stake."

Farther on, he adds:

"Now, in the North-West there were untold millions of acres of land. They were told by the hon. member for Northumberland that this was the heritage of Canada, that it had been bought by the people's money; but, in its present shape, of what value was this great, wild, lone land to us? The question was how that land should be utilized, and, for that purpose, the Minister of the Interior had devised a Bill which, in its conception, was admirable, and which, in his opinion, would, if carried out, attain the object of populating this vast country."

What was that Bill? It was, as far as I recollect, far more liberal with regard to land grants than anything we proposed. If I recollect aright, it was to grant land to railways, according to their location, varying from 25,000 acres per mile down to 10,000 or 12,000 acres. Hon. gentlemen, I think, at that time took a much more liberal view than we have ever taken with regard to railway construction. I might read still further sentiments in the same direction of hon. gentlemen opposite, sentiments which, to a very great extent, I endorse. I believe that to develop the country we must have railways, and I think this Government has taken the most reasonable plan in encouraging the building of railways in our western country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The only objection I have to the motion is that it does not go quite far enough. I am sorry the mover has also included the lands locked up in the hands of speculators. The fact of the matter, as it appears to me, is that the method of the Government in dealing with the lands in the North-West has been a wrong method from beginning to end. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, who understand the matter of settling up new countries, that the best evidence of prosperity is the number of industrious settlers who settle in a country, and that nothing conduces to the prosperity or the wealth of a country so much as to have that country settled up by an intelligent

and industrious population. This being the case, the plain duty of the Government was to adopt such means as would best be calculated to attain this end, to afford to those intending to settle the best opportunities to make a settlement, in other words, to see that the lands were kept for the settlers, or, if they were parted with at all, they should only have been parted with on such terms as would make them available for settlers at a fair, reasonable price. What we complain of is that this plan was not adopted, that that method was not followed, that the lands in the North-West at the time the great boom took place there were largely locked up in the hands of colonization companies and projected railway companies, and a large quantity of them have gone into the hands of private speculators. Those who were members of the Committee on Immigration and Colonization during the years 1883, 1884 and 1885, will remember the glowing accounts which the Deputy Minister of Agriculture used to give to the committee of the hundreds of thousands of settlers who were going into that country. I believe that so far that gentleman was right, I believe that large numbers went into that country with the intention of settling there, and I believe that these men are not there to-day. We know that for a fact. Now, I believe the principal reason why these men are not there to-day as prosperous and industrious farmers, is that the land was in such a state that they could not find suitable locations for settling, that the land was locked up in the hands of colonization companies who were not prepared or had not made arrangements for the settlement of the lands, that it was locked up in the hands of speculators who wanted a larger price than the settlers would give, and that it was locked up in the hands of railway corporations who had not made the proper arrangements for settlement and probably held these lands for a higher price; so that the result was that these intending settlers, tens and hundreds of thousands in number, left the country in disgust. The object of the Government should have been to adopt the means best suited to bring in the best of hardy, industrious settlers, in order to fill up the waste lands. I am partially inclined to agree with the Minister of the Interior and to disagree with my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that railways should go ahead of settlement, that nothing tends to induce colonization more than easy means of transport. That is another matter from running thousands of miles of railway through a country which is not likely to be settled for many years to come, locking up the lands in the hands of these railway corporations. I have always taken the ground that building railways by land grants is a wrong method. I know it is claimed that the people in the United States adopted that method, but I believe that, with the experience they have had, if the United States had the thing to do over again, they would not grant a single acre to any of these companies. The fact is that they adopted an excellent method of settling their wild lands at an early day. They would not give their lands into the hands of speculators at all. They adopted a fixed rule that lands should be sold to the settlers at $1.25 per acre, but only a certain quantity to each settler, and they would give a preemption right to hold the land for a year without paying the money. The result was that the people knew, wherever there were Government lands, or wild lands, they could go in and choose the land that suited them best without any trouble. With regard to building railways by land grants, it might be done, perhaps, if a proper system were adopted, that is the system of fixing a maximum price above which these lands must not be sold by these corporations. We have tried to have this adopted in this House, and we have failed. These lands which have been referred to to-day, lands which are larger than all the cultivated lands in the whole Dominion, have been handed over to railway corporations without the slightest restriction as to the price at which they may be sold, and not only that but additional grants have been made to colonization companies in commutation of their claims in addition to the lands which have been handed over to private speculators. How has this system worked? We were told, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company received their charter, that this was one of the great reasons for giving that company such great powers, that they would really be a colonization company, that it would be in their interest to have these lands settled up as rapidly as possible, and the natural result would be that they would be immigration agencies, that they would have their agents in the old country inducing the people to settle up our North-West lands. How have events justified the predictions then made? They have done absolutely nothing. They have held these lands for purposes of sale at the highest price they can wring from intending settlers. And not only that, you may say that it is to their interest to sell those lands as soon as possible, but they have an alternative policy. These lands can be mortgaged, and railway companies have been mortgaging their lands, and it becomes a question whether they would rather pay the rate of interest on the mortgage of their lands than sell the lands, whether they would not rather keep the land for a rise in the price and make money by the transaction. For example: if they can borrow money on their land at a low rate of interest, and have the prospect of doubling or trebling the value of that land in ten years, the question is whether it is not better for them to pay the low rate of interest than to sell the land now, and they will adopt the plan by which they will make the most money. I say that the system of giving these lands into the hands of railway corporations without fixing a price at which they are compelled to sell them, has been one of the greatest hinderances to the settlement of the North-West, and it seems to be a matter which this country cannot readily remedy. The only way I can see is that the people who have municipal institutions in those countries shall tax these lands at the highest rates the law will allow. It has been pointed out to-day that this system has had disastrous effects upon settlement. We have been told again and again that there are lands yet ungranted, free to intending settlers. But where are those lands? Are they anywhere within reasonable distance of railways? When a man goes into a new country the first consideration is to get good land to settle upon; the next consideration is, are there railway facilities for getting the produce to market, are there facilities for schools and churches, are there facilities for good neighbourhood? But all these inducements to settle a country are wanting when the lands are given over to

speculators who may hold them ten, twenty or thirty years, in pursuance of a plan which they think will bring them the most money. I am glad the member for North Norfolk has brought this resolution forward, because I believe it will be the means of drawing public attention to the fact that enormous quantities of land have been locked up from settlement; and I hope the resolution will be the means of bringing public opinion to bear upon the Government so that in the future the lands that yet remain will not be locked up in the same way, and that some means will be adopted to have these lands opened for settlement.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the motion is put to the House I may be permitted a few moments to reply to some of the points made by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. I doubt whether the hon. gentleman was justified in assuming that my position with regard to this matter was one of utter hostility to land grants of any character or to any extent whatever. The drift of my argument, I think, was to show that the grants made for the purpose of promoting the construction of railways in the North-West, had been excessively large, that the Government had not exercised due caution in this matter, and had made land grants far in advance of the wants of the country, had made land grants to speculative companies, and made these grants to an extent which was likely to prove, in many respects, disastrous to the interests of that country. Now, I think the admission made by that hon. gentleman himself goes far to prove the position I took in this matter, when he informs the House that 12,000,000 acres of land grants made to roads in that country will lapse. If that is the case, certainly we are warranted in assuming that the Government has made land grants to railway companies to the extent of 12,000,000 acres and has not enquired with sufficient care into the character of each company, and has actually made grants to companies of straw, who are not likely to carry out their stipulations with the Government, or to construct the road for which these grants were made.

The hon. Minister refers to a speech made by myself, I understood him to say, in 1878. The occasion upon which that speech was made was the introduction of a Bill by my hon. friend the present member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), then Minister of the Interior. That hon. gentleman introduced a Bill of a general character for the purpose of promoting railway construction in the North-West, which of course was then a new country and had not been reached by railway at all. The line from Lake Superior to the Red River was not constructed, and that country had no railway outlet. Now, the character of that Bill was briefly this: The hon. member made general provisions for the aid of railway lines; the maximum grant of land, I think, was 12,800 acres per mile in remote districts; but in the Red River district the grant was to be 6,400 acres per mile. The Bill had this feature which commended it to me and which made it infinitely preferable to any Bill that the Government has presented, in that it limited the price that railway companies receiving these land grants were permitted to ask for their lands; the price was limited, if my memory serves me, to $2 per acre, and if lands were sold in excess of that price, such excess went into the treasury of the country. The Government of that day also reserved certain powers to themselves with reference to acting as trustee over these lands, and the utmost care was taken to guard the public interest, and to prevent railways from receiving returns from the land grants in excess of the amount required to render aid sufficient to enable them to construct their lines. Now, I have nothing to retract in what I may have said at that time about the propriety or the necessity of fostering the construction of railway lines. I have not said anything to-day that would warrant the assumption that I am utterly opposed to railway grants. What I have said, and what I reiterate now, is that the Government, in voting aid to railways, should act in the spirit of prudence, should examine the standing of the companies proposing to construct sections of roads, should satisfy themselves as to the *bonâ fides* of the proposals, should satisfy themselves that the company had business responsibilities and a business standing and business methods, and intended to proceed with the business of the construction of the road; and the Government having satisfied themselves on these points, would then be warranted in making grants to such an extent as was necessary and prudent. I was aiming my criticisms largely to a condemnation of the policy of fostering companies of straw, of making grants far in advance of the requirements of the country, of tying up enormous areas of land by covering them with charters for roads that it should be known to the Government would not be constructed for many years. I also made allusion to the granting of lands in aid of the construction of branch lines, and that was a point, so far as I noticed, that the Minister of the Interior did not refer to. I made the assertion that grants had been made to branch lines that would inevitably be constructed without any aid whatever, by the main trunk line, which would construct them as feeders just as soon as their business required it. Now, we had a discussion here last session where it was shown that a company had received a grant by Order in Council for 66 miles of road that was actually built; they had gone on and built that 60 miles of road because their interests required that they should reach certain coal fields, and after building their line they made application for this land, and a grant for 60 miles of road was made to them. Now, I hold that many of these branch lines required no aid whatever, and that the Government in pursuing the policy it has in making grants to an enormous extent, in locking up 42,000,000 acres of land in the North-West, in granting over a thousand acres for every family in that country to provide means for that family to have ingress and egress, has gone too far, has gone too fast; and the prime object of my motion was to call attention to this fact and to exhort the Government, to implore the Government to be more careful of the great interests placed in their hands, to realize that the management of millions of acres in the North-West was a trust of immense importance, that that was a country yet to teem with population, that its resources were to be developed, that it was the heart of the nation, and that mismanagement now might be fatal to the interests of that country in the future when population poured in there and the resources were developed. I was simply asking them to build wisely and to lay the foundations properly, to guard the interests of this country with jealous care, and not to pass into the

hands of cormorant corporations and trusts lands that they ought to keep and to guard for the people. I hope that the Government will be animated by that spirit in dealing with this question, and when these 12,000,000 acres of land now granted shall lapse, I trust the Government will exercise the utmost care as to the manner in which they will grant any portion of those lands again to corporations to aid in the construction of railways. We shall have no fault to find with the Government, we shall have no complaint to make, if their policy in this regard is a prudent policy, if they proceed as fast as prudence requires, if they make grants to the extent that the interests of the country require—if they do this it will be well. But I think 42,000,000 acres of land have been granted in that country to promote the construction of railroads, when there are only a quarter of a million of inhabitants there, a quantity one-half as large as that granted in the United States to develop a region with a population of over 25,000,000, that fact bears on its face a refutation of the assertion that the policy of the Government has been justified in every respect. I hope that the discussion of this question, and I did not intend to discuss it except in a spirit of fairness and candour, will bear good fruit, and we may realize more fully than we have done the importance of dealing with our public domain in the North-West with care and prudence and in the interest of the people.

Motion agreed to.

I. C. R.—LIVE STOCK RATES.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved for :

Return showing: 1. Tariffs in force on live stock on the Intercolonial Railway, and all changes in same during the last five years; 2. Number of cattle shipped from Sackville, Nappan, Au Lac and Amherst stations each year, with destination, distinguishing between car load lots and less than car load lots.

He said : Some very important changes were made in the Intercolonial freight tariff on live stock some two or three years ago. I put a question on the Order Paper some weeks ago, asking for the last changes which were made in the tariff. The answer given me was that the tariff went into force on the 24th April, 1890. The changes, however, made in that were very slight and unimportant, and do not include the more important changes which I presume were made some time previously, and which was the information I desired to obtain. In the first part of this motion I have asked for the changes that have taken place during the last five years, and they no doubt will include the more important changes and the information sought for. Since these important changes were made we have had very frequent complaints in the County of Westmoreland from those engaged in the cattle trade, and also from a similar class of persons so engaged in the County of Cumberland. The claim is that these changes have operated very much to the disadvantage of small shippers. It is said that the changes are very considerable, that the increase in rates on single animals or on animals shipped in less lots than by the car load was from 75 to 100 per cent, while the rates on car load lots were changed very slightly. The effect, they claim, has been to very seriously injure the trade of the farmers and small dealers in those localities. Before those changes were made farmers were in the habit of dealing directly with the butchers in the large cities, such as St. John and Halifax. They were able, in dealing in that way directly, to obtain better prices for their stock and to ship them at convenient times. They claim now that the increase in the tariff has taken away any advantages which they had from this mode of carrying on their business, and that it has, indeed, placed the whole business in the hands of the drovers. It is claimed too that the business which was formerly done with the small towns has been very seriously affected, particularly with the towns of Chatham and Newcastle on the Miramichi. The markets in those places are limited. The dealers are not able to sell advantageously by car load lots, and the trade which was formerly done has been, they claim, largely interfered with and very much lessened by those changes in rates. It is also said that the effect has not been to the advantage of the Intercolonial. On this point I am not in a position at present to express an opinion ; but the claim set up by those in the trade is that the receipts of the railway since those changes were made are less than they were before. I have before me freight rates between Sackville and some of the points which I have mentioned. I find that the car load rate from Sackville to Halifax is $25, that the rate for a single animal over the same distance is $3.30. A car carries from 15 to 18 animals. Taking the small number, 15, this makes the rate on small lots just double the car load rate, and where a larger number are placed in the car, as is often the case in those localities, where the cattle are not very large, the proportion is increased from 100 to 150 per cent. We do not claim, of course, that single animals or small lots should be carried at the same rates as animals are carried by the car load, but it appears to some of us, at all events, that the disproportion is too great It will be seen that it costs a small shipper, who ships his animals singly, as much to convey eight animals from Sackville to the place I have named, as it would a large shipper to convey a car load. This gives the large shipper as against the small one an advantage of free carriage of eight or ten cattle on every car load. In the motion which I had placed on the Paper I limited the statement of places from which cattle are shipped to Sackville and Nappan ; I should like to include Au Lac and Amherst. These four stations will embrace the principal shipping districts in those two counties. My object in moving the motion is to get the information necessary in order to enable us to form a correct judgment as to whether there is any ground for these rates to be changed, and to show just what has been the effect on the cattle trade, and upon the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, of the changes in the tariff which were made.

Motion agreed to.

THE LATE PIERRE ALEXANDRE DENIS DE LA RONDE.

Mr. BERGERON moved for :

Copies of all papers, information, &c., respecting the succession of the late Pierre Alexandre Denis de la Ronde, duc de St. Simon, in his lifetime of the village of Valleyfield, in the County of Beauharnois, more especially—1. Of the deeds of sale bearing date the 19th December, 1771, and the 22nd August, 1778, by Dame Angélique Denis de St. Simon to the Crown of England ; 2. Copies of a judgment of date the 20th April, 1842, No. 406, Court of Queen's

Bench, Quebec—in which case Alexandre Thibaudière de la Ronde is plaintiff and Michel Tessier, defendant; 3. Copies of the acknowledgments and receipts which the deceased had given to the English Government, either on account of the leasing of his lands, or on account of the price of sale; 4. Copies of a lease for 99 years, running from 1778 to 1877, for the lands belonging to him; 6. Copies of documents showing who are the last proprietors of the property derived from this succession in the city of Quebec and the Seigniory of Rigaud.

He said: The gentleman whose name is mentioned in this motion was Mr. Pierre Alexandre Denis de la Ronde, duc de St. Simon, who died the other day in my county. He had a number of papers, some of which are believed to be in the Department of Justice or the Department of Finance, and it is asked that these papers should be obtained now. I know some years ago, I got some money for him in connection with certain titles to land, and I was told since, that many of these papers, titles, &c., had been sent to Quebec by an agreement between the Dominion and Provincial Governments, for matters concerning civil rights, because most of the properties on which he had claims are in the Province of Quebec. The old gentleman died the other day and his sons have consulted a lawyer about these claims, and this legal gentleman has written to me asking me to ask for these documents, so that if there are any here he may have them, and if they are not here we will be able to find them in possession of the Quebec Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The only connection which this gentleman had with the Department of Justice was the fact that he was entitled to rents which were commuted under the Act relating to the abolition of seignorial tenures. So far as I know the matter was closed years ago.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARA moved for:

Return showing the number of voters in the several electoral districts of the Province of British Columbia, and the number of voters in each polling district of the electoral district.

He said I would ask that this return be laid on the Table before the Redistribution Bill comes up for discussion

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all pleadings, orders, and judgments and other papers in, or in connection with, the suit of Logan vs. The City of Winnipeg, being a suit to test the constitutionality of the "Manitoba School Act."—(Mr. Watson.)

A copy of the report of the Inspector of Customs, N.S., in reference to the establishment of a port of entry at West Bay, in the County of Inverness.—(Mr. Cameron.)

A copy of the report of the Inspector of Nova Scotia, in reference to the establishment of a port of entry at Whycocomagh, in the County of Inverness.—(Mr. Cameron.)

THE CASE OF P. D. DODS.

Mr. CURRAN moved for:

Papers in connection with the case of P. D. Dods, and reports on loss of glaziers' diamonds in the customs warehouse at Montreal.

He said: I am glad that my hon. friend the present Minister of Militia, who was formerly the Minister of Customs, is here, as I wish to direct his attention to the facts of this case. I am satisfied that when he and the Minister of Justice will have taken cognizance of what has transpired in the matter, justice will be done to this firm. The facts are very few. It appears that the firm of P. D. Dods & Co. imported to Montreal, from England, a box containing glaziers' diamonds. The arrival of the goods was reported in Montreal, and Dods & Co. went to the customs house and there paid the duty on the diamonds imported. The customs carter gave a receipt for the goods at the Grand Trunk Railway station and brought them to the customs warehouse. The amount of money paid by Dods & Co. was $107 duty on about $350 worth of their diamonds. They asked for the delivery of their goods, but they were told they could not have them until they had been examined. For three days the firm called upon the authorities and asked for these goods, but on the third day they were informed that the box had been just opened and it was found to be empty. The department was communicated with and an enquiry was ordered under the superintendence of the late Mr. Lewis, surveyor of the port of Montreal. He took evidence on the matter and came to the conclusion that the goods had been stolen from the warehouse. That, it appears, did not satisfy the department, and another enquiry was ordered, and the surveyor came to the same conclusion as before. They were not necessarily stolen by any of the employés there, the warehouse being open at all hours of the day it was quite possible for a stranger to have gone in there and to have taken these goods. At all events, one of the reasons given by the surveyor of the port that the goods had been stolen, was, that from the state which the box which was supposed to contain these diamonds, was in, it having a nail projecting from the side, it was perfectly evident that a box in that condition would never have been accepted by the Government carter as being in good order, and that it must have been in good order at the time it was received at the warehouse. We made an application to the department for reimbursement, and it was thought only reasonable that, if the goods were not paid for, at all events the $107 which had been paid as duty upon the goods should be reimbursed. But it was all in vain, and we took a suit against the department. His Honour Mr. Justice Burbidge held that these goods, having been imported into the country, were liable for duty, that the money had been properly collected, and that under the law the Government were not responsible for the loss of the goods in any of the Government warehouses. The result was that the importer not only lost his goods, amounting to about $350, but lost his $107 paid for duty, and was mulcted in the costs, amounting to $300 more. That decision it was impossible to appeal from, owing to the amount at stake being less than $500. In any case I appear before Parliament to ask that the Government, now that the facts of the case are known, will take it into their consideration whether this firm should not be paid back their money under the peculiar circumstances of hardship which I have narrated. The customs law is extremely rigid. Any goods brought into the country are taken possession of by the authorities for the protection of the revenue, and under the 36th section of the Customs Act it is provided:

"Unless the goods are to be warehoused in the manner by this Act provided, the importer shall, at the same time, pay down or cause to be so paid, all duties upon all goods entered inwards; and the collector or other proper officer shall, immediately thereupon, grant his warrant for the unlading of such goods, and grant a permit for the conveyance of such goods further into Canada, if so required by the importer."

Section 37 provides:

"In default of such entry and landing, or production of the goods, or payment of duty, the officer of customs may convey the goods to a customs warehouse, or some secure place appointed by the collector for such purpose, there to be kept at the risk and charge of the owner."

So that the law provides distinctly and clearly that where the duty has not been paid the goods shall be taken possession of and kept at the warehouse or some secure place at the risk and cost of the owner. There is no such provision made where the duty has been paid, and the inference would naturally be that where the goods are taken possession of in such cases, it should be at the risk and cost of the Government. The authorities have not only the right to take the goods, but if they allow the goods to go out of their possession, and at any subsequent time a suspicion arises that the duties have not been paid, or that goods have been smuggled in cases containing other goods on which duties have been paid, the packages can be taken to the custom house and there examined, and if everything is found right, they are repacked at the cost of the Government and returned to the importer while on the other hand, if everything is not found exactly correct, the goods are confiscated and penalties imposed. If we take for granted that this harsh decision, which has been enforced by the Exchequer Court, is really the law of the land, we know that in a great many cases, where for instance proceedings have been instituted against the Government for damages on account of accidents on Government railways, and other cases where the Government was not technically responsible but where the circumstances were peculiarly hard in their nature, the Government took that hardship into consideration and paid the parties the damages they had incurred. Now, I do not suppose that in 25 years such a case as the present one would likely occur again. In view of the uncertainty of the law, in view of the fact that this man imported these goods and paid the duty in good faith, and waited for three days until those in charge had an opportunity of examining the box containing the diamonds, in view of all the circumstances that I have related, I am satisfied that my hon. friend will recommend that the money be reimbursed to the importer, and that substantial justice will be done. There is no equity whatever on the side of the Government in this matter. It is a case of the very greatest hardship, and I am sure my hon. friend who resisted this application was not aware of all that had taken place, or he would not have ordered the payment of these moneys. This matter has come up before the Board of Trade of Montreal, I believe, and I have been requested to bring it under the notice of the Government, and I am sure that I shall not have done so in vain.

Mr. BOWELL. There are no objections that I am aware of to these papers being laid before the House. This case illustrates one of the difficulties that arise in enforcing any customs law. I do not know that Canada is singular in that respect. All bonded goods are known to be held at the risk of the owner, and consequently, neither in Canada or elsewhere, has responsibility ever been assumed for the loss, whether in warehouse or in transmission from the vessel in which they are brought to the country, or from the railway station to the warehouse; and I think the House will readily understand that if any Government were to become responsible for the loss of goods under such circumstances, it would open the door to very great fraud and that there would be no end to the demands which would be made on the public exchequer on account of goods that may or may not have come into the country. If all that has been laid down by my hon. friend were to be carried out, all that it would be necessary for a rogue to do would be to pretend to import into the country very valuable goods and send them to the warehouse, and then, upon the examination of the package, if they are not found to be there, to claim, at once, compensation for the value of the goods. This principle has never been questioned. The practice that prevailed in the past, and which prevails now, is simply this: Goods are brought into the country, invoices are presented to the computing clerks, the rates of duty upon the various articles are checked, and the invoices then sent to the examining warehouses where the goods are examined. It may be quite true, for on that point I have no information, that it took three days to have them examined, but I think commercial men will readily understand that in many cases goods are necessarily kept much longer than three days in the warehouse before they can be examined. In a large port like Montreal, for instance, where the duties collected amount to from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 a year, and where the importation is principally confined to the spring and the fall, it would be utterly impossible, unless we had four or five times the accommodation that now exists in that large city, where the warehouse accommodation is pretty large as it is, we could not deliver the goods immediately upon their arrival. Certain delays must of necessity occur; and having made some enquiry into this particular branch of the subject, which has been discussed a good deal by boards of trade, I find that in Canada there is less delay in delivery of goods than in any other country of which I have received information, and the facilities for obtaining goods in Canada are fourfold greater than in the neighbouring Republic where the restrictions with reference to examination and delivery are much greater. If on the receipt of the invoices, upon which the rate of duty has been fixed by the appraiser or those whose duty it is to examine the goods, they find the goods are not there, they at once report; and then if, as is usual when the entry is made, the duty has been paid, the parties apply for a refund and a refund is made. Now, I have made enquiry as to whether an application had ever been made in this case for a refund of the duty. I understand the hon. member for Montreal says it was, but I have been informed by the commissioner, not an hour ago, that none had been made. I asked if these goods were not in the parcel when it was examined, and was informed they were not. The presumption, therefore, is that they never were imported, or if they were, they must have been stolen prior to being sent to the examining warehouse. I enquired why the same principle was not acted upon, as is followed in cases where the goods are not in accordance with the order, and where goods are returned, or where there is a less quantity in the parcel than appears

in the invoice, a refund of the duty being made in each case. The answer to that was, that the case had been taken to court at once, not for the purpose of obtaining a refund of the duty, but for the purpose of compelling the government to pay the value of the diamonds alleged to have been in this box. I quite agree that if there was evidence of the goods having actually been imported but stolen, no matter where, it was the duty of the Government to collect the amount paid as duty: but acting upon the principle that the diamonds did not come into Canada a recommendation was made some time ago to the Treasury Board for the refunding of the amount of duty paid, upon the presumption, not that the goods were stolen when in our possession or in transit from the vessel to the customs warehouse, but upon the presumption that the goods never were imported. As the judge properly said, if the goods were imported, the duty was legally and properly collected. If they never were imported, or were stolen on board ship or in transit from the vessel to the warehouse, the Government equitably ought not to retain the amount of duty paid. Acting upon that principle, the recommendation has been made for the refunding of the amount of duty paid. How the amount could have been $107 I am at a loss to know, if the value of the diamonds were only $300 or $350, because if they came in the rough they would be free, and if they came in manufactured or set the duty would be from 20 to 35 per cent. I am quite satisfied from the practical experience I have had, that to change the law in the direction indicated by the board of trade would not be practical; and I am inclined to think they made their representations to the department without a full knowledge of all the facts. To change the law in the direction asked would be to place the Government in the position of being mulcted in very large sums of money upon goods never brought into the country. The whole system of bonding goods is for the benefit of the merchants. The principle upon which all customs laws is founded is that duty should be collected at once on the arrival of the goods: and it is in order to facilitate trade and assist the merchants by not compelling them to pay large sums in duty for goods which they do not require to put on the market for some time, that the system of bonding warehouses was established. I hope that the action of the department in making this recommendation to remit the duty will be looked upon favourably by the Governor in Council.

Mr. CURRAN. What about the costs?

Mr. BOWELL. We will let the lawyers settle that among them. We will try to do justice to the importer, acting on the presumption that these goods never came into the country, and he may settle with his lawyers who advised him to go into court in this matter. He or they must be the sufferers.

Mr. CURRAN. In reply to my hon. friend, I would just direct his attention to the English Act, section 85:

"If any goods shall be taken out of any warehouse without due entry, the occupier of such warehouse shall forthwith pay the duties due upon such goods; and every person taking out any goods from any warehouse without payment of duty, or who shall aid, assist, or be concerned therein, and every person who shall destroy or embezzle any goods duly warehoused, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour and shall, upon conviction, suffer the punishment by law inflicted in cases of misdemeanour; but if such person shall be an officer of customs or excise not acting in the due execution of his duty, and shall be prosecuted to conviction by the importer, consignee or proprietor of such goods, no duty shall be payable for or in respect of such goods and the damage occasioned by such destruction or embezzlement shall, with the sanction of the commissioners of the treasury, be repaid or made good to such importer, consignee or proprietor by the Commissioner of Customs."

My hon. friend has suggested that it would be a very dangerous thing for the public at large to make any change with regard to the stringency of our regulations, and he says that any person might make a fictitious entry of goods which had not been imported at all, and the Government would be liable through his dishonest acts. That is all very well in regard to the case of rogues, but in the case of a firm occupying a respectable position in the commercial world it would not happen, and it is quite competent for the authorities to make enquiries as to the standing of a particular person who may have a claim against the Government as P. D. Dods had in this case. I think the Government incurs very little danger in dealing with people of known responsibility. My hon. friend has stated that there is nothing in the department to show that any application was made for a refund of that duty. If there are no papers there, I have a recollection of going there twenty-five or thirty times to get the matter settled before action was finally taken, but no offer was made to refund the duty which I think was improperly exacted. Two investigations took place at the instance of the department, and the matter was again brought before the notice of my hon. friend. I am sorry that my hon. friend, who states he is going to recommend that the $107 should be restored to the pocket of my constituent, has not also thought it consistent with his magnanimous disposition to reimburse the costs which have been paid, which would be only fair. I am satisfied that when this comes before the Minister of Justice, who understands these things thoroughly, he will see that the matter has been dealt with unjustly, and that it is unfair that this respectable merchant should be mulct, especially as the department is not likely to be troubled with anything of the same kind for a quarter of a century to come.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not state that there were no papers in the department, but that I was informed, just before coming to the House, that no application had been made for a refund of the duties that were paid. I would also call the attention of the House to the extract from the English statute which was read by my hon. friend, in which there was nothing which would conflict with our own law.

Mr. CURRAN. The only thing proven was that the goods were stolen—I do not say by any one in the department—but that they were stolen from the warehouse department. I know most of the men there, and I believe them to be honest men, but two reports gave the opinion that they were so taken.

Mr. BOWELL. The surveyor's report was, that after examining the case, he had come to the conclusion that it had not been shown whether the goods were taken from the case after or before their arrival. There was not a particle of evidence to

show that the contents of the packages were interfered with after they came to the department.

Motion agreed to.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

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

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TISDALE. I have a few remarks to offer in connection with this Bill which I shall conclude with a motion. We have had the hon. gentleman introducing a Bill of a similar sort every session since I have had the honour of sitting in this Parliament or the last Parliament. It is true that the Bill as now introduced is much smaller than it was in the first place, but I do not think there is any clause in this Bill that should occupy the attention or receive the assent of this House. Every provision of the Bill except two items has already been regulated by the Provincial Legislature of Ontario. I have not examined the other provincial laws, but I apprehend there has also been legislation in the same respect in the other provinces. The hon. gentleman who introduces this Bill is a very strong advocate of provincial rights upon many questions. I have had the pleasure of listening to him many times in my province, and sometimes at great length in provincial elections, and I have never found a greater advocate of provincial rights. I am also an advocate of provincial rights within proper bounds. I deprecate any interference by this Government or this Legislature with the Local Legislature within proper bounds, and I think it is to be deprecated that, in these matters where no party politics is concerned, any gentleman should interfere or try to induce the House to interfere with matters of provincial rights, and more especially when these matters are an interference with what may be called moral rights, such as the regulation of the Sabbath day. I claim liberty of conscience in all matters. I have always in public or in private endeavoured to get people to understand that, while I have views of my own, I am willing that all others shall exercise their views as they see fit. In this Bill, except in regard to the management of the canals and the Government railways, there is not an item which any gentleman who has paid the slightest attention to the legislative powers of the provinces and of the Legislature will not say the Provincial Legislatures have the power to deal with. I have examined the law in every particular that this Bill pretends to affect, and I wish to repeat that the Province of Ontario has already passed laws in respect to those questions. Now, I say it would be an unwise, I do not think it would be too strong a term to say, it would be a deplorable thing, if this House, even if we have jurisdiction, were to interfere with the views of the Provincial Legislatures as expressed by them or as may be expressed by them; it would be a deplorable thing, in my opinion, if this House were for one moment to entertain such a proposition. As to the question of jurisdiction there are, no doubt, differences of opinion. I do not propose to argue one way or the other upon that, because I think the members of this committee and the members of this House will agree with the proposition that as to matters where Provincial Legislatures have jurisdiction, we should leave them to be regulated according to the sentiment, and the feeling, and the conscience of the different provinces having control over them. Now, with regard to the management of the canals and the Government railways, I am satisfied to leave it in the hands of whatever Government may be in power. If hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, I would be quite satisfied to leave in their hands the control and management of these public works on the Sabbath day, in such a manner as they might deem proper. I say it is a reflection upon the Government, it is a reflection upon the parties, I care not which party may be in power, to say that it is necessary to ask this House to pass a Bill compelling the Government of the day to follow a certain line of conduct in reference to the public service on the Sabbath day. I beg, therefore, without further remarks, to move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill which is now under the consideration of the committee, as the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) very truly says, is a Bill that I have presented to the House on two occasions before this, or a Bill of a similar character. This, however, is the first action taken by the House of Commons on this Bill. The Bill as now presented was reported by a select committee last session, and that select committee, with all deference to my hon. friend from South Norfolk, took a view of this matter quite different from his own. The committee eliminated from the Bill every portion of it that came within the purview of provincial legislation, and retained only such features as, in their opinion, pertained to Dominion legislation. There were six sections of the Bill eliminated, there were four sections retained, and the four sections retained by that committee are the sections now under the consideration of this House. The first of these sections is that with reference to the publication of Sunday newspapers. Now, my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, while not agreeing with me as to the propriety of making this provision with regard to the publication of Sunday newspapers, did agree that it was within the jurisdiction of this House and of this Government to make the provision that this Bill asks shall be made. With regard to the canals, of course, it is not necessary to inform my hon. friend that the Provincial Legislatures of this Dominion have no jurisdiction whatever in the matter; and when he says he considers it a reflection upon the Government that the House of Commons should define what the Government is at liberty to do with regard to the canals, I quite disagree with the hon. gentleman. I think that this House is charged with certain functions, that it is not necessary to delegate its functions to the Ministry, and that it is no reflection upon the Ministry, no reflection upon the Government of the day, to discuss the question temperately, and after discussion to arrive at a decision, as representatives of the people, as to what policy the Government shall follow with regard to the management of the canals. Now, the Minister of Justice was kind enough to indicate to me same days ago the action he proposed to take with regard to the second section of the Bill referring to the canals, and while the proposition of that hon. gentleman does not go so far as I could wish, while it comes short of what I believe to be the proper

requirements of Divine law and a proper regard for the welfare of the subject in securing to him his seventh day's rest, yet I shall be glad to accept his proposition if I cannot get more. I intended, when this Bill was referred to the committee, to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and having accepted that suggestion and secured what he was willing to grant, if I could get no more, I would perforce, have been satisfied with that. Now, I do not think the hon. member for South Norfolk, in taking the position he does upon this Bill, will commend himself very strongly to the christain sentiment of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. Yah!

Mr. CHARLTON. I hear a derisive yah! The Dominion of Canada is a part of the British Empire, and the British Empire is a christian nation, and the Queen of this Empire is declared to be the Queen and Defender of the Faith by the grace of God; and there are laws upon the Statute-book of every British colony, there are laws upon the Statute-book of Great Britain, providing for the observance of the Lord's Day; and to assert gravely in this House that it is derogatory to the dignity of the Government of this country, and a piece of interference on the part of this Dominion Legislature with the rights of the people, to make provision within our jurisdiction for the proper observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest, and to act in consonance with legislation of the Empire, is a position I am surprised to see the hon. gentleman take. The hon. gentleman alludes with some facetiousness to my want of success in presenting this Bill. Sir, I am accustomed to that kind of raillery. I introduced a Bill into this House some years ago and it was hooted out of the House. I introduced it again, and it was treated with a little less disrespect and contumely; I introduced it a third time, and it secured a small measure of respect; I introduced it the fourth time, and it passed, but it was thrown out by the Senate; I introduced it the fifth time, and it passed here and the Senate treated it with some measure of regard; I introduced it the sixth time, and it passed this House and passed the Senate; and the leader of this House, the Minister of Justice, has since approved of the features of that Bill and has even gone further than the Bill at first asked the House of Commons to go, although the Bill was at first scouted out of this House. Now, the Bill I present to-day is a Bill of more importance than that; it is a Bill that commends itself as thoroughly to the christian and moral sentiment of this country as that Bill did. Hon. gentlemen in this House who are opposed to this kind of legislation, may rise and cast discredit upon the sentiment that backs the Bill, but if God spares my life, if that Bill is thrown out to-day, it will come in here again, it will come in as long as I have the honour to sit in this House, until that Bill becomes law. In introducing this Bill I am sustained by the christian sentiment of Canada, by the worth of Canada, and I can inform the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and I can inform other members of this House, that it would be well for them at least to treat this matter with respect and to give to men who have convictions upon this subject the benefit of supposing they are acting honestly in pursuing their convictions and are worthy of fair treatment by this House. Of course at this stage of the matter, the Bill is in the hands of this committee. I do not know what course the leader of the Government intends to take, whether he intends to implement his promise to me, embodied in the memorandum I hold in my hand, which covers the amendment he proposes to make to section 2, or not. Of course, I am in his hands. If he proposes to withdraw from that arrangement, and if he declines to carry it out, and if the majority of the committee choose to rise, the Bill is lost. I rest the matter there; I rest it, first, on the decision of the Minister of Justice; and, second, on the decision of the committee as to what should be done.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. So far as I am concerned I must answer the reference which the hon. gentleman has made to me at this moment. I beg to say to him that so far as our understanding is concerned, I adhere to it. The understanding was simply this: I was disposed to accept, and am still disposed to accept, a provision similar in principle to that embodied in the second section of his Bill, but to make an amendment which the hon. gentleman holds in his hands. Personally I am unfavourable to the other sections of the Bill, the reasons for this I expressed when the Bill was before the House last session, not because the Bill is beyond our powers, for I think it is not beyond our powers, but because the subjects which are legislated upon here can be likewise legislated upon by the Provincial Parliaments, and can be legislated upon by them with more effect and with more knowledge of the local circumstances than we possess. If we take the first section, we have an illustration of what I mean. There is no Sunday newspaper published in any part of Canada, except one in British Columbia, I am told. The Bill will prevent the publishing of any Sunday newspaper. I think it is more within the duty of the Legislature of British Columbia to say whether that paper should be suppressed or not. I think it is more competent for the Provincial Legislatures in other sections of the country to say whether Sunday newspapers ought to be originated or not. So far as I am concerned, I am against the publishing of Sunday newspapers; but I do not think it wise for this Parliament to legislate on this subject, and if it were left to my choice, I would prefer very much that several of these provisions should be left to the Provincial Legislatures to adopt, if they please, for when they were adopted by those Legislatures they would be adopted from considerations of policy, of which they are better judges than we. But as regards the second section of the Bill, I stand to my promise to the hon. gentleman, and if he will accept my amendment I am in favour of the clause embodying that principle.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am willing to adopt the amendment of the Minister of Justice in regard to the second section.

Mr. TISDALE. I cannot allow the lecture which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) saw fit to address to me to pass unnoticed. I leave it to the intelligence and fair-play of the House to decide whether during his whole remarks he did not endeavour to place me in a false position before the public. Did I say anything that any fair-minded man could distort into the idea that I did not treat the measure with respect?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TISDALE. I think not. Did I say anything of a boastful nature?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TISDALE. I say no. I did not treat the measure with disrespect. On the contrary, I showed the insincerity of the hon. gentleman, either here or when he ascends the platform in the ridings of the county, from which we both come. If I am correct in the principle I advocate, that the Provincial Legislatures should deal with this matter, it is extremely unfair upon a matter on which public feeling is so strong, and properly so, namely, Sabbath observance, to attempt to place me in a false position. But was there any want of respect when I took the highest possible grounds that can be taken on any question of legislation in this country, that where subjects are properly relegated to the provinces, the question of dealing with them should be left to the provinces? When the hon. gentleman assumes to speak for the christian sentiment of this country, for what does he speak? The hon. gentleman placed himself in a most inconsistent position with regard to christian sentiment of this country when he endeavoured to force on the people, whose religious feelings were different from his own, action which they did not think fair to themselves. So long ago as when the Separate school question was brought up in the Province of Ontario the hon. gentleman was one of those who joined with his associates in bitterly attacking the Separate school system. I am a Protestant as he is, but I believe, under the circumstances, that the Catholics are entitled to Separate schools, and I never was sorry for having supported them. When the hon. gentleman rises here, and when he declares that I am attacking the christian sentiment of the country, I ask what is the christian sentiment for which he speaks? christian sentiment does not belong to any kind of man or to any legislation, but it is that broad right that our thoughts and feelings, on moral questions, should be free and should not be questioned. Did I question them? On the contrary; and if christian sentiment is not broad enough to cover this view, then I do not agree with it. I said that all the people in the provinces should have the right to regulate their own affairs in regard to this christian sentiment. That cannot be gainsaid. I have not boasted of my christian achievements. The Bill to which the hon. gentleman has referred may have been, in his opinion, an excellent Bill, but there was nothing in it that attacked the foundations of the constitution as between the Provincial and the Dominion Legislatures, and I do not understand it to be christian sentiment to induce people to follow sentiments which they do not accept. At all events, if it is christian sentiment which has been presented to us, I have never been able to embrace that sort of christianity, although I claim to be a christian equally with the hon. member. The hon. gentleman declares he will keep on introducing the Bill each year. Let him do so. If it is wrong the people's representatives will keep on throwing out the measure every year. Hon. members of the House are sufficiently independent, although party ties are so strong, to unite on moral questions and reject such a measure as that now under consideration, and unless proper justification can be adduced for it by the hon. gentleman, he may bring in his Bill as many times as we sit here and it will be rejected. A word as to his last point. The hon. gentleman claims that this Parliament has the right to regulate the running of Government railways and to control operations on the canals on Sunday. I agree with him that we have the right to do so; but I say that not only as regards this Government, but the Government controlled by hon. gentlemen opposite, it would be a reflection to pass such a measure, for there is no cause or complaint to be remedied, and both the Government of Mr. Mackenzie and the present Government so controlled the canals that no cause of complaint existed. If this Parliament tied down the Government by a strict set of rules, an occasion might arise when the restrictions would appear to be monstrous, and when there would be no discretion left to the Government. We have not, perhaps, that hon. gentleman's sentiment of christianity, we may not have his peculiar tenets on this question, but I am satisfied that we have, among the leaders of the great political parties, sufficient of that sentiment to guard all that should be guarded. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to place me in a false position. I am quite prepared to leave this question with the liberal-minded christian people, if it is explained to them in a proper way so that they will understand it, and I believe they will not thank the hon. gentleman for trying to force on other people his views. Or if they should, they ought to be checked, because I believe that each province should have within itself the control over these matters. I also believe that the leaders of both political parties in this country are sufficiently God-fearing and sufficiently upright to see that the Sabbath day is not degraded in the management of our public works.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that the question of Sabbath observance had been fully dealt with by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario. I remember that after the question had been discussed in this House, a somewhat similar Bill to the one brought before this Parliament but more restrictive in its provisions, was introduced in the Ontario Legislature and after some amendments became law. The contention there was, that it should be the duty of each province to enforce, so far as it was considered in accord with the consciences of the people, and its practicability, the observance of the Lord's Day. I am very strongly in favour, and I have always been in favour of preventing the carrying on of business on the Sabbath, and more especially am I against Sunday newspapers and their circulation throughout the country. I cannot understand, however, that it would be any more wicked for me or any other printer to begin work at 6 o'clock in order to print the Monday morning's paper, than if work was commenced only at 9 o'clock at night. I do not know, as we understand the Sabbath, whether it is more wicked for a man to begin work immediately after church or in the morning, than it is if he begins work at 9 o'clock at night and works until 12; or, in other words, that he is to be religious for 21 hours of the 24, which are supposed to constitute the Sabbath, and as wicked as he pleases during the three hours between 9 and 12 o'clock. However, to my mind, this Bill seems to be of a sort of hermaphrodite character; it is

neither one thing nor the other. You provide by it that a man shall have to observe the Sabbath during certain portions of the day, and you allow him to violate it during the remaining hours. The Bill provides also that one milk train may be run on the Sabbath. Well, is a milk cart to be prohibited? If it is necessary that the people residing in a city should have the milk brought to them on a train on the Sabbath day, is it any more wicked that a farmer living immediately adjacent to the city should bring in a supply of milk in his cart to the doors of the consumers? Then I find no provision in the Bill for the closing of post offices or telegraph offices on the Sabbath day, though they are open now during certain hours. My principal object in rising was to point out one or two objections to the Bill, and to congratulate the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the 7th clause. He has evidently become a convert to the principle which in the past he has condemned most vigorously in this House. The moiety system of distributing fines and penalties among informers is one for which the Government, and more especially the Customs Department, have been most severely censured and condemned by the hon. gentleman. However, he has now carried that principle a little further in this Bill than the Government have ever gone. While he condemns the distribution of the penalties imposed for violating the Customs Act by giving the informers one-third, and thereby creating an incentive for them to inform, and to become, as they have been repeatedly described by hon. gentlemen opposite, spies upon the business people of this country; the hon. gentleman provides in his Bill that the informer in the case of a violation of this law shall have one-half the penalty. The hon. gentleman has carried the moiety principle much further than the former Government or the present Government ever attempted. If it be wrong to provide an incentive to people to inform on violators of the law, in respect to the Customs Department, surely it must be equally wrong to compensate informers in respect to this law. At least, I am unable to discover where the virtue is in informing upon a man who happened to deliver a pound of meat on the Sabbath day, or sell a newspaper, and give the informer one-half the penalty, while it is said to be wrong to give one-third of the penalty to the informer on a man who had violated the law by smuggling goods into the country on any day, whether it be a Sunday or a week day. However, in this, as in most things, I am afraid some gentlemen in this House, as well as out of it, are too apt to argue the principle involved in this clause, more for the purpose of finding fault with the Government of the day than for the purpose of expressing an opinion against the principle itself. If it is wrong in one case, it is wrong in the other. However, I am of the opinion that it is quite right, if this Bill should become law, that there should be an incentive to those who desire to have it enforced by informing upon the law-breakers. If this Bill is to become law, let us have it a little more stringent than it is now, or throw it out altogether.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I was much pleased when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) first introduced his Bill last session, because I believed it was a good Bill. The aim of the Bill was not to interfere with any man's religious convictions, be they what they may; neither did it aim at compelling any man to observe the Lord's Day. The chief aim of the Bill, I think, was to secure to the employés of the Government, on railways and canals, in the Post Office Department and in the public service generally, the whole Sunday rest. It has been contended that this Bill was unnecessary, that it encroached upon provincial rights; but if this question is to be dealt with, so far as it relates to our railways, our post offices and our canals, it must be dealt with by this House and this Government. If the Bill as originally introduced had been enacted, I have no doubt it would have been a great boon to thousands of Government employés who are now robbed of their Sunday's rest, that rest which is so essential to their physical well-being, and deprived of all opportunity of attending Divine worship and receiving religious instruction. Many of these employés have been long anxiously looking for the relief promised by this Bill. They know by sad experience that a continued round of toil and drudgery, without a Sunday's rest, is not only disastrous to their physical well-being, impairing their health and shortening their lives, but is demoralizing in all its tendencies, and deprives them of many comforts and blessings which would otherwise brighten their lives and make them better and purer. Now, with this Bill as amended, and as proposed to be amended, I must say I have very little sympathy. If it is to be cut down to section 2, the title of the Bill becomes a misnomer. It does nothing whatever for the employés, but leaves them exactly where they were before. As I understand, the canals are now closed during a portion of the Lord's Day, under an Order in Council, and this Bill will simply provide for closing the canals during a portion of the day, and keeping them open during another portion. It does nothing to advance or promote the interests of Sabbath observance, and what is worse, it completely ignores the Sunday labour and Sunday desecration which is carried on now on our railways and in other departments of the public service. My contention is simply this, that it is our duty to see that the employés of the Government are protected in the enjoyment of a complete Sunday rest, and I think we should beware how we ignore or trample under foot the Divine law by depriving our fellow men, so many of them, of that day's rest which God has given them.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This question may be viewed from one of two aspects, the aspect of christianity and the aspect of social economy. So far it has been almost entirely discussed from the aspect of christianity. While I hope the day may never come when the teachings of christianity will cease to be the ruling spirit in both Government and the people of the British Empire, at the same time I may point out to the hon. Minister of Militia that there is no principle from which, if pushed to unreasonable lengths, a *reductio ad absurdum* may not be drawn. His argument may be illustrated in this way. He himself, I am sure, would not allow those in his employ in private life to do any unnecessary work on Sunday; but at the same time

he would not think it wrong that they should cook his dinner or make his bed or perform any of the other functions necessary to civilized life. The same argument would apply to the newspapers to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. Logically and strictly it may perhaps be as much a breach of Sunday to work after 9 o'clock in the evening as before 12 o'clock in the morning; but to apply the same rule in both cases would not be reasonable. Even this Bill admits it to be necessary that a newspaper employé should work after 9 o'clock on Sunday evening if he is required to do so, and exempts him from any legal consequences for doing so; but at the same time it secures for him the enjoyment of the day as well as any other class of employés. But the great object of the Bill, so far as I am inclined to support it, lies in this, that there are a certain class of employés who require the protection of the law, because in no other way can they possibly obtain protection. It is an old saying that we must deal with corporations on a different principle from individuals, because corporations have neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be saved; and while we give them great powers and privileges, it is necessary that there should be some limits to their powers and privileges. I allude especially to the case of railways. Now, the railways in this country enjoy many extraordinary powers and privileges. In fact, it is sometimes hard to say who governs this country, whether the gentlemen sitting on the right of the Speaker or a great railway corporation. But at all events, we are bound to protect the employés of those corporations by law, because they are at present unable to obtain protection in any other way. Now, I am satisfied from my own observations, that the railway companies impose upon their employés a great deal of Sunday labour that is not necessary, and that is the reason why I will vote against the motion that the committee rise. Where I live I constantly see trains passing on Sunday, which I know are not necessary, and the sending of which involves a large amount of labour from which the employés should be protected. I trust that this Bill may go to the committee, and that the clause in regard to railways may be adopted in some form or other, for any one who knows anything of the subject knows how difficult it is for any employés of the railway companies to obtain redress if they are called on to work. They are perfectly helpless; there is no way in which they can obtain redress unless from the strong hands of the law. It is all very fine to talk about religious liberty and all that sort of thing; but at the same time the object of our legislation is to give equal rights to all classes of the community, whether they are employés of private individuals or of great corporations; and I speak chiefly in the interest of the employés of great corporations who are not and will not be liable to those influences which control the actions of private individuals. Farmers are not allowed to send their employés into the fields on Sunday, though we can think of circumstances in which it is reasonable that they should do so; but railway corporations have a control over their men such as no private employer has, and, therefore, the law should step in and give these men that protection which they would not otherwise have. I shall vote against the motion that the committee rise, because I think, with regard to a measure of this kind, some step ought to be taken to prevent what is an abuse on the part of railway corporations, who compel their men, under circumstances, which would not be tolerated in the case of any private individual, to work on Sundays.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, before you put that motion. The hon. member for South Norfolk, in moving that the committee do now rise, did not perhaps realize that he proposed ignominiously to kick out of this High Court of Parliament a measure which interests a large portion of very respectable class of the people, and that in making this motion he seeks to cast contumely and reproach upon a class of people whom, upon consideration, he might be disposed to treat with more courtesy. The hon. gentleman has a very great regard to-night for provincial rights. I quite sympathize with him in that sentiment, and I certainly would desire to refrain from advancing or attempting to advance any legislation in this House which would be an infringement on the rights of any person in this Dominion; and the Bill now before the committee is a Bill from which, as I have said already, every feature was eliminated that pertained in any sense to the jurisdiction of Provincial Legislatures, with the single exception of the Sunday newspaper; and I will explain briefly in a moment why that feature was maintained. I presume the hon. gentleman will not venture to assert in this House that Provincial Legislatures have jurisdiction over the canals belonging to this Dominion or our railway traffic, or that this House, in making provision with reference to the management of canals which are Dominion property or with reference to the management of railways and the traffic upon them, which are of a national character, is in any way infringing upon provincial rights. The hon. gentleman would hardly be guilty of so great an absurdity as to make such an assertion There is but one feature of this Bill that can be said to pertain to legislation within the purview of provincial legislatures, and that is the feature with regard to Sunday newspapers. We have been informed by the Minister of Justice that this Parliament has jurisdiction in that respect, that it is perfectly competent for this House to deal with that question, and I may inform the hon. gentleman that the committee to which was referred this Bill, in considering the question as to the propriety of retaining the section with regard to Sunday newspapers, took this view of the case. First, they held that it was desirable that there should be a uniformity of law throughout the Dominion with regard to that matter, for the reason that the Government of this country has control of the copyright laws and the transmission of printed matter through the mails, and has control of the introduction of literature into this country through the customs. For these and other reasons not necessary to mention, they felt it was in the highest degree desirable that the law with regard to Sunday newspapers should be a uniform law, and I am happy to hear the declaration of the Minister of Justice that, so far as his sympathies and his own private views are concerned, he is opposed to the publication of Sunday newspapers; and I take this occasion of expressing my obligations to that hon. gentleman for fair treatment and courtesy in all cases where I have had

anything to do which has brought me into contact with him. The Provincial Legislature or Government of Ontario have not met this case. They have made no provisions with regard to the publication of Sunday newspaper. I hold in my hand a Sunday newspaper published in the city of Toronto by the Conservative candidate for East York, the *Sunday World* of Toronto, the harbinger of an evil swarm of foul birds which may follow in its wake. I remember when the first Sunday newspaper was published in the United States, which Horace Greeley, the editor of the *Tribune*, characterized as a social demon. When one newspaper office publishes a Sunday newspaper, others are forced to follow suit; and if the *Sunday World* is continued in Toronto, the day is not distant when every newspaper in that city will have its Sunday edition. If we are to deal with this matter, we must deal with it now, and as a Dominion matter, just as we would with the copyright question, the introduction of immoral literature, or its transmission through the mails. The hon. gentleman in his remarks with respect to provincial jurisdiction, did not touch upon the case at all, because we are dealing with matters now exclusively pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Dominion. When the hon. gentleman ignominiously proposes to kick this Bill out of court, does he know whom he is insulting by this summary treatment of the measure? Perhaps he thought he was affecting only the interests of one poor Grit on this side; but there are others interested in preventing Sunday desecration. Every church court, synod, general assembly, conference or presbytery, and the Catholic prelates, Archbishop Fabre and Cardinal Taschereau, have expressed themselves in favour of Sunday observance and Pope Leo XIII is also on record in its favour. I could enumerate ministers, bishops, cardinals, archbishops, jurists, statesmen, labour movement leaders, all over the world, who favour a law such as the one we have under discussion, yet the hon. gentleman moves that the committee do now rise and treat this Bill with the utmost ignominy and contempt. He asks that the committee refuse to consider a single provision embodied in this Bill, and that we should say to every church court, synod, general assembly, conference and other church bodies, that in advocating a Sunday observance law, in sending their petitions and passing their resolutions in its favour, they were not acting in a way worthy of the notice of Parliament. He asks that we should treat all their fulminations, petitions, expressions of sentiment, with the utmost unconcern, and refuse to consider for one moment any provision in this Bill which has received their sanction. That is the position that the hon. member for South Norfolk takes. It is one I hardly supposed a gentleman of his acuteness would have voluntarily taken. I am sorry he has done so, and I hardly believe the House will concur with him and treat this Bill as he asks that it should be treated. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman's course will meet with approval in his constituency. I am sure some of his constituents have deeply at heart the passage of a measure such as that now proposed. A few words with reference to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Militia. That hon. gentleman has criticised this Bill as hermaphrodite measure, as being neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring in his estimation. It sacrifices, he says, the principles of Sabbath observance; it is not stringent enough; if he went in for a Sabbath Observance Bill, he would give us something stronger. I am quite willing to second the hon. gentleman's views in any respect in this regard. The Bill itself is not such a one in all respects as I would desire, but in arranging a measure of this kind, you have to conciliate divergent views, you have to compromise your own views, or you cannot get the Bill reported by the special committee or secure the support of the majority of the House of Commons. Some provisions have to be made which people in favour of strict observance would not be likely to approve. Such is the provision with regard to labour on newspapers on Sunday evenings after 9 o'clock, and also with regard to milk delivery trains. As the hon. member for Muskoka says, we have to take various circumstances into consideration. We cannot adopt the strict old Jewish method of keeping the Sabbath. We have to decide what constitutes a work of necessity and mercy, because under the christian dispensation, works of necessity and mercy are always excepted, and it may be that a little work, two or three hours of a Sunday evening, is a work of necessity. It may be that the sending of milk trains to the city, where the supply of fresh milk is necessary to the welfare and health of the people, is a work of necessity. I think it is. There are various other things which some strict Sabbathterians might not deem properly a work of necessity, and the Bill to-night is broad and liberal in its provisions, not going so far as strict sabbatherians would like, a Bill not insuring strict religious observance at all, but designed to secure to the labourer his civil right of enjoying one day's rest in the seven and to protect him from the exactions of the employer and the capitalist. The hon. Minister of Militia drew attention to the feature of the Bill with regard to the moiety of fines, and referring to some remarks made by myself on a former occasion about the custom-house system of making seizures and allowing officials to share in the fines imposed. That is a matter not pertinent to the consideration of the Bill; and although I might easily show that the two cases are not parallel, I will not stop to do so. But he goes on to make various criticisms as to the details of the Bill in other respects. All I have to say about that matter is this: The proper time to discuss the different clauses is when we are in committee. The Bill is not presented as a perfect measure, and every clause may be amended at the discretion of the House. But it does not follow because an hon. member may consider this or that section incomplete or requiring amendment, that the Bill should not be considered at all, but if there is anything in this Bill worthy of the consideration of this House, if the amendment the Minister of Justice proposes is worthy our consideration, or if anything whatever in it is worthy of consideration, let the Bill be considered in committee, let the Bill stand upon its merits in the committee, let each section of the Bill be adopted or rejected, as the case may be, in the committee, but do not refuse the Bill that degree of courtesy which entitles it to the consideration of the committee. Do not ignominiously throw the Bill out and in that way flout every man in the Dominion who believes, either for civil or religious reasons, in a Sabbath day's rest being secured for the toiler. I present these reasons and

submit the Bill to this committee, trusting it will not be treated in the humiliating and ignominious manner proposed by the hon. member for South Norfolk, but that it will receive the consideration of the committee. If there is anything in the measure worthy of consideration, adopt it. If not, reject it, but at least give it the courtesy of consideration.

Committee rose.

COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE ELLIOTT.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Lister :

That a copy of the petition laid upon the Table of this House from Thomas Hobbs and others, complaining of the conduct of William Elliott, Esquire, county judge of Middlesex, in relation to the revision of the voters' list for the Electoral District of the City of London, be forthwith furnished him for his information, and to enable him to make such statement or answer to the charges therein contained as he may deem proper, and that the said petition and any such answer as the said judge may make be referred to a special committee of this House, to enquire into the truth of the several allegations therein, with a view of finding whether such charges should be investigated by a commission.

Mr. MULOCK. The petition which was laid upon the Table of this House on the 30th of March last, contains certain grave charges reflecting upon the conduct of a dignitary in the service of this country, the judge of the County Court of the County of Middlesex, not strictly in his capacity as a County Court judge but in his capacity as a judge interpreting the Franchise Act. That petition received due publicity through the journals of this country. It was endeavoured at an early date to bring it to the attention of this House in order that the serious charges involved in it might at the earliest possible moment receive that consideration which they demanded ; but for certain reasons, which appear to justify the Administration in taking the course they did, or in consequence of a ruling which hardly seemed to be in harmony with precedent, but to which the House notwithstanding bowed submissively, the consideration of the petition was not given that priority to which its importance entitled it, and through the tedious process of postponement, which the rules of this House require, it is now approaching almost the close of the session before one of the most serious charges that could be brought before Parliament is investigated. The Government is responsible in this regard. The Government had it in its own power, by acquiescence, to allow this motion to be entertained at an earlier date, and after succeeding in having it postponed to this late hour, I would not be surprised to find them complain that the lateness of the session is a sufficient reason for dismissing the application. I am surprised that up to this moment, notwithstanding the great publicity that has been given to this petition, and the charges involved, not one person in this House, or out of it, has been found courageous or rash enough to give a denial to the charges. They stand before the country to-day uncontradicted by any one in the House or out of it ; and if ever there was a confession of weakness it was furnished by the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has ventured to defend the action of the judge, and who, I suppose, ransacked all possible resources of ingenuity in order to discover reasons for denying this application. His defences were very similar to those that cropped up on another important occasion to which the rules of this House will not allow me more particularly to refer ; but when I heard the exceptions taken that the charges were too vague, that they were not specific, that the petitioners were not respectable, and so on, I was very much reminded of the excuses offered when a motion was made on a certain occasion to investigate charges against the Postmaster General. Mr. Speaker, what are the charges made against this judicial officer, and how did the member for East Lambton (Mr. Monerieff) endeavour to controvert them ? Without quoting at this stage the exact language of the petition, it is sufficient to say that the petition was presented to this House under the signature of a large number of respectable citizens of the city of London, a petition which contained on its face the most specific charges that could be very well framed. I fail to understand how the English language could supply more apt terms for the description of the offences. The offences set forth in that petition are, that this judge was partisan in the discharge of his duties, and acted in a partisan manner, that he publicly denounced a certain political party in the city of London, that he publicly stated that means would be found for seating Mr. Carling ; that this judge pending the determination of this question, pending the election, and prior to his giving judgment, wrote inflammatory or partisan articles and published them in the press of the city of London ; that all these things were done by him whilst he was seized of this question in his judicial capacity, and bound as a man of honour to administer justice impartially between the two parties, and so far as any action on his part went, to keep his mind judicially unbiassed, and in an unprejudiced condition. That is the simple statement contained in the petition, those are the charges that are made against this official ; and I suppose the hon. member for East Lambton, being the one, perhaps, of all others in this House, most deeply concerned in presenting the best face of the case on behalf of the judge, has advanced the best arguments possible why there should not be an enquiry for I would remind the hon. gentleman and this House that the petition in question does not ask that the judge be convicted at this stage ; the motion asks nothing of that kind. The motion in question is couched in the most temperate language, and I think presents a very fair proposition to this House ; that motion is that in view of these charges made in this House, accredited, as they are by the petitioners in question, these charges are of that serious character that the House would not be justified in passing them by in silence, but should call upon the official in question to make answer to them, if an answer he can make. That is a fair proposition, and that is one of the least of the duties that this House can discharge under the circumstances. Now, what were the objections offered by the hon. member for East Lambton ? He stated that in connection with the London election the only disgraceful thing he could discover was the action of the Liberal press. Instead of confining himself to defending the accused, he endeavours, I presume from tactical motives, to carry the war into Africa, to raise some irrelevant issue, with a view to diverting attention from the motion itself. I am not aware that the

conduct of the Liberal press, be it upright and straightforward or the opposite, would, in the slightest degree, interfere with the merits of this issue, which is a wholly different one altogether. We are not now trying the Liberal press ; we are now considering the case of an official of the Crown : therefore, I fail to understand what the action of the Liberal press of Middlesex or elsewhere had to do with the alleged crime of Judge Elliott. I may say that the Chief Justice of the Province of Ontario will not thank the hon. member for East Lambton, nor will those other law officers to whom he alluded, when he endeavoured to protect the position of Judge Elliott by classifying him with them. He attacked the standing, he said, of some of the petitioners. He said it was right that Judge Elliott should know who his accusers were, and as if that were a defence, as if it were a reason for not considering the conduct of Judge Elliott who is said to have committed a crime, the hon. gentleman proceeds to attack the petitioners who had not committed a crime. He sought to discredit the first and the last of the petitioners ; I have not counted the number, but there are at least twenty or thirty prominent citizens. As to the first of these petitioners he says, he is not to be believed, he is not to be considered in this House, because, forsooth, he took part in a previous election case, and because on one occasion he had partaken freely of pigs' feet, and on another occasion had strengthened his weary nature with lager beer, and for these reasons the first petitioner was not to be considered a credible witness against the judge. Then he made some passing allusions to the last petitioner and because he could make these running comments upon a couple of the petitioners, he asks this House to ignore the charges that these responsible men have made, made openly and manfully over their hands, and presented to this House in the only constitutional course open to them. I fail to see how the status of the petitioners has been so shaken by anything that has fallen from the hon. member for East Lambton, as not to entitle their statements, given in this petition, to that credence that ought to be given to any given number of men who, up to this moment, must be considered as respectable citizens. It is well to bear in mind that the member for East Lambton was specially guarded in denying nothing. I presume if he could have given a denial to one of these charges, he would have done so, but as an astute lawyer he knew it would be better for him not to commit himself to such a position, and he simply took the ground : Prove your case if you can ; in the mean time I will not commit myself by saying these charges are unfounded. But one of the most extraordinary reasons that was ever assigned for a judge refusing to follow the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench, was that the decision was not in writing, that because the Queen's Bench did not choose to reason out their decision but gave it immediately after the argument, orally from the bench, that that was a sufficient reason for their decision and their pronouncement of the law being disregarded. I am sure there is no member of the bar, no man of common sense, I care not what his calling may be, that will not see the fallacy of such a reason as that. He said that Judge Elliott was warranted in disregarding the decision of the Court of Appeal because the court had only given an opinion. Why, they had given a decision based on argument. The very point in issue was argued by learned counsel on both sides before the Court of Appeal, and although that court at one stage, in giving judgment held that it was not necessary for them to deal with the one point, yet when pressed by counsel on both sides, they proceeded to deal with it. They did not deal with it as a point that had not been argued before them. The judgment of the court, or what the hon. gentleman calls their opinion, was on the point on which the case had been taken to the Court of Appeal. It was the main point in the argument in the case before the court, and although the judges chose to say : "This case may go off on another point and it is not necessary for us to deliver judgment on the particular question as to the validity of the notice, yet as both counsel ask us to give judgment, and as we have made up our minds, we are prepared to deliver judgment :" they gave judgment on both points, both points being decided against the contention of Judge Elliott. But one point would have been sufficient to have determined what future action should be taken. The hon. gentleman said that although those two courts had given those judgments adversely to Judge Elliott's opinion, Judge Elliott in reversing judgment had at no stage undertaken to follow the judgment of the Superior Court. Is that not an extraordinary proposition ? A judge who is trying a case, which by certain process gets into appeal, says to counsel : "I reserve my judgment until the Superior Court, where the appeal is now carried, delivers judgment." On what principle does he reserve judgment, if he is not to be governed by the decision of the Superior Court ? Was he performing an empty and hollow sham when he said : "I will reserve judgment to see what the Superior Court thinks, to ascertain what, in that court's opinion the law is," if after that court has stated what the law is, he is going to ignore the law ? The very fact that he reserved judgment until the Court of Appeal gave judgment was an implied undertaking that he was going to act as every upright judge would act, be governed as regards the law by the opinion laid down by his superiors. Yet we are told that because he did not give an undertaking that he would follow the law, he was thereby warranted in disregarding the law. Then the hon. gentleman, instead of having the courage to say that the clause in the petition which charges Judge Elliott with having inserted partisan articles in the press, and with having taken a partisan attitude, in talking to his neighbours in the city of London, was incorrect, instead of denying the accuracy of those statements, if he could, what is his defence ? It is a defence which goes to the very foundation of the very judiciary of the country. He says, is it to be the case that when a man takes a position on the bench, his mouth is to be thereby closed on political questions ? What does he mean by the expression ? The first thing that happens to a man who takes a position on the bench is that he loses his qualifications to be an elector. What is the meaning of that feature in the law ? We cannot prevent a judge entertaining opinions. We all have our opinions, and I have no doubt that judges, who take office, politicians as they may be, and as most prominent men in Canada are, as a rule lay aside, so far as may be, their political views once they accept the ermine. I venture to say there is not another case on record, I can recollect none at

all events, and I am certain there has not been a case in the last 40 years, where a judge on the bench has taken part, as this judge has been accused of having taken part, in a political contest of this kind. Is it because the man is on the bench, because he occupies a position so far above his brethren, that he can do acts that unfit him for the proper discharge of his duties? I want to know what can more disqualify a judge from giving an impartial consideration on matters political, when they come before him in his judicial capacity, than the circumstance that he is allying himself actively as an agent to promote the candidature of one candidate or another, for the success of one political party or another. And therefore whilst the judges may be allowed to have their political opinions, while it is impossible for them to strip themselves of their political views, I think no one will say that they are warranted in saying that they may, after taking the ermine, either in the press, on the street, or on the platform, manifest party bias for one political party or another. I therefore say the hon. gentleman has wholly mistaken the issue if he supposes these charges simply accuse Judge Elliott of having political opinions. They are much more serious. They charge him with being an active political party man, nothing more nor less than a party heeler, and that, at the time when he had it in his judicial power to seat one candidate or the other, and which power we say he has exercised in the way in which his party leanings went. I will not controvert, at this stage, the statement made by the hon. gentleman, that Judge Elliott is one of the purest of judges that ever adorned the Canadian bench. I think it will be better to reserve an expression of that kind until his particular conduct in question is investigated, and if these charges are foundationless, I shall rejoice, as all honourable men ought to rejoice, in his being exculpated; but the friends of Judge Elliott, if they believe in his innocence, should be the first men to ask Parliament to carry this motion and have his conduct investigated, and when I find, on the floor of this House, efforts made to prevent enquiry, I certainly am compelled to arrive at the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite do not believe that Judge Elliott's conduct is of the purest of the pure. The hon. gentleman said that nothing improper could be implied from anything that Judge Elliott has said or written. He did not venture to say that Judge Elliott did not write any of these articles; Judge Elliott did not venture to instruct him to that extent, I venture to warrant. Judge Elliott has never, up to this moment, denied writing these articles.

An hon. MEMBER. What articles?

Mr. MULOCK. Before I am through, hon. gentlemen will have the advantage of knowing what the articles are. I have them before me. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) did not care to read these articles. He proposed to lay this case before Parliament to allow the judge, as he ought to have done, to come before Parliament in a manly way and give his answer at an early stage. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not deny the existenee of these articles, further than to say that nobody could point to anything improper, but before I take my seat I will refer to some of those articles and I will leave it to the hon. gentlemen to say whether their contents are proper or not. Now, Sir, what did Judge Elliott do? There is a good deal that is controversial in his conduct, but there is a good deal which depends upon proceedings that have taken place and about which there is no controversy. There is the following in evidence about which there is no controversy. On the 20th November Judge Elliott held that he had no power to overrule the revising officer who decided that he had power to amend and to adjourn his court to permit an amendment. As the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncreiff) said, at this stage Judge Elliott did not know whether or not there would be another election, because the seat was not vacant. Assuming that to be the case, I am inclined to attach a great deal more importance to his decision then, than to his decision later on, when it was clear that his judgment was going to have a great influence on the representation of that constituency. From the decision of the revising officer there was an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, and it is not in doubt at all that when the election was over, and when it depended upon overruling the decision of the revising officer whether Mr. Carling should take his seat or not, Judge Elliott then proceeded to deal with this matter, and he did deal with it in favour of Mr. Carling. But in order to seat Mr. Carling what did he have to do? In order to seat Mr. Carling, who did not get a majority of the qualified voters, he had, in the first instance, to find in favour of the qualification of 128 voters who had been held by the revising officer to have no vote. To that extent he overruled the findings in fact and law of the revising officer. He further had to overrule the unanimous decision of the Court of Queen's Bench, and in order to explain why he did this he says that the Court of Queen's Bench had not given a judgment with reasons. It is true they decided the law, but they did not give those reasons that commended themselves to Judge Elliott. That court seemed to know what the law was, it was so plain to them that they did not, I presume, deem it necessary to deliver an elaborate judgment, but assumed, as they had a right to assume, that their judgment, without giving reasons, should be accepted as an honest and correct judgment. Judge Elliott had to overrule that judgment too. He did so, and he says that in doing so, he supposes he would cover himself with obloquy. I think he has well prophesied the result. But he had to go further, and to overrule the decision of the Court of Appeal. The three judges of the Court of Appeal who gave judgment unanimously decided in favour of the decision of the revising officer, and they supported the decision of Judge Elliott himself in the first instance. They decided in the same way as the Court of Queen's Bench, and it, therefore, became necessary for Judge Elliott to overrule the decision of the Court of Appeal. How did he do that? His contention was that these judges of the Court of Appeal did not know what they were about, that though they had delivered judgment on a point that had been threshed out before them by able counsel on both sides, Judge Elliott chose to place the construction upon that judgment, that it was not necessary to be given in order to determine the case. And so the junior judge overruled the decision of the Supreme Court, the highest court in the Province of Ontario. But he had also to overrule another judgment.

Before Judge Elliott knew that his decision was necessary in order to seat Mr. Carling, he had decided that the revising officer was perfectly within the law in allowing the amendments and adjourning the court, and having so decided, he had decided also that the revising officer was perfectly within the law when on his court reassembling he had disallowed the 128 votes which Judge Elliott afterwards allowed. But, when after the election, these 128 votes had found their way into the ballot box, and it became necessary to have them counted in order to seat Mr. Carling, Judge Elliott not only had to overrule the Superior Court, but he also had to overrule himself, and he who on the 20th November had decided that there was no appeal to him from the revising barrister, who had allowed the amendments, and threw out these fagot votes; afterwards, on the 9th of March, a couple of weeks after the election, he decided in favour of Mr. Carling and decided against himself. Now, Sir, how comes it that his mind underwent such a change? Was he throughout these whole proceedings, so conducting himself that he was able to deliver an impartial judgment, and in this connection I shall treat of the newspaper articles. In the city of London is published a daily newspaper called the *Free Press* the Conservative organ there. This bye-election commenced about the month of January, when I understand Mr. Hyman was unseated, and on the 5th day of February there appeared in the London *Free Press* the following item:—

"REASONS FOR VOTING FOR CARLING.

"1. Carling is a Cabinet Minister and is powerful with the Government to help in promoting the prosperity of London.

"2. He asserts that to surrender our tariff system to the States, is hostile to our position, as part of the British Empire, and must inevitably lead to political annexation."

I think we have heard a certain political party in this House, and out of the House, advance similar arguments against another party.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Do you know that Judge Elliott wrote that?

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure that Judge Elliott wrote this article.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. That is not what I asked you.

Mr. MULOCK. I was told so; and I am reading this article as Judge Elliott's.

Mr. TUPPER. You were told so.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, told so, and I believe so, and I have sworn evidence that it is so. I am not a witness now. I am a member of this House, and I am stating what I believe to be true; and if any hon. gentleman does not believe it to be true, why does he not take the chance of disproving it? I accuse Judge Elliott of having written it.

Mr. TUPPER. That is another thing.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has assured me that Judge Elliott has written these articles which I am about to quote, and I have in my possession sworn testimony that he did write these articles. It is said that so particular was he that there should be no errors in these articles that he corrected the proofs with his own hand, and that the manuscript of every one of these articles was in his own handwriting, and was delivered in his own handwriting to the London *Free Press*; and if hon. gentlemen think that he did not write these articles and can prove that he did not, will they not place those who say he did in a nice position? He is accused on the floor of this House of having written these articles; and now perhaps the hon. gentlemen having recovered from their excitement, will allow me to proceed with my quotations from this nice bit of literature. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) invited me to do this, and I suppose he will regard me as meeting his views. I go on to quote the reasons which Judge Elliott advanced for voting against Mr. Hyman:

"First, he has neither ability nor power to help the city."

That is a patriotic, a judicial sentiment.—

"His want of ability is shown by his silly conduct by which the city lost the car-works. 2nd. He is for surrendering our fiscal policy to the States, yet professing to go against political annexation which Mr. Blake has announced must inevitably follow."

Well, about the same time, on the 5th of February last, there began a series of articles in the same paper, the London *Free Press*, which hon. gentlemen will find under the heading, "Questions by a Liberal Voter and Answers:" and I may say that this series of articles will be found in the issues of that paper of the following days: the 5th of February, the 6th of February, the 8th of February, and the 9th of February. Judge Elliott, as the author of these articles, has purported to represent a Liberal questioning him upon the political issues of the day. Perhaps he can show that there was a Liberal who put these questions to him, or perhaps he was personating a Liberal and putting questions in order to answer them. I am sure that no hon. gentleman would desire me to read these various columns of articles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. MULOCK. I have given the dates, and hon. gentlemen can read them for themselves. They are questions and answers dealing with the great political issues of the day, principally the great trade question. Hon. gentlemen ask me to read them. The first question is:

"Have you seen Mr. Gibbons's address on the trade question?—Yes."

So it goes on, and the last question is:

"There are some other points to which I would like to refer, but not at present.—I should be happy to hear you, and I think I have seen no argument urged on behalf of the Liberal party in furtherance of their scheme of commercial or political union with the States which cannot be refuted."

There we accuse Judge Elliott of having insinuated that the Liberal party is in favour of political union with the United States. I will not quote the article of the 6th of February, but will leave that pleasure for hon. gentlemen opposite. The one on the 8th appears to be a little over a column in length and is made up of questions and answers of the same kind containing arguments against the Liberal party, the regular stock arguments used by the Conservative party in the campaign. For example, this imaginary Liberal is supposed to have put this question:

"But, do you say there is not justice in the assertion that the Liberal party are for free trade?—I say that when they assert free trade is their object in seeking to have the American tariff to rule, they talk the verist nonsense. I must say that it is a dishonest cry, and those who ask for such an assimilation of tariffs and say it is for free trade, must know that the cry is unfounded and dishonest."

I think hon. gentlemen will admit that that question has something to do with politics. The last of this series appeared on the 9th of February, and the questions are very much of the same character as the others. For instance, I find the following:—

"I have read not only Mr. Gibbons's pamphlet, but also the various speeches on this side of the question, and so far as I can make out, they all blame this protective system for what they regard as the unprogressive state of Canada, and yet, as I have said, with matchless inconsistency they advocate the adoption of the higher duties of the United States. This is a fatal blow on their prescription for prosperity.

"Do you regard Mr. Blake's separation from the Liberal party as an act prompted by sincere motives?—We have no right to impute any motive but an honourable one to Mr. Blake; and I affirm that neither Mr. Gibbons nor any other man can effectively answer Mr. Blake's letter on his renunciation of the policy of the Liberal party on this question."

At another place he goes on to say:

"Now, having advanced in this discussion so far, I would like to ask you, as one of the Liberal party, what policy you propose to adopt in relation to the trade of this country? Well, my feeling is this, that Canada is in such a condition that some great change is necessary for her recuperation, and I don't wonder that Mr. Story, Mr. Gibbons and others are discouraged and despondent. Answer—Yes, there it is. These gentlemen and others who are politically associated with them are for ever depreciating the country. They say: Behold how the population stagnates? See how property is appreciating in value. See how our railways are badly managed. See how everything, in fact, is going to destruction. It seems to give them gratification to find fault, and to disparage the country. Everything in the States is so excellent. The farmers there are so flourishing, property is so valuable, manufactures are so profitable. But all this laudation of the States and depreciation of Canada is a miserable policy. Is it not the last resource of disappointed office hunters? Differences of opinion we shall always have, but when party rancour is carried so far as to find satisfaction in representing the country in an unfavourable light and thus discourage immigration and create a prejudice against the mother country, I say when these things are done, as we know they are, it is time to ask Canadians to unite in their denunciation of a policy so unworthy and so unpatriotic."

The little narrative stopped at this stage. The Liberal did not appear to have asked any more questions. The judge had succeeded, in his own mind, in answering these questions satisfactorily. Now, on the 18th of February, the Court of Appeal delivered the judgment to which I have referred, and up to that time Judge Elliott had some chance of a decision being in his favour, enabling him to decide in favour of the allowance of these bad votes. But on the 18th of February the judgment of the Court of Appeal was given, which, so far as that court could go, cut away from him that very last chance; and on the following day there appeared the following article in the London *Free Press*, which article we also charge having been written by Judge Elliott, in proof of which I have sworn evidence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When his judgment was pending?

Mr. MULOCK. The Court of Appeal had delivered judgment, but he had not. His judgment had been reserved, and it was not delivered until 15 or 20 days afterwards. On the 19th February, however, the pen that subsequently wrote the judgment seating Mr. Carling, wrote this article:

"In comparing the two candidates for this city in a personal sense there is a vast inequality. There never was in the Dominion a shrewder or keener judge of human character than Sir John Macdonald. Like Disraeli, it was his strong forte instantly, by a sort of intuition, to perceive what a man's qualifications were. Mr. Carling first appeared in Parliament on his election in 1857. As William Lyon Mackenzie said, in good looks he surpassed all others in that assembly. And good looks are not to be despised as an index to character. But Sir John went deeper than external appearance. He saw that there was a young man not only of a winning aspect, but that his qualities of mind and heart were well represented by his countenance and demeanour, and he at once put his trust in him, and up to the last moment of the old warrior's life he never faltered in his confidence in John Carling. And why had he and others such confidence in John Carling? Because they found in him that good solid sense, judgment and tact, and that plain, unfailing integrity which among men is often more potent than the most brilliant talent. Every one possessed of any sagacity must see that Mr. Carling possesses faculties which constitute an essential element in cementing and influencing a party, and in promoting the interests of his constituents. He has been well tried in the fire of experience and not a particle of confidence that has been bestowed upon him has ever been betrayed, and his influence is scarcely exceeded in the case of any one who can be mentioned in securing for his constituents all that they can by any possible fairness be entitled to. But where are Mr. Hyman's qualifications? There is no brilliance about him, that is certain. He has a few sentences about trade which he has learnt by heart. But any one can easily pick out 50 young men as gifted as he. Then, where is his talent for dealing with and managing men."

He could not manage the judge, evidently.—

"He has passed through no ordeal like Mr. Carling. He is a new experiment. He has shown no power to influence men or gain their confidence as Mr. Carling has done. He can play a good game of tennis with some nice little girls, and can sip his glass of wine pleasantly in their company. But where there is that masculine, strong, common sense and tact of judgment which give an immense advantage in obtaining such benefits as a constituency looks for in fairness and equity? It is ridiculous to compare the two men in capacity to accomplish advantages for a constituency.

"Now, if Mr. Carling were not a Cabinet Minister, the comparison would be most unequal. But when we consider that Mr Carling occupies that position, and under a victorious majority in Parliament, any comparison in a personal sense is absurd. So much for a personal comparison. In a political sense, there is something yet to be said."

The affidavit I have does not cover further extracts than these, but I am told that the *Free Press* of that month, prior to the election, was teeming with similar articles emanating from the same pen. Now, Sir, I presume there is no hon. gentleman here who would say it would be a decent or a proper thing for a judge, whether he has to deal with anything connected with an election or not, to appear on a political platform either in connection with that or any other election. I cannot conceive of any justification nor of its being possible in any way to palliate the action of a judge in appearing on one side or the other in a public gathering and manifesting an active party interest. If that would be a sound proposition, much more I think should this particular judge have been guarded in his conduct, considering that he was likely in a few days to be called upon to determine to whom the seat went, and if it is wrong if it is indefensible for a judge to go on the platform and utter a political speech, to give expression to political sentiments, much more must it be wrong if he addresses the electorate through a newspaper. In addressing an audience, his words may but reach the ears of a few hundred people, but, when he writes in a newspaper, the audience is much greater and the influence is greater, and under all the circumstances I am unable to understand how any hon. gentleman can for one moment under the circumstances of the case refuse to Judge Elliott, if he be innocent, an opportunity of answering the petition, or, if he be guilty of enabling this High Court of Parliament to deal with him as this motion proposes. I think the motion is a

fair one in every sense. It does not prejudge or accuse, but it simply asks as follows:—

"That a copy of the petition laid upon the Table of this House from Thomas Hobbs and others, complaining of the conduct of William Elliott, Esquire, County Judge of Middlesex, in relation to the revision of the voter's list for the Electoral District of the City of London, be forthwith furnished him for his information and to enable him to make such statement or answer to the charges therein contained as he may deem proper, and that the said petition and any such answer as the said judge may make be referred to a special committee of this House, to inquire into the truth of the several allegations therein, with a view of finding whether such charges should be investigated by a commission."

That preliminary investigation I think it was the duty of Parliament to make. Hon. gentlemen, perhaps, would like me to present them with the affidavit verifying the extracts I have read. I do not intend to do so. I do not intend at this stage to give them that bit of information. I am willing, however, if it is desired, to place the affidavit and the information in regard to this evidence in the hands of Mr. Speaker to be retained by him in a confidential way. I believe in the absolute truth of the charges in question as to Judge Elliott having written these articles in the press. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Monerieff) said that these charges were vague. Let me again read them for the information of the House, and it will then be for the House and the country to say whether if these charges were not sufficiently definite to enable Judge Elliott to know what he was accused of. I think they must be sufficiently explicit for every member of this House to understand, except my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Monerieff), who thinks them vague and not specific. Paragraphs 17, 18, and 19 are as follows:—

"17. The said William Elliott, during the said election and while the said appeals were pending before him, contributed editorially and also under an assumed name to the London *Free Press* newspaper, articles of a violent and partisan character bearing upon the said revision of the voters' list and political questions of the day, and particularly upon the said election for the said electoral district and in support of the candidature of the said Carling and against the said Hyman.

"18. After the said election and before deciding said appeals the said William Elliott in strong and violent language denounced the said Hyman and his supporters and stated to several electors of the said city that the said Carling would certainly get the seat in the House of Commons for the said electoral district.

"19. That the conduct of the said William Elliott, in writing the said newspaper articles pending the said appeals, and in making the said oral declarations and in afterwards carrying out the spirit of such articles and declarations by overruling the judgment of the said Queen's Bench Division and the express decision of the said judges of the Court of Appeal, show him to be a violent political partisan incapable of giving an honest or unbiassed judgment on the subject-matter of such appeals."

I think that language is plain enough to be understood. I do not think any person who desires to know the meaning of the charges cannot gratify his desires by reading that section of the petition. There you find plain, serious and outspoken language which demands the serious consideration of this House.

Mr. TISDALE. I confess I am somewhat at a loss, taking the latter part of the hon. gentleman's address, to decide as to what he means or what he intends the House to deal with. If he intends or contends for a moment that these newspaper articles which he has read have anything to do with this discussion, I must totally disagree with him, and I shall decline to discuss them, because the only thing I can say in regard to them is that it is the highest compliment the hon. gentleman can pay to the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Monerieff) whose argument the other day he attempted to disparage, because, if he means that these are the charges now under discussion, he must admit beyond contradiction that his friends have abandoned the motion which is now before the House. He cannot contend that these articles have anything to do with the matter at all. What we have to vote upon and decide here is the petition and the charges contained in that petition. I apprehend that there can be no two opinions about that in the position in which we stand. If the hon. gentleman proposes to found a charge on those papers, let him do so, but let us not waste time in discussing them on this motion. If he says, we abandon the petition, let him do so. Hon. gentlemen may smile, but let us get at sense and propriety and at some rules in the discussion of these matters. I understand the motion now is not to send these newspaper articles or anything connected with them to a committee, but that this petition is under discussion and, in the words of the hon. gentleman himself, the petition makes no accusation and no charge.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. TISDALE. He said it contains grave matter which should be considered, but it contained no charge against the judge.

Mr. MULOCK. I said the petition makes grave charges against the judge.

Mr. TISDALE. Then he repeats the bald charges against the judge, and he said, in substance, that it was not a matter of accusation against the judge, but simply something to put him on a preliminary enquiry. I propose now to discuss the matter before the House. I must confess that I am disappointed with my hon. friend, if he means that he has a charge to bring, and that these newspaper articles are sufficient to be dealt with by the House. We are not dealing with that part of the question now. Let some person who is responsible, such as the hon. gentleman himself, make the charge and it will be dealt with. I wish to make one correction of a statement of the hon. gentleman before taking up the time I intend to take in connection with the matter before the House. The hon. gentleman was either not fully advised of Judge Elliott's decision on the 20th November, or he misinformed the House in regard to it. I wish to correct him on that point, or let him correct me. What Judge Elliott decided was not only what the hon. gentleman said, but a great deal more. The hon. gentleman says that, when the matter first came before him, the judge decided that the revising officer was within the law, and that was all he said.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say that.

Mr. TISDALE. What Judge Elliott decided comprised two things. The first was in reference to the power of the revising officer to make an amendment, and, that being a matter of procedure, he decided that he had no jurisdiction; but he decided then and there that the notice was bad, and the hon. gentleman said that Judge Elliott's

second judgment went back and contradicted his first.

Mr. MULOCK. So it did.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) read the statement in the first place that the judge said he had no jurisdiction in regard to that matter.

Mr. MULOCK. If you will permit me for a moment, I will say that on the 20th November, 1891, Judge Elliott held that he could not interfere with an amendment made by the revising officer, which amendment and adjournment of the court consequent upon it led this revising officer to try all these cases, and the result was that the revising officer disallowed the votes in question. On the 9th December, the judge decided that the revising officer was wrong in doing that, and restored these votes to the voters' list.

Mr. TISDALE. At the same time, on the 20th November, the judge decided that the notice was bad. As to procedure, he could not decide, but when it came before him by way of appeal, he held that the votes were bad, and he did the same thing the second time the question came before him. That is one point I want to emphasize, and the only point, because what the hon. gentleman asserted was not the fact, that Judge Elliott decided against himself. But it is a fact that the notice of appeal was decided to be bad on the first occasion, and on the second occasion he decided the same way. Now, I propose to look a little outside of the legal proposition, and try to find out the circumstances surrounding this whole matter. A great deal has been said outside of this House and something inside of this House, about a conspiracy between Judge Elliott and Mr. Carling to deprive London of its proper representative at the last election. Now, a more uncalled for, a more unjust, and a more impudent perversion of facts, never was made in this country nor in any other. I say the fact is just the contrary. I agree with them that there was a conspiracy to defraud London of its proper representation, a conspiracy conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin, conceived by the political heelers and wire-pullers of Mr. Hyman and his machine in the city of London to deprive that city of its proper representation, and brought forth by an organized system of fraud, of force, of personation and corruption when the election came on, that has seldom been equalled in an election in this or any other country, and followed by a deliberate attempt to force a judge, against whom up to that time not a word had been whispered, to give a judgment that would suit them or destroy his character. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are strong words, but I think I will be able to justify them and to show that they are even weaker than the facts warrant. Now, in arriving at conclusions, the motives of men and the surrounding circumstances often throw a stronger light than the acts themselves. Let us look at the political history of the city of London. Go back to 1857. What has been its political history? From that time down to the present it has always been largely Conservative, and on a fair vote still is largely Conservative: and more than that, from that time down to the present, except during two sessions of Parliament, a Conservative member has always been returned, and with two exceptions, that constituency has returned the hon. Mr. Carling during 35 years. Look at the record of the two parties during that time. Never during all that time has even a charge been made in court against Mr. Carling or the Conservative party that they ever attempted to carry the election by corrupt practices, their opponents never dared to file a protest. Now, what is the record of the Reform party, and how came they to hold the seat two sessions? In 1874 a gentleman named John Walker carried the city of London. He sat one session. There was a protest, and what happened then? I will read the judgment of the court, after the trial, to show what happened:

"That throughout the contest the agents of the respondent, acting on his behalf in promoting his election, were impressed with the strong conviction that in order to ensure the respondent's election it would be necessary to expend a very considerable sum of money bribing some voters to vote for respondent, and in bribing others not to vote for his opponent: and that the respondent himself was impressed with the same conviction. (2) That, influenced by the pressure of this conviction, dozens of those agents of the respondents did commit acts of bribery upon a very extensive scale, with the knowledge and consent of the respondent, for the purpose of promoting his election although the respondent may have been and very probably was, kept in ignorance of each single particular instance of such acts of bribery. That corruption should have prevailed and that bribery could have been committed upon the extensive scale, and in the open manner which the evidence discloses throughout the whole contest, and that the moneys with which this bribery and corruption were consummated should have been almost all disbursed at the respondent's own headquarters, and that he should have been constantly in and out of these headquarters and canvassing, as he says, throughout the city, night and day, and be ignorant that acts of bribery in his interest—acts from which he alone could derive any benefit—were being constantly committed by his agents, is to my mind utterly incredible. I do not seek for any reported case to support the principle upon which I proceed. It requires only the honest application of the common sense of a conscientious juror, to lead me to a conclusion upon the matter submitted to me in this case. I can readily believe it possible for the respondent to have been immersed in the lake and to be taken out dry, as that the acts of bribery which the evidence discloses to have been committed on his behalf, almost under his eyes, in his daily path, with means of corruption proceeding from his own headquarters, and from the hands of his confidential agents there, could have been committed otherwise than with his knowledge and consent."

He goes on then to disqualify Mr. Walker personally, and in another clause of the judgment, he finds no less than 19 parties that he names guilty of corrupt practices.—

"And further, that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the said election."

Now, it took the Liberal party 17 years to recover from that blow, and in 1891 Mr. Hyman was elected. He sat one session, and a protest was entered. What happened then? The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Monerieff) the other day gave us some idea of what happened then: he gave us some of the reasons why Mr. Hyman was unseated. Take the history of the three meetings that he mentioned. We find that at one meeting called they consumed half a barrel of beer and a lot of crackers and cheese. At another meeting, where Mr. Hyman was present, a large uncovered basket was brought into the meeting containing several dozen bottles of ale. At another meeting, known as the coloured meeting, upon the very platform from which Mr. Hyman addressed the electors, there was a whole barrel of beer. Moreover at that very meeting a subscription list was passed around and gentlemen signed their names but put down no amounts, and Mr. Hyman made the remark, "I cannot have anything to do with that now, but

I may afterwards." What does that mean? That was a hint for the boys: "Put your names down, you won't be called upon for any amounts, but I will take care of it afterwards." At that celebrated meeting, according to the witness, the order of proceedings was: the chair was taken at 10; at 11 there were pigs' feet passed around; at 11.30, Mr. Hyman, and at 12 the beer was tapped. They had a band, speeches with music, pigs' feet and beer at intervals, "a feast of reason and a flow of soul" for this pure candidate who is now whining because he was defeated, and who is now endeavouring to disgrace a judge.

Mr. LISTER. Was Judge Elliott there?

Mr. TISDALE. Judge Elliott was not there, Judge Elliott does not attend this sort of thing. These meetings are reserved for those who take pleasure in that sort of thing, and who attempt to destroy a man's character, if they cannot reach their end in any other way.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I presume jealousy arose because the beer was not Carling's?

Mr. TISDALE. Probably you think so. You are a very good judge of some things, Doctor. I dare say your heart would have swelled with joy if you had been there.

An hon. MEMBER. With beer.

Mr. TISDALE. Then there was another bit of evidence given. There was a collector of election funds engaged and he collected $2,000. That is a very small sum compared with what must have been expended. Now, does any sensible man think that a candidate wants $2,000 to pay the legitimate expenses of an election campaign?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. At all events we would think it a great deal up in the Province of Ontario. Down by the sea you have different methods.

An hon. MEMBER. Carling's election cost $10,000.

Mr. TISDALE. Some gentlemen know a great deal about expenses, I have no doubt. Over in Welland there is another place where large sums were said to have been expended.

Mr. LISTER. What about the railroad?

Mr. TISDALE. When the hon. gentleman was speaking the other day I allowed him to pursue his remarks without any undue interruption.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You did not gerrymander him in his speech.

Mr. TISDALE. If some of you would gerrymander the parts of your body that you talk with, I might get on a little faster.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen will please not interrupt, and the hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Mr. TISDALE. Now, there was another significant thing according to this evidence, in connection with this gentleman who collected the funds, and that was that he kept no account. He had no memory, he could not remember what he did with any of the money. Further than that, when he found there was a protest, he destroyed all the books and papers so that if the case ever came into court, there would be no papers to expose him. What was the result of that trial? Many other disclosures were made, and the result was that Mr. Hyman finally consented to accept unseating on the evidence, to agree not to appeal, and to pay the costs. This was accepted on the other side rather than go on with personal disqualification and allow him to appeal and hold the seat much longer. I have no doubt from the disclosures made that Mr. Hyman would have gone the way of John Walker even then, if this compromise had not been arrived at. This brings us to 1892, and it is in regard to this election that all the row has been kicked up. To my mind it has been entirely brought about to cover the disgraceful tactics resorted to by Mr. Hyman and his committee and to draw public attention away from them, and those gentlemen have vented their disappointment by attacking the judge and seeking to compel him either to give a judgment to suit them or else they would try and ruin his character. I would say nothing about what happened at this election if Mr. Hyman had acted, as the Conservatives did in London both times they were defeated, filed a petition and brought forward disclosures, if there were any, and subject himself to the cross-fire of a petition. But, I will mention some matters that were of public notoriety in London, in order to give hon. members in this House, who do not know London, and did not follow the papers in that connection, some information. The first thing they did was to openly declare that Mr. Hyman was to be elected at all hazards, no matter what means had to be resorted to or what it might cost. This alarmed our party, I do not deny. What next happened? They established an organized betting ring, that wagered tens of thousands of dollars on the result of the election, and out of this betting fund they expended large sums in corrupting and debauching the electors. They circulated a bogus circular among the employés of one of the largest corporations in London, employing 500 or 600 voters, and by that means they tried to make the employés of that corporation believe that the head officials of it were in favour of Mr. Hyman, though in the offices and shops of the corporation a circular was issued by the general manager stating that in this election they were to vote as they pleased and the management was entirely neutral. In the third place they organized a body of ruffians —I use the word advisedly—to traverse the streets of London and attack and maltreat in the night-time different supporters of Mr. Carling. They went so far as to attack Mr. Meredith, the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, who went to a house, and if he had not been well known as a man of great physical capacity he would have been injured. These are facts which the citizens of London well know. On polling day scores of voters were hired to leave London for the day without voting. Down the river, about four miles, they hired a summer hotel, which happened to be vacant, and a large number of men were made drunk and taken down there and kept drunk until after the poll had closed. An army of personators invaded the city. These are facts which are notorious in London; they are some of the means resorted to, connected with the conspiracy which I charge was attempted to wrest London from Mr. Carling and the Conservative party. When they found their machinations fail and their schemes were in vain, then, in their anger, what did they do? Did they do what the Conservative party had done at previous elections when they

were defeated? Did they file a petition and go to the courts? It is ridiculous to talk about Conservatives entering into a conspiracy to wrest that stronghold of the Conservatives from the Reform party, to which it never belonged. The records of the courts show that it never belonged to them, they show that fact in the case of John Walker, and if the personal charges had been pushed against Mr. Hyman it would have shown the same result. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite on that point, because they had the chance to protest the election and they dare not protest it; and when I come to the legal part of my argument I will have some remarks to offer on this subject, because it will have a strong bearing on the case. No, they lost their money, they lost their honour, and they lost the election, and something must be done. They dare not go into the courts. They knew their candidate could not stand the light of an investigation and a cross-petition. What did they do? They said: "We will compel the Judge of the County Court, who had not given judgment in regard to the disputed votes, either to give judgment in our favour or we will try to ruin and disgrace him." Am I justified in making this statement? I think I am by what followed. What did follow? Who was the judge they had ventured to attack? He is a venerable man of 70 years of age, who during a quarter of a century has presided over the hundred thousand people who live in London and the county, who is respected and admired personally by every person who knows him, who is well known in the city, and the country round, as well as in the province, as an honest, straightforward, kindly christian gentleman in private life. He is revered and respected for his uprightness, impartiality and wisdom as a judge, and loved for his kindness of heart. This old man, against whom not a breath of suspicion had ever even been whispered either as to his judicial or private life, which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) will no doubt admit, is the man and the judge whom they resolved to attack. I say shame upon the cause and shame upon the men who resort to such an expediency when their political passions are excited. I am not following up the legal features of the case as closely as some hon. members who have preceded me have done, and some who may perhaps follow will do, but I am dwelling more particularly on the position of the judge. What were the circumstances? Let us give them fairly, in order to see where we stand. The House well knows that London has a revising officer, who is not the county judge, and he proceeded with the work of revision. Then there is an appeal, under certain circumstances, from the revising officer to the county judge. We know that it cannot be gainsaid that on the 20th November, this appeal came to him; it was the first time in which the notice was in dispute, and he decided that the notice was bad. It is important that there should be no question about that fact. I did not suppose any doubted it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He expressed an opinion, but at the same time he said he had not jurisdiction.

Mr. TISDALE. No. Now here is Mr. Lister's own statement of it, that is the judgment of Judge Elliott on the 20th November:

"I am of opinion that under the 33rd section my power is confined to the action of the revising officer in dealing with the list; that is to say, as to proper admission of names or the exclusion of them being as to something which is or should be in the list or which ought not to be in it. It is not said that there is an appeal to the county judge as to the proceedings of the revising officer, which would be a comprehensive term, such as is used in section 26. I consider that I have no authority to interfere with the action of the revising officer in amending or adjourning the court to a future time. Whatever may be the importance of my ruling as to the question whether the notice in question is unsufficient or invalid and null and void, as I am pressed to decide I do so, and rule as I have said, that it is invalid under the Act and so far the appeal is sustained, but in respect to my authority to interfere with the revising officer's power to order amendment or to adjourn the court, I do not entertain the appeal."

Now that is plain. He entertained the appeal so far as the notice of appeal was concerned and held it bad, and what happened subsequently showed that he was quite consistent. When the revising officer went on afterwards and struck off some of the names because of his allowing them to be amended, then a subsequent appeal was taken to the judge to restore them under his ruling that the notice was invalid, he the judge ordered them to be restored to the list as he had a perfect right to do. Therefore both of his judgments so far as that part of the case is concerned were consistent with each other. At the time of the election Judge Elliott had held that the notice was not valid, and by the proceedings against the revising officer, the Queen's Bench had held that the notice was valid. The Court of Appeal declined to give a judgment, but upon pressure as has been stated, three of the judges expressed an opinion, the other judges declining to express any opinion that the notices were valid. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court from the Court of Appeal, so that as far as that question goes, there has been no final judgment yet. What else happened? The Court of Chancery, a court of equal jurisdiction with the Court of Queen's Bench which the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) quoted, decided that in such cases no Superior Court had any jurisdiction to interfere with the judge at all. That was the position at the time of the election. Let me summarize it. The Court of Queen's Bench had given a judgment. It was appealed to the Court of Appeal which gave no judgment, but only expressed an opinion, and their decision stood appealed to the Supreme Court, and the Court of Chancery had decided in another case, but on the same principle, contrary to what the Court of Queen's Bench decided, and that was not appealed from. That was the way it stood at the time of Mr. Carling's election which is now in dispute. Then what happened, and who caused it to happen, and that is an important point in my opinion. What happened was caused by the Hyman party. It was not the voluntary action of Judge Elliott that he gave any decision after the further appeal had been made to him, but it was the Hyman party that insisted on his going on and deciding it. Let me show the hardship of that, and let me put that as a strong point justifying the line I am taking, and unanswerably justifying it in my opinion under these circumstances. Had the Hyman party left Judge Elliott alone, he would have pronounced no judgment. It is claimed that a lot of these votes should have been left off the list, and were depending on the validity of the notice of appeal. There was not only a question as to whether the notice of appeal was valid or not, but there was the question of the jurisdiction of the higher court. Let me say here, and no lawyer can

gainsay it, that if there is no jurisdiction, I do not care if ten Superior Courts gave judgments or opinions, it relieves no judge from the responsibility on his oath of giving his own judgment. It is a principle which not even a third-rate lawyer dare gainsay, that if a court pronounced judgment without jurisdiction it is totally void and is not quotable as an authority in another court. There was, therefore, two questions involved, the question of jurisdiction and the validity of the notice of appeal. It was Mr. Hyman's friends who insisted upon Judge Elliott giving judgment. Why did they not wait to file their protest, and then all questions of law and fact could have been raised and if advisable in the opinion of either party carried to the Supreme Court, and Judge Elliott never would have been put into the position they forced him? That is in my opinion a strong point. They forced him into this position, and what did they do before he gave judgment? Their party newspapers threatened him about his judgment, and an hon. member of this House so far forgot himself, the day before it was rendered, that he got up here and spoke of what would happen with regard to the judgment, and had to be called to order by the Speaker and made to withdraw. This shows a strong organized feeling which is most unjust and unfair to the judge in regard to this matter. Mr. Hyman's friends said that he must go on and give his decision, and that was the way they treated him for complying with that request. Let me read from what happened in the court to show how strong was the insistence upon Judge Elliott giving his judgment. Mr. Aylesworth, a counsel from Toronto, went up to London on behalf of Mr. Hyman, and he said:

"We ask that judgment may be given now on the appeals that were before Your Honour in December last. As to what the position of matters was in December I understand that on the appeals which are now in question—some 229 in number—coming before Your Honour, and it appearing that the only point in question was the sufficiency of the notices of objections to the votes that had been given by Mr. Lilley, it was pointed out to Your Honour that an appeal was pending before the Court of Appeal at Toronto, and it was thought by Your Honour that it would be well to await the decision of the Court of Appeal before any judgment was pronounced. It was, therefore, postponed. That decision has now been had, and it is submitted on behalf of Mr. Lilley that this fact and the facts shown in Mr. Magee's affidavit as a reason why there should not be any further waiting for the decision of any other court. I need not point out that the judgment of the Court of Appeal, of the High Court, or the Supreme Court, are judgments that are useful only in interpreting the law in the opinion of the learned judges on any particular point upon the decision of Your Honour. But as a matter of respect that one court would pay to another court Your Honour would be governed very much by these expressions of opinion. We are justified, we think, in asking you not to delay longer the disposing of this question which has now become of so much importance. We urge upon your consideration the vital consequence to the city and people of the whole country that this case should be settled. All the parties are interested in having it settled, and the man who is the choice of the majority of the duly qualified electors shall be returned, and shall hold the seat. So much depends on Your Honour's decision in this case that we've taken this somewhat unusual course, and with Your Honour's permission presented our reasons to you. The question of the validity of the notices has already been passed on—not that I argue it as binding on Your Honour—but I draw your attention to that."

Mr. Hellmuth, representing the other side of the question, spoke as follows:—

"I contended upon that application, and I opposed any settlement of what is really the first question to be decided in these appeals. That is, as to the sufficiency of the notice, until after the Supreme Court, to whom an appeal had been taken, was decided.

Mr. TISDALE.

"I showed Your Honour the notice of appeal that had been served upon my learned friend, and I had an affidavit of the service of that notice, admission having been refused. But my learned friend did not, at the time, pretend to say that he had not been served with that notice of appeal to the Supreme Court.

"Your Honour then asked me: Is it your *bonâ fide* intention to prosecute an appeal to the Supreme Court? And to that I answered, yes. And I have yet to learn that when I make an assertion in my capacity as counsel for appellants that I, having a *bonâ fide* intention to appeal to another court, that assertion is to be doubted or controverted in any way. I still make that assertion, and I decline absolutely to answer the affidavit which my learned friend, Mr Aylesworth, must know, would form no ground whatever for the dismissal of the appeal to the Supreme Court, and it is only on such ground that he could come to Your Honour and practically ask that you should cut off this appeal to the Supreme Court.

"Now there is a statement that they are very anxious for a decision in the Supreme Court. Now, I will undertake, if my learned friend will give me assistance, to expedite this appeal to the Supreme Court, so that it shall be heard at the next sitting. And it could not, under any possibility under the rules of the Supreme Court, be heard before the next sittings in May."

That was the insistence of these gentlemen that the judge should go on and give his judgment. Well, what did he do and what were the circumstances? Mr. Aylesworth, you will notice, did not pretend to argue that the opinions of these courts were binding on the judge. The hon. member for West Lambton also, in his argument the other day, said:

"One would have thought, under the circumstances, that the learned judge of the County Court would have had no hesitation in following the *dicta* of the Court of Appeal and the High Court of Justice. Although I do not contend that he was bound to do so, because I recognize that the judgment of the County Court would be, in a proper matter of appeal, a final judgment."

Now, neither the counsel for Mr. Hyman nor the hon. gentleman in charge of the motion contend that the opinion of that court is binding upon him; and I reassert, and I am satisfied that no lawyer will disagree with this, that if there was no jurisdiction in the Superior Courts, their judgment amounted to nothing. Now, a judge is supposed to be a great lawyer; but some men at the bar are in my opinion greater lawyers than some of our judges; but from how many of them would you accept opinions, and expect a judge to pay attention to them? He would laugh at them. Further, there was no decision given by either the Court of Queen's Bench or the Court of Appeal that amounted to a decision. Suppose the question had been allowed to go on to the Supreme Court. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but there are too many good lawyers among them to disagree with this proposition; and suppose the Supreme Court had said that the notice was good. Would hon. gentlemen claim that the Supreme Court was wrong? Suppose they said the notice was bad, would the hon. gentlemen claim that this judge was bad in his law? We know that it is a rule that until the court finally decides, if a judge has a strong opinion, he should follow it. Hon. gentlemen forget also that the English courts had decided on all fours with Judge Elliott in several cases, that the notices of appeal were insufficient. Hon. gentlemen may shake their heads, but they certainly do not like the decision, and they have not attempted to answer and cannot answer that. The only charge against Judge Elliott, so far as his legal conduct is concerned, is not that he decided wrongfully or even contrary to law, but that he would not follow the opinions, not the completed decisions, of certain courts, though another court of equal jurisdiction had decided the other way; and the English decision, in the

opinion of our Supreme Court judges, rank higher than their own decisions, although they do not always follow them. You might as well say that where there is an English decision and our courts, though not bound by them, do not follow them they ought to be impeached, as to say that Judge Elliott ought to be impeached on that branch of the case. Now, what did the judge do, and what was his position? For these are pertinent matters for the laymen of the House who do not understand the law. Let us look at this matter in a manly, fair-minded, non-partisan spirit, with a sense of the high duty imposed upon us of protecting the judges of the land, while they act honestly and fairly and in accordance with their oath. It is of the greatest possible importance to this country that a judge who acts fairly in a proper case should have the protection of Parliament. What was his position? Challenged by the partisan press of London before he gave judgment and by the language of the hon. member of this House to whom I have alluded to dare to pronounce judgment in the same way as he had done before; and confronted with the conflicting decisions of our Superior Courts and by the decisions of the English courts, what did he do? He did what an honest man and an upright judge would do. They would not allow the case to go on to the Supreme Court; and remember, at this time the time for the protest was not up. They insisted on having judgment there and then; and with this uncompleted appeal, which could have gone to the Supreme Court where the whole question could have been decided by our highest tribunal, Judge Elliott said: I have to act on my own responsibility, here are these conflicting decisions; I have sworn to give judgment honestly according to my conscience; the responsibility is thrown upon me; I will hear your arguments and decide; and by a well-reasoned judgment he decided in consonance with his previous decision. I say all honour to the man who in the face of threats, in the face of these conflicting decisions, did as he did, gave a well-reasoned judgment in the case. Another significant matter in connection with this case has not been brought out, a matter showing whether there has been anything like fair-play towards Mr. Carling or his friends in reference to the conduct of this judge. During the time they were pressing the judge to give judgment, Mr. Hellmuth, who was acting for Mr. Carling, came forward with a proposition to Mr. Aylesworth. What was the proposition? Mr. Hyman claimed that he ought to have 22 majority if all the disputed votes were struck off. Do not forget this fact, which has not been fully understood—let me impress it upon the hon. members of this House—that of the 125 or 126 of these people whose disputed votes were recorded, nearly all of them had never been heard upon the merits whether they were entitled to vote or not. They had declined to appear before the revising officer, because their counsel had advised them that they had no occasion to appear on the notice they received. Mr. Hellmuth came forward and said: 40 or 50 of these men reside in or about London, but have never been heard; I propose, if Your Honour will hear them, and if Mr. Aylesworth will consent, to produce them immediately. I will say nothing but this. If you will abandon the technicalities, if you will not say that not having appeared and therefore you have lost the right to be heard, I will guarantee to bring these here; and out of those 50 we will establish more than 22 votes. And what was the answer of the counsel of the Hyman party? It was: "No," he wanted the technicality of the law applied against us, but he did not want it applied when it was in our favour; and he declined the offer which would have settled the matter on its merits. That brings me down to the matter of the petition before the House. What is the first charge? There are three charges, and any hon. gentleman who is a lawyer, at all events, and the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House is one, know very well what is meant by a charge. He was very careful not to define anything himself, which might be considered a charge sufficient to put any one on his trial. The first clause substantially is this, that Judge Elliott, under the circumstances, with the conflicting decisions of the different courts upon the subject, ventured to express an opinion that did not agree with all these courts. The petitioners do not say his decision was wrong, they do not say in their petition, in any shape or manner, that he decided contrary to law, even the hon. member for North York did not pretend to say it was wrong. The law is in a mixed condition, and the question cannot be finally decided until it goes to the Supreme Court where they might have let it gone if they had seen fit. He simply gave his decision contrary to some of the other judges of the Superior Court. The very people who argued the point before this judge did not, for one moment, contend that it was binding upon them. Now this is no charge at all. No one knows better than the hon. member for West Lambton and the hon member for North York that they must charge the decision was wilfully corrupt and wrong to make it a charge at all. How would it be in this or any country, if a judge is to be held up to contumely by the press and Parliament, simply because he might make a mistake in the law? How would it be if the high privileges of Parliament were to be invoked in such a case? No judge would dare administer the law. What are the two other charges?

"The said William Elliott, during the said election and while the said appeals were pending before him, contributed editorially and also under an assumed name to the London *Free Press* newspaper, articles of a violent and partisan character bearing upon the said revision of the voters' list and political questions of the day, and particularly upon the said election for the said electoral district and in support of the candidature of the said Carling and against the said Hyman.

"After the said election and before deciding said appeals, the said William Elliott, in strong and violent language, denounced the said Hyman and his supporters and stated to several electors of the said city, that the said Carling would certainly get the seat in the House of Commons for the said electoral district."

Now those gentlemen know well that those are not charges. They know that no county magistrate would commit the meanest citizen in this country for trial unless they produced, in a case where a written paper was in question, the paper before him containing the article or proved it was lost or destroyed, and in that case proved its contents by other evidence. That is a clear rule of law. No fair-minded lawyer who knows anything about law or practice can gainsay it. Secondly, where it is spoken words which are in question, they must give the words or the substance of them, the time, place and circumstances under which they were

spoken and the name of the person who uttered them, so that the accused may have a fair chance to answer or else the judge will not put him on trial. For that reason, the petition does not, in substance, amount to any charge that a man should plead to or answer. I was a little surprised to hear the way the hon. member for York spoke of the respectable citizens of London who signed this petition. How many do you think signed it? Forty-five persons out of the one hundred thousand over whom Judge Elliott has presided for twenty-five years in the county and in the city of London the district his court covers. And who are these men who signed the petition? Sixteen of them are irresponsible clerks, whose employers would not sign, as mentioned by the hon. member for East Lambton. Seventeen are merchants and small dealers, strong partisans, and hon. gentlemen from Ontario will understand how strong partisans they are, by the explanation that every one of them furnishes the London Asylum with supplies. Hon. members for Ontario know what that means, but I will explain it to other hon. gentlemen. Under the Reform Government in Ontario, we have the same individuals, year after year, supplying our different public institutions, which are under the control of our Local House, with hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of supplies, and in no case are these contracts put up to public tender despite the frequent protests of the Opposition in the Local House. And so it comes these seventeen favoured gentlemen, thus encouraged by public contracts, had no hesitation in signing this petition. Who else signed it? Four liquor dealers. I do not blame these poor fellows for they have no other resource In Ontario we have not the secret ballot. No, they will not give, us, corrupt Tories, the secret ballot. A mark is put on every ballot and although these ballots are sealed up, when the election is over, they are in the control of the people in power, and they either open them afterwards or else they tell falsehoods in the matter, because they have told people in my riding that they knew how they voted. It is in their power to know how, and they either exercise that power or at any rate threaten people with its exercise. What has happened? There was a time when we used to have some municipal control. The glory of Ontario was her municipal institutions, and the old Reformers who helped to get them for us deserved as much credit as, and perhaps a little more, than the Conservatives, but the people now in power in Ontario have restricted those municipal rights. The municipal councils used to decide who should have liquor licenses, but now this pure Government which runs Ontario took that power away into their own hands, and the greater part of the money paid for them also which used to go to the municipalities. They appoint license commissioners and an inspector, the latter generally being a political heeler for the riding, and who goes around earning the salary the public pay him by looking after the elections and looking after the lists of voters, and as a result, every hotel keeper almost is now a Grit. There used to be a large majority of them Conservatives in Ontario, but to-day you cannot find one Conservative in ten. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but what I tell them is true, and I can prove it. The hotel keeper has either to vote straight under the coercion of this ballot, which is not secret, or he cannot get a license. Four of them have signed the petition. Who else? Two license commissioners, and last, but not least, the three witnesses my hon. friend referred to. Who are these three witnesses. One is the man who collected $2,000 for election expenses, who kept no accounts, destroyed the books, and had no memory. The others are conveners of meetings of electors to be addressed by Mr. Hyman, at which speeches, cigars, beer and music were furnished at intervals. That is the class of men who signed this petition. Mr. Hyman had too much sense of self-respect himself to sign it. Mr. Gibbons, the great lawyer in London, of whom the hon. member for North York spoke dare not sign it. There is not a lawyer, a doctor, a clergyman or a professional man, or any citizen ever known or heard of ten miles from the city of London, who could be got to sign it. More than that, there is not an affidavit connected with it. There is no affirmation of any person, and it contains nothing for which any county magistrate would send up the meanest citizen for trial. What is the object? We all know that there are men, beings in the form of men, who are so foul that they will go around telling scandals about innocent women. No matter how innocent a woman may be when this occurs, when these reptiles once whisper their tales about her, be she ever so innocent, she cannot recover from the insinuations made against her. We all know the system of blackmail is reduced to a science in some of the large cities of the continent, and every day we hear of innocent and most estimable, moral and christian men who, rather than face the public scandal and the talk which would result, become the prey of these vampires, and the more innocent they are and the more godly they are, the more they tremble at being accused of vicious courses, and we sometimes even see them driven to suicide when they are made the subjects of such charges though perfectly innocent. So it is when a judge is put on his trial. In one of the large cities of this continent since the commencement of this discussion, an eminent divine preached on this subject, and, with the permission of the House, I will give a few extracts from what he said:

"You have heard that 'the men brought up an evil report of the land which they had gone to view,' albeit evidence to the contrary was in their own hands. But facts make no difference with the man determined to blacken a character. He will pervert evidence, distort proofs, cast suspicion upon motives and twist testimony to his sinister purpose.

"The human ear and mind seem to be especially adapted for the reception of 'evil reports.' For the good we demand proofs many and strong, and unless favourably predisposed remain sceptical in spite of them. Why should it be so hard for us to think well of others and so easy to believe evil? Is it because we shrink from confessing ourselves inferiors? Is it because the admission implies a reproach? How is it that good actions are uninteresting, while failings and wrong-doings carry with them a spice that makes them palatable? Certain it is that 'evil reports' spread like wildfire through the length and breadth of our gossiping society, while the best deeds and noblest efforts find so few to do them homage.

"The rabbis of old denied paradise to those who refrained not from backbiting, and held it better for man to throw himself into a fiery furnace than to commit the sin of 'lashonhara'—*i. e.*, the evil tongue—and Schiller says in "Don Carlos" that tale-bearers have caused more suffering in the world than poison or dagger in the murderer's hands."

Now, that is the object: They wish to put this judge upon his trial here. They have not charged him, but still they wish to put him on his trial. I ask any fair-minded man to say if a judge, once put upon

his trial, is not subject to disgrace and indignity, and those who come after him also. I say the independent members of this House should not allow themselves to be made the "lashonhara" or "evil tongue" of disappointed partisans. I think we should stand up here and should not allow the high privileges of this Parliament to be distorted to such partisan ends. At all events, we should say: You shall not put any judge of this land upon his trial unless you make an accusation for such a matter and in such a way as would put the meanest citizen of this land on his trial. That is but simple justice and British fair-play, and I appeal to hon. members of this House to uphold that proposition and vote down this resolution.

Mr. FRASER. It is certainly an edifying sight to listen to the hon. gentleman's peroration where he talked about cursed reptiles and blackmailing, where he went into all the purlieus of scandal and spoke of partisan scandal, while the musical tones of his voice has not ceased to ring in the ears of hon. members when he tried to blacken the names of the 47 petitioners. He did not scorn to say that these men should not be listened to because 17 of them were clerks, a few were tailors, 4 were licensed dealers, and the rest were miserable mechanics.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I said nothing about "miserable mechanics." I said "merchants and small traders."

Mr. FRASER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon if he did not say "mechanics."

Mr. SPROULE. He said "mechanics," but not "miserable mechanics."

Mr. FRASER. He tried to show how disreputable they were by showing that there were no lawyers or doctors among them. I have known clerks and merchants and tailors and liquor dealers as respectable as some lawyers and doctors and clergymen, and I will venture to say that there are among these men those who would not do what Judge Elliott did. It was very easy to get up a sympathy against 47 men who are as respectable as the hon. gentleman or myself. The fact they are clerks or merchants supplying a certain asylum would not shut them out from their rights, or there are thousands of merchants who supply the Dominion Government who would be shut out. As to the liquor dealers, they must be in close affinity with the present member for London (Mr. Carling) who is in that business himself. Then the hon. gentleman indulged in a tirade, as usual, against the Mowat Government. I am not here to defend the Mowat Government and they need no defence. I observe that they seem to have been working into the heart of the strong Conservative constituencies in Ontario, and the people of Toronto must have gone mad, according to the hon. gentleman or they would not support so bad a Government. The hon. gentleman, in trying to make a case, had wandered away from the point under discussion, which is, whether Judge Elliott has so misconducted himself that an investigation should be demanded into his conduct. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to get wrathy at the sins of others, and to call down the imprecations of Heaven upon their heads, and then say that these charges should not be listened to here. If these petitioners have given us a case worthy of attention, we should not refuse to hear them, and the hon. gentleman should be the last man to insinuate anything against the characters of these people. Surely he is not going to show their want of character by stating what their employment is. He is like a good many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who believe that only the favoured few are entitled to be heard, but that these men should not be listened to because they are poor clerks or tailors. The hon. gentleman would be a nice looking object in this House if he could not find a tailor. I submit that the characters of these people should not be judged according to their employment. Now, he was good enough, first, to speak upon the points of the law, then upon points of morals, and finally he wound up by speaking on a question of divinity. Let us see what he has to say upon the points of law? Are we here to discuss whether London has been Conservative for so many years? Or does his argument mean that because it has been Conservative so long, it should never be anything else, or that the electors of London have no right to elect any one else but a Conservative? That seems to be the hon. gentleman's idea. But I think the young men of London have got something to say upon the question as to who shall represent that city. The hon. gentleman and his friends think the constituency belongs to them, it is a hive, it is a preserve that has always belonged to Mr. Carling, and he is founding an argument upon that fact to show that London being Conservative, it could not possibly have been won by the Liberals. What have we to do just now with this barrel of beer, this basket of ale, this coloured meeting, these pigs' feet, this bogus circular, these ruffians who attacked Mr. Meredith? Did they affect the judgment of the court? Are they matters that ought to be taken into consideration in an enquiry as to whether that petition is sufficient for this House to accept as a basis upon which to order an enquiry? Does it make any difference whether the people of London feed upon the finest beef or upon pigs' feet? Does it make any difference to us whether they drink ale, beer, or wine, or anything else? The hon. gentleman likes to deal with questions of this kind, and he puts them into the scale in discussing the question as to whether the judge has done that which is right in his judicial capacity. Sir, we are here to look into the question as to whether the member who now sits for London, is here by the judgment of an unbiassed judge, who gave such a judgment as he ought to have given in that instance. I see the hon. member for South Norfolk has left his seat; unfortunately for his argument, the judge and he does not agree. He says the judge was right in disregarding the judgment that was given by the higher court because it was not a court in which the case could be entertained. Now, the judge himself did not think that. Here is a very nice tinted little pamphlet that was sent, I suppose, to all the members, containing the full text of Judge Elliott's judgment. It will be noticed that Judge Elliott does not pretend to say that that court had no jurisdiction and that he disregarded it for that reason. Here is the reason the judge gives:

"In the Court of Appeal to which the case was carried no judgment or costs were given, but three of the judges expressed an opinion that the notices given were sufficient. I entertain an unfeigned respect for opinions expressed by learned judges of that court, and I would gladly, if I could, shelter myself from inevitable odium by conform-

ing to their expression of opinion. But it is evident from the language used by these learned judges, or at least by some of them, that they were rather reluctantly drawn into any expression of opinion on the subject, and one of them described any opinion expressed by the court to be simply an *obiter dictum*."

The judge says that the reason why he will not follow their judgment is that they were drawn into giving their judgment, and hence it must have been a hasty judgment that he did not like to follow because he had give the question more mature consideration. The hon. member said he had a right to disregard the judgment because it was given by a court in a case where there was no jurisdiction. The judge himself did not seem to think so. He says that his judgment is better than that of the three judges of the Court of Appeal for this reason: that, first of all, they were drawn into giving the judgment, and next, one of the judges said any opinion expressed by the court, was an *obiter dictum*. The two points the judge makes were these: If it was a judgment it was wrongly given, and one of the judges went so far as to say that the judgment of the other two judges was an *obiter dictum*, and every lawyer knows very well that a judge does not feel himself bound to follow *obiter dictum*. Now, that was the strange decision for the judge to give upon that one point. I need not enter into the case as far as the learned gentleman has done who preceded me. It certainly must be a new doctrine to this House that the opinions of such eminent judges as sat on this case ought not to be followed by Judge Elliott. It would appear from the argument of Judge Elliott that he had the English authority, and he was bound to follow it rather than the Canadian authority, and that the Canadian judges who gave a judgment had no English authority at all. I always thought that judges of the Court of Appeal in Ontario had the English decisions at hand. We know that our judges in the Lower Provinces always consult English decisions; they not only know that such judgments exist, but they have fully read those judgments in a particular case. More than that, it will be remembered that the very men who were arguing the case before Judge Elliott went before this Court of Appeal. Did they not mention these cases that strengthened Judge Elliott in giving his decision, the English cases on which the hon. gentleman said the judge ought to have acted as being better law than the law of the Court of Appeal? Did they forget to show that it was necessary that this judge himself should in the first place find out those cases? Now, it is very laughable to find him strengthening his judgment by giving a quotation from one of the judges. He quotes from Hartly *vs.* Halse, 22 Q. B. Div., where Coleridge, C.J., said:

"Where a statute directs that a particular form shall be used, and a form is used which omits some essential element in the statutory form, the use of the defective form invalidates the proceeding."

That is one of the judgments upon which Judge Elliott based his decision. If there had been a form of notice in our statute, and that form had not been given but a different one had been given, I could understand how it would strengthen the judgment, but no such form prevails. But the learned judge comes into conflict with all these decisions that are given. Now, no man has a right in this place to impugn the motives of a judge. All I say is this: I submit that a County Court judge who has read the decision given by the judges of the Court of Appeal, in the province in which he lives, and gives contrary judgment, does not act as I would expect a judge of the Supreme Court to act. But when it is taken into consideration that from his judgment there could be no appeal, even if he did not accept the judgment of the Court of Appeal, it can be well understood, if he had partisan ideas, if he was kindly disposed towards the Minister, when his judgment could never be attacked except in this Parliament, how easy it was for him to give the judgment that he did. That is only one of the many things that have happened from this miserable Act, which is framed in the interests of men who may use it for their own purposes. Now, when Judge Elliott gave his decision, did he have any idea of what he wanted done? I find in this pamphlet that he states that in November last an appeal was heard before him as to the validity of a notice under the Dominion Franchise Act, and he says:

"I then expressed my opinion that this notice was invalid for the reason that it did not conform with the requirements of the Dominion Franchise Act."

He goes on to say:

"Had this expression of opinion been carried into practical effect, the name of Allan and others similarly situated would have been retained on the voters' list unaffected."

He means by that statement that if his expressed opinion in November had been taken by those parties, those men would have been on the list, and he would have been safe in giving this other judgment. Did it not look at the time he was giving the judgment in November, when he gave that expression of opinion, that he was looking forward to the same thing happening again? I do not say he was, but taking that expression of opinion in connection with the other matter, it appears that he understood from the beginning what he was going to do. Does a judge do what he likes in retaining those names on the list and declaring they have a right to vote? I take it that the revising barrister had just as good an idea of what votes should be on the list, particularly a revising officer appointed by the present Government, as any other man, and no evidence that could be given would lead him to do that which was against the interest of Mr. Carling and his party. This, to my mind, is a very important point, that the revising officer himself found that over 200 names were not entitled to vote because they did not possess the franchise. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House spoke of the fairness shown in the statement of Mr. Hellmuth that he would take a number of those votes and would show that they had a right to be on the list; that is to say, he would go before Judge Elliott and would prove that, although they were left out by the revising officer, they were entitled to vote according to the decision of Judge Elliott. That was not a great stretch of generosity, for if the judge was so much of a partisan as to allow himself to do in his judicial capacity that which he ought not to do, it was easy to get those names placed on the list. It must not be forgotten in the discussion of this question that the conduct of Judge Elliott had the effect of returning the member to this House who now sits here, not as the representative of London but as the representative of Judge Elliott. If the position taken by the petitioners is correct, namely, that these names had no

right to be on the list and that the revising barrister had so decided, then the judgment of Judge Elliott made these voters good which the revising barrister decided to be bad. Consequently the member returned has no legal majority. It strikes me in this connection as strange that the hon. gentleman should sit here, that a man in regard to whom it was a question as to whether he had obtained a majority, shall not go again to the same electors. There is such a thing as a man throwing down the gauntlet and succeeding, and nothing in this world receives the approbation of honourable men, like the action of a man who, on being accused of unfairness, declares he is ready to again appeal to the same people, who returned him previously. Is it fair, on the other hand, that the candidate receiving a majority of the qualified votes should, owing to the conduct of Judge Elliott, be deprived of his seat? The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) treated very lightly the accusation that the judge wrote political articles, and it seemed to be the height of the ridiculous when he said that there should be an affidavit produced to show that this was true. Fancy a petition coming into this House with an affidavit of its truthfulness attached? How would such a petition be dealt with here? Whoever heard of pleadings in a court being sworn to before evidence was given. At certain steps this must be done and in certain kinds of action, but this is not the kind of subject in which it is called for. I can understand also, if these men are unworthy of credence, why we should not proceed; but if 47 petitioners declare that Judge Elliott did write the articles for the newspapers, then I care not whether he gave a wrong judgment knowingly or not, the fact that he wrote political articles unfitted him to be a judge. It is very well to talk about this old christian gentleman and about his great virtues, but if a man has no more respect for the bench, before whom the parties may come, who have their political views, before whom as he knew these very parties would come of whom he was writing, then during the heat of an election contest to write for a newspaper on one side is to unfit him to sit in the poorest court in the land. Is this fact true or not? Is it worthy of being investigated or not? If enquired into, what would be done? It seems to me that is the whole point. I can very well understand how a legal argument can be made in regard to this judgment and an argument adduced to show that it should not be disturbed, but if behind the judgment there is a judge, who at that time was writing political articles, then he was unfitted to give that judgment or any other. I do not believe there is another judge who would act in this manner, but if there should be such a one, the most wholesome action we could take with respect to Judge Elliott was to have an investigation in order that there may not be a repetition of such an occurrence. Have we come to this point, that judges can write political articles and Parliament should not enquire into the matter? I admit it is a grave matter for Parliament to investigate the conduct of any judge, and except for the fact that many men had made statements detailing the actions of the judge, I would have some difficulty in coming to the conclusion that Parliament should enquire into the matter. If these statements were true there should be no difficulty in making an investigation. I have never known any judge, with whom I have come in contact, so act. I know judges who were heated partisans in the arena of politics, I know men in Nova Scotia, on the bench to-day, who held high positions here, and whose political leanings, in the different cases, have been, if anything, against the party with whom they were originally associated, lest it should be considered that, as they were partisans at one time, this fact would give them leanings in a certain direction. But this old christian gentleman, grey-haired in the service of God, as he was represented by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), after all these days was removed from the political turmoil of his years, presiding with judicial dignity over a hundred thousand people—what a large place that must be over which he presides—how that he so far forgot himself as to write political articles is a remarkable circumstance. He was prepared to help his political friends. Is that true or is it not? Does the fact that 47 respectable people say it is true, form a sufficient ground for parliamentary action? If not, then I can understand the position taken, but if it has to be verified by an affidavit I cannot understand it. If the fact that these people are clerks or merchants or tailors is to debar them from petitioning Parliament to enquire into the conduct of a judge or anybody else, then I say that this Parliament has come to be a farce. If the only ground that the hon. gentleman urges as to their character is because of their associations, I do not believe that that is any reason against their petition being heard. The fact that a clerk has a yard stick in his hand and measure cotton or broad cloth, or sells groceries or that a tailor either with his own needle or a new sewing machine makes a coat, does not debar them from petitioning Parliament. If that were the case it would be for Parliament to lay down a rule as to the character of the petitioners that will be heard; it would be for hon. gentlemen opposite to have an *index expurgatoris* of all these characters so that none of them can enter Parliament to petition, and it would be for those hon. gentlemen to have the effrontery to say that because men are clerks or tailors we shall pay no heed to them. I thought that any man's position in this country, so long as he was an honest man, entitled him to the ear of Parliament. I have been vainly dreaming that in this country we were building up a nation where class distinction could not prevail, but I see I am mistaken. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has dispelled the illusion, and he has discovered that the character of these people is such as not to entitle them to petition. Well, I do not believe that. If all that is contained in this charge is true, it is the duty of the Government to enquire into it and to ascertain the conduct of the judge previously with regard to political partisanship. If the Government do not enquire into this matter, we will soon have a new word coined in this country, and when a man by force takes away his neighbour's goods and keeps them we shall say, not that he stole them, but that he "Elliottized" them. It is our duty to proceed with this enquiry, first, in order that we may bring down on these people the just retribution which should fall upon any men who attack a judge if they cannot prove what they said, and secondly, if the charges are true, to show a man who now occupies a place on the bench, that when he gives judgment he must remember that he ceases to be a partisan, and that

the bench is only for men who can lay aside their feelings in such matters. Now, Mr. Speaker, that being the question I shall vote that this matter be enquired into, and if we adopt that course we shall first of all do Judge Elliott justice, if it is found to be incorrect; and we will do him justice if it is found to be correct, because he himself will understand that it is better he should be brought to justice now than that he should be allowed to go on in the same course and do worse

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) might be excused for the remarks they have made, because they had taken an active part in the election in question, and they were no doubt greatly disappointed at the result, and want in some way to lay the blame of their defeat on Judge Elliott on account of the decision which he has given. I thought that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) coming as he does from the sea, would be somewhat cooler and would advance us some arguments upon this point in order that those who are willing to deal fairly in this matter would be enabled to vote intelligently on the question before the House. If there was anything wanted to show to the members of this House that this motion should not be entertained, the address which we have listened to from the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) would have furnished it. The hon. gentleman of course told us that the object of this petition was not to discuss the characters of the parties who signed it, nor of the great moral question which he says has been brought forward by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), but simply that the question was to see whether or not by the decision of this judge, a member was sitting in this House who had no right to sit here: that is, if the decision of Judge Elliott gave a certain number of votes to persons who had voted for Mr. Carling, then of course the matter must be pressed. I am sure that any person listening to the hon. gentleman must have come to the conclusion that this is what he meant. Then the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) told us that the judges in Nova Scotia were so pure that they would not give a decision in favour of the Conservatives, but would rather lean towards the Liberals. I have not that opinion of the judges in Nova Scotia, nor do I believe that any person practising before the bar of that province ever thought that any of the judges in any manner whatever undertook to give a decision against his friends in order to win a reputation of being considered impartial.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. What I said was that I knew them to be so particularly careful that if there was any leaning it was considered to be on the side of their own political friends. I did not say anything in reference to their giving judgment.

Mr. McDONALD (Victoria). The hon. gentleman may qualify his statement now, and I am quite willing to accept that as what he meant to say. I am sure he would not wish to misrepresent the judges in that way. Coming back to the question before the House, I really cannot understand how gentlemen opposite seem to mix up the facts in regard to it. I believe it was some time in November or October that Mr. Lilley, of London, had undertaken to give notices objecting to 500 or 600 names on the voters' lists. In sending out his notices the only objection that he made to the parties on the list was simply the words "not qualified," and when they appeared before the revising barrister, objection was taken to the form, and the revising barrister allowed him to amend. I wish to draw attention to the amendments which were made, and which were simply to state "no income within the statute," not "owner within the Act," or "not tenant within the Act." These were the amended notices which were sent out to these various parties. The matter was then brought before Judge Elliott, and I think every one in the House will agree that it was brought up rather immaturely. There was no decision given as to whether the names should remain on the list or not, and I believe that in reading the statute every person must come to the conclusion that Judge Elliott had no power to decide with regard to anything the revising officer had done, either in reference to amending the notices or extending the day for hearing. Judge Elliott then so decided, but he intimated strongly that he believed that the notices were invalid and were not capable of being amended. The judge clearly says this, and in so far as the decision went, it was in favour of those who appealed from the revising officer, but he believed that he had no power at that time to deal with the matter. The judge gave his decision and it was the same as he gave afterwards, and from which he did not recede in any way from beginning to end. These proceedings as the House is well aware came before the Court of Queen's Bench by a motion for a mandamus to compel the revising officer to proceed. I believe that in the mean time the revising officer acting upon the suggestion or hint thrown out by the County Court judge, declined to proceed any further with these names or to pay any attention to the amending notices which he had ordered to be given himself. Now, I find that a mandamus was applied for. I have the Ontario report, and there was no written decision. The judge simply said that the notice was sufficient, and no appeal is given by the Act from the County Court judge. The Court of Queen's Bench decided in the same way. But when we come to the decision that was given by Chief Justice Hagarty, I think we shall find that the revising barrister, the County Court judge and the chief justice were not so very far apart; and I believe that following the decision of Chief Justice Hagarty and Mr. Justice Burton, a large number of those names that were struck off by the revising barrister would still have remained on the list, and the original notices and the amended notices would never have touched them. Chief Justice Hagarty, in his decision, says:

"We cannot obtain much assistance from English authority as to the requirements of a notice of objection. The statutes differ much from ours in this respect."

Further on he says:

"The notice to him merely stated that it was objected to, his name being retained on the list of voters for the south-west division of the County of Lancaster. That was held by the court to be insufficient, as the column of the list on which the objection was grounded was not named, which specially referred to county voters on a new franchise. The general Act had also to be considered."

Then he goes on to say:

"Our Act does not draw this distinction, and I do not think we can hold these amended notices insufficient. They specially attack the voter's interest, that is his posi-

tion as owner or tenant, and his right to that character as defined in the Franchise Act. Under such a notice he would not I conceive be liable to attack on a merely personal ground, as post office or customs official, &c., &c."

Chief Justice Hagarty goes on to say that he does not think they would be allowed to go into any objection except as to the qualifications. Mr. Justice Burton says:

"As to the suggestion that the revising officer could under it enter upon the consideration of another and distinct ground of disqualification, my inclination is against it, although it is unnecessary to venture a final opinion; but, to call in aid again the old system of pleading and the reasoning by analogy upon it, I think it would have assumed the shape of a plea in confession and avoidance—thus: we admit you are apparently qualified as a landlord, but we set up that you are disqualified as an alien or as one of the parties disqualified under the Act, and possibly without such an affirmative statement the objection would not be open."

Now, when hon. gentlemen charge Judge Elliott with having it in his mind to allow these voters to remain on the list with the object of giving the seat to Mr. Carling, I say that if he had that intention he could easily have carried it out and at the same time have appeared the fairest possible man. He had there the decisions of Chief Justice Hagarty and Mr. Chief Justice Burton, and some of the other judges I think went nearly as far, who said he could go on to consider the qualifications, but could not enquire into other things. He could not enquire whether a person was of age, whether he was a British subject, whether he had resided one year in the locality, whether his income was derived in the Dominion or outside, whether he was a farmer's son or an owner's son. Now, a list of the parties struck off is given here by the revising officer. Take the first name on the list, Lewis Allan. Evidence was given to satisfy the revising officer that he did not reside in London. But under the amended notices, according to the decision of the judges, he would not be permitted to enquire whether he resided in London or not. The next case was that of R. J. B. Moore, who lives in South London, according to the testimony of his brother. He could have enquired into that case, even under the amended notice. Of course, the judge decided that the revising officer could not have gone on and heard these cases, but limited the matters into which he could enquire. I think there were 75 names struck off this list, for the simple reason that the parties were not living at the time or had not a sufficient residence within the electoral district of London to qualify them to vote. There was nothing to show that they had not the necessary income or were not of age or British subjects. The simple fact was that they did not reside for the specified number of months previous to their applications in London. These are the objections which are not covered by the notice given; and so Judge Elliott, if he were plotting and scheming as parties on the other side say he was, could have gone into these cases and with the most apparent fairness have decided that these 75 names should remain on the list, whereas the revising officer struck them off; and he could have done that under the judgment delivered by the Court of Appeal. How can any person say that Judge Elliott, for the purpose of returning the Hon. Mr. Carling to this House as the member for London, would undertake without good reasons to give a decision contrary to those of the Court of Appeal, and the Court of Queen's Bench, when he could have decided quite as effectively and given a decision on other grounds and in accordance with the decision of the majority of the Court of Appeal? Now, in the petition the County Court judge is not attacked for doing anything wrong. It does not set forth that he has done anything wrong in regard to the revision of these lists. The solicitor who appeared on behalf of the parties objecting said that he was not bound by the decision of the Court of Appeal; and even if he were bound, there is nothing to show from the evidence taken before the revising officer that more than twenty or thirty of those who voted in the election should have been struck off, and I understood that in other cases, in the case of twenty-three, on one side or on the other, the County Court judge had accepted evidence that was given before the revising officer. In this case he might have done the same thing, and have retained 75 of those who had voted for Mr. Carling on the list, and have come within the judgment delivered by the Court of Appeal. I say, then, that I think this shows a considerable amount of fairness on the part of Judge Elliott. It shows at least that in the judgment he gave he must have been convinced he was right, when he could have resorted to another matter if he had been so disposed. If he was anxious to have the hon. member for London returned, he could have come within the Act and within the judgment of the Court of Appeal. With regard to the writing in the newspaper, I do not think we are bound to take any notice of this. I have no doubt but what members on the other side would judge very differently from members on this side as to what constituted violent language at the time of an election. I have no doubt that Judge Elliott expressed himself in favour of Mr. Carling as a better representative, and in this he was in accord with the people of London. Hon. gentlemen opposite would characterize his expression of opinion no doubt as very violent language. One of the first essentials in an indictment is that the words must be distinctly set forth. I know of one celebrated case which came under an old statute against swearing. A man was brought before the magistrate for having used 50 oaths, but the magistrate refused to entertain the complaint until the party complaining set out the words which he considered as constituted swearing; and on his setting them out, the magistrate found that they did not amount to an offence. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite would consider as violent language at the London election what this side would consider as very moderate. I believe, in the first place, that the decision of Judge Elliott was strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Franchise Act, and, in the second place, I do not see that there is anything in the petition which Judge Elliott should be called on to answer. I believe a judge of a County Court or even of any of the inferior courts should not be afraid of rendering justice, and we ought to allow the judges full liberty to dispense justice without any fear of being brought before the courts of Parliament or any other courts. I believe it would be an injury to Judge Elliott that he should be called upon to answer a vague, indefinite charge of this kind, which, even if true, he should not be called upon to answer, at least until he was furnished with the very words, the very language he is accused of having spoken during the London election.

Mr. WELDON. I would not at this time of the night rise to speak were I not possessed strongly of the opinion that the procedure which the hon. member for West Lambton asks this House to take is an unsound procedure and one which it would be unwise for this House, in the best interests of this country, to follow. The House of Commons can do something to preserve the dignity of justice by the tone of its discussion in matters of this kind. It is a fair subject of complaint and remonstrance that more than one member of this House, in addressing himself to this question, has forgotten the nature of the question to which he was speaking; and I fully endorse the scathing rebuke which the hon. member for South Norfolk administered to the hon. member for North York concerning the remarks made by that hon. gentleman with a view to coercing Judge Elliott a few days before his judgment was delivered. I speak without heat and passion, I hope, when I say that in the six sessions during which I have had the honour of having a seat in this Parliament, that speech stands without rival or parallel in our parliamentary record. It is one which should have called out a strong rebuke, coming from a layman, but coming from a barrister it merits a still stronger rebuke. Not only can this House do something to preserve the dignity of justice by the sobriety and moderation with which hon. members discuss questions affecting the administration of justice, but we can do still more by laying down a safe procedure for dealing with charges of misbehaviour against one of the judges of the land. I object, in the strongest way, to the procedure which the hon. member for the West Riding of Lambton has asked this House to adopt in his motion upon the Paper. I object to it for the reason that it is adverse to the public interest, that it runs counter to a usage which is well established, that it is in conflict with an Act which Parliament, ten years ago, in its wisdom, chose to pass for our guidance in matters of this kind. And, furthermore, I would urge that it is in conflict with the sound constitutional rule laid down, I think, in one of the sections of the British North America Act. In the first place, we are asked to take a copy of the petition which has been laid upon the Table of this House, complaining of the conduct of a county judge:

"And to furnish that petition to that judge for his information and enable him to make such statement or answer to the charge therein contained as he may deem proper, and that the said petition and any such answer as the said judge may make be referred to a special committee of this House to enquire into the truth of the several allegations therein, with a view of finding whether such charges should be investigated by a commission."

Now, the practice which we are asked to adopt in this debate is not the practice which has been pursued in this country for a number of years. I submit that the hon. member for West Lambton has been misled by the reading which he made from Bourinot's book on the Practice and Procedure of Parliament, and which is found on page 35. I need not read that quotation, but I would suggest to the hon. member that if he would take that reading and follow out the Canadian cases mentioned in it, and the English cases cited in the foot-note, and then look up in the English *Hansard* the comments on these cases, he will find he is not well warranted in asking this House to adopt the procedure he proposes. The procedure open to us to adopt is this: That if a member has reason to complain of misbehaviour on the part of a County Court judge, his duty is to put those facts before the Government, and it is the duty of the Government, pursuant to an Act which I will quote in a moment, if, in the opinion of the Government the charges are of a character so grave that, if true, they will call for further enquiry, to put those charges before the judge, and then what comes next? What comes next is the issue of a Royal Commission, should the Government think fit to do so. My hon. friend from East Lambton, who has spoken so clearly and so convincingly twice on this question, says, we cannot be too careful in this House in trying to maintain public respect for our courts of justice. Let me remind the House that one of the wisest law reformers of the English race said that it was of supreme importance to a free commonwealth that it should have the highest confidence in its courts of justice, so much so that he believed it was better that the people should believe they were getting pure law from the courts of justice when they were not than the contrary. I refer, of course, to Jeremy Bentham, whose works have largely affected the jurisprudence of some forty English-speaking commonwealths. If we would be guided by the constitution, if we would be guided by the old practice in the mother country as well as in this, even if we were making a new practice, we should take care that, in the early stages of an attack upon a judge, the charges were grave. I have indicated what is the established usage, and I have shown that the quotation from May, which my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) relied on, will, if he examines the authorities in regard to it, bring him to a different conclusion from that which he has enunciated. I have shown that the usage we have followed in Canada in regard to County Court judges for ten years has been that the complaint should be put before the Administration and that they must take the responsibility of dealing with it. Ten years ago, the Parliament of Canada passed an Act dealing with cases of this kind. It is found in the Revised Statutes, chapter 18. Section 2 of that statute provides that judges of the County Court shall hold office during good behaviour. Then sub-section 2 of that section provides that:

"A judge of a county court may be removed from office by the Governor in Council for misbehaviour, or for incapacity or for inability to perform his duties properly, on account of old age, ill-health or any other cause: if—

"(*a*). The circumstances respecting the misbehaviour, incapacity or inability are first enquired into: and—

"(*b*). Such judge is given reasonable notice of the time and place appointed for the enquiry, and is afforded an opportunity, by himself or his counsel, of being heard thereat, and of cross-examining the witnesses and adducing evidence on his own behalf;

"3. If any such judge is removed from office for any of such reasons, the Order in Council providing for such removal, and all reports, evidence and correspondence relating thereto, shall be laid before Parliament within the first fifteen days of the next ensuing session.

"4. The Governor General in Council may, for the purpose of making enquiry into the circumstances respecting the misbehaviour, inability or incapacity of such judge, issue a commission to one or more judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, or to any one or more judges of any Superior Court in any province of Canada, empowering him or them to make such enquiry and to report, and may, by such commission, confer upon the person or persons appointed full power to summon before him or them any persons or witnesses, and to require them to give evidence on oath, orally or in writing or on solemn affirmation, if they are persons entitled to affirm in civil matters, and to

produce such documents and things as the commissioner or commissioners deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to enquire."

Now, when Parliament has deliberately chosen a way which may be adopted in trying a County Court judge for misbehaviour, and when ten years of usage have indicated the elementary stages of that procedure, what good reason is there for departing from this usage and here and now dragging the name of a judge before Parliament and leading Parliament into an acrimonious discussion which, as I said at the outset, does little to maintain the dignity of Parliament, and may do much to lower the dignity of justice? The existence of such a statute indicates the deliberate intention of Parliament that such matters should be enquired into outside of Parliament. The third sub-section that I have quoted clearly does not contemplate this being done by Parliament at all, because the fact that all the evidence and papers are to be laid before Parliament early in the next session, indicates that this must be done, as it were, behind the back of Parliament. So I say that the existence of the Act, and the reading of the third sub-section indicate that the trial of County Court judges should be had in another way, and that the preliminary enquiries should be conducted in some more guarded and quiet manner than can be expected in a discussion in this House. Further, we find that, when our constitution was drafted, there was put in a section which is numbered 99, which says:

"The judges of the Superior Courts shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons."

It is noticeable that, in that section, the judges of the County Courts are not named, and, when we remember that this Imperial statute was only the crystallization of the regulations which were drafted by Canadian public men, the omission is more significant. To make that more apparent, I would call attention to the fact that the Quebec resolutions which were the precursor of the British North America Act, contained this provision in the same words. Article 37 of the Quebec resolutions uses the same language:

"The judges of the Superior Courts shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall be removable only on the address of both Houses of Parliament."

At the union of the provinces County Courts were established in at least two provinces. The framers of the Quebec resolutions were familiar with these facts. The distinction between County Courts and Superior Courts was well established and commonly observed. Therefore it was the purpose of the British North America Act, to distinguish between the Superior Court judges and the County Court judges. Parliament took control of the Superior Court judges, or rather the Senate and the House of Commons took control of them, and the Imperial Parliament guaranteed them a tenure of their offices during good behaviour, subject to an address by the Houses of the Canadian Parliament. But it did not give power to the Senate and House of Commons to remove the county judges. As to whether the power to remove a Superior Court judge involves the power to remove a County Court judge, there is at least much doubt. If you say that the omission of the words "County Court" in Section 99 of the Constitution Act is insignificant or is an accident, I would answer, the burden rests on him who takes that point to prove it. I would now direct the House to another aspect of the case. I would call attention to the fact that in the mother country, where Parliament has power to remove the judges by address, the greatest care has been taken to protect the judge in the preliminary proceeding, and to see that no injustice is done him, and that neither his reputation nor his cause is prejudiced in any way, I will read a case from the English *Hansard* bearing on the one we have before us, the case of Sir James Scarlett, who was then, I think, Lord Abinger, who was tried on a charge of having used intemperate political language in addressing both the grand jury and the petit jury in reference to a case before him. He was accused of having used the language of an extreme Tory, and his conduct came under review before the English House of Commons. Lord John Russell spoke on the subject of that judge's conduct, and I will read what he said in that debate. The case is reported in *Hansard*, Vol. 66, page 1071. Now, take note, the judge was charged with having on the bench used the language of a violent political partisan. The attack was made by Mr. Thomas Duncombe, a famous man at that time, some 40 years ago. He said that Lord Abinger had spoken from the bench in terms that were more appropriate to a politician than to a judge. The Attorney-General, Sir F. Pollock, defended the conduct of the judge, and said:

"It is in fact an admitted principle that no Government should support a motion for an enquiry into the conduct of a judge, unless they have first made an investigation, and are prepared to say that they think it a fit case to be followed up by an address for his dismissal."

There was a case where a charge was brought before Parliament, and where the English Parliament undoubtedly had power to remove a superior judge by an address from the Lords and Commons, and in that case so cautious was the English Parliament that the Liberal leader, although stung by the conduct of the judge, nevertheless saw fit to lay down that rule that I have read. Again, in the same debate, Lord John Russell objected, "that Lord Abinger had spoken both as a politician and as a lawyer, when he should have spoken as a judge;" but nevertheless he said:

"He regarded the independence of the judges to be so sacred that nothing but the most imperious necessity should induce the House to adopt a course that might tend to weaken their standing or endanger their authority."

Now, I would be content to stop here and say that these statutes, and these decisions, and these judgments are at least some reason for supporting the position I took up at the beginning, that the better practice for us to pursue was the old practice, and that the better way for the hon. member for West Lambton would be to put his charges in the hands of the Minister of Justice and ask him to put these before a commission with the result that whether the charges were proved true or not, the case will again come later on before Parliament. The hon. member for West Lambton cannot say that this is giving him no chance, that the Ministry of the day will be guided by partisan considerations. If they are, they are blameworthy, and if they have not discharged their duty under oath, their conduct must come before this House for criticism, and the member then has not only his right, but it is his bounden duty to make his statement. While on my feet I would like to say a word, not making any

new argument at all, but endorsing heartily the capital statement made by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) a few moments ago, as to the duty of the judge of the County Court who, if I understand the law aright, was a judge who gave a final judgment from which there was no appeal. There was no constitutional duty cast upon Judge Elliott, as I understand it, to obey and accept *ex cathedra* the law of the judges of the High Court of Justice, even if they had given a well reasoned judgment, seeing that he was by law the final judge. The judgment of the High Court of Justice was no more obligatory upon Judge Elliott than was the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States. It was a judgment of able lawyers who had heard argument and were therefore able to give a valuable legal opinion to which every prudent man sitting in a court of lower rank, would give due consideration, and that is all. But how absurd to impeach a judge in that regard and to argue that his law was bad. It is no ground for holding that he should be impeached, even if his law was bad, even if he has misread those cases that he cites, if he has misconstrued them, if he has misunderstood the English statute, if he is wrong in his law from top to bottom, that is no reason in the world for dragging his name with censure before this House. But I say that, in my opinion—and I have read that judgment carefully and have taken the trouble to look up the law reports, and the English election laws and compared them with our own—the judge cannot be censured for the position he took. I have had my attention called to a few cases which are not cited here, but which seem to be very apposite and to confirm the judgment of Judge Elliott, and I will take the responsibility of saying that in my opinion the judgment of the County Court judge seems to be a carefully reasoned judgment. If you follow the English cases, if you follow the spirit of the English decisions, it seems to me that they can leave no doubt as to the correctness of the position he has taken. If I had time I would like to cite some other English judgments much more technical than ours, and if you go by the light of these English cases, you can with difficulty come to any other conclusion. Let me refer to one case very much in point, a case reported in Vol. 12, Queen's Bench Division. No case could be stronger to show that the English judges are severely technical in construing their franchise Acts. I might quote from Lord Coleridge and Lord Esher to show that the position of a voter who is on the list is stronger than that of the man who attacks it. Lord Esher shows furthermore that the voter whose name is on the list and attacked can only hold his position as against the attacking party by being prepared to resist some seven distinct allegations of non-qualification. If, therefore, you go by the law of reason, you see how unfair it is to say that in a doubtful case the voter on this list is bound to be ready to defend himself against attacks from seven different quarters rather than that the man objecting shall specifically make one challenge. Here is a case to show how extremely stringent and technical the English courts have been recently in interpreting their English laws. Hon. members have had it already explained to them that the English Act differs from ours in that the objections to names on the list are first sent to overseers. There was a case where an objection was given to the overseers and by them sent on, as the law requires, to the claimant. The notice of objection given to the overseers was in the ordinary form, but ended thus: "Dated this eighteenth day of August, one thousand eight hundred and eighty ...." The year was 1883, but the word "three" was omitted. Then the name of the party follows. The overseers duly published a list of persons objected to, including the name of the claimant. The claimant objected that the notice given to the overseers was insufficient on account of this omission, but the revising barrister himself stated in his judgment that, as a fact, the claimant had not been inconvenienced or misled. The court decided that the notice was bad, and their judgment may be found in Vol. 12, Queen's Bench Division, page 373. If Judge Elliott had given a ruling so technical as that, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) would have made all Canada ring in denunciation of Judge Elliott's action. Now, on the point that the judge wrote political articles, I do not know whether he did or not. I have heard gentlemen who claimed to know, and who have denied that statement, that say that my hon. friend is all wrong in his affidavits, and that this will be found out when the case goes on to enquiry. These references that I have made show that in the mother country judges have sometimes used injudicious language, and when it was attempted to make such the basis of a parliamentary enquiry, Ministers of the Crown simply stopped the thing there and then. Now, let us remember when we are arguing that the judges should have consideration, that we are not arguing so much for them, we are not so much concerned in this case as to the feelings of one old man, whether he be a blameless and worthy gentleman, as our friends say, or on the contrary, a heated and unwise partisan: we, as public men, are trying to protect him, not for his sake, but for our own sake, and for the good of the commonwealth. Judge Elliott did not seek his jurisdiction, we put it upon him; and I think we ought to be exceptionally careful in Parliament when we pass Acts, as we did some years ago, divesting ourselves of the trial of controverted elections, and throwing that unwelcome duty upon the judges, not afterwards to scold and lecture them. We cast this duty upon them, it is not of their seeking. I will take my seat by saying that for the reasons I have given, in the light of the statute I have cited, of the opinions I have referred to, of this English debate at which I have glanced, I think Judge Elliott gave a sound decision, and, furthermore, that this House had better promptly and flatly vote down the motion of the hon. member for West Lambton.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) has evidently given this matter a good deal of attention, but I do not think that so far as the authorities are concerned as to the constitutional mode of procedure he has thrown very much light on the subject, or given us any information that we did not possess before. When this matter was first brought before the House I undertook to state the various modes in which judges, who had been guilty of corrupt practices, had heretofore been tried by Parliament. I pointed out that under our statutes the proper way to proceed against County Court judges was before the Governor in Council where a regular

trial took place. I then pointed out that the Consolidated Statutes provided a court of punishment for County Court judges, but that statute was repealed, and that we have in its place, the Revised Statutes, chap. 138, which provided that a County Court judge might be tried, for improper conduct, by a commission appointed by the Governor in Council. Now, I admit frankly so far as the actual trial of a judge is concerned, that that would be the proper course to pursue, but I submit that we are not seeking to impeach Judge Elliott in this House; but certain residents and residents of this country have petitioned this House, representing and setting forth certain wrong-doings on the part of Judge Elliott, and asking this House to investigate the facts, and if they are sustained to have Judge Elliott tried by the proper tribunal. That we have a perfect right to entertain that petition and to act upon it is beyond question. So far as the allegation that a mistake has been caused by reading Bourinot's work, I desire to say there has been no mistake at all. There never was a mistake. The proceedings taken have been taken after due deliberation and a consideration of Bourinot's work and all other works on the subject. After showing how Superior Court judges may be impeached by addresses to both Houses of Parliament, speaking of the British North America Act, Bourinot in his "Constitution and History of Canada" uses these words:

"B. N. A. Act of 1867, Section 99. This section does not apply to County Court judges, whose removal for sufficient cause is provided for by 45 Victoria, chap. 12. It is, however, always competent for the House to address the Governor General for the removal of such judicial officers, and the procedure in Parliament should be as in the case of Superior Court judges."

Bourinot lays down the plain principle in unmistakable language, that it is competent for this House, if it thinks proper, to investigate the conduct of a County Court judge in the same way as the conduct of a Superior Court judge can be investigated by this House, But the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) says: "Oh, you may bring Superior Court judges before Parliament, you may lacerate their feelings as much as you like, you may charge them with high crimes and misdemeanours, but you must not touch a County Court judge; he is more sacred than a Superior Court judge, and his conduct cannot be investigated by the High Court of Parliament. There is no pleasing the supporters of the Government, do what you will; whatever proposition you make, hon. gentlemen opposite will not be pleased. Make a charge against a member of the Government in the plainest English you can possibly put on paper, and the Government will say the charge is too vague, that we cannot investigate it on account of its vagueness. Charge a judge, if you please, with high crimes against the people and an hon. gentleman with the responsibility of the hon. member for Albert, who is always spoken of as such a fair-minded man, arises and declares that this is not right procedure, that we should have proceeded in some other way in order to get at this judge. And what does he propose? He says that we ought, instead of bringing this matter before the House, to present it to the Government. Present it to the Government! This old man they talk about has deprived a citizen of his right to sit in this House. We are asked to present a charge to the Government, one of the members of which is the man whom he placed in this House. That is the tribunal which hon. gentlemen ask the citizens of London to appeal to. If justice is not done here, let me tell hon. gentlemen that a petition will be sent to the Governor General of this country in order that it may be seen if something cannot be done. If Parliament and the representatives of the people refuse to accord to those petitioners that what is their right, an investigation into these charges, then it will be for them to consider whether their duty is not to place before the Governor General, not before the men who advise him, the wrongs under which they are suffering and which they claim to have remedied. What is the position? A returning officer, appointed by the Government, has decided that 131 votes polled at that election were bad. He has decided that they had not the right to vote. He struck them from the list. They had no right, according to his judgment, and he had the evidence and tried the case, to be on the list. The effect of the judgment of Judge Elliott was to keep them there, and those votes elected Mr. Carling, whom I must call the hon. member for the city of London. Without those votes, which the returning officer declares to be bad, which six judges of this country decided had no right to appear, the hon. member for London could not have been returned, and he sits here to-day by virtue of those bad votes, and in defiance of the majority of 22 good votes for Mr. Hyman. Have the people of this country no rights? Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about this old man. Has Parliament no right to investigate this case? Has Mr. Hyman no rights? I say, Sir, that it is essentially and eminently a proper case for Parliament to investigate. I say that when a judge can, by citing authorities such as my hon. friend speaks of; English authorities based upon statutes different from our statutes, and decides in the face of a judgment of six judges given upon our own statutes, I say that it is *prima facie* evidence that the judge was acting corruptly. Judge Elliott, the friend of the hon. member for London (Mr. Carling), the man who owes his position to the hon. member for London, his tried friend for forty years, is that nothing? Have we not the right to infer in the face of all these facts that Judge Elliott was leaning a little more than straight, that he was leaning a little towards the hon. member for the city of London? We need not go into a discussion as to whether this judgment was right or wrong. There is the plain fact of the matter that our courts decided that the revising officer had power to hear these appeals, there is the undisputed fact that the revising officer did hear these appeals, and there is the judgment of six judges of the Province of Ontario deciding that the revising officer had a right to hear them and instructing him to hear them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And deciding that the notices were good.

Mr. LISTER. As my hon. friend says: and deciding that the notice was good, and it followed as a matter of course that he had to hear them. Then why try to rake up English decisions? Why try to bolster up the conduct of this judge by English decisions having no bearing upon this case; decisions on the law of another country in no sense like the statute under which we are proceeding here. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. McDonald) did not seem to know very much about the

case. He evidently did not give it very much consideration so far as the facts are concerned. He says that Judge Elliott had no power to hear the appeal at all in the first place. Judge Elliott himself, I believe, admits that he had no power, although it was not contended by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) that that was the judgment. There can be no doubt at all that so far the first decision of Judge Elliott is concerned it was a mere expression of opinion, and that he himself was conscious that he had not power to entertain an appeal on a matter of that kind from the revising officer. Then, Sir, we come to the second judgment. I say, that after having had this matter argued before him and all the cases that my hon. friend speaks of cited, Judge Elliott himself places upon record this statement:

"The decision of the Court of Queen's Bench is now, it appears, appealed against, and an appeal is now pending before the proper appellate court. In this situation of the matter I reserve judgment on the question which is now brought before me as to the revision or removal of their names, until the result of this appeal shall be known."

So, Sir, there is the evidence in Judge Elliott's own handwriting that he reserved his decision until the judgment of the court of appeal had been given, I have stated before, and I state it now in addition to what is written there, that Judge Elliott had stated that he would be bound by the judgment of the Court of Appeal. It was believed that the decision of the Court of Appeal would be adverse to the Liberal party; that was the belief in the city of London; at least it was so thought, and there is no doubt whatever, that Judge Elliott at the time he penned that statement intended to follow the decision of the Court of Appeal. When that decision was given he was asked to render judgment upon it. The counsel for the Conservatives at once gave a notice of appeal to the Supreme Court, not with any *bonâ fide* intention of carrying out the appeal, but with the intention of hanging up the judgment of Judge Elliott until after the election, to see how the vote went. That is what their object was I have no doubt. And after the decision was given Mr. Hyman's friends, believing that the judgment given by the Court of Appeal, or the *dicta* given by the Court of Appeal would be respected by Judge Elliott, asked him to give judgment, and he gave the judgment which is now the subject of investigation. Sir, I admit that the judgment of the county judge was a final judgment, but I say, looking at the fact that six judges had decided that the notice of appeal was good, taking the fact that Judge Elliott was a contributor to a party newspaper of party political articles, taking the statement that he made before his judgment, I say that all these together show that Judge Elliott was animated and actuated by corrupt motives in giving that judgment. While I say that if it were simply a mistake as to the reading of the decision or a mistake as to the law, but an honest judgment, his judgment could not be questioned here, yet at the same time I say, taking all the facts connected with this matter from first to last; the fact of his judgment being given as it were in the face of the judgment of six judges, his whole conduct during the bye-election in writing articles, political and otherwise in favour of the present member for the city of London (Mr. Carling) and against Mr. Hyman, his public utterances as between the two candidates; taking all together, they make such a strong case as to lead to the almost resistless conviction that Judge Elliott, while he may have thought he was acting right, was acting in the interests of Mr. Carling and was not carrying out the law as understood in this country. The hon. gentleman from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) was very unfortunate in the statement he made to-night. In his speech he jumped from Dan to Beersheba. He tried to belittle, so far as lay in his power, the gentlemen who have signed that petition. He described them as insignificant individuals, individuals whose petition ought not to receive the attention of this august assembly. Sir, the time may come when that hon. gentleman will have to answer elsewhere for the statement he has made here to-night. When a charge was made against a judge he thought it was a proper defence to say that in election proceedings certain of the candidates had been guilty of corrupt practices, and I think most unfortunately for himself he went back to 1874, and brought in the name of Col. Walker in connection with an election which took place between Col. Walker and the present member for the city of London (Mr. Carling). He ought to have told all the story, because John Carling, so-called "Honest John," in justice to him ought to have it all told. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House that Mr. Walker contested the election with John Carling and that it was proven that while a Minister of the Crown and an adviser of Her Majesty, the Hon. John Carling was a secret partner in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, and so much did the people feel it that they resented the impropriety by rejecting Mr. Carling, and they elected Major Walker, whose election was after set aside. But John Carling was afraid to go back to the electors, and James H. Fraser appeared before them as a candidate, and Mr. Fraser is now the revising officer. Five short years passed away, the public condoned this great offence, and the Hon. Mr. Carling was again returned for the city of London. The hon. gentleman talks about voters' lists and corruption. Why does he not tell this House that for fifteen years the city of London was under the complete control of the Conservative party, which appointed the assessors and every public officer in the city, and the consequence was that the voters' lists of that city for all those long years, had been so stuffed that the Conservatives have come to look upon the city of London as their particular preserve, and they resent and become angry at any person who undertakes to interfere with them. The hon. gentleman talks about ruffians patrolling the streets. Why, Sir, it was necessary to patrol the streets. Members of the Conservative party were going from house to house, as the Liberals believed, bribing everybody whom they could bribe, and it was necessary to follow those men up and enter every house they entered to see that the funds known to be in their possession were not expended in bribery. That is the reason these things were done. Hon. gentlemen ask: Why did not Mr. Hyman go into the courts? Mr. Hyman did not go into the courts because the judgment of Judge Elliott was final; and with 130 bad votes on the list, what could Mr. Hyman hope by a new election? But if these names had been removed, a petition would have been filed against Mr. Carling, and he would have been brought before the courts to answer for what took place during the last election in the city of London. Now, Mr. Speaker, I

have nothing more to add. It is not necessary that this debate should take up a very great length of time, because the facts involved are not numerous. I repeat what I stated when introducing this resolution, that I state here on my responsibility as a member of this House, that I believe I can establish—I am sure I can establish—that His Honour Judge Elliott contributed political articles during that campaign. I believe I can show that he used words and language undignified on the part of a judge during such a time. We have a right to expect of the judiciary of this country, that the moment they are appointed to that position, they shall lift themselves above party politics, shall hold the scales of justice evenly between all parties, in order that the people who have to appear before them will feel that only equal and exact justice will be meted out to them. Sir, when we find a partisan occupying that position, how can we avoid feeling that political considerations will enter into his decision of the matters coming before him? The moment a judge shows himself to be a partisan that moment he becomes unfit for his duty and should be removed. Sir, this is an important matter in many respects, as showing the inferior judges in this country that they must act with as much equity as the judges of the Court of Appeal—that they must discharge their duties thoroughly and equally and in a manner that will gain the approval of the people of this country. That is the tribunal to which they must answer. It is in the interest of the people themselves, because we know that unless the liberties which we have are well protected, it may not be long before we lose them. It is in the interest of the people, in the interest of the judiciary, and in the interest of the community at large, that the improper acts charged against Judge Elliott should be investigated, and I repeat that if the charges stated in that petition are true, Judge Elliott is unfit to fill the position of a judge of this land.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think it is necessary to prolong this debate; but I desire to call the attention of the House to a very grave error into which the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) fell. I understood him to say that when Mr. Carling contested the city of London with Mr. Walker, he was then a member of the Government of Canada, and at the same time a secret partner in the corporation then being formed for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Carling did not become a member of the Government of Canada until 1882, and had nothing whatever to do with advising His Excellency in the awarding of the contract.

Mr. LISTER. Was he not a member of Parliament?

Mr. BOWELL. That was not what the hon. gentleman said. He was a member of Parliament, but that was quite a different thing from being an adviser of the Crown.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. While the debate was progressing, I felt that all the questions involved in it, and they are principally questions of law, were so fully dealt with by others that it was unnecessary for me to say a word on the subject at all. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) to-night put the position which I think this House ought to adopt in relation to a resolution of this kind, better and more forcibly than I could do; and I would have remained silent, even at this late stage of the debate, if I did not think that the hon. member for West Lambton has entirely misapprehended some of the very strong points which my hon. friend from Albert put before the House. The hon. gentleman's remarks with reference to those points might possibly have the effect of obscuring the judgment of the House on this question, or obscuring the judgment of those who may review the action of the House itself. For my part, I take entirely the view that my hon. friend from Albert did, that nothing is more to be deprecated than for this House to undertake an enquiry of this kind unless necessity compels it to do so. In the few remarks which I will make on the subject, I will leave out of consideration entirely the political arguments which have been put forward—statements made with regard to the election contest which ended with the decision of Judge Elliott, and the discussions of past elections in the city of London. I think the position assumed by the hon. member for Albert was perfectly sound—the position referred to by the hon. member for West Lambton just now—that this House should not enter into an enquiry of this kind in reference to County Court judges. The hon. member for West Lambton says that it is absurd to say that petitions may be laid on the Table of this House, attacking the character of Superior Court judges, that they are to be subjected to the indignity of discussion and debate over the purity of their motives and to every scrutiny and enquiry that Parliament can adopt, while a judge of a County Court is a sacred thing. I submit to the hon. gentleman himself that he, unconsciously I am bound to assume, entirely misrepresented the argument which was so forcibly stated by the hon. member for Albert, in putting it in that way. The law makes it obligatory on this House, for very wise reasons, to deal with charges laid before it affecting the character and dignity of a Superior Court judge; the constitution provides that a judge of a Superior Court shall hold his office by such an independent tenure that the action of the Executive cannot remove him, until an address shall be passed by both Houses of Parliament. It is therefore necessary, for the purpose of securing the independence of the bench, that, in the case of that class of judges, the complaint shall come here and be adjudicated upon by this House before it shall go to the Executive. But will any one say that this is a task which we ought to assume if the law or the constitution provides another remedy? Does any one pretend to argue that because in the case of the Superior Court judges the constitution compels us to exercise that function, we should therefore grasp the jurisdiction and exercise it in regard to other judges in reference to whom the same reason does not exist? With reference to County Court judges, Parliament has provided a method of trial by a commission issued to one of the higher judges, and has made provision as to the mode of conducting that trial; and if the constitution had made like provisions with regard to the trial of Superior Court judges, I take it that this House would never desire to enter on the enquiry, but would desire that it should be pursued in that course. Now, the authority my hon. friend from Albert referred to, and on which the hon. member for

Lambton rested as an authority in favour of his position, is this: that the House probably has and that both Houses probably have the same authority and the same powers with regard to a County Court judge as with regard to a Superior Court judge. I do not propose to controvert that position nor did my hon. friend from Albert controvert it; but the position we take is this, that while the House may have the power, there is a better tribunal established by law, one having greater convenience for trial and ample jurisdiction, and that the law should take its course with regard to this matter, instead of Parliament undertaking to assert its authority. Now, the answer which is made to that by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), and which was suggested by an interpolation in the debate by some other hon. member, was this: "Are these persons, who have a grievance against Judge Elliott in respect of an improper judgment which he gave in the interest of a member of the Executive, to be told that they must go to the Executive where that member sits, and ask redress for their grievance?" That sounds plausible, but let us see what the resolution of the hon. member for Lambton is. It is distinctly a resolution that a special committee of this House shall be appointed "for the purpose of enquiring into the truth of the several allegations contained in the petition, with the view of finding out whether such charges should be investigated by a commission." So that after this committee, if it should be appointed, has done its work, the report is to be whether or not these petitioners ought to go to the Executive to have a commission appointed after all. With regard to that, will any one tell me what the difference is, the practical difference, between letting these persons, who have to state their grievances, go to the Executive at once, and having them go to a committee of this House, to see whether they should go to the Executive or not. Any one I suppose can tell me what the difference is. The difference is illustrated by some of the phases of the discussion we have had to-day. The difference is that, while, as a matter of course, the member of the Executive concerned would not interfere or vote in Council on this subject any more than he would sitting upon a committee here for the purpose of trying this case, in the debate in this House we have this judge assailed, not only in strong terms for having done what the petition alleges he did, but for having done many other things which these petitioners, whether they be high or low, have not ventured to say he did. We have him, for instance, accused by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution with having "perpetrated one of the greatest wrongs that a judge could perpetrate." We have him accused of having "deprived a member of his seat and sent a man here who has no more right to sit than the messenger at the door"—and not a word of that said in the petition on which we are to try Judge Elliott. We have that statement made to supplement a petition which does not even allege that the decision of the judge is a wrong one; and any one who knows anything of the subject knows that we have to do a great deal more, when we undertake to impeach a judge, than to say he has given a wrong decision. We have to show also that he was actuated by a corrupt motive. In this case the hon. gentleman, who is to be one of his judges, has accused him of things which these forty odd petitioners have not ventured to assert in their accusation.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Judge Elliott is assailed on the floor of this House by extracts from what is called the independent press, and a little later on in the debate another of these, his would-be judges rises and says: "Well, if it does not appear from the petition what these partisan articles are that the judge is charged with having written, I will read some of them to this House, and he, in the position of an accuser, with ten times the acrimony of the petitioners, undertakes to assail the character of Judge Elliott and to read anonymous articles, and to assert that the judge is the author of those articles, not on his own responsibility, not on his own word, and not on his own information, but on the strength of an affidavit, which he refuses either to read or submit to the House and will only consent to put in the hands of the Speaker, provided the Speaker puts it in his pocket and agrees to kept it secret. I should think if anything illustrated the wisdom of the statute passed ten years ago to provide another way of trying county judges, the progress of this debate would do so. To the assertion that it is unreasonable that these petitioners should be sent to the Executive for redress, it is an answer that the statute prescribes that course. It is an answer and a conclusive answer which the hon. member for Albert gave when he said: "If the Executive refuse to do these people justice, the Executive will be answerable to this House, and you will not be assailing a judge whose character and position and claim to respect we must all preserve, because of the great value which an independent bench gives to the community at large: you will not be assailing the bench but the Executive for an act for which they are distinctly responsible." Let me call the attention of the House again to a point which the hon. member for Albert took with regard to the way in which these matters are viewed in other Parliaments. We have had fortunately but little experience here in dealing with charges against members of the bench; but in the reports of the British House of Commons we find that—I was going to say scores—but at least very many of the judges of the land—some of them the very highest in eminence of those who ever have sat in Westminster Hall have been made the subject of charges before the House of Commons and the House of Lords and investigation has been asked into their conduct. They have been accused—some of the greatest of them—of wrong decisions, wrong decisions influenced by partiality and corruption. Surely then, with the reverence which some gentlemen in this House attach to British practice and precedents, we may safely look there for guidance as to how these matters should be treated. How are charges there brought? Are they brought in the shape of assaults on personal character? Are they brought by political attacks, by the reading of anonymous articles which are not even alleged in the petitions to have been written by the judge? Everywhere in those discussions we find expressions such as this: "That the investigation into the conduct of a judge is the most grave function that the House can exercise;" that "it is one that the House will never enter upon without the most imperative necessity." Sir, when the hon. member for West Lambton told the House that this was not an impeachment of the judge, that this was not an address for the removal of a judge, I had recalled to my mind another passage from a speech of a very eminent man, in the course of one

of these discussions, who laid down this principle, that unless it be necessary for the impeachment of a judge, a petition against a judge ought not to be entertained. So reluctant is that House, so reluctant are both Houses of Parliament in the United Kingdom to enter into an enquiry which will in the least degree appear to limit the independence of the bench or lower the dignity and reputation of the judges, that unless for the exercise of an inevitable function, namely, for the passing of an address by way of an impeachment, they will not entertain any petition or complaint against a judge. But the House here is told that one reason for this motion is that it is not a motion for impeachment or for passing an address at all. Let me call the attention of the House to some of the observations in regard to the independence of the bench which have occurred in the investigations which have taken place in England. The independence of the bench is always spoken of in terms which I shall read in a few moments by such high authorities as were cited by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon), such as Lord John Russell, Sir Robert Peel and others. Lord Chief Justice Holt, when he was called to the bar of the English House of Commons for having given a decision which was supposed to have infringed upon the rights of the House of Commons, made the noble answer which was afterwards reiterated and endorsed by some of the greatest statesmen. He said:

"I hold an authority independent of yours. I gave my reasons for the judgment I delivered in that place in which I was sworn to administer justice. By this House, I look to be protected and not to be arraigned, and I will not assign the reasons here on which I founded my judgment."

In one of these discussions it was said to be a principle well established that "enquiry should not be instituted otherwise than with a view to addressing the Throne in order to remove a judge, and if any other principle were adopted the independence of the bench would be a mockery." Sir Robert Peel said on another occasion:

"To exercise the function of enquiring into the conduct and the character of a judge for any other purpose than removing him from the bench on grounds which would justify an impeachment would be simply to hang a label around the neck of the judge so that he would be held in contempt by the country."

And he further said that "by doing that"—by appointing such a committee as we are asked now to appoint—"you evade the law which requires that you should take action by an address for the judge's removal." Let me refer also to the remarks which were quoted by my hon. friend from Albert (Mr. Weldon) at the beginning of his address, which were made by Lord John Russell, on 21st February, 1843, when he said he "regarded the independence of the judges to be so sacred that nothing but the most imperious necessity should induce the House to adopt a course which might by any means imply that the judges were to depend for the future, not on the sanction of an Act of Parliament—not on that tenure which had protected them as long as they were not guilty of any crime, but on the particular views of a particular portion of their fellow countrymen." To apply that at present, if any judge gives a judgment in favour of some one in political life, or against him, that is to be a subject of debate and investigation by a committee, though the law provides another mode of investigation and though the proceedings are not in the way of an address to the Crown to have the judge removed, but are simply designed to hang a label round his neck. The judges will then no longer be independent and will no longer hold their office on the tenure which Parliament has prescribed, and the independence of the bench then becomes a mockery and a matter dependent on the whims or notions of one section of the judge's fellow countrymen. Let us consider the range this discussion has taken as indicating the necessity of adopting another course, if it can be done. The petition does not even allege a wrongful decision. The statements have been made that certain articles which have been produced in the House and which were published in a newspaper were written by the judge. Those statements have been made on no authority whatever but simply by way of attack, by way of invective against the judge—and revengeful invective too—and we have heard the time of the House taken up hour after hour—by the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) for instance—in reviewing the decision of Judge Elliott, in declaring that it was bad law, in holding up to ridicule the kind of law which he administered in keeping Mr. Hyman out of his seat, as if this House were a court of appeal from the county judge of Middlesex. That is the position the House will be in if it adopts what the hon. gentleman suggests, and this resolution does stop short of that because it looks to the final investigation by a Royal Commission, and the investigation which would take place before a committee of the House is to be a second trial conducted for no purpose that it is possible to conceive. If that investigation takes place, if it is favourable to further proceedings, the petitioners are directed to pursue those further proceedings. I have endeavoured to refrain, and I shall endeavour to refrain, from saying anything as to what might be the result of an application to the Executive, because it may come to that in the future. I simply express myself in regard to the policy of this House dealing with so important a question in this way, dealing with a matter involving the independence of the bench when the law provides another tribunal for the purpose, which Parliament ten years ago thought a better tribunal, and a tribunal which has exercised its functions in three or four cases since, and which may exercise its functions now if the petitioners choose to exercise their rights in the direction pointed out to them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) To many of the propositions of the hon. gentleman I take no objection, but to some of them I certainly do take exception, and I think it will be apparent to those who followed the hon. gentleman in his speech to-night that, if his argument is carried to its logical conclusion, there is no possible conduct which any County Court judge could take which could come under the animadversion of this House. That is the result of his reasoning. I take exception to the hon. gentleman's statement in that regard, and, when we come to look at the position the County Court judges hold, and at the statute defining their tenure of office, we must come to the conclusion that not only is it open and proper for this House to take the initiatory step in advising the Governor in Council to proceed under the statute we have passed, but this House would be neglecting its plain and direct duty if, when a plain and proper case is

laid before it, it refrained from pursuing that duty. This House forms part of the great council of the state, established for the purpose of advising the Crown as to the course it ought to pursue. The Governor General is the Executive officer, he executes according to the direction of this House, practically, under the constitution; and Parliament has vested certain powers in the Governor in Council, under certain circumstances, to direct an enquiry into the conduct of a public functionary, and the tribunal above all others, I should surmise, which ought to be in a position to determine whether the time has come, and whether the acts justify the issue of an inquisition, is the House of Commons and the Parliament of Canada. Sir, if any hon. gentleman will look at the statutes he will find that every judge of the County Court shall hold his office during good behaviour, that a judge of a County Court may be removed from office by the Governor in Council for misbehaviour. How are the initiatory steps to be taken? Who is to advise the Executive in the first instance? Who is to control the Executive? Is the Executive Council of His Excellency to stand a body removed from Parliament, not amenable to Parliament, and not to take the advice of Parliament? The thing is preposterous. Hon. gentlemen, therefore, will see that the argument of the Minister of Justice, when followed to its logical conclusion, removes from this House matters of great public concern with respect to the administration of justice, for which this House cannot relieve itself of responsibility, and for which, when the facts are brought properly before it, they are bound to take the responsibility of advising one way or the other. Now, let us see what position these judges occupy. I am one of those who feel disposed to pay all proper respect and deference to County Court judges or Superior Court judges: but I draw a broad distinction between the manly respect which I entertain for the bench, and the cringing servility that we very often see exhibited towards it. These are merely men of like passions with ourselves, and I regret to say that I cannot join in the expression which has fallen from hon. gentlemen on both sides, my experience does not justify me in joining in the opinion that when these gentlemen go on the bench they leave their politics behind them. Sir, I submit to this House as a proposition of so grave a nature that it should not be cast to one side, that when the conduct of a County Court judge is alleged by 47 petitioners, voters of full age, British subjects, competent to vote for members of this House —when they allege with particularity that the conduct of a particular County Court judge in a matter affecting the election of one of its members, has been such that if the facts were proved his removal from the bench must follow, the House ought not to hesitate for one moment as to what course it should take. This is a proposition which hon. members should bear in mind. Admitting every fact alleged in the petition to be true, is it possible that Judge Elliott could with self-respect, or with credit to himself, or to the state, remain any longer upon a County Court bench? If he can, it is no use going on with the enquiry. If this House of Commons determines that pending a judicial enquiry before a judge of the land, it is competent and proper for the judge to rush to the party press, to write editorial articles of a violent partisan character, and, to use the words of the petition, to write letters to the public under an assumed name, violently attacking a litigant whose case is before him for judgment; if this House determines that a judge can decide with judicial impartiality who writes violent and bitter diatribes against the man whose case he is deciding, then I tell them to vote against the enquiry. Let the public know that a man can be a judge, not as an English judge is understood to be, but a violent political party hack and a judge at the same time. But I do not think that is the rule this Parliament is going to take. These judges occupy positions which make them differ from all other public functionaries. No action will lie against them for any judicial act; even if that act is alleged to be done maliciously and corruptly, the courts of the land are closed and you have no redress; I would almost go so far as to say that if a judge expressed that his judgment was malicious and corrupt, you have no remedy in the courts of the land. And where are you drifting? From time immemorial there has been a high court to which every subject having a grievance can appeal. That high court is in session now, that high court has before it the petition of electors in London who say that the constituency to which they belong has been wronged by a judge who forgot the position he occupied—mind you, my argument is entirely based upon the admission that these statements can be proved—who failed to remember that he occupied a position which precluded him from becoming a political partisan; and that being the case, they call upon us to do justice in the premises. Sir, we have had it called in question whether this Parliament has a right to interfere in matters where the administration of justice is concerned. I will not rely upon my own opinion, but like the Minister of Justice, I would ask the House to read and reflect upon the decisions given by the high court of Parliament of Great Britain and the opinions given to that Parliament by some of its most eminent men. Some years ago a resolution was brought into the House of Commons condemning Baron Smith, one of the barons of the Exchequer of Ireland, because he had forgotten himself so far in his addresses to the grand juries of some counties as to import strong political matter into these addresses. A resolution was proposed based not in a petition from electors, but emanating from a member of the House, on his responsibility as a member. That resolution condemning Baron Smith, was, in the first instance, carried by a majority of the members of the House of Commons and afterwards reversed by a small minority. Upon that occasion a very eminent man, the late Lord Derby, who was for some years Prime Minister of Great Britain, laid down what the law was in his opinion upon these matters—and I am now speaking upon the one point whether it is proper or improper for Parliament to interfere at all in these matters, or whether they are to be left to some other tribunal. He says:

> "The propriety of the administration of justice is one of interest and importance to all persons in the country, and being so it is a subject that, without false delicacy as without unnecessary interference, this House is bound to watch over as that which is dearest to the country."

Sir, that was the opinion of the most distinguished statesman of Great Britain, and I call upon the Commons of Canada to adopt that opinion in the present case. Here is a case where the propriety of the

administration of justice has been challenged; here is a case which, above all others, we are called upon, to use the words of that eminent statesman, "to watch over that which is dearest to the country;" here is a case in which not only the petty pounds, shillings and pence of John Smiths and John Browns are involved, but as to whether the people of a large and important constituency have been cheated out of their rights, one of the most important questions that could engage the attention of Parliament at any time. What do we find in that debate laid down as the proper rule which should guide Parliament in receiving matters of this kind? We find no less an authority than the late Sir Robert Peel laying down the rule which I hold to be clear and explicit. He laid it down in terms which I am prepared to adopt and which I am prepared to recommend this House to adopt. He said in the same debate:

"We ought to ask ourselves the preliminary question: Is the question a grave one? Does it so far affect the impartiality, the integrity or the moral character of the judges that, if proved, it will justify an appeal to the Crown for his removal?"

I am prepared to adopt that as the rule in this House, and I ask hon. members whether the charge submitted in this petition is a grave one? Do they think the charge, that this constituency has been robbed of its rights (we are not talking as to whether it can be proved, but as to the charge itself, the proof will come afterwards) a grave one? Is the charge that this man sitting here as London's representative has no more right, if the facts stated are true, to sit in this House than has the messenger at the door; that this man is sitting in this House, joining in making the laws, a sworn member of the Privy Council, a member of the Executive Council advising His Excellency the Governor General, a grave one? Is it true that the constitution has been violated, that the judge trying the case has prostituted his judicial position and tainted the ermine? Is the charge a grave one? If so, it comes within the first proposition Sir Robert Peel lays down. Then he asks:

"Does it so far affect the impartiality, the integrity or the moral character of the judge, that if proved it will justify an appeal to the Crown for his removal?"

The question need only to be asked in the British House of Commons to answer itself. Do you think any judge in the United Kingdom would be found guilty of such charges as these laid at the door of Judge Elliott? I do not know whether they are true; I am not assuming they are true. I am asking that in the case of these grave charges, made by forty-seven representative men, a committee of enquiry should be appointed to see whether there are sufficient grounds for the issue of a commission to try the truth of the charges. I find the charges as follows:—

"The said William Elliott, during the said election and while the said appeals were pending before him, contributed editorially and also under an assumed name to the London *Free Press* newspaper, articles of a violent and partisan character bearing upon the said revision of the voters' list and political questions of the day, and particularly upon the said election of the said electoral district and in support of the candidature of the said Carling and against the said Hyman.

"After the said election and before deciding said appeals the said William Elliott in strong and violent language denounced the said Hyman and his supporters and stated to several electors of the said city that the said Carling would certainly get the seat in the House of Commons for the said electoral district."

And the petitioners went on to express their opinion on the judge's conduct, I care not what their opinion is; I want to know what is the opinion of the high court of Parliament. Have we fallen so low in this House of Commons, have our party feuds and fights become so bitter, that we are prepared to declare affirmatively in this House that conduct such as is described in this petition, does not merit even enquiry? Great heavens, what can we hope for the country if the Parliament of Canada determine, as it will determine if this motion is voted down, that such a prostitution of the judicial position does not deserve even enquiry at the hands of this court? Arguments need go no further. If you say this judge is right in sneaking into a newspaper office and under an assumed name attacking violently, as this petition says he did, one of the men whose case he had in hand judicially to determine, if you say he was right in trying to excite popular passion and popular prejudice against one of these litigants, if you say he was right in denouncing the man as unworthy and unfit to occupy his seat about which he was to give his judicial determination in a day or two, say so and let the whole County Court judges throughout the Dominion know it. Let them know that if they serve one party, the party in power, no enquiry will be permitted into their conduct. You may do that, but you will almost prostitute your position as badly here as Judge Elliott prostituted his position. Are we treating Judge Elliott himself properly? Charges have been made of a very serious character, and if you do not intend to investigate them you should never have allowed that petition to have gone on file. That petition charges him with conduct which in any other country would not only drive him into obscurity but cover him with disgrace. You have received the petition. You have placed it on the records of this country. How are you going to treat Judge Elliott? Are you not going to give him any chance to reply? Are you going to say that this charge shall remain on the records of Parliament and this record shall go down to time immemorial unanswered? You have received the petition and placed it on file, and published it to the world, and you are going to refuse this man an opportunity of saying whether the charge is true. Talk about age. He will be disgraced. Talk about infamy. Of course he will be considered infamous. The result cannot be anything else, if the charge is true, so long as uprightness and honesty distinguish the bench. When we find the opposite qualities prevail, when we find qualities which would disgrace a western justice of the peace distinguishing a County Court judge of the great Dominion of Canada, and the declaration is made that Parliament should not interfere, are we doing justice in the case? Let me read what a great and distinguished man, the late Lord Derby said, on an occasion of this kind when Parliament had received charges of a serious nature against a judge. He said:

"If not being a member of this House and not having an opportunity of making statements before this House an accusation were preferred against me here, which on the face of it should lead the House to think that they ought to enquire into the conduct which I had pursued, so far from deprecating that enquiry I should implore to be allowed to meet it and I should entreat that the House would not leave me under a half expressed vote of censure without a possibility of justification or vindication on my part. Sir, this is the course which I should

adopt, and which I think would be adopted by every honourable and high-minded gentleman."

Your ideas of what is right and wrong may differ from those of Lord Derby and the gentlemen who were associated with him, but he laid down a principle which gentlemen, at all events, are in the habit of being guided by. That principle is one underlying the whole course of British justice, that if a charge is made against a man he should have an opportunity of replying to it. You have made yourselves parties to this by receiving the petition and putting it upon your file, and you are bound to give the man implicated an opportunity to reply if you believe in his innocence. But, Sir, I doubt very much whether some hon. gentlemen opposite do believe in his innocence. What a spectacle did we see presented here to-night! A few days ago the hon. gentleman from East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) held this House by the half hour denouncing his colleague from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) because he presented this petition and made a speech in support of it, without reading the evidence on which he hoped to support some of the charges. "How dare you," he said, "speak in support of your resolution without reading the evidence." Where are your newspaper articles, why do you not read them, and he looked triumphantly when he added "because you have not got any." Now, to-night, when his demand was gratified, when what he asked was done, when a few of the articles were read, the Minister of Justice rises, and, with well simulated anger, denounces in the most violent, and I would almost say, unbecoming terms, my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) for having ventured to take the course which the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) demanded should be taken. I never heard the Minister of Justice speak more severely of an hon. member of this House than he did of the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), for having done what the member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) demanded should be done, or failing which that the case should be thrown out of court. Now, Sir, you have got the petition and these articles read to-night, some of the articles which will be produced in support of the charges which, in my mind, are the most grave and the most serious, and in the face of that, if the Government choose to say: we will vote down an enquiry, they will have to do it under the miserable subterfuge that Parliament has delegated the control over this matter to the Governor in Council, and has no control itself. Sir, if we were impeaching a Superior Court judge, we would do what the hon. gentleman with irony attempted to say to-night the hon. members were doing here; we would be assailing the judge whom we were going to try. We are not assailing the man we are going to try; we contend for the great constitutional right of the Commons of Canada to advise the Crown. We say that Parliament has given the Governor in Council the power of instituting an enquiry into the conduct of a County Court judge when he is accused of misbehaviour, and we say that the tribunal above all others that is qualified to advise the Governor General as to whether there is a proper case on which an enquiry should be based, is the House of Commons. We do not say that the charges are true, but we ask for a committee to find out if they are true. If they are not true, let us proclaim it to the world, with the same publicity that we have given to the charge, that we find the charge failed, and let the old man of whom you speak with his seventy years on his shoulders, before he goes to his grave, get the verdict of the House of Commons that he is innocent. But if he has forgotten himself, if he has soiled the ermine, if he has deregarded his position on the bench, if he has sent here a man whom the people did not send, and kept back one whom they did send; then I say whether he is 70 or 79 years let him be punished. I say, Sir, he is a political coward, no matter on what side of the House he is, who will shirk from doing his duty in this matter. I say that we are called upon on this occasion to rise above party, and to show that there are some crimes committed against the commonwealth which we will shake hands across the House and unite in punishing. I say that one of these crimes is the prostitution of his office by a judge, I care not whether he is a judge of the Superior or a judge of the County Court. I will not go into the question of whether the judgment of Judge Elliott was right or wrong. I have my own opinion on it and it is not necessary to express it. I dare say if the judge had given his judgment, and had refrained from prostituting his position by giving to the press and public denunciations of the man against whom he was to give the judgment, he might have escaped impeachment in this House. But whether his judgment itself was bad or good, it was in defiance of the judgment of the Queen's Bench of Ontario and the Court of Appeal of Ontario, and that in itself would be enough to invite the attention of the House to it. I pronounce no opinion, but I believe from all the charges made against this judge, that we cannot refrain without loss of self respect from asking that an enquiry be instituted.

House divided on motion of Mr. Lister:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allan,	Landerkin,
Béchard,	Laurier,
Beith,	Leduc,
Bernier,	Lister,
Borden,	Livingston,
Bowers,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brodeur,	McGregor,
Brown,	McMillan (Huron),
Bruneau,	Mignault,
Campbell,	Mills (Bothwell),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Monet,
Casey,	Mulock,
Charlton,	Paterson (Brant),
Christie,	Perry,
Davies,	Proulx,
Dawson,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Featherston,	Rowand,
Flint,	Sanborn,
Forbes,	Semple,
Fraser,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gillmor,	Vaillancourt,
Godbout,	Watson, and
Guay,	Yeo.—50.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Mackintosh,
Baird,	McAlister,
Barnard,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bennett,	McDougald (Picton),
Bergeron,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Bowell,	McKay,
Boyle,	McLean,
Burns,	McLennan,
Cameron,	McLeod,

Cargill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Coatsworth,
Cochrane,
Corbould,
Costigan,
Craig,
Curran,
Davis,
Denison,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),
Desjardins (L'Islet),
Dewdney,
Dickey,
Dupont,
Earle,
Fairbairn,
Foster,
Fréchette,
Gillies,
Gordon,
Guillet,
Haggart,
Hazen,
Hearn,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hutchins,
Kaulbach,
Kenny,
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin (Sir Hector),
LaRivière,
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McNeill,
Madill,
Mara,
Marshall,
Miller,
Mills (Annapolis),
Moncrieff,
O'Brien,
Ouimet,
Patterson (Colchester),
Patterson (Huron),
Pridham,
Reid,
Roome,
Rosamond,
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Lisgar),
Ryckman,
Savard,
Smith (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stairs,
Taylor,
Temple,
Thompson (Sir John),
Tisdale,
Tupper,
Turcotte,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Weldon,
White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Lippé,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Winnipeg),
Macdonell (Algoma),
Wilmot,
Wilson, and
Wood (Brockville).—93.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	*Opposition.*
Mr. Pope,	Mr. Choquette,
Mr. Masson,	Mr. McMullen,
Mr. Prior,	Mr. Edgar,
Mr. Bergin,	Mr. Armstrong,
Mr. Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Mr. Préfontaine,
Mr. Carpenter,	Mr. Bain (Wentworth),
Mr. Northrup,	Mr. Innes,
Mr. Chapleau,	Mr. Bowman,
Mr. Hearn,	Mr. Frémont,
Mr. Lépine,	Mr. Delisle,
Mr. Macdowall,	Mr. Fauvel,
Mr. Cleveland,	Mr. Carroll,
Mr. Adams,	Mr. Colter,
Mr. Joncas,	Mr. Beausoleil,
Mr. Putnam,	Mr. Edwards,
Mr. Wood (Westmoreland),	Mr. Welsh,
Mr. Stevenson,	Mr. Scriver,
Mr. Grandbois,	Mr. Bourassa.

Motion negatived.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.35 a.m. (Tuesday).

INDEX.

SECOND SESSION—SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1892.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur., Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Withdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adams, Mr. M., *Northumberland, N.B.*

SUPPLY:

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 2598 (ii).

Allan, Mr. H. W., *South Essex.*

Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2862 (ii).

Prosser, Wm., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ques.) 2490 (ii).

——— (M. for Cor., &c.) 3114 (ii).

Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4580 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3665 (ii).

Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1279 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Clothing) 1341 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2862 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4700.

Budget, on the, 564 (i).

Compulsory Voting (B. 46, 1°*) 578; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1083 (i).

Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2702 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3097, 3368, 3381 (ii).

Militia, Active, on M. for Ret., 676 (i).

Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4533 (ii).

Trudel, Edmond, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques. 3237 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex.*

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4600 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Ret., 2280 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1080 (i); in Com., 3393 (ii).

N. W.T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2485 (ii).

——— Education and Dual Languages (prop. Res.) 3062 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3160; in Com., 3937, 3957, 4123, 4326 (ii).

Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1276 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1438.

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 2248 (i).

Civil Government (Interior) 851 (i).

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1842 (i).

Miscellaneous (C. S. Commissioners) 1095 (1).

Voters' List, 1891, B. 67 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4501; neg. (Y. 30, N. 63) 4505 (ii).

Wilson, Convict Ed., Release (M. for Ret.) 2642.

Bain, Mr. J. W., *Soulanges.*

Address, The, in Answer to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 18 (i).

Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copies, 19, 209, 224 (i).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).
Milk Cans, Inspection under Act (Ques.) 4262.
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3577; in Com., 3912, 3934, 3957 (ii).
Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1269 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 983 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 904 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1019 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1526, 1836, 1909 (i).

Baker, Mr. G. B., *Missisquoi.*
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4522 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4095; on Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) to M. for 3°, 4339 (ii).

Barnard, Mr. F. S., *Cariboo.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1871 (i).
Indian Reserves, B.C. (M. for Ret.) 511 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*
Beet Root Sugar Bounty (Ques.) 751 (i).
——— Bounty for Manufacture (M. for Cor.) 1373 (i).
——— Cultivation, French Reps. (Ques.) 750 (i).
——— Prof. Saunders' Rep. (M. for copies) 1373.
——— Manufacture, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 1366 (i).
Fishing License, on St. Lawrence (Ques.) 2641.
Lake St. Peter, Fishing Privileges, (Ques.) 2955.
Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Ry. Co.'s (B. 87, 1° *) 2700 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 3556; neg. (Y. 53, N. 96) 3563 (ii).

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4702.
Budget, on the, 423 (i).
Eatonville Harbour (N.S.) Expenditure (Ques.) 2641 (ii).
Fishing Licenses on St. Lawrence (Ques.) 2641.
Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Ry. Co. Pet. (M.) 2482 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2484 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4532 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3174; in Com., 3992, 4042, 4046, 4093; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4336; neg. (Y. 54, N. 89) 4342 (ii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4646.
Three Sisters' Harbour, N.S., Expenditure (Ques.) 2489 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3459; in Com., 3965, 4324 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 423 (i).
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2061 (i).
Militia (Drill Sheds, &c., 1375 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Coteau, Water Overflow (remarks) 914 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4599 (ii).
De LaRonde, late Pierre A. Denis (M. for Ret.) 2286 (i).
Employés in Customs Department, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2506 (ii).
Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Engineers' Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 191, 229 (i).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4726 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2977 (ii).
Ont. and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 50 1°*) 823 (i).
Printing Com. (Joint) 5th Rep. conc., (M.) 2171.
——— 8th Rep., conc. (M.) 3643 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 144 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res. 4682 (ii).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Cap St. Ignace Station P. O. (Ques.) 290 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4527 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4056, 4066, 4101 (ii).

Borden, Mr. F. W., *King's, N.S.*
C. P. R., P. O. and Militia Services, Payments (Ques.) 3331 (ii).
Dodwell, C. E. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1715 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4135 (ii).
I. C. R., Passenger Cars, Amount paid C. P. R. (Ques.) 399 (i).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ques.) 1088 (i), 3752 (ii).
Montreal Cadets, Duty on Presentation Flag (Ques.) 509 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2750, 2769 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3838, 4082 (ii).
Sheet Harbour Wharves, Dues collected, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Spanish West Indies, Exports (Ques.) 509 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 843 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1893 (i).

Borden, Mr. F. W.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 764, 770, 782 (i).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund: Buildings (N.B.) 989 (i).
Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2750 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2389 (i).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1877 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M., *North Hastings.*
American Cattle in Bond (Ans.) 400 (i).
Beef and Pork (American) Lumbermen's Imports (Ans.) 291 (i).
——— on M. for Ret., 294 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, Sums paid (Ans.) 41 (i).
——— Manufactured, &c., on M. for Sumnt., 1366.
Bridges, St. Lawrence River (Ans.) 1549 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Terminal accommodation (Ans.) 1549 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Amt.) 2068; agreed to (Y. 125, N. 63) 2169 (i).
Chatham Customs Collector (Ans.) 1391 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4716 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks, Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1718 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., Select Com. (M.) 34 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4586 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4598 (ii).
Dods, P. B., case of, *re* Loss of Diamonds, on M. for Ret., 2289 (i).
Esquimalt, Defence of, Imp. and Can. Govts., on M. for Cor., 222, 244 (ii).
Drill Hall, Ottawa, Contract for Roofing (Ans.) 4602 (ii).
Exports and Imports, on M. for Ret., 100 (i).
——— (remarks) 111 (i).
Farm Produce, Exports, on M. (Mr. *McMullen*) for Ret., 292 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 528 (i).
Fortifications at Esquimalt, Imp. and Can. Govts. (Ans.) 222 (i).
——— on M. for Cor., 244 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4489 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1229 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1203, 1219; on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1333 (i).
Granite, Manufactured, Imports and Exports, (Ans.) 509 (i).
Hammond, E., Seizures (Ans.) 2782 (ii).
Inland Revenue Officer at Quebec (Ans.) 2639.
I.C.R., Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 3897.
Lake St. John and Chicoutimi Ry. (Ans.) 1549.
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2349 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2298 (i), 3103, 3366 (ii).
Military District No. 9, Suspension of Officers (Ans.) 3332, 3643 (ii).
Militia, Active, on M. for Ret., 680 (i).
Militia and Defence Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1153 (i).
——— 60th Battalion, Annual Drill (Ans.) 4500.
Montreal Cadets, Duty on Presentation Flag (Ans.) 509 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2689 (ii).
Newfoundland and Canada, Bonding Privileges (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Duty collected on Fishing Outfits (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Discriminating Tariff (Ans.) 454 (i).
——— Papers, &c., *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 687 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Annapolis (Ans.) 1364 (i).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt, on M. for Cor., 1994.
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup. 2764, 2892 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2495 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4535 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir John *Thompson*) in Com., 3908, 3924, 3961 (ii).
Rhéaume, Antoine, Land Grant (Ans.) 2490 (ii).
Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, Removal (Ans.) 1032.
Standing Coms., Rep. of Sel. Com. (Lists presented) 101; conc., 106 (i).
——— additional Names (M.) 217, 563 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Jamaica Exhibition) 977 (i).
Civil Government (Customs) 268; (High Commissioner) 277; (Interior) 869 (i), conc., 4208 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Craven, Geo., Gratuity) 1007; (Detective Service, &c.) 1018; (Inspectors' Travelling Expenses) 821; (B. C.) 829; (N. S.) 811; (Ont.) 812. Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1016 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1538, 1833 1912; (Printing Pamphlets) 2014, 2023 (i).
Justice (Exchequer Court) conc., 1086 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing Voters' Lists) 976 (i); (Publishing Debates) conc., 4205 (ii). Senate, 974 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4301 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1161 (i), conc., 4209 (ii); (Armouries, &c.) 1351, 1415; (Clothing) 1340; (District Staff) 1161; (Drill Pay) 1354 (i), conc., 4209 (ii); (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1374; (Military College) 1376 (i); (Monuments) conc., 4210 (ii); (Permanent Forces) 1419; (Rifled Ordnance) 1363 (i), conc., 4210 (ii); (Stores) 1353 (i).
Miscellaneous (International Customs Bureau) 1006; (International Educational Association) 1006 (i).
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1018 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2626. *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2951; (N.S.) 2764: (Que.) 2914; (Gas and Electric Light) 4243: (Telephone Service) 4246 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2040 (i).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2267 (i); (St. John, accommodation) 2577, 2606 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 797 (i).
Territorial Account (N. W. Rebellion) 1018 (i); conc., 1087 (i).
SUPPLY (B. 62) Res. in Com. and 1°*, 1087; 2° m., 1090 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 37 (i).
U. S. Newspapers, Free Admission (Ans.) 1231.
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. for Com., 4673; in Com. on Res., 4680 (ii).
Worsley, Lieut. Col. and Lieut. Col. Murray (Ans.) 3332, 3643 (ii).
Wrecking in Can. Waters (B. 8, 1°) 106; 2° m., 173; 2° m., 970; in Com., 1091 (i).

Bowers, Mr. E. C., *Digby.*
Bear River Railway Bridge (Ques.) 398 (i).
Bounties to Fishermen, Distribution (Ques.) 190.
——— Applications Granted, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 417 (i).
Canvas Coal Bags, Tenders for making (Ques.) 2954 (ii).
Church Point Wharf, Expenditure for Repairs (Ques.) 398 (i).
Copyright, Reciprocity with U. S. (Ques.) 137 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2213; in Com., 2220 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2751, 2769.
Raquette Pier, completion (Ques.) 398 (i).
St. Mary's Bay, Hatcheries (Ques.) 398 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service, conc., 4471 (ii).
Fisheries: (Fish-Breeding) 4318; P.E.I. (Salaries) 4316 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4305 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and St. John (4304 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 4310 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 741 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 4441; (N.S.) 2751; (Telephone Service) 4246. Harbours and Rivers (Raquette Pier) 4247, 4448. Telegraphs (Nanaimo, &c.) 4259 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (St. John, accommodation 2599 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 798 (i).
Westport Harbour, Can Buoys (Ques.) 399 (i).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1880 (i).

Bowman, Mr. I. E., *North Waterloo.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com. 3869 (ii).

Boyle, Mr. A., *Monck.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3566; in Com., 3780, 3347, 3882, 3914; on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4333 (ii).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4707 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2101 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3040 (ii).
Fishing Rights on Richelieu River (Ques.) 35 (i).
Judiciary of Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 2639 (ii).
Mail Conductors, Superannuation (M. for Ret.) 2699 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection (West Farnham) in Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1861 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3164; in Com., 3978, 4025, 4044, 4053 (ii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Pets., &c.*) 100 (i).
——— (remarks) 4645 (ii).
St. Césaire Postmaster, Money Deposits (M. for Cor.) 400 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) conc., 4474 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2902. Dredging (Que., &c.) 4456 (ii).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Post Offices, Erection (Laprairie) in Com. of Sup., 2866 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4032, 4092 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2866 (ii)

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*
Lavalliere Bay, Dredging (M. for Ret.*) 2457 (ii).
McCarthy, Messrs., Lease of Land in Sorel (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4102 (ii).
Richelieu River, Subsidy for Bridge (M. for Ret.) 2453 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: H. of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 775 (i).

Burns, Mr. K. F., *Gloucester.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2202 (i).

Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4330 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. H., *Inverness.*
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. (M. to introd.) 666.
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4520 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 567 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1521, 1919 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2901 (ii).
West Bay, Customs Inspectors' Rep. (M. for copy*) 2287 (i).
Whycocomagh, Port of Entry (M. for Ret.*) 2287 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent, Ont.*
Binding Twine, Imports (M. for Ret.) 537 (i).
Budget, on the, 482 (i).
Coal Oil and Kerosene, Imports, on M. for Ret., 3059 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4140 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1201 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to prop. Res., 3342 (ii).
Lepage, J. B., Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1392 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2869, 2891, 2915 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3286 (i); in Com., 3882 (ii).
Rhéaume, Antoine, Land Grant (Ques.) 2490 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 482 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 1160.
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2058. *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 2261; (Chambly) 2257 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1021 (i). (Excise) 4430 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1837; (Expenses) 1910, 1945 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4299 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1186; (Drill Pay) 1361 (i).
Miscellaneous (Clerical Assistance) 4460; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 4430 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 740 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2624. *Income*—Buildings (Que.) 2869, 2915; (Gas and Electric Light) 4244; (Heating Ottawa Buildings) 4242. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Kingston Harbour) 4257 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (Expenses) 2427; (Flour Rates) 2559 (ii).
Superannuation, 802 (i).
Sydenham River, Obstructions, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4453 (ii).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1886 (i).

Carling, Hon. J., *London.*
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1062 (i).
——— Letter of Dep. Minister (Ans.) 1947 (i).
Archives of Canada (presented) 1153 (i).
Butter and Cheese Industry (Ques.) 3331 (ii).
Canada Illustrated, Purchase of Volumes (Ans.) 397 (i).

Carling, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Census and Statistics, Maps (Ans.) 824 (i).
——— Origins and Religions (Ans.) 190 (i), 2491, 3566 (ii).
Dairies and Cheese Factories, Prov. of Que. (Ans.) 2781 (ii).
Experimental Farm (Central) Dairy, on M. for Ret., 402 (i).
——— French Ed. of Reps. (Ans.) 397 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 3185 (ii).
High Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 1062 (ii).
London Election on B. 76 on M. for 2°, (remarks) 3249 (ii).
Mennonite Settlers and Census Returns (remarks) 4264 (ii).
Nationalities, &c., of the Population (Ans.) 824 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. (90, 1°), 3300; 2° m., 3729; in Com., 4215 (ii).
Payne, J. L., Payments for Services (Ans.) 1548 (i).
Quarantine in B. C. (remarks) 1548 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 983; (Columbian Exhibition) 983 (i), 4433 (ii); (Criminal Statistics) 1160; (Dairy Industry) 1464; (Experimental Farms) 1424; (Jamaica Exhibition) 976; (*Patent Record*) 1159 (i).
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) conc., 4204 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1492, 1828, 1852; (Expenses) 1889; (Printing Pamphlets) 2009 (i).
Public Works—Income: (Experimental Farms) 4448 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 987, 2033; (Grosse Isle) 2026, 2033; (St. John, Halifax and Victoria) 2032 (i); (Tracadie Lazaretto) conc., 4212 (ii); (Unorganized Service) 2049 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps. (Ans.) 1638 (i).
——— on M. for copy, 2452 (ii).
——— Visit, C. H. Cahan's Services (Ans.) 2432.

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., *Rimouski.*
Atlantic Mail Service (Ans.) 1231 (i).
Berthier (Montmagny) P. O., Management (Ans.) 2638 (ii).
Cap St. Ignace Station, Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ans.) 223 (i).
——— Opening (Ans.) 290, 751 (i).
C. P. R., P. O. and Militia Services, Payments (Ans.) 3331 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1467 (i)
Des Aulnets P. O., Management (Ans.) 750 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List, 1197 (i).
Hull P. O., Sunday Opening (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ans.) 1088 (i), 3752 (ii).
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ans.) 190 (i).
L'Islet, Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ans.) 750 (i).
Lotbinière County, Mail Service (Ans.) 4585 (ii).
Mail Service, Imperfect (remarks) 4399 (ii).
Montmagny Postmaster (Ans.) 2638 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A.—*Continued.*
Ocean Mails, Train Service (Ans.) 3185 (ii).
Point Tupper and Sydney Mail Service (Ans.) 2641 (ii).
Postmaster Gen.'s Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1364 (i)
Quebec and Pointe aux Trembles Mail Contract (Ans.) 1366 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4524 (ii).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Mail Service (Ans.) 2954 (ii).
Ste. Louise Postmaster, Rep. of Enquiry (Ans.) 2431 (ii).
Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4646 (ii).
St. Césaire Postmaster, Money Deposits, on M. for Cor., 400 (i).
Savings Bank, Interest on Deposits (Ans.) 916.
Stadacona P.O., Opening (Ans.) 222 (i).
Summerstown P.O., Receipts (Ans.) 1365 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition) 1197 (i), conc., 4209 (ii); (Clothing) 1341 (i).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund: Buildings (Ont.) 990 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 4445 (ii).

Carpenter, Mr. F. M., *South Wentworth.*
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 40, 1°*) 315 (i).

Carroll, Mr. H. G., *Kamouraska.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res., 2124 (i).
I. C. R., Accident at St. Joseph de Lévis (M. for Cor., &c.*) 292 (i).
Kamouraska Wharf, Construction (M. for Ret.) 510 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Mail Service (Ques.) 2954 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G., *South Oxford.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4697.
BUDGET, The (Ques.) 161: (Reply) 335 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 4714 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1060, 1741 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2144: Amt. to Amt., 2147 (i); neg. (Y. 63, N. 125) 2169 (i).
Census and Statistics (remarks) 824 (i).
——— Origins and Religions (Ques.) 824 (i), 2491, 3566 (ii).
Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 751 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2783, 3330 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1817 (i).
Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe* (Ques.) 3734 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4348 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., 1892 (remarks) 822 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
——— (remarks) 111 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, on presentation (remarks) 34 (i).
——— ref. to Pub. Acts. Com. (M.) 50 (i).
Govt Short Loans (Ques.) 137 (i).
I.C.R., Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 41 (i), 4392 (ii).
——— Running Privileges, &c., granted C.P.R., on M. for Ret., 562 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2739.
——— Penitentiary, Coal Contract (Ques.) 4393.
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2241 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 183 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Societys' B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3561 (ii).
Nationalities, &c., of the Population (Ques.) 824 (i), 2491, 3566 (ii).
Newfoundland, Papers, &c., *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 688 (i).
Order, Ques. of, 2823 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2°, 3730: in Com., 4215 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2802, 2890, 2894, 2905 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2496 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4576 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1863 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3445 (ii).
——— in Com., 3836, 3929, 3949, 4125, 4322 (ii).
——— on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4329; neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 4334 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 983; (Experimental Farm) 1439; (Jamaica Exhibition) 979 (i).
Canals—Capital (Carillon and Grenville) conc., 4233 (ii): (Cornwall) 2053; (Lachine) 2049 (i), conc., 4212 (ii): (Murray) 2054; (St. Lawrence River, &c.) 2054; (Trent) 2055; Sault Ste. Marie) 2241. *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 2261; (Chambly) 2258: (Rideau) 988; (St.Peter's) 2263; (Trent Valley) 2262; (Welland) 2252 (i).
Charges of Management (Brokerage, &c.) 254; (Public Debt,Commission) 253: (Dominion Notes) Printing) 255; (Inspector, &c.) 250 (i).
Geological Survey, 4386 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 994 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor General's Office) 257; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 896, conc., 1085; (Interior) 257, 825, 844, 867 (i), conc., 4206 (ii); (Mounted Police) 265; (Printing and Stationery) 256 (i), conc., 4204 (ii); (Privy Council Office) 255; (Railways and Canals) 274 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food, 4430 (ii). Canals (Lachine) 1017. Excise (Tobacco Stamps, &c.) 1010; (General Vote) 811; (Detective Service) 1019, conc., 4205 (ii): (N.S.) 811: (Ont.) 818 (i). Railways (Windsor Branch) 2629 (ii).
Fisheries (Commissioners' Expenses) 993 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1491, 1540, 1846, conc., 4210 (ii); (Expenses) 1899, 1918; (Printing Pamphlets) 2008 (i).
Legislation: H. of Commons (Printing Paper, &c.) 794; (Salaries, &c.) 763; (Printing Voters' Lists) conc., 1086. Library (Salaries, &c.) 789. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 754 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4308 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c. and West Indies) 4293 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) conc., 4209 (ii): (Military College) 1385 (i); (Rifled Ordnance) conc., 4210.
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., Salary) 4424: (Old Records' Classification) 4429 (ii).
Mounted Police (Pay of Force) 4423 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 4305 (ii).
Pensions (Fraser, H. & R.) 1918 (i).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) conc. 4205; suppl., 4433 (ii): (St. Vincent de Paul) 972 (i).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 2739 (ii). *Consolidated Fund:* Buildings (N.B.) 988, conc., 1086: (Ont.) 990. Dredging (Man.) 992: (Que.) 989 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2952; (N.B.) 2798: (N.S.) 2767: (N.W.T.) 2936, 2941; (Ont.) 2918, 2929: (Que.) 2802, 2805: (Repairs, &c.) 4240: (Gas and Electric Light) 4243. Harbours and Rivers (Kingston Harbour) 4257 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 2027 (i): (Tracadie Lazaretto) conc., 4212 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (construction) 987 (i). I.C.R. (Expenses) 2509 (ii); (Halifax, accomodation) 2264 (i); (St. John accommodation) 2616 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 4309 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 796 (i).
Territorial Accounts (N. W. Rebellion) 1017; conc., 1087 (i).
Supply B. 62 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 1091 (i).
—— B 100 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 3°, 4715 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps. (Ques.) 1638 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners B. (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1874; in Com., 1875 (i).
Trade Relations with Spain (remarks) 4602 (ii).
Treaty Negotiations with Germany (remarks) 1363.
—— Despatch to London *Times* (remarks) 110.
Unparliamentary Language, on withdrawal (remarks) 69 (i).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 3301 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. for Com., 4672; in Com. on Res., 4677 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1693 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1960 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to prop. Res. 2162 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3643 (ii).
Dom. Cotton Mills Co., Letters Patent, on M. for Ret., 924 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 955 (i).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Deadacy*) on M. for 2°, 1653 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1332 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2760, 2768, 2806, 2888, 2911 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2500 (ii).
Procedure (Ques. of) on Notices of Motion, 1550.
Prohibition, Plebiscite on, prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2657 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3441 (ii).
St. Thomas, Appmnt. of Customs Collector (M. for Cor.) 1998, 2003 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 983: (Columbian Exhibition) 984; (Experimental Farms) 1455; (Jamaica Exhibition) 978 (i).
Canals—Income (Lachine) 2250 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1514, 1839 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salary, Dep. Speaker) 975. Senate (Debates) 974 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1164; (Armouries, &c.) 1359; (Contingencies, &c.) 1363; (Clothing) 1340: (Drill Pay) 1353: (Military College) 1383: (Permanent Forces) 1415: (Rifled Ordnance) 1363; (Stores) 1353 (i).
Miscellaneous (C. S. Commissioners) 1004 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 2951; (N.S.) 2760: (Que.) 2806, 2884, 2911 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps., on M. for copy, 2435 (ii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1478 (i).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2091 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Gordon*) 2° m., 4631 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2977, 3324, 4233 (ii).
Customs Seizures, Commissions Paid (Ans.) 3238.
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3107 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4525 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4034, 4093 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) to M. for 3°, 4341.

Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*

Ste. Angèle Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4646.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Customs) 4433 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service, &c.) conc., 4205 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., Salary) 4426 (ii).

Trudel, Edmond, Emplmnt. by Customs (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*

Adjmnt., Ascension and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2781 (ii).

Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Observance (prop. Res.) 1037 (i).

Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3320 (ii).

Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1822 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3313 (ii).

Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 935 (i).

Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1655 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 2490 (ii).

Labrador, reported Distress (Ques) 4263 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.) 2269, 2283 (i).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. *Fairbairn*) in Com., 1228 (i).

Liquor Traffic, Members of Royal Commission (Ques.) 2172 (i).

Lord's Day Observance (B. 2, 1ˢᵗ) 40; 2ᵈ m., 1062.

——— (M.) to place B. on Order Paper, 2431 (ii).

——— on M. that Com. rise, 2294, 2302 (i).

——— M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 77, N. 40) 3090; in Com., 3091, 3363, 3374 (ii).

Obscene Literature, &c., Suppression (B. 21) 2ᵈ m., 2457 (ii).

Ocean Mails, Train Service (Ques.) 3184 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B. on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1629 (i).

——— Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2507 (ii).

Prohibition, Plebiscite (prop. Res.) 2646, 2664.

Representation in H. of C. B. 75 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1ˢᵗ, 1864 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2ᵈ, 3136.

——— in Com., 3820, 3849, 4121, 4172 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 155 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Tenders for Deepening (Ques.) 3184 (ii).

Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1240, 1271 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1395 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 983; (Columbian Exhibition) 984: (Experimental Farms) 1443 (i).

Civil Government (Interior) 1158 (i).

Government of N.W.T. (Schools) 1001 (i).

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1495, 1830 (i).

Militia (Ammunition) 1161 (i).

Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont) 2622; (Que.) 2619.

Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps., on M. for copy, 2437 (ii).

U. S. Vessels in Hudson Bay (Ques.) 4262 (ii).

Wrecking in Can. Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2ᵈ, 173; on M. for 2ᵈ, 970; in Com., 1091 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*

Alert, Str., Accident (Ques.) 750, 917 (i).

Berthier (Montmagny) P.O., Management (Ques.) 2638 (ii).

Butter and Cheese Industry (Ques.) 3331 (ii).

Cap. St. Ignace Station, Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ques.) 223 (i).

——— Opening (Ques.) 290, 751 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* 1555 (i).

——— M. for Cor., 2667 (ii).

Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2116 (i).

Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4229 (i).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1469 (ii).

Des Aulnets P.O., Management (Ques.) 750 (i).

Experimental Farms, Papers respecting (remarks) 3114, 3185 (ii).

Franchise Act, Legislation (Ans.) 916 (i).

Hammond, E., Seizures (Ques.) 2782 (ii).

Inland Revenue Officer at Quebec (Ques.) 2639.

La Rivière du Sud, Works (M. for Cor.*) 2695.

——— (remarks) 4656 (ii).

L'Islet, Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ques.) 750 (i).

Montmagny Postmaster (Ques.) 2638 (ii).

Post Offices, Erection (Laprairie) in Com. of Sup., 2803, 2853 (ii).

Quebec Legislature, Sessions (Ques.) 3644 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2ᵈ, 3186 (ii).

——— in Com., 4001, 4049 (ii).

Rivière du Loup P. O., Workmen's Claims (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Ste. Louise Postmaster, Rep. of Enquiry (Ques.) 2431 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2801, 2853, 2880 (ii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*

Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).

Christie, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 4637 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1079; in Com., 2390 (i).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2660 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3634 (ii).

Coatsworth, Mr. E., jun., *East Toronto.*
Boiler Inspection and Ins. Co. of Canada (B. 19, 1°*) 129 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1323 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3105, 3391 (ii).
Man. and North-Western Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 80, 1°*) 2006 (i).
Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 29, 1°*) 245 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance, B. 58 (Mr *Dewdney*) in Com., 1640 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2°, 3730; in Com., 4222 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3545 (ii).
——— in Com., 4073 (ii).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., *Centre Toronto.*
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Workmen's Claims, &c. (M. for Sel. Com.) 42 (i).
Canadian Representatives at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1962 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2139 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr *Denison*) 1330 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4622 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3590 (ii).
——— in Com., 4070, 4143 (ii).
Victoria Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 47, 1°*) 749 (i).

Colter, Mr. N. R., *Carleton, N.B.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1858 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 4256 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4404 (ii).
Woodstock Public Building, Caretaker (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

Corbould, Mr. G. E., *New Westminster.*
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 65, 1°*) 1153 (i).
Lobsters and Whitefish for B.C. (Ques.) 751 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3727, 4090 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1239 (i).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s (B. 28, 1°) 245 (i).
Post Offices, Erection (St. Henri) in Com. of Sup., 2880 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4616 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Apples, Export, under Inspection Act (Ans.) 3238 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 95) in Com., 4482 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to prop. Res., 3361 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 71, 1°) 1469: 2° m., 2007 (i).
Inland Revenue Deptl. Rep. (presented) 751 (i).
Milk Cans, Inspection under Act (Ans.) 4262, 4647 (ii)
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4553; conc., 4662 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenue (Adulteration of Food) 4430 (ii). Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1015; (Preventive Service) 1014: (Tobacco Stamps) 1007: (Weights and Masures) contingencies, 1016 (i).
Tobacco, &c., Law respecting (Ans.) 750 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 465 (i).

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*
Adjmnt., Ascension and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2781 (ii).
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 39, 1°*) 315 (i).
Bell Telephone Co. of Can. (B. 41, 1°*) 315 (i).
Buckingham and Liévre River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86, 1°*) 2699 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1770 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4723 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 1°, 1636 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2704, 2968, 3648, 4225 (ii).
Dods, P. B., case of, *re* Loss of Diamonds (M. for Ret.) 2287 (i).
Gear and Tackle Inspector, Appmnt. (Ques.) 224.

Curran, Mr. J. J.—*Continued.*
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to prop. Res., 3349 (ii).
Lachine Canal, New Bridge at Montreal (M. for Ret.) 524 (i).
Montreal Board of Trade (B. 25, 1st) 161 (i).
Montreal Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1st) 1636 (i).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2655 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4030 (ii).

Daly, Mr. T. M., *Selkirk.*
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3305 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1212 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 986 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1853, 1938 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1212 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2048 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 553 (i).
Budget, on the, 629 (i).
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1974 (i).
Canals, Contracts for Enlargement, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 417 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2156 (i).
Approval of Commissioners on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3027 (ii).
Commercial Relations with U.S., Sir C. Tupper's Speech (remarks) 224 (i).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1303 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2702, 2786, 2827, 2958, 3637, 3644, 4225 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1809 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 960 (i).
Electric Lighting, Public Buildings in Can. (M. for Ret.*) 417 (i).
Fisheries (Lobster) Act Amt. B. 9 (remarks) 160.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1655 (i).
——— on M. for Com., 2190; in Com., 2225, 2230
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of U.S. B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2nd, 177; in Com., 1472.
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1217 (i).
Govt. Rys., Employés, on M. for Ret., 694 (i).
Indian Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret., 523 (i).
I. C. R., Arrangements with C. P. R. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
I. C. R., Employés, Salaries and Dismissals (M. for O.C.'s) 293 (i).
——— Running Privileges, &c., Amount paid by C. P. R. (Ques.) 510 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 556 (i).
——— St. John, Expropriation of Property (Ques.) 1031 (i).
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2238 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2457, 2491, 3089 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 2957 (ii).
London Election, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 246.
——— Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2354 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3094 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 181 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3557 (ii).
Newfoundland, Admission into Can. (M. for Cor., &c.*) 695 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Settlement of difficulties (Ques.) 825 (i), 2956 (ii).
——— Despatch *re* complications (remarks) 1638.
——— Papers respecting (Ques.) 508, 684, 914, 1088, 1227, 1491 (i).
——— Discriminating Tariff (Ques.) 454 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2nd, 2486 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1640 (i).
Piers, Breakwaters, &c. (P. E. I.) Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 237 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1614; (Amt.) 1623; neg. (Y. 64, N. 98) 1634 (i).
———Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2492 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Dismissal of Employés, on M. for Ret., 2005 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1st, 1858 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2nd, 3239.
——— in Com., 3725, 3753, 4109, 4146, 4184 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3697 (ii).
Robertson, J. F., Claim *re* Ry. Accident (M. for Ret.) 1367 (i).
Sea Fisheries Development B. 5 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2nd, 162; in Com., 166 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) on Res., 752; in Com., 1402 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 629 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 1160; (Experimental Farms) 1425 (i).
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) 283; (High Commissioner) 277, contingencies, 909; (Interior) 258, 832, 848, 1155: (Justice) 913; (Marine) 270: (Public Works) 271; (Railways and Canals) 273 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues: Railways (P.E.I.) 2635.
Dominion Police, 313 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1517: (Expenses) 1896 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 311: (Exchequer Court) 971: (Registrar in Admiralty, Que.) 313: (Supreme Court, Reporter) 312 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 794: Library (Purchase of Books) 792: (Salaries, &c.) 789. Senate (Salaries, &c. 753, 59 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1167, 1217: (Brigade Majors) 1161: (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1374 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 973 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 2618. *Income:* Buildings (N.W.T.) 2943: (Gas and Electric Light) 4242. (Ottawa Grounds) 4240. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4251: (P.E.I.) 4252 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2264, 2530: (St. John, accommodation) 2563 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 796 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners B. (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1876 (i).
Tunnel (Submarine) P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 413 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 177; in Com., 1472 (i).
Winter Communication with P. E. I. (remarks) 187 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4708.
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 544 (i).
Blue-Books, &c., Throwing, on Adjmnt. (remarks) 1636 (i).
Budget, on the, 648 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2089 (i).
——— Approval of Commssioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3001 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 4727 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3322 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4588.
Dom. Lands Act.: prop. Amt. (wthdn.) 3183 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3307; on M. for 3°, 3815; (Amt.) 3818, 4204 (ii).
Gov. Gen's Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1338 (i).
Land Grants to Militia B. 96 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4264 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3092, 3397 (ii).
Man. and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 88, 1°) 3183 (ii).
North-West Assembly Resolutions (M. for copies) 1551 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Preferential Trade with G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1604 (i).
——— Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2498 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3279 (ii).
——— in Com., 4011, 4153 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. deb. (personal explanation) 3472 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 151 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 648 (i).
Civil Government (Mounted Police) 286 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 999 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2036 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2452 (ii).

Davis, Mr. D. W., *Alberta.*
High Creek and Sheep Creek Irrigation and Water Power Co.'s (B. 23, 1°) 161 (i).

Dawson, Mr. G. W. W., *Addington.*
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 965 (i).
Representation in H of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3675 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 456 (i).
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2055 (i).

Delisle, Mr. A., *Portneuf.*
Judges on Commissions (Ques.) 37 (i).
Post Offices, Erection (Laprairie) in Com. of Sup., 2814 (ii).
St. Raymond P. O. (Ques.) 37 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ques.) 2814 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., C.M.G., *West Toronto.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4590 (ii): on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4600.
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3315 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (denial) 1192 (i); on M. for Com. of Sup. (Ques. of Priv.) 1319 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3100 (ii).
Militia, Active, on M. for Ret., 678 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2483 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 175; in Com. on B., 1639 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., Despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Private Bills, Reps. from Com., extension of time (M.) 3564 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3962, 4070, 4121 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening (prop. Res.) 138 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenue: Customs (Ont.) 819 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1161, 1188; (Military College) 1379 (i).
Toronto Ry. Works (B. 18, 1°*) 129 (i).

Desaulniers, Mr. F. S. L., *St. Maurice.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2128 (i).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1467 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4104 (ii).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 1153 (i).
——— conc. (M.) 1465 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 4585 (ii).
Montreal and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 82, 1°*) 2171.
School Savings Bank incorp. Act Amt. (B. 36, 1°*) 314 (i); in Com., 4638 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) 755 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. L. G., *L'Islet.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2107 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1571 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4516 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3205 ii).
SUPPPLY:
Militia—(Drill Pay) 1357 (i).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., *Ottawa County.*
Budget, on the, 498 (i).
Civil Service Employés, Stoppage of Pay, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2238 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on prop. Res (Mr. *Mills*, Bothwell) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
Culbute Canal, Cost of Construction, on M. for Stmnt. 929 (i).
Experimental Farm Reps., French Ed. (Ques) 397 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. to take Mondays, 3565 (ii)
N. W. T., Education and Dual Languages, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3072 (ii).
Ottawa Ship Canal, prop. Construction (M. for Cor.*) 1719 (i).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt., on M. for Cor., 1991.
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2749, 2816, 2879, 2892, 2899 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. C. R.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3147 (ii).
——— in Com., 4018 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland (prop. Res.) 3335 (ii).
——— despatch in London *Times* (Ques. of Priv.) 3815 (ii).
Hull P. O., Sunday Opening (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Ottawa City Passenger Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. *Robillard*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1267 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 498 (i).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 2247. *Income* (Carillon and Grenville) 2260; (Culbute) 2263; (Welland) 2252 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 1000 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Judges Queen's Bench, Man.) 312 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.,) 765 (i).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 991 (i). *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 2749; (Que.) 2879, 2899 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Halifax, accomodation) 2542.

Dewdney, Hon. E., East Assiniboia.
Boundaries of Prov. of Que., on M. for Cor., &c., 119 (i).
Cockburn Island, Location Tickets, on M. for copies, 1981 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 89, 1°) 2979; in Com., 3302, 3733; on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3°, 3819, 4204 (ii).
Geological Survey Dept. Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°*) 578; 2° m., 1648; in Com., 1655 (i).
Geological Survey, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2172.
Govt. Land Sale in Quebec City (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Indian Affairs Deptl. Rep. (presented) 112 (i).
——— Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4414 (ii).
——— Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret. 513 (i).
Indians, B.C. and Proclamation (Ans.) 289 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3300 (ii).
Land Grants to Militia (B. 96, 1°*) 4203; 2 and in Com., 4264; 3° m., 4399 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. (Man. and N.W.T.) on M. for Ret., 2273 (i).
Land Office, Edmonton, Removal (remarks) 4392
Lands Sold or Leased in Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Ret., 242 (i).
Lapage, J. B., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1392.
Man. North-Western Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for 2°, 2638 (ii).
Morton Dairy Co.'s Claims (Ans.) 916 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2673, 2698 (ii).
——— Rep. (presented) 4320 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 61, 1°*) 1062 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance (prop. Res.) 129; (M. for Com. on Res.) 174; in Com., 1639; (B. 58, 1°*) 825 (i).

Dewdney, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Ranching Companies, N.W.T. (Ans.) 1946 (i).
Settlers' Claims (Ans.) 223 (i).
——— Grievances, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4408 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 258, 825, 845, 1154 (i); conc., 4206, 4472 (ii).
Collection of Revenue: Dom. Lands, 4431 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 4431 (ii).
Geological Survey, 4386 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 993 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1846, 1899 (i); conc., 4210.
Indians, 4460; (B.C.) conc., 4479; (D. Chisholm's Claim) conc., 4479; (Reserve Commission) 4423; (Schools) 4421 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Springs) 4428; (Bulmer *vs.* Queen, Expenses) 4461 (ii); (Jukes, Dr. A., medical Services) 1003 (i); (Refunds) 4462 (ii); (Ross, Hon. J. G., Refund) 1002 (i).
Mounted Police (Pay of Force) 4423 (ii).
Pensions (Fraser, H. & R.) 1018 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2942; conc., 4468 (ii).
Temperance Colonization Society, on M. for Ret., 930 (i).
Waldron Co.'s Ranche, Settlers' Claims (Ans.) 223 (i).
White Pine Timber Areas, on M. for Map, 293 (i).

Dickey, Mr. A. R., *Cumberland.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1750 (i).
Chignecto Transport Ry. Co.'s (B. 831,**) 2361 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2829, 3320, 4268 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3384 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3563 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2654 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3414 (ii).
——— in Com., 4191 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (Coal Tariff) 2548 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. L. E., *Montcalm.*
Dairies and Cheese Factories, Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 2781 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2122 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2857 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4526 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3192 (ii).
——— in Com. 4054, 4061 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2857 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 39 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 2254 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 306 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, Sums Paid (Ques.) 41 (i).
Canal Tolls and U. S. (remarks) 4643 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against (Stmnt. read) 1032 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) 1038, 1760 (i).
——— on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2147 (i).
Copyright Laws, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2233 (i).
Dom. Cotton Mills Co., Letters Patent (M. for copies) 920; (enquiry) 2172 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) *re* Pet., 666 (i).
Favoured Nations Clause (Ques.) 34 (i).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1230 (i).
Lands Sold or Leased in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for Ret.) 241 (i).
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet. (objection) 667 (i).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, York*) to M. for 3°, 4614 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4506; on conc. (Amt.) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3857 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) 758 (i).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1093 (i).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3234 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3630 (ii).
——— in Com., 3780 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1451 (i).

Fairbairn, Mr. C., *South Victoria.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 550 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4487 (ii).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 45, 1°*) 578 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2898 (ii).

Fauvel, Mr. O. Le B., *Bonaventure.*
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2824, 2898 (ii).

Fauvel, Mr. O. Le B.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 742 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2824 (ii).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*
Milk Cans, Inspection under Act (Ques.) 4262, 4647 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1642 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 985; (Experimental Farms) 1458; (Haras National Co.) 1465 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures (contingencies) 1016 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 987, 2033 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 548 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*
Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 6, 1°) 98; 2° n., 418; in Com., 455 (i).
C. P. R., P. O. and Militia Services, Payments (Ques.) 3331 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2074 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2995 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2785, 2837, 2967, 3320, 4346 (ii).
Dom. Millers' Association B. 70 (Mr. *Stevenson*) on M. for 3°, 2940 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c. (M. for Ret.) 930, 962 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2216, 2230 (i).
Fishing Bounty, Ret. (Enquiry) 914 (i).
Judges, Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses (Enquiry for Ret.) 3115 (ii).
Kentville Postmaster, Suspension (Ques.) 1088 (i).
Point Tupper and Sydney Mail Service (Ques.) 2641 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection in Com. of Sup., 2747, 2770, 2845, 2890 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3481 (ii).
Sandford Breakwater (Ques.) 398 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1414 (i).
Superior Court Judges, Que., Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 695 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 1160 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 910 (i).
Geological Survey, 4388 (ii).
Immigration (Expenses) 1889, 1915 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 774, 781 (i).
Militia (Military College) 1382 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 664 (i), 4441 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 741 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4441; (N.S.) 2747; (N.W.T.) 2937; (Ont.) 2926; (Que.) 2845. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4448 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2044 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2552; (St. John, accommodation) 2600.
Superannuation, 807 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps., on M. for copy, 2444 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4681 (ii).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1882 (i).
Worsley, Lieut. Col., and Lieut. Col. Murray (Ques.) 3643 (ii).

Forbes, Mr. F. G., *Queen's, N.S.*
Annapolis and Atlantic Ry. Co. (M. for Cor., &c.) 688 (i).
Beef and Pork (American) Lumbermen's Imports (Ques.) 291 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 294 (i).
Election Pets., Decisions, on M. for Ret., 1554.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2206; in Com., 2219 (i).
Ordnance Lands, Annapolis (Ques.) 1364 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Sale of Type (Ques.) 2954 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4542 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4075 (ii).
Spanish West Indies, Exports (Ques.), 4499 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) conc., 4471 (ii).
Fisheries (Ont.) 4310; (P.E.I.) 4315 (ii).
Immigration (Expenses) 1893 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 772 (i).
Mail Subsidies (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 4281 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2773. Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 4455. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4252 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2266, 2543 (ii).
Treaty with Spain (remarks) 4474 (ii).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1884.

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N.B.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
Auditor Gen.'s Rep. (Ans.) 36 (i).
——— (presented) 188 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty (prop. Res.) 4697; in Com., 4698; (B. 102, 1°*) 4715 (ii).
——— Bounty (Ans.) 751 (i).
——— Cultivation, French Reps. (Ans.) 750 (i).
——— Prof. Saunders' Rep. (presented) 71 (i).
BUDGET, THE (Ans.) 161, 663 (i).
——— (Annual Stmnt.) 315 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1953 (i).
Canal Tolls and U. S. (remarks) 4642 (ii).
Civil Service, Rep. of Privy Council (presented) 751 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup. 1124 (i).
Crude Petroleum, Duty (Ans.) 1946 (i).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 103, 1ᵒ*) 4715; in Com., 4728 (ii).
ESTIMATES, THE (presented) 138 (i).
——— Suppl., 1892 (remarks) 822 (i).
——— Suppl., 1893, (presented) 4265 (ii).
Favoured Nations Clause (Ans.) 35 (i).
——— Despatch *re* Treaties, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1470 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants (presented) 34 (i).
——— on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to ref. to Pub. Acts. Com., 50 (i).
Govt. Short Loans (Ans.) 137 (i).
High Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 665 (i).
I. C. R. Audit of Accts., on M. for Com of Sup., 4276 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Coal Contract (Ans.) 4393 (ii).
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent (remarks) 2457 (ii).
Liquor Traffic, Members of Royal Commission (Ans.) 2172 (i).
Members' Indemnity (Res. and 1ᵒ of B. 104) 4715 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3557 (ii).
Newfoundland and Canada, negotiations (Ans.) 2957 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1499 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2818, 2895, 2905 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (M. *McNeill*) 1608 (i).
Prohibition (Plebiscite) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2661 (ii).
Public Accounts. (presented) 37 (i).
Quebec Harbour Police B. (wthdn.) 4482 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4514, 4536 (ii).
St. John Harbour Commission (prop. Res.) 4398.
——— (M. for Com.) 4493 (ii).
St. John Harbour Commission (B. 99) Res. conc. in and 1ᵒ* of B., 4506; in Com., 4649 (ii).
Savings Bank at St. John, Mr. McLeod's appointment (Ans.) 3644 (ii).
Savings Banks, Superannuation of Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4274 (ii).
Saw-logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1281 (i).
Spanish West Indies, Exports (Ans.) 509 (i), 4500 (ii).
Superannuation of Civil Servants (Ans.) 1637 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—Res. for Com., 33 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) conc., 4474 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 1429 (i).
Charges of Management (Brokerage, &c.) 254; (Dom. Notes, Printing) 255; (Inspector) 250; (Pub. Debt, Commission) 253 (i).
Civil Government (Auditor Gen.'s Office) 267; (Civil Service Examiners) 283; (Customs) 267; (Deptl. Buildings, care, &c.) contingencies, 286; (Finance and Treasury Board) contingencies, 285; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 255, contingencies, 284; (High Commissioner) 275, contingencies, 282, 896; (Interior) 257, 826, 844, 1154 (i), 4432; (Marine and Fisheries) 4432 (ii); (Militia and Defence) 256; (Mounted Police) 265; (Printing and Stationery) 256; (Public Works) 271; (Privy Council) 255 (i), 4453, 4440 (ii); (Railways and Canals) contingencies, 286 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Adulteration of Food. 4430 (ii). Customs (General Vote) 811; (Ont.) 820 (i). Post Office (Mail Service) conc., 4471 (ii).
Dominion Police, 314 (i).
Fisheries (Behring Sea Arbitration) 4460; (Fish-Breeding) 4317, conc., 4479; (B.C., Salaries) 4317; (N.S.) 4311; (Ont.) 4310; (P.E.I.) 4312; (Protection Steamers) 4339 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1842 (i); conc., 4467 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 794; (Salaries, &c.) 777. Library (Purchase of Books) 794; (Salaries, &c.) 791. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 752 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4308; (Salaries, &c.) 4305 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Can. and Liverpool) conc., 4478; (Canso, Arichat, &c.) 4277; (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4282, conc., 4469; (Magdalen Islands) 4277; (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 4279 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 4310 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Arbitration, Costs) 4430, conc., 4470; (Str. *Bayfield*, Supplies) 4461; (Clerical assistance) 4457; (Commercial Agencies) 4427; (Georgian Bay Survey) conc., 4479; (International Customs Bureau) 4463; (Litigated matters) 4426; (Mr. Fabre's Salary) 4424; (Monument, late Sir John Macdonald) 4458; (Old Records, classification) 4429; (Survey, P.E.I. and Mainland) 4463 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Tidal Observations) 4305.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 4433, 4440 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B. C.) 4442; (Que.) 2818, 2898. Harbours and Rivers (Ship Channel) 4439. (Major's Hill Park) conc., 4468.
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Service) 4309 (ii).
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 796 (i).
Supply B. 62 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2ᵒ, 1090 (i).
——— (B. 100) Res. in Com., 4506; 1ᵒ, 4603; 2ᵒ m., 4655; 3ᵒ m., 4715 (ii).
Sydenham River Floods (remarks) 4465, 4500 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (prop. Res.) 1788 (i).
——— (M.) for Com., 1874; in Com., 1875.
——— Res. conc. in, 4265 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners (B. 98, 1ᵒ*) 4265 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Trade Relations with Spain, &c. (remarks) 4602.
Treaty with Spain (remarks) 4474 (ii).
Treaty with Germany, Despatch to London *Times* (remarks) 110 (i).
Tunnel (Submarine) P.E. I. and Mainland (Ans.) 98 (i).
——— on M. for Cor., 417 (i).
Ways and Means—prop. Res. for Com., 34 (i).
——— The Tariff (M. for Com.) 4668 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4677 (ii).
West India Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1880 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4261 (ii).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 297 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2130.
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3007 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2840, 2976, 3321, 4269 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2218, 2231 (i).
Fishery Regulations, Mackerel (Ques.) 3054 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to prop. Res., 3362 (ii).
I. C. R., Accident at New Glasgow (remarks) 3088 (ii).
——— Passenger Cars, Amount Paid C. P. R. (Ques.) 399 (i).
——— Traffic at Mulgrave Station (M. for Stmnt.) 35 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 3896.
Liabilities of the Dom., Amount (M. for Ret.*) 969 (i).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliot, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2329 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3100 (ii).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3775 (ii).
Military District No. 9, Suspension of Officers (Ques.) 3332 (ii).
Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Co.'s (B. 30, 1°*) 245 (i).
Point Tupper and Sydney Mail Service (Ques.) 2641 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Sale of Type (Ques.) 2954 (ii).
Prohibition, Pets. presented to H. of C. (M. for Stmnt.*) 100 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4522 (ii).
Rimouski, Change of Route (Ques.) 3183 (ii).
Sea Fisheries Development B. 5 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 170 (i).
Telegraph Line in Victoria, N.S. (Ques.) 3897.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 264 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1039 (i). P. O. (Mail Service) conc., 4471.
Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) 4317: (N. S. Salaries) 4310: (P.E.I.) 4312; (Protection Vessels) 4319.
Indians (D. Chisholm's Claim) conc., 4479 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c., 783 (i).
Mail Subsidies (Cango, Arichat, &c.) 4277; (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 4279 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1163, 1210 (i).
Public Works Consolidated Fund: Buildings (N.B.) 989 (i). *Income:* Buildings (N.W.T.) 2946; (Que.) 2914. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) conc. 4477 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2398 (ii).

Frémont, Mr. J. J. T., *Quebec County.*
Bridges, St. Lawrence River (Ques.) 291, 1549 (i).
C. P. R., North Shore Section (Ques.) 3480 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Location &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 682 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 3114 (ii).
Govt. Land Sale in Quebec City (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Grain Shipments *viâ* New York &c. (Ques.) 291.
I. C. R., Transfer to a Company (Ques.) 3055 (ii).
Lake St. John and Chicoutimi Ry. (Ques.) 1549.
Railway Bridge at Quebec, construction (Ques.) 291 (i).
Stadacona P.O., Opening (Ques.) 222 (i).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Great Northern Ry. Engineer's Rep. (Ques.) 915.
Tobacco, &c., Law respecting (Ques.) 750 (i).

Geoffrion, Hon. F., *Verchères.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4044, 4052 (ii).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Welland Election, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) declaring Seat vacant, 578 (i).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Kingston Graving Dock, Payments to Bancroft, Connolly & Co. (M. for Ret.*) 2006 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2716 (ii).
Post Offices, in Com. of Sup., 2883 (ii).
Seditious, &c., Associations and Oaths B. 85 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2489 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Soulanges) 2050; (Trent) 2056 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1022 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1829, 1849 (i).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 2716. *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 2883 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2038 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Canadian Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 51, 1°*) 823 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc. (Amt.) 4601.
Election Pets., Decisions (M. for copies) 1553 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4079 (ii).

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) conc., 4478 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 4454 (ii).
Railways : I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2537.

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 554 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 957 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2221 (i).
Granite, Manufactnred, Imports and Exports (Ques.) 509 (i).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1264 (i).
SUPPLY :
Railways : I.C.R. (Expenses) 2527 (ii).
Superannuation, 804 (i).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 4631 ; in Com., 4717 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3728 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (B. C., Salaries) 4317 ; (Fish-Breeding) 4218 ; (Protection Vessels) 4320 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4306 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (San Francisco and Victoria, B.C.) 4281 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Dredging (B.C.) 4456 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Alert, Str., Accident (Ques.) 917 (i).
Butter and Cheese Industry (Ques.) 3331 (ii).
Franchise Act, Legislation (Ques.) 916 (i).
Great Northern Ry. Co., Engineer's Rep. (Ques.) 915 (i).
I. C. R., Drake, Alfred, Dismissal (Ques.) 2490 (ii).
——— Quinn, Michael, Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 401 (i).
——— (M. for Cor.) 3332 (ii).
Judiciary of Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 2639 (ii).
Longueuil Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 1231 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2815 (ii).
Summerstown P. O., Receipts (Ques.) 1365 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Que.) 2815 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland.*
Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 49, 1°*) 823 (i).
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. (M. to receive Pet.) 667 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Northumberland Election, 3058 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4517 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Coteau, Water Overflow (remarks) 915 (i).
Culbute Canal, Cost of Construction, on M. for Stmnt., 928 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 535 (i).
Galops Rapids, Str. *Traveller,* on M. for Ret., 132 (i).
Govt. Rys., Employés, on M. for Ret., 41, 694 (i).
——— Property accommodation, on M. for copies, 1984 (i).
Great Northern Ry., Engineer's Rep. (Ans.) 916.
I. C. R., Arrangements with C. P. R. (Ans.) 667.
——— Drake, Alfred, Dismissal (Ans.) 2490 (ii).
——— Employés, Salaries and Dismissals, on M. for O. C.'s, 293 (i).
——— Live Stock Tariff (Ans.) 1365 (i).
——— Passenger Cars, Amount paid C. P. R. (Ans.) 399 (i).
——— Quinn, Michael, Dismissal on M. for Ret., 491 (i) ; on M. for Cor., 3335 (ii).
——— Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 41 (i), 4393.
——— Running Privileges, &c., Amount Paid by C.P.R. (Ans.) 510 (i).
——— Running Privileges, &c., granted C.P.R., on M. for Ret., 561 (i).
——— St. John, Expropriation of Property (Ans) 1031 (i).
——— Shipment of Hay (Ans.) 4644 (ii).
——— Stationery Supplies (Ans.) 1032 (i).
——— Transfer to a Company (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
Lachine Canal, New Bridge at Montreal, on M. for Ret., 526 (i).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Traffic Earnings (Ans.) 4262 (ii).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3774 (ii).
Miscouche Station, Closing (Ans.) 2563 (ii).
Pontiac and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, on M. for Ret., 919 (i).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt, on M. for Cor., 1989 (i).
Pridham, Mr., Salary Paid, in Com. of Sup., 4213 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry., Employés dismissed, on M. for Ret., 2006 (i).
Railway Act Amt. (B. 84, 1°) 2488 ; in Com., 4481 (ii).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1052 (i).
Railway Bridge at Quebec, Construction (Ans.) 291 (i).
Railway Com. of Privy Council, Applications or Complaints, on M. for Stmnt., 1949 (i).
Railway Statistics (Ans.) 3398 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, prop. Res. (1st) 4394 ; (2nd 4466 ; (3rd) 4644 (ii).
——— in Com., 4506, 4629, 4644, 4662 (ii).
——— (B. 101, 1°*) 4669 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3436 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C., in Com., 3787, 3949 (ii).
Richelieu River, Subsidy for Bridge, on M. for Ret., 2456 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 153 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contract for Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 2954, 3184, 4261 (ii).
Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copies, 227 (i).
Summerside and Richmond Branch Ry. (Ans.) 40 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Carillon and Grenville) conc., 4213(ii): (Cornwall) 2053: (Lachine) 2049: (Murray) 2054: (Rapide Plat) 2054: (St. Lawrence River, &c.) 2054: (Sault Ste. Marie) 2241: (Soulanges) 2050: (Trent) 2055 (i); conc., 4476 (ii). *Income:* (Carillon and Grenville) 2260: (Chambly) 2257; (Culbute) 2263: (Lachine) 2250; (Miscellaneous) 2264 (i), 4439 (ii): (Rideau) 988: (Ste. Anne's Lock) 2260; (St. Peter's) 2263: (Trent Valley) 2262: (Welland) 2252 (i).
Civil Government (Railways and Canals) 273 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Canals (Lachine) 1017 (i). Railways (I.C.R.) 2628 (ii): (P.E.I.) 1017 (i), 2632; (Windsor Branch) 2629 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4302 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2625 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. B. Ry. (Train Ferry) conc., 4475. C. P. R., 4438: (Arbitrators' Award) 4438 (ii); (Construction) 987, 2264 (i). I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2563; (Expenses) 2361, 2379, 2516, 2524. Oxford and New Glasgow (Construction) conc., 4475 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioner's Rep. (Ans.) 397 (i).

Hazen, Mr. J. D., *St. John, N.B., City and County.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4594 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1214 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3388 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 185 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 173 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1578 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4561 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson* in Com., 4199 (ii).
St. John Harbour Commissioners B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4651 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1397, 1645 (i).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance, &c.) 4306, 4366 (ii).

Hazen, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4283 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1168 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (St. John, accommodation) 2581; (Expenses) 2418 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1684 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures (contingencies) 1017 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria, Ont.*
Budget, on the, 443 (i).
Exports (Can.) to Nfld. (M. for Ret.*) 113 (i).
Fenelon Falls Ry. Bridge, Govt. and G. T. R. Agreement (M. for Ret.*) 133 (i).
Flour (Can.) admitted into Nfld. (M. for Ret.) 112.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4489 (ii).
Meat and Farm Products (American) Imports (M. for Ret.*) 291 (i).
Militia, Active (M. for Ret.) 667, 681 (i).
Pork and Hog Products, Imports from U. S. (M. for Ret.*) 292 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3493 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse. (personal explanation) 3541 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 443 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 4437 (ii): (Experimental Farms) 1447 (i).
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2059 (i), 4438 (ii). *Income* (Trent) conc., 4475 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) conc., 4470 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition) 1163 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 309 (i).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 34, 1°*) 245 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 955 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
St. Thomas, appointment of Collector of Customs, on M. for Cor., 2001 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1375 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 2762; (Que.) 2912 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*
Crude Petroleum, Duty (Ques.) 1946 (i).
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 31, 1°*) 245 (i).
U. S. Newspapers, Free Admission (Ques.) 1230.

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 307 (i).
Canadian White Pine Areas (M. for Map) 217 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 530 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2487 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty (prop. Res.) 1231, 1270 (i).
Transfer of Shares in Corporations (B. 48, 1°) 749 (i).
White Pine Timber Areas (M. for Map) 293 (i).

Jeannotte, Mr. H., *L'Assomption.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3999, 4027 (ii).

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., *Gaspé.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2218 (i).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Dominion Day (remarks) 4320 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4399 (ii).
License Fees, Refund by Nfld. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Modus Vivendi, on Prorogation (remarks) 4729.
Newfoundland Bait Act, Cor., &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).
——— and Canada, Bait Sales to St. Pierre Fishermen (Ques.) 189 (i).
——— Bonding Privileges (Ques.) 189 (i).
——— Duty collected on Fishing Outfits (Ques.) 189 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2770.
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) 4318; (P.E.I., Salaries, &c.) 4314 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2770 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., *Halifax.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2195 (i).
Preferential Trade with G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1606 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4522 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4302 (ii).
Railways—Capital (Expenses) 2381 (i); (Halifax, accommodation) 2533 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac.*
C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 38, 1°*) 315 (i).
Library of Parlt., 1st Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 2826 (ii).
London Election, Original Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 38 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s (B. 53, 1°*) 823 (i).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A.—*Continued.*
Seditions, &c., Associations and Oaths (B. 85, 1°) 2488 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 765, 784 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1162; (Brigade Majors) 1161; (Military College) 1387 (i).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1482 (i).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1094 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Budget, on the, 725 (i).
Canadian Cattle scheduled in England (remarks) 249 (i).
Charges against a Member (Ques.) 4499 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1719 (i).
Cobourg Customs Buildings, Lease (Ques.) 1366.
Controverted Election Act, Legislation (Ques.) 134 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2828 (i).
Dodwell, C. E. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1715 (i).
Election Statistics (remarks) 3185 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 931 (i).
Eugenia, Dismissal and Appmnt of Postmaster (M. for Ret.) 1985 (i).
Finkle, Roland, Appmnt. as Fishery Inspector (Ques.) 1365 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4490 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Employés (M. for Ret.) 41 (i).
Land Grants to Militia B. 96 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4265 (ii).
McIntyre, Dismissal and Appmnt. of Postmaster (M. for Ret.) 1985 (i).
Mennonite Settlers and Census Returns (remarks) 4263 (ii).
Montreal Cadets, Duty on Presentation Flag (Ques.) 509 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2694 (ii).
Population of Electoral Districts, Ret. (enquiry) 2700 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2752, 2798, 2812, 2870 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *imes re* Deb. (remarks) 2498 (ii).
Pub. Works, Return *re* Expenditure (Ques.) 1090.
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4519, 4562.
Ranching Companies, N.W.T. (Ques.) 1946 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3247 (ii).
——— in Com., 3808, 3956 (ii).
Rets. (enquiry) 100 (i), 2700 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Royal Commissions since Confederation (M. for Ret.*) 39 (i).
——— enquiry for Ret., 2089, 2172 (i), 2700, 3239 (ii).
St. Maurice Public Words (Ques.) 3564 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 725 (1).
Canals—Capital (Trent) 2063 (i).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) contingencies, 902: (Interior) 853 (i).
Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 994 (i).
Immigration (Printing Pamphlets) 2025 (i).
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) 753 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4284: (San Francisco and Vic., B.C.) 4279 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Ross, Hon. J. G., Refund) 1003 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 2798: (N.S.) 2752: (Que.) 2802, 2870, 2889: (Heating, &c.) 4246: (Major's Hill Park) conc., 4468 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 2028; (Unorganized Service) 2049 (i).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. to M. for 3°, 4504 (ii).
Voters' Lists (Ques.) 1637 (i).
——— Cost of Revision (M. for Ret.) 683 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Centre Quebec.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty (Ques.) 751 (i).
——— Cultivation, French Reps. (Ques.) 750 (i).
Bic Wharf, Collector (Ques.) 2638 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2701 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1465 (i).
Divorce, Mead, H. R., Relief B. 81 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 3°, 2636 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's (B. 55, 1°*) 823 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. ofSup., 2816 (ii).
Quebec and Pointe aux Trembles Mail Service (Ques.) 1366 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Jamaica Exhibition) 977.
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2259 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 775.
Quarantine (Cattle) 2033 (i).
U. S. Alien Labour Law (remarks) 1548 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*
Boundaries of Prov. of Que. (M. for Cor., &c.) 115 (i).
——— (remarks) 99 (i).
Census, Origin and Religious Creeds (Ques.) 190.
Divorce, H. R. Mead Relief B. 81 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 2093 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1862 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Barret *vs.* City of Winnipeg, Supreme Court Judgt. (M. for copy) 158 (i).
Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 35, 1°*) 245.
N. W. T. Act. Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 1°, 221 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W., *East Quebec.*
Address, on the, 23 (i).
Adjmnt., Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2700, 2781 (ii).
——— Easter (remarks) 1311 (i).
Agriculture, Letter of Dep. Minister (Ques.) 1947 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 304 (i).
Allan, Messrs., &c., Duties on Iron (M. for Pets.*) 159 (i).
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Workmen's Claims, on M. (Mr. *Cockburn*) for Sel. Com., 50 (i).
Beef and Pork, American Imports, on M. for Ret., 295 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4709, 4714 (ii).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Press despatch re Treaty (read) 36 (i).
Cacouna Pier, Expenditure (Ques.) 137 (i).
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1956, 1976 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2467 (ii).
Canadian White Pine Areas, on M. for Map (objection) 217 (i).
Canal Tolls in U. S. (remarks) 4642 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Mr. *Edgar's* Stmnt. (remarks) 1035 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1047 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners (Amt.) 2981; neg. (Y. 32, N. 79) 3053 (ii).
Charlebois, F., Claim against Fisheries Dept. (M. for Cor.) 1036 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 1°, 1636 (i); in Com., 4639 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1718 (i).
Cockburn Island, Location Tickets, on M. for copies, 1984 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1136 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 46 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1083 (i).
Criminal Law B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1316 (i); in Com., 2709, 2966, 2782, 3322, 3646, 4228 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1307 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4728 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 1468 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4601 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1789; neg. (Y. 57, N. 98) 1827 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Edmonton Land Office, Removal (remarks) 4043, 4392 (ii).
Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4377 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 930 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) *re* Hobbs', &c., Pet., 666 (i).
Esquimalt, Defences of, Imp. and Can. Govts. (M. for Cor.) 244 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 536 (i).
Fishing Rights on Richelieu River (Ques.) 35 (i).
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of U.S. B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 176; in Com., 1475, 1639 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4485 (ii).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1648 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to take in Thursdays, 699 (i).
——— Wednesdays, 2491 (ii).
——— Mondays, 3565 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Employés, on M. for Ret., 41, 694 (i).
Govt. Measures (remarks) 1153 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1215 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1329 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2° (objection) 1648; on M. for 2°, 2007.
Land Office, Edmonton, Removal (remarks) 4043, 4392 (ii).
L'Assomption and Pontiac Writs (Ques.) 2700.
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2241 (i).
Lieut. Gov.'s Instructions (M. for copy) 2268 (i).
London Election, Original Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 38, 64 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 248 (i).
Mackenzie, late Hon. Alex. (remarks) 1389 (i).
Ministers' Visit to Washington, Papers respecting (remarks) 333 (i), 3239, 3398 (ii).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2684 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3558 (ii).
Newfoundland Bait Act, Cor., &c. (remarks) 98.
——— Fishing Licenses (remarks) 135 (i).
——— Papers respecting (Ques.) 315 (i).
——— on M. for copies, 686 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2484 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance, B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).
Perth, North Riding, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 1639.
Pontiac Electoral District, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 2700, 2980, 3054 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2820 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *Times re* deb. (remarks) 2499 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2652 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 4481; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4728 (ii).
Railway Com. of Privy Council, Applications or Complaints, on M. for Statmt., 1949 (i).
Railway Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4398 (ii).
——— on 2nd prop. Res., 4467 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4510, 4629 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1866 (i).
——— on M for 2° (Amt.) 3116; (Y. 58, N. 100) 3299 (ii).
——— in Com., 3727, 3782, 3912, 3966, 4022, 4026, 4037, 4047, 4098, 4187, 4321 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) to M. for 3°, 4340.
Returning Officers, &c., Duties, on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res., 90 (i).
St. Césaire Postmaster, Money Deposits, on M. for Cor., 401 (i).
St. John Harbour Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4494; in Com., 4498 (ii).
——— B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4647; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 53, N. 93) 4654 (ii).
Sick Mariners' Dues, Circular issued by Marine Dept. (M. for copies*) 159 (i).
Sittings of the Hse., on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3897 (ii).
Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copies, 232 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 277: (Interior) 837, 884 (i), conc., 4207 4472 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 912: (Public Works) 272 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Mail Service) conc., 4471. Railways (I. C. R.) 2628 (ii).
Dominion Police, 314 (i).
Fisheries (Behring Sea Arbitration) conc., 4478.
Indians (Reserve Commission) 4422 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 779 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Can. and Liverpool) conc., 4478: (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4233; conc., 4469 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 4310 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Monument, late Sir John Macdonald) 4458 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 736 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2950, conc. 4467; (Que.) 2393. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4251; (Que.) 4257, 4449. Slides and Booms, 4457 (ii).
Supply B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4603; on M. for 2°, 4655; on M. for 3°, 4715 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2435, 2444 (ii).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners B. 98 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for Com on Res., 1874.

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Trade Relations with G. B. (Ques.) 1979 (i).
——— with Spain (remarks) 4602 (ii).
U.S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 176; in Com., 1475, 1639 (ii),
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 3390; in Com., 4480; on Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) on M. for 3°, 4503 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4687 (ii).
Welland Election, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) declaring Seat vacant, 396, 583; (Amt.) 584 (i).
Wrecking in Can. Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 106 (i).
Writs for Elections, on enquiry for Ret., 3115 (ii).
——— Ques., 2700, 2980, 3054 (ii).
Yamaska River, Damages through Dam (M. for Ret.) 1985 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
I. C. R., Shipment of Hay (Ques.) 4643 (ii).
Pinsonneault, Alfred, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 749 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3151 (ii).
——— in Com., 4102 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1264 (i).

Leduc, Mr. J. H., *Nicolet.*
Drummond County Postal Service (Ques.) 289 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2850, 2861 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3229 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2850, 2861 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4711.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2861 (ii).

Lépine, A. T., *East Montreal.*
Gear and Tackle Inspector, Appmnt. (Ques.) 224.

Lippé, Mr. U., *Joliette.*
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4574 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).
Cockburn Island, Location Tickets (M. for copies) 1980, 2006 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2704, 4267 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4593 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Drill Hall, Ottawa, Contract for Roofing (Ques.) 4601 (ii).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against (M. *re* Pet.) 665.
Granite, Manufactured, Exports and Imports (Ques.) 509 (i).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2723 (ii)
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott (prop. Res.) 1719 (i).
——— Res., 2344 (i); neg. (Y. 50, N. 93) 2361 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 1089 (i).
——— Ret. of last Election (M.) 245 (i).
——— Voters' Lists, &c. (M.) 245 (i).
——— (M. for copies) 292 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2722, 2756, 2879, 2894 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G.B., despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) North Perth Election (remarks) 3056 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4554 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3612 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 4437 (ii).
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2257 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1900; (Printing Pamphlets) 2013 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2629; (Kingston Graving Dock) 2722. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 2756; (Ont.) 2863; (Que.) 2894 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2033 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 2004.
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2441 (ii).

Lowell, Mr. J. A., *South Waterloo.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3889 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2865 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Adjmt., Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2781 (ii).
Fisheries Act, Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2209; in Com., 2224 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3705 (ii).
——— in Com., 4127, 3754, 4189 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (P.E.I., Salaries) 4312 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4449 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. H. J., *Winnipeg.*
Preferential Trade with G.B. on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1594 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. H. J.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3914 (ii).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 33, 1°*) 245 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 546; Budget on, the, 469 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to prop. Res., 2152 (i).
Coal Oil and Kerosene, Imports, (M. for Ret.) 3059 (ii).
Contracts (Govt.) since Confedn. (M. for Stmnt.) 99; Wthdn., 110 (i).
Contracts (Govt.) 1887 to 1891 (M. for Stmnt.*) 110 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 951 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 532, (i).
N.W.T., Education and Dual Languages, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3075 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4572 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3528 (ii).
——— in Com., 3811, 3837, 3916, 4326 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2438 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 469 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Criminal Statistics) 1161 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1924, 1943 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 767. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 753 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 2921. Slides and Booms, 4457 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 2029 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. G. H., *Algoma.*
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2727.
Niagara Falls and Queenston Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 54, 1°*) 823 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2776, 2884 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 149 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Lachine) 2251 (i).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 2727. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2625. *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 2884 (ii).

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3620 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York.*
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com. (Amt.) 3771 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Continued.*
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4603; neg. (Y. 20, N. 128) 4628.
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4074 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2231 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2377 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
Canadian Representative at Washington (prop. Res.) 1950, 1977 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2480 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, Approval of Commissioners (M.) 2170 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2705, 2788, 3324 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1230 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on prop. Res. (Amt. to Amt.) 3357 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 27, 1°) 217; 2°, neg. (Y. 33, N. 132) 241 (i); Day for 2° (M.) 2483.
N. W. T. Education and Dual Languages, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3076 (ii).
Railway Com. of Privy Council, Applications or Complaints (M. for Stmnt.) 1937, 1950 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3399; (Amt.) 3414; neg. (Y. 62, N. 109) 3636 (ii).
——— in Com., 3785 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. Deb., (personal explanation) 3472 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 848 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 784 (i).
Welland Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 588 (i).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., *Victoria, N.S.*
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2335 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 847 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Mail Service, Imperfect (remarks) 4398 (ii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*
I.C.R., Accident at New Glasgow (remarks) 3088.
——— Expenditure out of Income (M. for Ret.) 1371 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2410 (ii).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2697 (ii).

McGregor, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2485 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4580 (ii).
Saw Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1262 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1646 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 2246 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1026 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1183 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2039 (i).
Superannuation, 804 (i).
Wilson, Convict, Ed., Release, on M. for Pet., &c., 2645 (ii).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1096 (i).

McKay, Mr. A., *Hamilton.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 306 (i).
Cotton Seed Oil, Imports (M. for Ret.*) 1555 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3559 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3911, 3945 (ii).

McLean, Mr. J., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2185; in Com., 2231 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3711 (ii).
——— B. 76 in Com., 4132, 4181 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Railways (P.E.I.) 2634 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4448 (ii).

McLeod, Mr. E., *St. John, N.B.*
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4226, 4347 (ii).
St. John Harbour B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4648 (ii).
——— Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4495; in Com., 4498 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3103 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4441 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (St. John, Accommodation) 2572 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. H., *Vaudreuil.*
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59, 1°*) 970.

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4702, 4713 (ii).
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 543 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1679 (i).
Budget, on the, 701 (i).
Dom. Millers' Association incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Stevenson*) on M. for 3°, 2940 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 954 (i).
Experimental Farm (Central) Dairy (M. for Ret.) 402 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports (M. for Ret.) 526.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4140; in Com., 4483.
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 4224 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2877 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4557 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3595 (ii).
——— in Com., 3864 (ii).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 701 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairy Industry) 1454; (Experimental Farms) 1425; (Haras National Co.) 1465 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1941 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Cattle Inspection) 992.
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 4441 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2877. Experimental Farms, 4448. Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4451 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep. (M. for copy) 2432 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 3116, 3566, 3637 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4401.

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Adjmt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
Auditor Gen.'s Rep. (Ques.) 36 (i).
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).
Budget, on the, 4 9 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Terminal Accommodation (Ques.) 1549 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2167 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3047 (ii).
Chatham, Customs Collector (Ques.) 1391 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74, in Com., 4641 (ii).
——— Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 1547 (i).
Customs Seizures, Commissions Paid (Ques.) 3238 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4591 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3306; on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3°, 3819 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 940 (i).
Farm Produce, Exports (M. for Ret.) 292 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Fisheries Dept., Irregularities by Dep. Min. (M. for Ret.*) 418 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4487 (ii).

Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay List (remarks) 1223 (i).

Govt. Rys., Employés (M. for Ret.) 41; Deb. rsmd., 692, 699 (i).

——— Property accommodation (M. for Ret.) 1984 (i).

I. C. R., Employés, Number, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 969 (i).

——— Stationery Supplies, value (Ques.) 1032.

Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2715.

Labrador, reported Distress (Ques.) 4263 (ii).

Land Grants to Militia B. 96 (*Mr. Deadney*) in Com., 4264 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1078 (i); in Com., 3069 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 183 (i).

Morton Dairy Co.'s Claims (Ques.) 916 (i).

Mounted Police, Reduction of Force (prop. Res.) 2668, 2699 (ii).

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2483 (ii).

——— Education and Dual Languages, on prop Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3069 (ii).

Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 4216 (ii).

Payne, J. L., Payments for Services (Ques.) 1548 (i).

Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2742, 2768 (ii).

Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2660 (ii).

Railway Statistics (Ques.) 3398; (remarks) 3185.

Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4506 (ii).

Ranching Companies, N.W.T. (Ques.) 1946 (i).

Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3499 (ii).

——— in Com., 3762, 3778, 3878, 3906, 3933, 4332 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4332 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 3545 (ii).

St. John Harbour Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4498 (ii).

Savings Banks, Superannuation of Officials, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4272 (ii).

Settlers' Grievances, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4407 (ii).

SUPPLY—on the Budget, 429 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Census) 4437: (Columbian Exhibition) 986 (i), 4435, conc., 4475 (ii); (Criminal Statistics) 1160; (Experimental Farms) 1424; (Jamaica Exhibition) 976; (*Patent Record*) 1159 (i).

Canals—Capital (Soulanges) 2051; (Trent) 2066 (i), 4438 (ii). *Income* (Rideau) 988 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Charges of Management (Public Debt, Commission) 253; (Country Savings Banks) 259 (i).

Civil Government (Agriculture) contingencies, 286; (Civil Service Examiners) 285; (Customs) 269; (Deptl. Buildings, care, &c.) contingencies 286; (Finance and Treasury Board) contingencies, 285; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) contingencies, 284; (High Commissioner) 275, contingencies, 282, 898; (Interior) 261, 847, 895, 1154; (Printing and Stationery) 912; (Public Works) 271; (Railways and Canals) 273 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1031; (B.C.) 821; (N.S.) 811; (Ont.) 817; (Craven, Geo., Gratuity) 1007. Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1015; (Tobacco Stamps) 1009 (i).

Fisheries (N. S., Salaries) 4311; (Ont.) 4310; (P.E.I.) 4312 (ii).

Government of N. W. T. (Schools) 995 (i).

Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1510, 1828; (Expenses) 1908, 1932; (Printing Pamphlets) 2029.

Justice, Administration of (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 311; (Judges, Queen's Bench, &c., Man.) 312; (Judges' Travelling Expenses, N.W.T.) 310 (i).

Legislation: House of Commons (Committees, &c.) 788; (Salaries, &c.) 762; (Salary, Dep. Speaker) 974. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 752 (i).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4284; conc., 4469 (ii).

Militia (Ammunition) 1185; (Clothing) 1346; (District Staff) 1161; (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1373; (Military College) 1380; (Permanent Forces) 1421; (Stores) 1953 (i).

Miscellaneous (Clerical Assistance) 4457 (ii); (Jukes, Dr. A., Medical Services) 1003 (i); Monument, late Sir John A. Macdonald) 4458 (ii); (Ross, Hon. J. G., Refund) 1003 (i).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 4449 (ii); (Man.) 744, 973; (Regina Gaol) 748; (St. Vincent de Paul) 736, 972 (i).

Public Works—Capital: (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 4439; (Kingston Graving Dock) 2715, 2741. *Income:* Buildings (Hearing) conc., 4477; (N. S.) 2742; (Major's Hill Park) conc., 4493 (ii).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle) 2025; (St. John and Halifax) 2032 (i).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Accomodation, St. John) 988 (i); (Expenses) 2367, 2515 (ii). Oxford and New Glasgow (Construction) conc., 4475 (ii).

Superannuation (W. Wallace) 798 (i).

Unprovided Items, 1018 (i).

Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2450 (ii).

U. S. Vessels in Hudson Bay (Ques.) 4262 (ii).

Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 4503 (ii).

Waldron Ranch Co., Settlers' Claims (M. for Cor., &c.*) 292 (i).

——— Settlers' Claims (Ques.) 223 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*

Atlantic Mail Service (Ques.) 1231 (i).

Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1967 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4595 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G.B. (prop. Res.) 1555 (i); agreed to (Y. 97, N. 63) 1635 (i).
——— despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2497 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3295.
——— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3603 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 876 (i).

Madill, Mr. F., *North Ontario.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4327 (ii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., *Yale.*
B. C. and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 20, 1°*) 129 (i).
Electoral Districts in B.C. (M. for Ret.) 2287 (i).
Indian Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret., 519 (i).
Nelson and Fort Sheppard Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 26, 1°*) 189 (i).
Nicola Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 24, 1°*) 161 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4511 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3725, 4091 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4690 (ii).

Masson, Mr. J., *North Argenteuil.*
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2845, 2960, 3326, 3638, 4225, 4267 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3304 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com., 4481 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3449 (ii).
——— in Com., 4169 (ii).
Welland Election, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) declaring Seat vacant, 580 (i).
Winnipeg and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 72, 1°*) 1636 (i).

Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., *Yamaska.*
Yamaska River Lock, Navigation, &c. (Ques.) 2171 (i).
——— Works, Total Cost (Ques.) 1714 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 307 (i).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Seizure of *Sayward* (remarks) 36 (i).
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1704 (i).
Boundaries of Prov. of Que., on M. for Cor., &c., 121 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Budget, on the, 589 (i).
Bye Elections, Enquiry for Rets., 1491 (i).
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1964 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2479 (ii).
Canal Tolls and U. S. (remarks) 4643 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1052 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2984 (ii).
Census and Statistics, Maps respecting (Ques.) 824 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Gordon*) in Com., 4721 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1717 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74, in Com., 4641 (ii).
Commercial Treaties (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1104; neg. (Y. 62, N. 106) 1151 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1317 (i).
——— in Com., 2702 2785, 2828, 2959, 3641, 3645, 4228, 4265, 4345 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1295 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4594 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4598 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1802 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3302 (ii).
Elections, General, 1891-92, Ret. *re* Returning Officers (remarks) 2491 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 932 (i).
Extra Clerks' Pay, Reduction, 4732 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2228 (i).
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of U.S. B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 178; in Com., 1483.
Flour (Can.) admitted into Nfld., on M. for Ret., 112 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4140 (ii).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1649; in Com., 1654 (i).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1230 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to take in Thursdays, 700 (i).
Govt. Rys., Employés, on M. for Ret., 696 (i).
Incomes of the People (remarks) 456 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4408 (ii).
——— Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret., 515 (i).
——— School Fund, Expenditure (remarks) 4214.
Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Ret., 2275 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Lieut. Gov., N.B. (remarks) 4732 (ii).
London Election, Original Voters' Lists (M. to lay on Table) 37, 52, 72 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3094 (ii).
Mackenzie, late Hon. Alex. (remarks) 1390 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation B. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 186 (i).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3776 (ii).
Minister's Visit to Washington, Rep. respecting (Ques.) 332 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2686 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3559 (ii).
Newfoundland, Papers, &c., *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 684 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2484 (ii).
——— Education and Dual Languages, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3082 (ii).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1641 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2°, 3730; in Com., 4218 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2743, 2775 (ii).
Polling Rets. at General Elections (M. for Map, &c.) 112 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., despatch to London *Times*, *re* Deb. (remarks) 2496 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2656 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4275 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 4512; conc., 4664 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1858, 1871 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3262.
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3682 (ii).
——— in Com., 3720, 3756, 3781, 3839, 3878, 3913, 3920, 3940, 4007, 4023, 4051, 4089, 4149, 4186, 4197, 4221 (ii).
Returning Officers, &c., Duties at Elections (prop. Res.) 73 (i).
St. John Harbour Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4493 (ii).
——— B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 4651 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 156 (i).
Speaker's Warrants, &c., Issued since last Session (M. for Ret.*) 71 (i).
——— incomplete Ret. (remarks) 100 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1399, 1643 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 589 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbia Exhibition) 4436 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Capital (Soulanges) 2051 (i).
Civil Government (Customs) 268; (High Commissioner) contingencies, 896; (Interior) 259, 827, 864, 1154 (i), suppl., 4432, conc., 4432, 4206 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 913 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Railways (I.C.R.) 2628 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys, &c.) 4431 (ii).
Fisheries (Fish-Breeding) 4318 (ii).
Geological Survey, 4390 (ii).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1536; (Expenses) 1897, 1936 (i); conc., 4212 (ii).
Legislation: Library (Salaries, &c.) 790. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 759 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax and West Indies) 4282; (San Francisco and Vic., B.C.) 4279 (ii).
Militia (Military College) 1387 (i).
Miscellaneous (Clerical Assistance) 4459; (Bulmer *vs.* The Queen, Expenses) 4461; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 4430; (Survey, P.E.I. and Mainland) 4463 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 664 (i), 4440 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 743 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2622 (ii).
Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4444; (N. S.) 2743; (N. W. T.) 2938, 2942. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Kingston Harbour) 4258; (Que.) 4451. Miscellaneous, 4259 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2041 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2521 (ii); (Halifax, accommodation) 2267 (i); (St. John, accommodation) 2588 (ii).
Sydenham River, Obstructions, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4451, 4464, 4500 (ii).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 3300; on Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 4501 (ii).
Washington Conference (remarks) 1228 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. for Com., 4675; in Com., 4686 (ii).
Welland Election, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 587 (i).
West Indian Trade, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1887 (i).
West Indies, Minister's Visit (remarks) 1224, 1228 (i).
——— Reps., &c. (M. for copy) 1372 (i).
Wrecking in Canadian Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 1096 (i).
Writs for Bye-Elections (remarks) 3186 (ii).
Writs of Election, delay in Issuing (remarks) 1089 (i), 3115 (ii).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis.*
Apples, Export, under Inspection Act (Ques.) 3238 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4137 (ii).
Militia, 60th Battalion, Annual Drill (Ques.) 4500 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets., Extension of Time (M.) 454, 970 (i).
——— Presentation, Extension of Time (M.) 823.

Mills, Mr. J. B.—*Continued.*
Round Hill Shear Dam, Tenders (Ques.) 2171 (i).
SUPPLY :
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 769 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., *East Lambton.*
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 22, 1ᵒ*) 161 (i).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliot, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 1728 (i).
——— Original Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 64 (i).
Returning Officers, &c., Duties at Elections, on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) to prop. Res., 92 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 94, 1ᵒ) 3479 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D., *Napierville.*
Post Office, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2806 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4582 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2ᵒ, 3223 (ii)
——— in Com., 4039, 4093 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2806 (ii).
Yamaska River Lock, Navigation, &c. (Ques.) 2171 (i).
——— Works, Total Cost (Ques.) 1714 (i).

Montague, Mr. W. H., *Haldimand.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4592 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4597 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2ᵒ, 3618 (ii).
——— in Com., 3910, 3919, 3939 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York, Ont.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 550 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1661 (i).
Can. Temp Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 455 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1780 (i).
Civil Service List, Number of Employés (Ques.) 917 (i).
Copyright Act, Proclamation (Ques.) 1366 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2701, 2784, 2826, 2964, 3639, 4265, 4272, 4345 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1309 (i).
Fertilizers, Artificial, Imports, on M. for Ret., 528 (i).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2ᵒ, 1651 (i).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Innes*) in Com., 1229 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1335 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Warrants issued since Recess (M. for Ret.*) 111 (i).
——— on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 51 (i).
Indian Affairs, Management, on M. for Com. of Sup. 4419 (ii).
I. C. R., Audit of Accounts, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4276 (ii).
——— Running Privileges, &c., granted C. P. R., on M. for Ret., 560 (i).
Lake St. John Ry., Gross Traffic Earnings (Ques.) 4261 (ii).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2305 (i).
——— Original Voters' Lists, &c., on M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 67 (i).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3777 (ii).
Newfoundland, Papers, &c., *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 687 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 1639 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2ᵒ, 3729, 3731; in Com., 4216 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2759, 2799, 2810, 2871, 2890, 2896 (ii).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt, on M. for Cor., 1993.
Procedure, Notices of Motion (remarks) 1551 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3806, 4048, 4178 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Deepening, Tenders (Ques.) 2954, 3184, 4261 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1406, 1644 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1459 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 849, 877 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 813 (i).
Immigration (Printing Pamphlets) 2020 (i).
Justice (Exchequer Court) conc., 1085 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 795: (Printing Voters' Lists) conc., 1086; Library (Purchase of Books) 793. (Senate, Salaries, &c.) 754 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c., and West Indies) 4300 (ii).
Militia (Clothing) 1348; (Military College, 1375 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 2799; (N.S.) 2762; (N.W.T.) 2936; (Ont.) 2918; (Que.) 2802, 2810, 2896 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2379 (ii).
Superannuation, 799 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2440 (ii).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*
Culbute Canal, Cost of Construction (M. for Stmnt.) 927 (i).
Dredging, Ottawa River (M. for Stmnt.) 926 (i).

Murray, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 958 (i).
Pontiac and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 63, 1°*) 1153 (i).
—— Subsidy (M. for Ret.) 917 (i).
Pontiac County Ry. Debt (M. for Cor., &c.) 1986, 1997 (i).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 7 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1058 (i).
Commercial Treaties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills*, Bothwell) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3328 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2300 (i), 3092 (ii).
Militia, Active, on M. for Ret., 673 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2856 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4507 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3233 (ii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3442 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1254 (i).
Treaty with Germany, despatch to London *Times* (remarks) 109 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Inspectors' Travelling Expenses) 821 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1936 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c) 767 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1162; (Armouries, &c.) 1349; (District Staff) 1161; (Drill Pay) 1354; (Permanent Forces) 1423 (i).
Miscellaneous (Georgian Bay Survey) conc., 4470.
Public Works—Income (Que.) 2856 (ii).
U. S. Fishing Vessels B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1473 (i).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., *Laval.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4703.
Dodwell, C. E. W., Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Eatonville Harbour (N.S.) Expenditure (Ans.) 2641 (ii).
Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4381 (ii).
Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2715.
Cacouna Pier, Expenditure (Ans.) 137 (i).
C. P. R., North Shore Section (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1056 (i).
Church Point Wharf, Expenditure for Repairs (Ans.) 399 (i).
Cobourg Customs Buildings, Lease (Ans.) 1366.
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4233, 4348 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1308 (i).
Little Miminegash Breakwater (Ans.) 190 (i).
Longueuil Wharf, Expenditure (Ans.) 1231 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3372 (ii).
McCarthy, Messrs., Lease of Land in Sorel (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Miminegash Breakwater, Contract (Ans.) 40 (i), 2431 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2487 (ii).
Piers, Breakwaters, &c., P. E. I., Expenditure, on M. for Stmnt., 239 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2743, 2768, 2798, 2802, 2859, 2868, 2890, 2894 (ii).
Public Works Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1393 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4533 (ii).
Raquette Pier, Completion (Ans.) 398 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1867 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3130.
—— in Com., 3766, 3826, 3973, 4021, 4037, 4044, 4103 (ii).
Rivière du Loup P. O., Workmen's Claims (Ans.) 3238 (ii).
Rivière du Sud Works (remarks) 4656 (ii).
Round Hill Shear Dam (Ans.) 2171 (i).
St. Maurice Public Works (Ans.) 3564 (ii).
Sandford Breakwater (Ans.) 398 (i).
Sheet Harbour, Wharves, &c. (Ans.) 1032 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Public Works (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1017 (i).
Civil Government: (Public Works) 271 (i).
Legislation House of Commons (contingencies) 788: (Salaries, &c.) 780 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: (Maintenance, &c.) 4308 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Clerical Assistance) 4457 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 4439 (ii); (N.B.) 2617; (Ont.) 2619; (Que.) 2619; (Kingston Graving Dock) 2715 (ii). *Consolidated Fund:* Buildings (N.B.) 988, conc., 1086; (Ont.) 990; (Que.) 989. Dredging (Man.) 992. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 990 (i). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2951, 4442; (Gas and Electric Light) 4242; (Heating Public Buildings) 4241, conc., 4477; (Man.) 2936; (N. B.) 2798, 4441; (N.S.) 2742, 4441; (N.W.T.) 2936, 2941; (Ont.) 2918, 2929; (Que.) 2801, 2860; (Repairs, &c.) 4240. Dredging (Mar. Provs.) 4455; (N.S.) 4458. Harbours and Rivers (N. B.) 4256; (N.S.) 4247, 4258, 4448; (Ont., Kingston

Ouimet, Hon. J. A.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Income—Continued.
Harbour) 4257; (P.E.I.) 4252: (Que.) 4449. Miscellaneous, 4259: (Ottawa Grounds) 4240). Slides and Booms, 4457. Telegraphs (Nanaimo, &c.) 4259: (Telephone Service) 4245 (ii).
Unprovided Items, 1018 (i).
Sydenham River, Obstructions, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4453 (ii).
Three Sisters Harbour, N.S., Expenditure (Ans.) 2490 (ii).
Woodstock Public Building, Caretaker (Ans.) 3480 (ii).
Yamaska River, Damages through Dam, on M. for Ret., 1986 (i).
——— Lock, Navigation, &c. (Ans.) 2172 (i).
——— Works, Total Cost (Ans.) 1715 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*
Adjmnt. for Holidays (remarks) 4260 (ii).
B.C. Indians and Proclamation (Ques.) 289 (i).
Budget, on the, 381 (i).
Indian Reserves, B.C., on M. for Ret., 520 (i).
Order, Ques. of, in Com. of Sup., 1503 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2ª, 3733 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2876 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G.B., despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2508 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2ª, 3454 (ii).
——— in Com., 3796, 3876, 3911, 3937, 4159, 4323.
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 381 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 986 (i), 4433 (ii); (Experimental Farms) 1429 (i).
Canals—Capital: (Trent) 2057, 2066 (i).
Civil Government: (Customs) 267 (i); (Finance and Treasury Board) contingencies, 285; (High Commissioner) 279, contingencies, 897; (Interior) 262, 880; (Marine) 271; (Militia and Defence) 256; (Public Works) 272 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1019 (i). Dom. Lands, 4431 (ii). Customs (Inspectors' Travelling Expenses) 821; (Ont.) 818. Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1015; (Preventive Service) 1015; (Tobacco Stamps) 1008 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1530; (Expenses) 1850, 1923, 1934; (Printing Pamphlets) 2017 (i).
Indians (Schools) 4421 (ii).
Legislation: Senate (Salaries, &c.) 757 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c. and West Indies) 4300 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Springs) 4428; (Commercial Agencies) 4426; (Printing Bureau, Plant) 4429; (Str. *Bayfield*, Supplies) 4461 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 664; (St. Vincent de Paul) 740 (i).
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1018 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B. C.) 4442; (N.S.) 4441; (Ont.) 2931; (Que.) 2876; (Heating) 4241, conc., 4477; (Telephone Service) 4245 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. for Com., 4675; in Com., 4678 (ii).

Patterson, Hon. J. C., *West Huron.*
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 74, 1ª) 1636 (i).
Civil Service List, Number of Employés (Ans.) 917 (i).
Election Statistics (remarks) 3185 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 930 (i).
Franchise Act, Legislation (Ans.) 916 (i).
London Election, Papers, &c. (Ans.) 914 (i).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3734 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Sale of Type (Ans.) 2954 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) North Perth Election, 3055.
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4573 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Printing and Stationery) 912 (i.)
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 795: (Printing Voters' Lists) conc., 1086 (i).
Miscellaneous (Old Records, Classification) 4429: (Printing Bureau, Plant) 4429 (ii).
Voters' Lists (Ans.) 1637 (i).
Voters' Lists, 1891 (B. 67, 1ª) 1227 (i): 2ª m., 3300; in Com., 4480 (ii).
Writs for Bye-Elections (remarks) 3186 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. W. A., *Colchester.*
I. C. R., Accident at Truro (M. for Ret.*) 969 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. L. C., *Laprairie.*
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2851 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 3ª (Amt.) 4342 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2851 (ii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Cascumpeque Harbour, Engineers' Rep. (M. for copy) 2268 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2197; in Com., 2227 (i).
Little Miminegash Breakwater (Ques.) 190 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Contract (Ques.) 40 (i), 2431 (ii).
Miscouche Station, Closing (Ques.) 2563 (ii).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2681 (ii).
Piers, Breakwaters, &c., P.E.I., Expenditure (M. for Stmnt.) 233, 241 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Employés Dismissed (M. for Ret.) 2004 (i).
Pontiac County Ry., Debt, on M. for Cor., 1992.
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2825 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2ª, 3713 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2ª, 3157.
——— in Com., 4129, 4195 (ii).
Summerside and Richmond Bay Branch Ry. (Ques.) 40 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 504 (i).
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2260 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Civil Government (Interior) 866 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Railways (P.E.I.) 2629.
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1524, 1832 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 768 (i).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 2619 (ii). *Consolidated Fund:* Dredging (N.S.) 991. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 990 (i). *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 2825. Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I. 4254 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Expenses) 2373; (St. John, accommodation) 2613 (ii).
Superannuation, 806 (i).
Tignish Wharfinger, Fees Collected (Ques.) 98 (i).
Tunnel (Submarine) P. E. I. and Mainland (Ques.) 98 (i).
—— (M. for Cor., &c.) 403 (i).
—— Papers respecting (remarks) 1471 (i).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., *Chambly.*
Longueuil Wharf, Expenditure (Ques.) 1231 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Fortifications at Esquimalt and Imp. H. of C (Ques.) 222 (i).
Quarantine in B. C. (remarks) 1547 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Ammunition) 1167; (Clothing) 1341; Drill Pay) 1359; (Dom. Artillery Asson.) 1363 (i).
Victoria, B.C., Public Buildings (M. for Cor.) 1550 (i).

Putnam, Mr. A., *Hants.*
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4522 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
Galops Rapids, Str. *Traveller* (M. for Ret.) 130.
St. Lawrence River Canals, Deepening, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 148 (i).

Rider, Mr. T. B., *Stanstead.*
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2893 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, Removal (Ques.) 1032.
—— (M. for Cor.) 1715 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2893 (ii).
Vote (explanation) 1828 (i).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., *Lotbinière.*
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 4484 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 4583 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 3201 (ii).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Mail Service (Ques.) 2954 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 4453 (ii).

Robillard, Mr. H., *Ottawa City.*
McKay Milling Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 15, 1°*) 129 (i).
Ottawa City Passenger Ry. Co.'s (B. 16, 1°*) 129.

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar.*
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3312 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co. (B. 37, 1°*) 315 (i).
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Man.) 746 (i).

Ross, Mr. H. H., *Dundas.*
Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 68, 1°*) 1364 (i).

Rowand, Mr. J., *West Bruce.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1450.

Ryckman, Mr. S. S., *Hamilton.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 305 (i).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4701.
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc. 4592 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3108 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3563 (ii).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2487 (ii).
——Education and Dual Language, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3075 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2803 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2666 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4579 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4034, 4041, 4043, 4092, 4100.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Soulanges) 2052 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1024 (i).
Legislation: Library (Purchase of Books) 793; (Salaries, &c.) 789 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2803 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4691 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 553 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3550 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms 1454 (i).
Superannuation, 805 (i).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., *St. John, N.B., City and Co.*
Preferential Trade with G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1585 (i).
St. John and Maine Ry. Co., &c. (B. 57, 1°*) 823 (i).
St. John Harbour Commission, on M. for Com. on Res., 4496 (ii).
Tobique Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s (B. 56, 1°*) 823 (i).

Smith, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) on Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1683 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 446 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4587 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4597 (ii).
Dominion Illustrated, Purchase of Volumes (Ques.) 397 (i).
Engraving and Printing since 1882, Tenders and Contracts (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Galops Rapids, Work done by Tug *Iroquois* (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Gov. Gen's. Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (read) 1189 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1324, 1339.
Letter Postage, Reduction (Ques.) 190 (i).
Live Cattle admitted from U.S. (M. for Cor.*) 159 (i).
Post Office, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2804 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 3649; (Amt.) 3665; neg. (Y. 60, N. 95) 3717 (ii).
——— in Com., 3879, 3912, 3936 (ii).
Returns (Enquiry) 1637 (i).
Savings Bank at St. John, Mr. McLeod's Appmnt. (Ques.) 3644 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 984; (Jamaica Exhibition) 977 (i).
Charges of Management (Dom. Notes, Printing) 255 (i).
Civil Government (Customs) 267; (High Commissioner) 276, contingencies, 282, 898; (Interior) 257, 828, 846, 851 (i), conc., 4472 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 256; (Public Works) 271; (Railways and Canals) 273, contingencies, 286 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (Customs Officers' Commissions) 1016; (Tobacco Stamps) 1008 (i).
Government of N.W.T. (Schools) 1002 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1839; (Expenses) 1848, 1901; (Printing Pamphlets) 2011 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing Voters' Lists) 976. Senate (Debates) 974 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1189; (Clothing) 1343 (i).
Miscellaneous (Jukes, Dr. A., Medical Services) 1003 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2804 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2034; (Grosse Isle) 2027, 2033; (Unorganized Service) 2049 (i).
Voters' Lists, Revised, Printing (Ques.) 2641 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (HON. PETER WHITE) *North Renfrew.*
Address, The, His Ex.'s Reply (read) 129 (i).
Canada and Nfld., Recognition of Licenses, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 245 (i).
Can. White Pine Areas, on M. for Map (remarks) 217 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against (ruling) 1035 (i).
Charges against a Member, Ques. ruled out of Order, 4499 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74, in Com., 4639 (ii).
Civil Service Commissioners' Rep., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2917 (ii).
Controverted Elections, 1, 6, 39, 96, 1062, 1152, 1391 (i), 2461, 2714, 2979, 3681, 4731 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3329 (ii).
Coal Oil and Kerosene, Imports, on M. for Ret., 3059 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4598 (ii).
Duke of Clarence and Avondale, Address of Condolence, Mess. from Sen. (read) 71, 96 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1393 (i).
——— Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2170 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) *re* Hobbs' Pet., 665 (i).
Estimates, The, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 138, 822, (i), 4265 (ii).
Favoured Nation Clauses, despatch *re* Treaties, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1470 (i).
Fisheries, Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 667 (i).
Frontenac Electoral District, Issue of Writ, 3055.
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 71 (i).
L'Assomption and Pontiac, Writs (remarks) 2700 (ii).
Lennox Electoral Lists, notification of production, 287 (i).
Lieut. Gov.'s., Instructions, on presentation of Documents, 2268 (i).
London Election, on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 246, 248, 287 (i).
——— Original Voters' Lists, Clerk of Crown in attendance, 72 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Lister*) for copies (remarks) 292 (i).
——— Returns, attendance of Clerk of Crown, notification, 287 (i).
——— Pet. of T. S. Hobbs, &c., M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) ruled out of Order, 824 (i).
Marquette Electoral District, Issue of Writ, 4393.
Members, New, notification of Return, 3, 6, 40, 97, 111, 114, 133, 138, 453, 1364, 1391 (i); 2431, 3183, 3649, 3770, 3815, 4715 (ii).
Member's remarks checked, 1833, 2000, 2004 (i); 3185, 4321, 4628, 4645, 4657 (ii).
Member's Resignation (notification) 4393 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 71, 129, 138, 216, 245, 667, 822, 1088, 1393, 1470, 2170 (i), 2461, 2917, 4265 (ii).
Ministers' Visit to Washington (ruling) 334 (i).
Newfoundland and Canada, Papers respecting, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1088 (i), 2917 (ii).
——— Sale of Bait, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2461 (ii).
Newspaper Paragraphs, Reading checked, 2561.
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2485 (ii).
Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. *Cameron*) to introd., 667 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) North Perth Election, 3056 (ii).
Prorogation, Communication from Gov. Gen.'s Acting Sec., 4731 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4537, 4629; conc., 4660 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3908, 3962 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 3542, 3615, 3664 (ii).
Serjeant-at-Arms, Deputy, Appmnt. (notification) 749 (i).
Speech from the Throne (Rep.) 4 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2258 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Ont.) 817 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Committees, &c.) 788; (Salaries, &c.) 763; (Salary, Dep. Speaker) 975; (Serjeant-at-Arms) 789 (i). Library (Sessional Messengers) 976. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 755, 974 (i).
Public Works—Income (Gas and Electric Light, 4244 (ii).
Superannuation, 808 (i).
Trade Extension, Canada and U.S., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 216 (i).
Vacancies, 2, 1547 (i), 4393 (ii).
York, East Riding, Ret. of Member (notification) 2917 (ii).
——— Vacancy in Representation, Issue of Writ, 1547 (i).
Unparliamentary Language, 69 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON) *Beauharnois.*
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (ruling) 3374 (ii).
Members called to Order, 774, 904 (i), 3754, 3767.
Member's Remarks checked, 1833 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4689 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).
American Cattle in Bond (Ques.) 399 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4589 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4598 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 947 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3371 (ii).
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3774 (ii).
Obscene Literature, &c., Suppression B. 21 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2460 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2748, 2881 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4617 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3516 (ii).
——— in Com., 3781, 3804, 3838, 4193 (ii).
Saw-Logs, &c., Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1250 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 715 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dairy Industry) 1464; (Experimental Farms) 1435 (i).
Civil Government (Interior) 858 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1206 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2748; (Que.) 2881 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2037 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (Expenses) 2396 (i).
Temperance Colonization Society (M for Ret.) 929 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4670 (ii).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-Wm., *Halifax.*
Carl Auer Von Welsbach Patent Relief (B. 75, 1°*) 1714 (i).
Binding Twine, Imports, on M. for Ret., 553 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 2221, 2231 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act. Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1644 (i).
SUPPLY:
Geological Survey, 4390 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Halifax, &c. and West Indies) 4284 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 2746; (Gas and Electric Light) 4244. Dredging (N.S.) 4258 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2557 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com. on Res., 4682 (ii).
Women's Baptist Missionary Union of Maritime Provs. incorp. (B. 32, 1°*) 245 (i).

Stevenson, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*
Dominion Millers' Association (B. 70, 1°*) 1465.
Trent Valley Canal, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 397 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Adjmnt., Easter (remarks) 1311 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, Sums Paid (Ques.) 41.
Binding Twine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Watson*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).
Civil Service List, Number of Employés (Ques.) 917 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, Printing Pet. in Votes and Proceedings (M.) 823 (i).
Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
Govt. Short Loans (Ques.) 137 (i).
Lepage, J. B., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1392 (i).
London Election Returns (M.) to lay on Table, 287 (i).
——— Papers respecting (Ques.) 824, 914 (i).
——— Pet. of T. S. Hobbs and others (M.) 1037.
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. B. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 3775 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3560 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Annapolis (Ques.) 1364 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for 2°, 3731 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2821 (ii).
Returning Officers and General Election (M. for Cor.*) 969 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Tenders, &c. (M. for Ret.) 128.
Summerstown P. O., Receipts (Ques.) 1365 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Detective Service) 1027; (Ont.) 815 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 786 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1174: (Drill Sheds, &c.) 1375 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2821 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Adjmnt., Easter (remarks) 1311 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 4, 1°*) 40; 2° m., 295 (i).
Brockville and New York Bridge Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 42, 1°*) 454 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 64, 1°*) 1153 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4593 (ii).
Divorce, Aikins, J. A. M., Relief (B. 78, 1°*) 2006 (i).
——— Donigan, Ada, Relief (B. 79, 1°*) 2006.
——— Mead, H. R., Relief (B. 81, 1°*) 2068; 2° on a div., 2093 (i); 3° agreed to (Y. 63, N. 31) 2636.
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 4141; in Com., 4485.
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 3565.
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 60, 1°*) 1031 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, Erection of Monument (Ques.) 917 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 77, 1°*) 1946 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2824 (ii).
Prohibition, Plebiscite, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2654 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3922 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Interior) 891, 1157 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 2824. 2887, 2897 (ii).

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N.R.*
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1410 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I. C. R. (St. John, accommodation) 2596 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J., K.C.M.G., *Antigonish.*
Address, on the, 30 (i).
——— Com. to draft Ans. (M.) 33 (i).
——— His Ex.'s Reply (presented) 129 (i).
Adjmnt., Absence of Leader of Opposition (M.) 6.
——— Ascension Day and Queen's Birthday (remarks) 2700; (M.) 2780 (ii).
——— Annunciation Day (M.) 392 (i).
——— Ash Wednesday (M.) 35 (i).
——— Corpus Christi (M.) 3752 (ii).
——— Dom. Day, &c. (remarks) 4214 (ii).
——— Easter (M.) 1088, 1364; (remarks) 1311 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 39 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 2256 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).
Annapolis and Atlantic Ry. Co., on M. for Cor., 690 (i).
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Workmen's Claims, on M. (Mr. *Cockburn*) for Sel. Com., 48 (i).
Bear River Railway Bridge (Ans.) 398 (i).
Behring's Sea Seal Fisheries, Press despatch *re* Treaty (remarks) 36 (i).
Boundaries of Prov. of Que., on M. for Cor., &c., 120 (i).
Budget, on the, 614 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 7 (i).
——— Adjmnt. for Holidays (M.) 4259 (ii).
——— Adjmnt (M.) 4697 (ii).
——— *See* "GOVT. BUSINESS."
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1970 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2477 (ii).
Canal Tolls, U. S. and Canada (M. for Address to His Ex.) 4644 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on Mr. Edgar's Stmnt. (objection) 1035 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1040; M. to set Day for Deb., 1788 (i).
——— Approval of Commissioners (M.) 2980; M. agreed to (Y. 79, N. 32) 3053 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Census and Statistics, Maps respecting (Ans.) 824 (i).
Chicoutimi and Saguenay Election, Judges' Rep. (remarks) 3733 (ii).
——— Issue of Writ (M.) 3896 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 44 (Mr. *Gordon*) M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 4263; on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3015 (ii).
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks' Extra Pay, on M. for Ret., 1719 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) on M. for 1°, 1636 (i); in Com., 4639.
Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 751, 1547 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2917 (ii).
Civil Service Employés, Deduction of Pay, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2238 (i).
Columbian Exhibition, Sunday Observance, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1038 (i).
Commercial Relations with U. S., Sir Charles Tupper's Speech (remarks) 224 (i).
Compulsory Voting B. 46 (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for 2°, 1083 (i).
Contracts (Govt.) since Confedn., on M. for Stmnt., 99 (i).
Controverted Elections Act, Legislation (Ans.) 134 (i).
Copyright Act, Proclamation (Ans.) 1366 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2235 (i).
——— Reciprocity with U. S. (Ans.) 137 (i).
Criminal Code (B. 7, 1°) 106 (i).
——— 2° m., 1312; 2° and ref. to Sel. Joint Com., 1319 (i).
——— in Com., 2701, 2783, 2958, 3320, 3638, 3645, 4225, 4266, 4272, 4343 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits (prop. Res.) 1283.
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4586 (ii).
De la Ronde, late Pierre A., on M. for Ret., 2287.
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1795 (i).
Divorce, Mead, H. R., Relief B. 81 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 2094 (i).
Dom. Cotton Mills Co., Letters Patent, on M. for Ret., 923 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3301 (ii).
Drummond County Postal Service (Ans.) 289 (i).
Duke of Clarence and Avondale, Joint Address of Condolence to Her Maj. (M.) 72 (i).
——— Prince and Princess of Wales, (M.) 73 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1393 (i).
——— Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2170 (i).
Edmonton Land Office, Removal (remarks) 4043.
Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe* (Ans.) 3735, 3750 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4368 (ii).
Elections, General, 1891, Ret. *re* Returning Officers (remarks) 2491 (ii).
Election Pets., Decisions, on M. for Ret., 1554 (i).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 961 (i).
Elliott, Judge, Charges against, on M. (Mr. *Lister*) *re* Hobbs' Pet., 665 (i).
Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 683 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 3114 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., 1892, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 822 (i).
Extra Clerks, Reduction of Pay (remarks) 4732.
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of U. S., B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 179; in Com., 1475 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 95, 1°*) 3896; 2° m., 4135 (ii).
Geological Survey Dept. B. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*) on M. for 2°, 1650; in Com., 1655 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence on Mondays (M.) 3564 (ii).
——— Wednesdays (M.) 2490, 2980 (ii).
——— Thursdays (M.) 699 (i).
——— Sittings of the Hse. (M.) 3897 (ii).
Govt. Employés, on M. for Ret., 697 (i).
Govt. Measures (remarks) 1153 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1216 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Denison*) 1329 (i).
Grain Shipments *viâ* New York, &c. (Ans.) 291.
Incomes of the People (Ans.) 456 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 71 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 1648, 2008 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 71 (i).
I.C.R., Accident at New Glasgow (remarks) 2089.
Judges on Commissions (Ans.) 37 (i).
——— Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 3115 (ii).
——— Salaries, Increase (prop. Res.) 1392 (i).
Judiciary of Prov. of Que. (Ans.) 2640 (ii).
Labrador, Reported Distress (Ans.) 4263 (ii).
L'Assomption and Pontiac Writs (Ans.) 2700 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 112 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 2826 (ii).
Lieut. Gov.'s Assent (remarks) 2492, 2957, 3089.
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2240 (i).
——— Instructions (presented) 2268 (i).
Lieut. Gov. of N.B. (remarks) 4732 (ii).
Lobster Packing Fee (prop. Res.) 699 (i).
London Election, Original Voters' Lists, on M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to lay on Table, 3756 (i).
——— Pet. of T. S. Hobbs, &c., M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) objected to, 823 (i).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 247 (i).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 1089 (i).
——— Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 665, 2349 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1076; in Com., 2296 (i), 3091, 3364 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Macdonald, Sir John, Erection of Monument (Ans.) 917 (i).
Mackenzie, late Hon. Alex. (remarks and M. to adjn. Hse.) 1388 (i).
Man. School Act, Legal Expenses (Ans.) 2068 (i).
Ministers' Visit to Washington, Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) objected to, 333 (i).
——— (remarks) 3239, 3398 (ii).
Modus Vivendi, on Prorogation (remarks) 4731.
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2685 (ii).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3559 (ii).
Newfoundland and Canada, Duties on Can. products (remarks) 3054 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Settlement of difficulties (Ans.) 825 (i), 2957 (ii).
——— Papers *re* Fishing Vessels, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2917 (ii).
——— *re* Trade, on M. for copies, 685 (i).
——— Sale of Bait, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2461 (ii).
——— Recognition of Licenses, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 245 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 27 on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to set Day for 2°, 2483 (ii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 4 (i).
Obscene Literature, &c., Suppression B. 21 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2460 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, in Com. of Sup., 1502 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com. on Res., 176; in Com. on B., 1640 (i).
Ottawa City Passenger Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. *Robillard*) in Com., 2939 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 4217 (ii).
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 397 (i).
Perth, North Riding, Issue of Writ (Ans.) 1639.
Polling Rets. at General Election, on M. for Map of Dom., 113 (i).
Population of Electoral Districts (remarks) 2700, 2827 (ii).
Preferential Trade with Great Britain, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1623 (i).
——— despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2495 (ii).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 112 (i).
——— 8th Rep. of Com., on conc., 3643 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time (M.) 72.
Procedure, Ques. of (Mr. *Casey*) on Notices of Motion (remarks) 1550 (i).
Quebec Legislature, Sessions (Ans.) 3644 (ii).
Railway Com. of Privy Council, Applications or Complaints, on M. for Stmnt., 1950 (i).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4511, 4631; conc., 4660 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4276 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Representation in H. of C. (B. 76, 1°) 1855 (i).
——— 2° m., 3116, 3254; agreed to (Y. 97, N. 60) 3719 (ii).
——— in Com., 3721, 3755, 3781, 3790, 3910, 4002, 4048, 4073, 4084, 4114, 4148, 4193, 4321 (ii).
——— 3° m., 4329; on Amt. (Mr. *Pelletier*) 4343 (ii).
Returning Officers, &c., Duties at Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 85; (Amt.) 89.
Returns, on Enquiry for (remarks) 2172 (i).
Rimouski, Change of Route (Ans.) 3183 (ii).
Robertson, J. F., Claim *re* Ry. Accident, on M. for Stmnt., 1369 (i).
Royal Commissions, Ret., on Enquiry, 2700, 3090, 3239 (ii).
St. Raymond Post Office (Ans.) 37 (i).
Sittings of the Hse. (M.) 3897 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Tenders, &c., on M. for Ret., 128 (i).
Speaker's Warrants, on incomplete Ret. (remarks) 101 (i).
Speech from the Throne, consdn. (M.) 5 (i).
Standing Committees (M.) 5 (i).
——— Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 34 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 614 (i).
Canals—Capital (Lachine) conc., 4213 (ii).
Civil Government (High Commissioner) 278, contingencies, conc., 1085: (Interior) 260, 830, 862, (i), conc., 4208 (ii); (Justice) 913; (Mounted Police) 266; (Public Works) 272 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Excise (Tobacco Stamps) 1011 (i).
Dominion Police, 313 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1895 (i).
Justice, Administration of (Circuit Allowances, B.C.) 311; (Exchequer Court, Publishing Reports) 313, conc., 1085; (Judges, Queen's Bench, &c., Man.) 311; (Judges, Travelling Expenses, N.W.T.) 311; (Registrar in Admiralty, Que.) 313; (Supreme Court) 312, 971 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Printing, Paper, &c.) 795; (Salaries, &c.) 772; (Printing Voters' Lists) conc., 1086. Library (Purchase of Books) 793; (Salaries, &c.) 789. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 754 (i).
Miscellaneous (C. S. Commissioners) 1004 (i).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 748; (Dorchester) 972; (Kingston) 664 (i), conc., 4205 (ii); (Man.) 744, 973; (Regina Gaol) 748, 973; (St. Vincent de Paul) 736, 972 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2937, 2944; (Ont.) 2923 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2267; (St. John, accommodation) 988 (i), 2571 (ii).
Superannuation, 803 (i).
Territorial Accounts (Rebellion, N.W.T.) conc., 1087 (i).
Supply B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 4603; on M. for 2°, 4655 (ii).
Telegraph Line, Victoria, N.S. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2435, 2443 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3116, 3566 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. Sir J.—*Continued.*
Trade Extension, Canada and U.S., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 216 (i).
Trade Relations with Great Britain (Ans.) 1980.
U. S. Alien Labour Law (remarks) 1548 (i).
U. S. Vessels in Hudson Bay (Ans.) 4263 (ii).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3° m., 4500 (ii).
Voters' Lists, Revised, Printing (Ans.) 2641 (ii).
West Indies, Minister's Visit (remarks) 1224 (i).
——— Reps., &c., on M. for copy, 1372 (i).
Welland Election, on M. (Mr. *Tisdale*) declaring Seat Vacant, 396 (i).
——— Day suggested for Deb., 454 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 584 (i).
Wilson, Convict Ed., Release, on M. for Pet., &c., 2642 (ii).
Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 97, 1°*) 4204 (ii).
Witnesses and Evidence (B. 69, 1°) 1391 ; 2°* and ref. to Com. on B. 7, 2008 (i).
Wrecking in Can. Waters B. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 1°, 107 (i).
Writs for Elections, on enquiry for Ret., 3115.

Tisdale, Mr. D., *South Norfolk.*
Civil Servants, Permanent Clerks Extra Pay (M. for Ret.) 1715 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) in Com., 4639 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 4232 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep., on Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to conc., 4597 (ii).
Divorce, Hattie Adele Harrison, Relief (B. 92,1°) 3300 (ii).
——— Wright, James, Relief (B. 91, 1°) 3300 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 3317 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on prop. Res. (Amt.) 3340 (ii).
Kingston Belt Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52, 1°*) 823 (i).
G. T. R. Co. of Can. (B. 14, 1°*) 129 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1199 (i).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2315 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) M. that Com. rise, 2293 (i) ; in Com., 3364, 3386.
Midland Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 93, 1°*) 3300 (ii).
P. O. Savings Banks, Interest on Deposits (Ques.) 916 (i).
Privilege (Ques of) par. in *Free Press re* Trades and Labour Council, 2561 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Dewdney*) in Com., 4481 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4624 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, in Com. on Res., 4549 (ii).
Representation in H.of C. B. 76 (Sir John *Thompson*) 3915 (ii).

Tisdale, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Columbian Exhibition) 4436.
Militia (Ammunition) 1199 (i).
Voters' Lists, 1891, B. 67 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 4502 (ii).
Welland County Election, Proceedings at Trial, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 244 (i).
——— (M.) declaring Seat Vacant, 392 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 588 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H., *Pictou.*
Alert, Str., Accident to (Ans.) 750, 917 (i).
Bic Wharf, Collector (Ans.) 2638 (ii).
Bounties to Fishermen, Distribution (Ans.) 190.
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2463 ; (Amt.) 2467.
Canadian Cattle scheduled in England (remarks) 249 (i).
Canvas Coal Bags, Tenders for Making (Ans.) 2954 (ii).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1049 (i).
Charlebois, F., Claim against Fisheries Dept., on M. for Cor., 1036 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2841 (ii).
Crown Prosecutions and Suits, on prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1302 (i).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1813 (i).
Finkle, Roland, Appmnt. as Fishery Inspector (Ans.) 1365 (i).
Fisheries, Lobster (prop. Res.) 130 ; (remarks) 160 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 9, 1°) 107 ; 2° m., 1655 in Com. on Res., 1656 ; M. for Com. on B., 2173 ; in Com., 2216, 2230 (i).
Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3237 (ii).
Fisheries, Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 667 (i).
Fishery Regulations, Mackerel (Ans.) 3055 (ii).
Fishing Rights on Richelieu River (Ans.) 35 (i).
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) of the U. S. (B. 11, 1°) 109 ; 2° m., 176 ; in Com., 1474, 1639 (i).
Gear and Tackle Inspector, Appmnt. (Ans.) 224.
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1222 (i).
Harbour and River Police (Que.) Repeal (B. 66, 1°) 1225 (i).
Flour (Can.) admitted into Nfld., on M. for Ret., 112 (i).
Lake St. Peter, Fishing Privileges (Ans.) 2956.
License Fees, Refund by Nfld. (Ans.) 190 (i).
Lobsters and Whitefish for B.C. (Ans.) 751 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalgamation (B. 12, 1°) 109 ; in Com., 181 (i).
Marine, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 913 (i).
Newfoundland Bait Act, Cor., &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

Tupper, Hon. C. H.—*Continued.*
Newfoundland Bait Act, Bait Sales to St. Pierre Fishermen (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Fishing Regulations, enforcing (Ans.) 134.
——— Imperial Assent (Ans.) 136 (i).
——— Papers respecting (Ans.) 315, 508, 914, 1228, 1491 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1088 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 10, 1°) 108; 2° m., 173 (i).
Pinsonneault, Alfred, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 749 (i).
Prosser, Wm., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (Ans.) 2490 (ii).
St. Mary's Bay Hatcheries (Ans.) 398 (i).
Sea Fisheries Development Act Amt. (B. 5, 1°) 97; 2° m., 161; in Com., 167 (i).
Sheet Harbour, Dues Collected (Ans.) 1032 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (prop. Res.) 129; on Res., 752 (i).
——— (B. 13, 1°) 114; in Com., 1394, 1642 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 358; (remarks) 386, 577, 630 (i).
Civil Government (Marine) 270 (i).
Fisheries (Commissioners' Expenses) 993; (Intelligence Bureau) 992 (i).
Immigration (Expenses) 1891 (i).
Militia (Ammunition) 1222 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Cattle Inspection) 992.
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2265 (i).
Tignish Wharfinger, Fees Collected (Ans.) 98 (i).
Westport Harbour, Can Buoys (Ans.) 399 (i).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, Affidavits *re* Pay-List (remarks) 1208 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1441.
Militia (Ammunition) 1208 (i).

Vaillancourt, Mr. C. E., *Dorchester.*
Judges on Commissions (Ques.) 37 (i).
St. Raymond Post Office (Ques.) 37 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc. (Amt.) 4597 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 938 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) to prop. Res., 3345 (ii).
N.W.T., Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to set Day for 2°, 2486 (ii).
——— Education and Dual Language, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3067 (ii).
Preferential Trade with Great Britain, despatch to London *Times re* Deb. (remarks) 2500 (ii).
Pub. Accounts and Auditor Gen.'s Rep., ref. to Standing Com. (M.) 188 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3836, 3951, 3842, 3893 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 1442 (i).

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette.*
Binding Twine, on M. for Ret., 540 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713 (i).
Budget, on the, 656 (i).
Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N. W. T., on M. for Ret., 2277 (i).
Man. School Act (M. for Ret.*) 2287 (i).
——— Legal Expenses (Ques.) 2068 (i).
Mounted Police, Reduction of Force, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2678 (ii).
Preferential Trade with Great Britain, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1600 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1865 (i).
SUPPLY—on the Budget, 656 (i).
Canals—Income (Chambly) 2259 (i).
Immigration (Agents' Salaries) 1834, 1851; (Expenses) 1931, 1943 (i).
Militia (Drill Pay) 1355 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 745 (i).
Quarantine (Cattle) 2043 (i).
Superannuation, 800 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Rep., on M. for copy, 2449 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., *Albert.*
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty, in Com. on Res., 4707.
Canadian Representative at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1959, 1973 (i).
Caron, Sir Adolphe, Charges against, Approval of Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3034 (ii).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2705, 3324 (ii).
Diplomatic Papers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to M. for Com. of Sup., 1807 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4592 (ii).
I. C. R. Running Privileges, &c., granted C.P.R., on M. for Ret., 559 (i).
London Election, Charges against Judge Elliott, on Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 2339 (i).
Post Offices, Erection, in Com. of Sup., 2759 (ii).
Railway Subsidies, on conc., 4660 (ii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 2°, 3464 (ii).
——— in Com., 3872, 3912, 3918, 4177 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S) 2759 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2547.

Welsh, Mr. W., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2196, 2231 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 3755, 4106 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1395 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (Halifax, accommodation) 2513.

White, Mr. N. W., *Shelburne.*
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2829 (ii).
Electoral Lists, Revising Officers, &c., on M. for Ret., 964 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2204; in Com., 2232 (i).
Fish, Fish Oil, &c., Imports from Nfld. (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Fishing Vessels (*Modus Vivendi*) U.S. B. 11 (Mr. *Tupper*) in Com., 1479 (i).
Nfld. Bait Act, Imperial Assent (Ques.) 136 (i).
——— Fishing Regulations, enforcing (Ques.) 134 (i).
Newfoundlanders in Labrador, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Tenant Farmers' Delegates Visit, C. H. Cahan's Services (Ques.) 2432 (ii).

White, Mr. R. S., *Cardwell.*
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 3, 1°) 40; 2° m., 456 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 3101 (ii).
Preferential Trade with Great Britain, on Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1632 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*
Lennox Voters' List (M. for Ret.*) 159 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 3°, 4330 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Superannuation (W. Wallace) 798 (i).

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 39 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 2255 (i).
Criminal Code B. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*) in Com., 2712 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on conc., 4593 (ii).
Edwards, W. C., Co.'s incorp. (B. 17, 1°*) 129 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3561 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) M. to place on Order Paper, 4214 (ii).
Private Bills, Reps. from Com., Extension of Time (M.) 4214 (ii).
Railway Act Amt. B. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean, East York*) to M. for 3°, 4610.
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Salaries, &c.) 771. Senate (Salaries, &c.) 755 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*
Live Stock, Tariff (Ques.) 1365 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 2285 (i).
I. C. R., Expenditure out of Income (M. for Ret.) 1371 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. 53 (Mr. *Beausoleil*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3558 (ii).
Private Bills, Reps. from Com. Extension of Time (M.) 3815 (ii).
School Savings Bank B. 36 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) M. to place on Orders of the Day, 4466 (ii)
SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (Expenses) 2405 (ii).

Yeo, Mr. J., *Prince, P.E.I.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*) on M. for Com., 2214 (i).
Little Miminegash Breakwater (Ques.) 190 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) to M. for 2°, 3707 (ii).
——— in Com. 4164 (ii).
——— on M. for 3° (Amt.) 4335; neg. (Y. 54, N. 87) 4335 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Railways (P.E.I.) 2631 (ii).
Fisheries (P.E.I., Salaries, &c.) 4312 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4255 (ii).
Tunnel (Submarine) P.E.I. and Mainland, on M. for Cor., 411 (i).

INDEX—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

"A," "B" AND "C" BATTERIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).

ACTIVE MILITIA, DRILL, QUALIFIED OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 667 (i).

ADDINGTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Northrup*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 18.

——— His Ex.'s Reply, 129 (i).

ADJOURNMENTS, ANNUNCIATION DAY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 392 (i).

——— ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 35.

——— CORPUS CHRISTI: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3752 (ii).

——— DOMINION DAY, &c.: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 4214 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4260 (ii).

——— EASTER: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1088, 1364.

——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 1311 (i).

——— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, &c.: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 2700 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 2780 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. *See* "JUSTICE."

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°* (*pro forma*) 4 (i).

ADMIRALTY COURT, QUE., REGISTRAR: in Com. of Sup., 313 (i).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).

AGENTS' (DOM. LANDS) SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4431 (ii).

——— *See* "IMMIGRATION."

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COM.: List of Members, 105 (i).

AGRICULTURE:

BRITISH FARMERS' DELEGATES REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2432, 3637 (ii).

——— *See* "TENANT FARMERS."

BUTTER AND CHEESE INDUSTRY, PAMPHLET: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3331 (ii).

CATTLE SHIPMENTS, INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 992, 2033 (i).

DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 1464 (i).

DEPTL. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 286 (i).

——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Carling*) 1062 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 286 (i).

DEPUTY MINISTER, LETTER *re* PAMPHLETS: in Com. of Sup., Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1947 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL (CENTRAL) FARM, DAIRY STOCK, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).

——— FRENCH COR.: Remarks (Mr. *Frémont*) 3114.

AGRICULTURE—*Continued.*

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1424, 4448.

——— NUMBER, LOCATION, EXPEND., &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Frémont*) 682 (i).

——— REPS., FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 397 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Frémont*) 3185 (ii).

HARAS NATIONAL CO.: in Com. of Sup., 1465 (i).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 275, 282, 896; conc., 1085 (i).

INTELLIGENCE BUREAU, DAILY REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).

MORTON DAIRY CO.'S CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 916 (i).

NATIONALITIES OF THE POPULATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 824 (i).

"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).

SUGAR-BEET CULTIVATION, FRENCH EDITION OF REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 750 (i).

——— *See* "BEET-ROOT."

TENANT FARMERS' DELEGATES REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3166, 3566 (ii).

——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1638 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).

——— M. for copies (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2432, 3637 (ii).

——— VISIT, MR. C. CAHAN'S EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2432 (ii).

[*See* "ARTS AND STATISTICS;" "IMMIGRATION;" "SUPPLY."]

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; M. for Com., 2254; in Com. and 3°*, 2256 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 30.)

Aikins, Jas. A. M. *See* "DIVORCE."

"ALERT," STR., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750, 917 (i).

ALGOMA, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

Alien Contract Labour Prohibition B. No. 4 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 40; 2° m., 295; deb. adjd., 310 (i); Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h., agreed to, 2457 (ii).

ALIEN LABOUR LAW (U. S.) PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 1548 (i).

ALLAN, MESSRS., &c., DECREASE OF CUSTOMS DUTIES: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Laurier*) 159 (i).

AMERICAN CATTLE IN BOND, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 399 (i).

AMMUNITION, MANUFACTURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 1161 (i); conc., 4209 (ii).

ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY., &c., COR., &c., *re* SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 688 (i).
APPLES, EXPORT, INSPECTION UNDER ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 3238 (ii).
ARBITRATION *re* PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4430; conc., 4470 (ii).
ARCHIBALD, H. D., CONDUCTOR ON I. C. R., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 969 (i).
ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
ARMOURIES AND CARE OF ARMS: in Com. of Sup., 1349 (i).
ARPIN, MR., CHARGES FOR DEMURRAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4643 (ii).
ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, QUANTITY IMPORTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 526 (i).
ARTS AND STATISTICS:
CENSUS AND STATISTICS, MAP SHOWING BOUNDARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 824 (i).
—— BIRTHPLACES, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3566 (ii).
—— Enquiry (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4135 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 983 (i), 4437 (ii).
—— ORIGIN AND RELIGIOUS CREEDS: Ques. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 190 (i), 2490 (ii).
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
ELECTION STATISTICS: Remarks (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3185 (ii).
JAMAICA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
MENNONITES, ENUMERATION IN CENSUS: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4263 (ii).
POPULATION OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2700 (ii).
RAILWAY STATISTICS, DELAY IN PRESENTING: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3185 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3398 (ii).
WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 983 (i), 4433; conc., 4474 (ii).
[*See* "AGRICULTURE;" "IMMIGRATION."]
ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 976, 983, 1159, 1424, 1464 (i), 4433; conc., 4474 (ii).
ASSISTANT RECEIVER GEN., VIC.: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES AND NEWFOUNDLAND: Mess. from His Ex., 1088 (i).
ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1231.
—— SUNDAY TRAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3184 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 267 (i).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 188 (i).
AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4276 (ii).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 42 (i).
BAIN, JAS. WM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR SOULANGES: Introduced, 3 (i).
BANCROFT & CONNOLLY. *See* "KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK."
BANFF SPRINGS, SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4428.
BANKING AND COMMERCE COM.: List of Members, 104 (i).
Baptist Missionary Union. *See* "WOMAN'S."
BARRETT *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, SUPREME COURT JDGT.: M. for copy (Mr. *LaRivière*) 158 (i).
—— LEGAL EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2068.
"BAYFIELD," STR., SUPPLIES, ENQUIRY: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).
BEAR RIVER (N.S.) RAILWAY BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, ENGINEERS' REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (ii).
BEEF AND PORK, U.S. AND CAN. FISHERMEN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 294 (i).
—— LUMBERMEN'S IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 291 (i).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, PROF. SAUNDERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 71 (i).
—— INSTRUCTIONS: M. for copies (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1373 (i).
—— BOUNTY ON MANUFACTURE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1366, 1373 (i).
—— BOUNTIES PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 41 (i).
—— *See* "SUGAR BEET."
Beet-Root Sugar Bounty B. No. 102 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop. and in Com., 4697; 1°* and 2°* of B., 4715; in Com. and 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 8.)
BEHRING'S SEA ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 4460; conc., 4478 (ii).
—— SEAL FISHERIES, PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 36 (i).
Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Corby*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 696 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 31.)
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4535 (ii).
Bell Telephone Co. of Can. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 67.)
BENNETT, WM. H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST SIMCOE: Introduced, 129 (i).
BERTHIER (MONTMAGNY) P.O., MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
BIC, COLLECTOR AT WHARF, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2638 (ii).
BIG FORTUNE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4448.
BIG TRACADIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4252.
BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 4; *pro formâ.*
BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 40; 2° m., 1062; 2°, 1083; in Com., 2293; Com. rose, 2305 (i); Ms. to recom., 2431, 3090; agreed to (Y. 77; N. 50) and in Com., 3091; again in Com., 3363 (ii).
BILL (No. 3) To amend the Insurance Act.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°*, 40; 2°, 456 (i).

BILL (No. 4) To prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 40; 2° m., 295; deb. adjd., 310 (i); Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 6 m. h. agreed to, 2457 (ii).

BILL (No. 5) To amend Chap. 96 of the Revised Statutes, to encourage the development of the Sea Fisheries and the building of Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 97; 2°*, 130; M. for Com., 161; in Com., 166; 3°*, 249 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Canada Temperance Amendment Act of 1888.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 98; 2°, 418; in Com., 455; 3°*, 692 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 7) Respecting the Criminal Law.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 106; 2°, 1312 (i); in Com., 2701, 2782, 2795, 2826, 2958, 3320, 3637, 3640, 3644, 4225, 4230, 4265, 4343; 3°, 4348; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4732 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 8) Respecting aid by United States Wreckers in Canadian waters.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
1°, 106; 2° m., 173; 2°, 970; in Com., 1091; 3°*, 1153 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 9) Further to amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 130; 1°, 107; 2°, 1655; Res. in. Com., 1656; M. for Com. on B., 2173; in Com., 2216, 2230 (i).

BILL (No. 10) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 108; 2°, 173; in Com., 970; 3°*, 1090 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 11) Respecting Fishing Vessels of the United States of America.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 109; 2°, 176; in Com., 1472, 1639; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 12) Respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 109; 2° and in Com., 181; 3°*, 249 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 13) To further amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
Res. prop., 129; 1°, 114; 2°, 752; Res. in Com., 752; B. in Com., 1394, 1642; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 14) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Act to incorporate the McKay Milling Company.—(Mr. *Robillard.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 855 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 16) Respecting the Ottawa City Passenger Railway Company.—(Mr. *Robillard.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134 (i); in Com., 2939; 3°*, 2940 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 17) To incorporate W. C. Edwards and Company.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 855 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 18) Respecting certain Railway Works in the City of Toronto.—(Mr. *Denison.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 20) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 129; 2°*, 134 (i).

BILL (No. 21) For the suppression of obscene literature, and to provide for the punishment of certain immoral and criminal practices.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 133 (i); 2° m., 2457; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com. on B. (No. 7) 2461 (ii).

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the High River and Sheep Creek Irrigation and Water Power Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 24) Respecting the Nicola Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Montreal Board of Trade.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mara.*)
1°*, 189; 2°*, 275 (i).

BILL (No. 27) To further amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 217 (i); 2° m., 2461; neg. (Y. 33, N. 132) 2462; M. to recom., 2483 (ii).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. *Corby.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 696 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 30) Respecting the Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 31) Respecting the *Globe* Printing Company.—(Mr. *Innes.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com., 1229; 3°*, 1230 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Women's Baptist Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—(Mr. *Stairs.*)
1°*, 245, 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c 76.)

BILL (No. 33) Respecting the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 34) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i) (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 34.)

BILL (No. 35) Respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 696 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 36) To amend the Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga.*)
1°*, 314; 2°*, 418 (i); M. to transfer to the Orders of the Day, 4466; in Com. and 3°*, 4638 (ii).

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Lisgar.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; M. for Com., 2254; in Com. and 3°*, 2256 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 30.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting the Saint Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Carpenter.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 58.)

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 42) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 509 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2461 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 43) To amend an Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 578; 2°, 1648; in Com., 1654; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 16.)

BILL (No. 44) Further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. *Gordon.*)
1°*, 508 (i); M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 4263; 2° m., 4631; in Com., 4637, 4716; Amt. (Mr. *Gordon*) 4726; neg. and 3°, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 25.)

BILL (No. 45) To revive and amend the Act to incorporate the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fairbairn.*)
1°*, 578; 2°*, 696; in Com., 1228; 3°*, 1229 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 42.)

BILL (No. 46) To make Voting compulsory.—(Mr. *Amyot.*)
1°*, 578; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1083 (i).

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr *Cockburn.*)
1°*, 749; 2°*, 855; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 48) Respecting the transfer of Shares in Corporations.—(Mr. *Ives.*)
1°, 749 (i).

BILL (No. 49) Respecting the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guillet.*)
M. to read and receive Pet., 667; 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 38.)

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergin.*)
M. to introd., 666; 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 52.)

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Canadian Railway Company (name changed to "Canso and Louisbourg").—(Mr. *Gillies.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Kingston Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915 (i).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Niagara Falls and Queenston Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 1061 (i).

BILL (No. 55) To amalgamate the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Montreal and the National Mutual Loan and Building Society of Hamilton under the name of "The National Mutual Loan and Building Society.—(Mr. *Langelier.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 1061 (i); M. to ref. Rep. back to Banking and Commerce Com., 3556; neg. (Y. 53, N. 96) 3563 (ii).

BILL (No. 56) To confirm an agreement between the Tobique Valley Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 60.)

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the St. John and Maine Railway Company and the New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Skinner.*)
1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 58) To authorize the conveyance to the Corporation of the City of Toronto of certain Ordnance Lands in that city.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
Res. prop., 129; in Com., 174; 1°*, 825; 2°*, 1491; in Com., 1639; 3°*, 1642 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

BILL (No. 59) To incorporate the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McMillan, Vaudreuil.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1062 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4230 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1031; 2°*, 1181 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2594 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 61) To amend the North-West Territories Act.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 1062 (i).

BILL (No. 62) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1892, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Bowell.*)
Res. in Com. and 1°* of B., 1087; 2°, 1090; 3°*, 1091 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 1.)

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Murray.*)
1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 56.)

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230; in Com. and 3°*, 2256 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 33.)

BILL (No. 65) To incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Corbould.*)
1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230 (i); Com., in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 66) To repeal the Act respecting the Harbour and River Police of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°, 1225 (i); B. wthdn., 4482 (ii).

BILL (No. 67) Respecting the Voters' Lists of 1891.—(Mr. *Patterson, Huron.*)
1°, 1227; 2° m., 3300; 2°, 3301; in Com., 4480; 3° m., 4500; Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 4501; neg. (Y. 30, N. 63) 4505 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 12.)

BILL (No. 68) To revive and amend the Acts respecting the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Dundas.*)
1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1497; in Com. and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 55.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting Witnesses and Evidence.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°, 1391; 2°* and ref. to Sel. Com. on B. 7, 2008 (i).

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate The Dominion Millers' Association.—(Mr. *Stevenson.*)
1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1548 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2940 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 71) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°, 1469; 2° objected to, 1648; 2° and in Com., 2007; 3°*, 2172 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 22.)

BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Winnipeg and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Masson.*)
1°*, 1636; 2°*, 1740 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2461 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 73) To amend the Act to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 1636; 2°*, 1740 (i).

BILL (No. 74) To amend the Acts respecting the Civil Service.—(Mr. *Patterson, Huron.*)
1°*, 1636 (i); 2°*, 4638; in Com., 4639; 3°*, 4641 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 14.)

BILL (No 75) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Carl Auer Von Welsbach and others.—(Mr. *Stairs.*)
1°*, 1714; 2°*, 1882 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2594 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 76) To readjust the representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1° m., 1855 (i); 2° m., 3116; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3129; deb. rsmd., 3186, 3239; neg. (Y. 58, N. 109) 3298; 2° m., 3398; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3414; deb. rsmd., 3480, 3566; neg. (Y. 62, N. 109) 3636; deb. rsmd. on M. for 2°, 3649; Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3665; deb. rsmd., 3682; neg. (Y. 60, N. 95) 3717; 2° agreed to (Y. 97, N. 60) 3718; in Com., 3720, 3753, 3778, 3820, 3898, 3966, 4043, 4143, 4321; 3° m., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4329; neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 4334; Amt. (Mr. *Yeo*) 4335; neg. (Y. 54, N. 87) 4335; Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4336; neg. (Y. 54, N. 89) 4341; Amt. (Mr. *Pelletier*) neg. and 3° of B., 4343 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

BILL (No. 77) To revive and amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa, Morrisburgh and New York Railway Company, and to change the name thereof to the Canadian American Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 1946; 2°, 2093 (i).

BILL (No. 78) For the relief of James Albert Manning Aikins—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2636 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 79) For the relief of Ada Donigan—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2636 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Coatsworth.*)
1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2638 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 81) For the relief of Herbert Rimmington Mead—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2068; 2° on a div., 2093 (i); 3° m., 2636; agreed to (Y. 63, N. 31) 2637 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 81.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the Montreal and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga.*)
1°*, 2172; 2°*, 2256 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3321 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dickey.*)
1°*, 2361; 2°*, 2461; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 37.)

BILL (No. 84) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°, 2488; 2°* and in Com., 4481; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4603; neg. (Y. 20, N. 128) and 3° of B., 4628 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 85) Further to amend the 10th Chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick.*)
1°, 2488 (i).

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the Buckingham and Lièvre River Railway Company—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 2699; 2°*, 2795; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 32.)

BILL (No. 87) Respecting the Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Railway Company.—(Mr. *Beausoleil.*)
1°*, 2700; 2°*, 2795; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 88) To amend an Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Assiniboia Grand Junction Railway Company—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 3183; 2°*, 3321; in Com. and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

BILL (No. 89) To amend the Dominion Lands Act, and amendments thereto.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°, 2979; 2°* and in Com., 3301, 3733; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 3815; deb. adjd., 3820; deb. rsmd., B. reconsid. and 3°*, 4204 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 15.)

BILL (No. 90) To amend the Patent Act and Acts amending the same.—(Mr. *Carling.*)
1°*, 3300; 2°, 3729; in Com., 4215; 3°*, 4264 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 24.)

BILL (No. 91) For the relief of James Wright—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1° on a div., 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3640 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 92) For the relief of Hattie Adele Harrison.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1° on a div., 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3640 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

BILL (No. 93) Respecting the Midland Railway of Canada.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com., 3771; 3°*, 3778 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 94) To amend the Winding-Up Act.—(Mr. *Moncrieff.*)
1°, 3479 (ii).

BILL (No. 95) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 3896; 2° m., 4135; in Com., 4482; 3°*, 4506 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 96) To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia force on Active service in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Dewdney.*)
1°*, 4201; 2° and in Com., 4264; 3°, 4399 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 6.)

BILL (No. 97) To amend the Winding-Up Act.—(Sir *John Thompson.*)
1°*, 4202; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4506 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Three Rivers.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4265; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4499 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 10.)

BILL (No. 99) To amend the Act relating to the Harbour of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 4398; M. for Com., 4493; in Com., 4498, 4603; 1° of B., 4506; 2°*, 4603; in Com., 4647; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 93) 4654 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 9.)

BILL (No. 100) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1893, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.
Res. in Com., 4506; conc. in and 1° of B., 4603; 2°, 4715; 3°*, 4729 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 2.)

BILL (No. 101) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
Res. prop. (1st) 4394; in Com., 4506; M. for conc. and Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667; (2nd Res.) 4466; in Com., 4629; (3rd Res.) 4644; in Com., 4667; 1°* and 2°* of B., 4668; 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 5.)

BILL (No. 102) Respecting a Bounty on beet-root sugar.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop. and in Com., 4697; 1°* and 2°* of B., 4715; in Com. and 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 8.)

BILL (No. 103) To amend the Act respecting Customs Duties.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 4670; in Com., 4677; conc. in and 1°* and 2°* of B., 4715; in Com., 4728; 3°*, 4729 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 21.)

BILL (No. 104) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4716; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 13.)

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1286, 2370 (i), 4732 (ii).

BINDING TWINE, QUANTITY IMPORTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 537 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Watson*) 540; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 543; (Mr. *Davin*) 544; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 546; (Mr. *Mulock*) 550; (Mr. *Ferguson*) 548; Mr. *Fairbairn*) 550; (Mr. *Semple*) 553; (Mr. *Stairs*) 553; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 553; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 554 (i).

BINDING TWINE, DUTY, REMOVAL: Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713 (i).
Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1661; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1663; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1664; (Mr. *Christie*) 1667; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1668; (Mr. *Fairbairn*) 1672; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1679; (Mr. *Smith, Ont.*) 1683; (Mr. *Henderson*) 1684; (Mr. *Casey*) 1693; (Mr. *Lister*) 1698; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1700; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1704; Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1709 (i).

BOARD OF CUSTOMS AND DETECTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i); conc., 4205 (ii).

Boiler Inspection and Ins. Co. of Can. B. No. 19 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

BOOKS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 792 (i).

BORDEN, W. W., ESQ., MEMBER FOR KING'S, N.S.: Introduced, 36 (i).

BOTHWELL, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

BOUNDARIES OF QUEBEC PROV.: Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 99 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 115 (i).

BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 190 (i).

——— APPLICATIONS AND REFUSALS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bowers*) 417 (i).

BOWERS, CHAS. ED., ESQ., MEMBER FOR DIGBY: Introduced, 7 (i).

BOYLE, ARTHUR, ESQ., MEMBER FOR MONCK: Introduced, 454 (i).

BRACEBRIDGE AND BAYSVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4575 (ii).

BRANDON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (ii).

BREAKWATERS, &C., IN PRINCE CO., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).

BRIDGE OVER RICHELIEU RIVER AT SOREL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).

BRIGADE MAJORS: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 1559 (i).

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS IN B.C., VOTERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 2287 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES, IMP. AND CAN. GOVTS., COR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 244 (i).

——— PROP. FORTIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 222.

GAMBLE AND FLETCHER, COR. *re* PUB. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA: M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).

INDIANS, PROCLAMATION OF 1892: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 289 (i).

LOBSTERS AND WHITEFISH FOR B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 751 (i).

MILITARY BUILDINGS, VICTORIA: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

NANAIMO TO COMOX TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).

NICOLA VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4521 (ii).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 748 (i).

REVELSTOKE AND ARROW LAKE (C. P. R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4510 (ii).

SMALL-POX ON "EMPRESS OF JAPAN": Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1547 (i).

WALLACE, W., EX-POSTMASTER, VICTORIA: in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).

VANCOUVER P. O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2951, 4442.

VICTORIA DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134 (i).

BRITISH FARMERS' DELEGATES REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2432 (i).

——— *See* "TENANT FARMERS."

Brockville and New York Bridge Co.'s (revival) B. No. 42 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 454; 2°*, 509 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2461 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4539 (ii).

BROME CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.

BRUCE, EAST AND NORTH, CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ, ESQ., MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU: Introduced, 3 (i).

BRYSON, JOHN, ESQ., MEMBER FOR PONTIAC: Introduced, 4715 (ii).

Buckingham and Lièvre River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 2699; 2°*, 2795; in Com and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4516 (ii).

BUDGET, THE, ANNUAL STMNT. (Mr. *Foster*) 315; Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 335 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Tupper*) 358; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 381; (Mr. *Bennett*) 423; (Mr. *McMullen*) 429; (Mr. *Hughes*) 443; (Mr. *Dawson*) 455; (Mr. *Craig*) 465; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 469; (Mr. *Campbell*) 482; (Mr. *Devlin*) 498; (Mr. *Perry*) 504; (Mr. *Amyot*) 564; (Mr. *Cameron*) 568; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 589; (Sir *John Thompson*) 614; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 629; (Mr. *Davin*) 648; (Mr. *Watson*) 656; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 701; (Mr. *Sproule*) 715; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 725 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 161 (i).

BULMER *vs.* THE QUEEN, LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).

BURGESS, A. M.: ref. in Com. of Sup., 825, 1157 (i).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 65 (Mr. *Corbould*). 1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE. *See* "GOVT. BUSINESS."

BUTTER AND CHEESE INDUSTRY, PAMPHLET: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3331 (ii).

BYE-ELECTIONS, ISSUER OF WRITS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1491 (i).

CACOUNA PIER, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137 (i).

CALGARY P.O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2938, 2941 (ii).

CAMERON, D. M., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2639 (ii).

CAN. AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SERVICE: conc., 4478 (ii).

Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230; in Com. and 3°*, 2256 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

CAN. COTTON MILLS CO.'S LETTERS PATENT: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 920 (i).

Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *Flint*). 1°*, 98; 2°, 418; in Com., 455; 3°*, 692 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

CANADIAN CATTLE IN ENG.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 249 (i).

——— REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON: prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1950 (i); Deb. rsmd., 2463; Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2467; agreed to, 2482 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1950, 1977, 2480; (Mr. *Foster*) 1953; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1956, 1976, 2467; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1959, 1973; (Mr. *Casey*) 1960; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1962; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1964, 2470; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1967; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1970, 2477; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1974 (i).

——— IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1491 (i), 4431; conc., 4467 (ii).

C. P. R., P. O. AND MILITIA SERVICES, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3331 (ii).

——— ARRANGEMENTS WITH I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 510, 667 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 987, 2264 (i), 4438 (ii).

——— NORTH SHORE SECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3480 (ii).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

CANALS:

CANALS, DEEPENING: prop. Res. (Mr. *Denison*) 138.

CANALS, HARBOURS, DOCKS, &C., CONTRACTS FOR ENLARGEMENT, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 417 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1017, 2049, 2241 (i).

CANAL TOLLS, DISCRIMINATION AGAINST U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4642 (ii).

——— U. S. AND CANADA, ADDRESS TO HIS EX.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4644 (ii).

BEAUHARNOIS, ENGINEERS' REPS., &C., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (i).

CARILLON AND GRENVILLE: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i); conc., 4213 (ii).

CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 2053 (i).

CHAMBLY: in Com, of Sup., 2257 (i).

CULBUTE, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 927 (i).

GALOPS RAPIDS, SURVEYS, PLANS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Reid*) 130 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).

LACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 1017, 2049 (i); conc., 4212 (ii).

——— NEW BRIDGE AT MONTREAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 524 (i).

LAKE ST. LOUIS: in Com. of Sup., 2050 (i).

MURRAY: in Com. of Sup, 2054 (i).

RAPIDE PLAT: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).

RIDEAU, VALUATOR'S EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE: in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).

——— TENDERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 128.

——— in Com. of Sup., 2050 (i).

——— CONTRACTS FOR DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3184 (ii).

——— LOWEST TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261 (ii).

SOULANGES, ENGINEERS' REPS., &C., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (i).

TRENT VALLEY: in Com. of Sup., 2055, 2262 (i), 4438; conc., 4473 (ii).

WELLAND: in Com. of Sup., 2252 (i).

CANNED LOBSTERS, FEE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 699 (i).

——— *See* "FISHERIES B. 9."

Canso and Louisburg Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 Mr. (*Gillies*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

CANSO, ARICHAT, PORT HOOD, &C., STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 4277 (ii).

CANVAS COAL BAGS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 2954 (ii).

CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).

——— TERMINAL ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 1549 (i).

CAP. ST. IGNACE STATION, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 223 (i).

——— OPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 290, 751 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1555 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2667 (ii).

CAPE TORMENTE AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4524 (ii).

CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2617.

CARGILL, H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST BRUCE: Introduced, 36 (i).

CARILLON AND GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i); conc., 4213 (ii).

CARLETON (N.B.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 39, 1391 (i).

CARLING, HON. JOHN, MEMBER FOR LONDON: Introduced, 161 (i).

CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, CHARGES AGAINST: Stmnt. read (Mr. *Edgar*) 1032; M., 1038 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1038; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1040; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1047; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1049; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1052; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1056; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1058; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1060, 1741; (Mr. *Dickey*) 1750; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1760; (Mr. *Curran*) 1770; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1780; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2068; Amt. 2068 (i).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to prop. Res., 2068; agreed to (Y. 125, N. 63); Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2144; neg. (Y. 63, N. 125) 2169; prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to ref. Commissioners' Names for approval of Hse., 2170 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Flint*) 2074: (Mr. *Davin*) 2089; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2101; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 2107; (Mr. *Choquette*) 2116; (Mr. *Dupont*) 2122; (Mr. *Carroll*) 2124; (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 2128; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2130; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 2139; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Amt. to Amt., 2144 (i).

Deb. on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2147; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2152; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2156; (Mr. *Casey*) 2162; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2167 (i).

——— APPROVAL OF COMMISSIONERS: Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 2980; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2984; neg. (Y. 32, N. 79) 3053 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2981°; Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2984; (Mr. *Chapleau*) 2991; (Mr. *Flint*) 2995; (Mr. *Davin*) 3001; (Mr. *Fraser*) 3007; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3015; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3027; (Mr. *Weldon*) 3034; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3040; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3047 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) setting day for Deb., 1788 (i).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, REP. *re* BLASTING: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 2268 (i).
CATTLE DISEASE: in Com. of Sup., 987, 2033 (i).
——— LIVE, ADMISSION FROM U. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS, INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 992, 2033 (i).
CENSUS AND STATISTICS, MAP SHOWING BOUNDARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 824 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 983 (i), 4437 (ii).
——— ORIGIN AND RELIGIOUS CREEDS: Ques. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 190 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2491 (ii).
——— BIRTHPLACES, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3566, 4135 (ii).
CHAMBLY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
CHAMPLAIN CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
CHARGES AGAINST A MEMBER: asking Ques. checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 4499 (ii).
CHARLEBOIS, F., CLAIMS AGAINST FISHERIES DEPT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1036 (i).
CHARLEVOIX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 6 (i).
CHATHAM CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1391 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2798 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 2971, 3733 (ii).
——— EVIDENCE: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 3896 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. *Dickey*). 1°*, 2361; 2°*, 2461; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 44 (Mr. *Gordon*). 1°*, 508 (i); M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 4263; 2°* m., 4631; in Com., 4637, 4716; Amt. (Mr. *Gordon*) 4726; neg. and 3°, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

CHISHOLM, D., LAND DAMAGES: conc., 4479 (ii).
CHURCH POINT WHARF, DIGBY, N.S., REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 311.
CIVIL GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 255, 267, 825, 896, 1007, 1154 (i), 4205, 4432, 4440, 4472 (ii).
CIVIL SERVANTS AND EXTRA PAY: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2500 (ii).
——— SICK PAY: Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2238 (i).
——— SUPERANNUATED, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1637 (i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*). 1°*, 1636 (i); 2°*, 4638; in Com., 4639; 3°*, 4641 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1004.
——— COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 751 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1547 (i).
——— EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 283 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, EXTRA CLERKS, PAYMENTS FOR DEDUCTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4732 (ii).
——— EXTRA PAYMENTS, 1874-1878: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1715 (i).
——— LIST, NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 917 (i).
CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, N. W. T. (1885): in Com. of Sup., 1017; conc., 1087 (i).
CLAIMS, &c., SETTLEMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 2259 (i), 4450 (ii).
CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4457 (ii).
CLOTHING AND OVERCOATS: in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
COAL OIL AND KEROSENE, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3059 (ii).
COBOURG CUSTOMS, &c., BUILDINGS, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1366 (i).

Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Ry. Co's B. No. 49 (Mr. *Guillet*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; M. to read and receive Pet., 669; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394, 4396; in Com., 4516, 4546 (ii).
COCKBURN ISLAND, LOCATION TICKET OF PETER MCLENNAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Lister*) 2006 (i).
——— J. A. MCLENNAN: M. for copy (Mr. *Lister*) 1980 (i).
COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 811, 1007 (i), 4430; conc., 4205 (ii).
COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 983 (i), 4433; conc., 4474 (ii).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4426 (ii).
——— RELATIONS, CAN. AND GREAT BRITAIN: prop. M. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1979 (i).
——— TREATIES: Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1104; neg. (Y. 62, N. 106) 1151 (i).
COMMISSIONERS' (FISHERIES) EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).
COMMISSIONS ON CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3238 (ii).
COMMITTEES:
AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: List of Members, 105 (i).
BAIE DES CHALEURS RY.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 42 (i).
BANKING AND COMMERCE: List of Members, 104 (i).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 34 (i).
——— 1ST REP.: Presented (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1153; conc., 1465 (i).
——— 2ND REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 4585 (ii).
EXPIRING LAWS: List of Members 101 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: List of Members, 104 (i).
——— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 112 (i).
PRINTING: List of Members, 104 (i).
——— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 112 (i).
——— 5TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 2171 (i).
——— 8TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 3643 (ii).
——— 11TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 4693 (ii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: List of Members, 101 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS: List of Members, 103 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS: List of Members, 104 (i).

COMMITTEES—*Continued.*

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: List of Members, 102 (i).

SELECT STANDING: prop. M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 5.

—— Special Com. to prepare Lists: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 34 (i).

—— Lists presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 101 (i).

—— ADDITION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Bowell*) 217, 563 (i).

STANDING ORDERS: List of Members, 103 (i).

COMMITTEES, SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).

COMPANIES. *See*

BELL TELEPHONE CO.
BOILER INSPECTION AND INSURANCE CO.
BROCKVILLE AND NEW YORK BRIDGE CO.
BURRARD INLET TUNNEL AND BRIDGE CO.
EDWARDS, W. C., CO.
HIGH RIVER, &c., IRRIGATION AND WATER POWER CO.
MCKAY MILLING CO.
NATIONAL MUTUAL LOAN AND BUILDING SOCIETY.
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL AND FORGE CO.
OTTAWA CITY PASSENGER RY. CO.
VICTORIA LIFE INSURANCE CO.

[*See* "RAILWAYS;" "SUBSIDIES;" &c.]

Compulsory Voting B. No. 46 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°*, 578; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1083 (i).

CONCURRENCE, 1084 (i), 4204, 4463 (ii).

CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 282, 788, 1007, 1363 (i), 4433 (ii).

CONTRACTS. *See* "GOVT."

Contract Labour. *See* "ALIEN."

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, 1, 6, 39, 96, 1062, 1152, 1391 (i), 2461, 2714, 2979, 3681, 4731 (ii).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 134 (i).

COPYRIGHT ACT, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1366 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2233 (i).

——— RECIPROCITY WITH U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 137 (i).

CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2053 (i).

COTEAU, OVERFLOW OF LAND: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 914 (i).

COTTON-SEED OIL, CRUDE, IMPORTS FOR 1891: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McKay*) 1555 (i).

COULTER, N. R., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CARLETON, N.B.: Introduced, 1391 (i).

COURT HOUSE AND LOCK-UPS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).

CRAVEN, GEORGE, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 1007.

Criminal Law Amt. (Witnesses and Evidence) B. No. 69 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 1391; 2°* and ref. to Sel. Com. on B. 7, 2008 (i).

Criminal Law (Codification) B. No. 7 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°, 106; 2°, 1312 (i); in Com., 2701, 2782, 2795, 2826, 2958, 3320, 3637, 3640, 3644, 4225, 4260, 4265, 4343; 3°, 4338; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 4732 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).

CROWN PROSECUTIONS AND SUITS: prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1283 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 1295; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1302; (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 1303; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1307; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1308; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1309 (i).

CULBUTE CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 927 (i).

CUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

CUSTOMS:

ALLAN, MESSRS., DECREASE OF CUSTOMS DUTIES: M. for Pets.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 159 (i).

APPLES, EXPORT, INSPECTION UNDER ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*, *Annapolis*) 3238 (ii).

BEEF AND PORK (AMERICAN) LUMBERMEN'S IMPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 291 (i).

—— U. S. AND CAN. FISHERMEN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 294 (i).

BINDING TWINE, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 537 (i).

—— DUTY, REMOVAL: Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713 (i).

BOARD OF CUSTOMS AND DETECTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i); conc., 4205 (ii).

BONDING PRIVILEGES, NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 189 (i).

CATTLE (AMERICAN) IN BOND, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 399 (i).

COAL OIL AND KEROSENE, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3059 (ii).

COMMISSIONS ON CUSTOMS SEIZURES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3238 (ii).

COTTON-SEED OIL, CRUDE, IMPORTS FOR 1891: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McKay*) 1555 (i).

CRAVEN, GEORGE, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 1007.

CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 267, 1007, 1018 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433 (ii).

CUSTOMS OFFICERS' COMMISSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 811, 1007 (i), 4431; conc., 4205 (ii).

DODS, P. D., CASE *re* LOSS OF DIAMONDS: M. for Papers (Mr. *Curran*) 2287 (i).

EGGS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4677 (ii).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 100 (i).

—— CAN. PRODUCE TO NEWFOUNDLAND; M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 113 (i).

—— FREE PRODUCE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).

FERTILIZERS, ARTIFICIAL, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 526 (i).

FLOUR (CAN.) TRADE AND NEWFOUNDLAND: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Hughes*) 112 (i).

GRAIN SHIPMENTS *viâ* NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 291 (i).

GRANITE, EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 509 (i).

HAMMOND, E., SEIZURES AND SHARE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2782 (ii).

INGRAM, W. H., APPMNT. AS COL. OF CUSTOMS, ST. THOMAS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 1998 (i).

INSPECTORS OF PORTS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 821 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Continued.*

INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i), 4463 (ii).

MEAT AND FARM PRODUCE, IMPORTS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Hughes*) 291 (i).

MOLASSES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4678 (ii).

PETROLEUM, CRUDE, REDUCTION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1946 (i).

PORK IMPORTS FROM U. S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 292 (i).

PRESENTATION FLAG, REMISSION OF DUTY: (Mr. *Landerkin*) 509 (i).

ST. THOMAS, COL. OF CUSTOMS, APPMNT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 1998 (i).

SAW-LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1231.

——— Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1032 (i).

——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rider*) 1705 (i).

SPANISH WEST INDIES, EXPORTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 4499 (ii).

TRUDEL, EDMOND, SEIZURES AND SHARES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3237 (ii).

U. S. NEWSPAPERS, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1230 (i).

WEST BAY AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Cameron*) 2287 (i).

WHYCOCOMAGH AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Cameron*) 2287 (i).

Customs (Duties) Act Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 4670; in Com., 4677; conc. in and 1°* and 2°* of B., 4715; in Com., 4728; 3°*, 4729 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 21.)

DAIRIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES, PROV. OF QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2781 (ii).

DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 1464 (i).

DARTMOUTH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).

DEBATES (H. OF C.) OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 34 (i).

——— 1ST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1153 (i).

——— conc., M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 1465 (i).

——— 2ND REP. OF COM.: conc., M. (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*) 4585 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 974 (i); conc., 4205 (ii).

DE LA RONDE, LATE PIERRE A. DENIS, PAPERS, &c., *re* SUCCESSION: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2286 (ii).

DEPARTMENTAL BUILDINGS, CARE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 286 (i).

DEPOSITS IN PEEL SAVINGS BANK, INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 916 (i).

DES AULNETS, P.O., MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750 (i).

PEEL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

DETECTIVE SERVICE, CUSTOMS: conc., 4205 (ii).

DICKEY, ARTHUR R., ESQ., MEMBER FOR CUMBERLAND: Introduced, 6 (i).

DIGBY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

DIPLOMATIC PAPERS: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 1789; neg. (Y. 57, N. 98) 1827 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1795; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1802; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1807; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1809; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1813; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1817; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1822 (i).

DIVISIONS:

BINDING TWINE, REMOVAL OF DUTY: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713 (i).

CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, CHARGES AGAINST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Edgar*) to ref. to Com. on Privileges and Elections, 1032; Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) 2068; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) neg. (Y. 63, N. 125) 2169; Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) agreed to (Y. 125, N. 63) 2170 (i).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *McCarthy*) approving appointment of Commissioners, agreed to (Y. 125, N. 63) 2170 (i).

——— Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) approving appointment of Commissioners, 2980; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2981; neg. (Y. 32, N. 79) 3053 (ii).

COMMERCIAL TREATIES: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1104; neg. (Y. 62, N. 106) 1151 (i).

DIPLOMATIC PAPERS: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1789; neg. (Y. 57, N. 98) 1827 (i).

DIVORCE (MEAD, HERBERT R.) B. 81: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) for 3° agreed to (Y. 63, N. 31) 2637 (ii).

ELLIOTT, JUDGE, CHARGES AGAINST: prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) to ref. Hobbs' and others Pet., *re* London Election, to Special Com., 1719; neg. (Y. 50, N. 93) 2360 (i).

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE B. 2: M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to recom. agreed to (Y. 77, N. 50) 3090 (ii).

NATIONAL MUTUAL LOAN AND BUILDING SOCIETY: M. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) to ref. back Rep. of Sel. Standing Com. on Banking and Commerce, 3556; neg. (Y. 53, N. 96) 3563 (ii).

N. W. T. ACT AMT. B. 27: M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) for 2°, neg. (Y. 33, N. 132) 2462 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1555; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1623; neg. (Y. 64, N. 98) 1634; Res. agreed to (Y. 97, N. 62) 1635 (i).

RAILWAY ACT AMT. B. 84: on M. (Mr. *Haggart*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) two cent per mile rate, 4610; neg. (Y. 20, N. 128) 4628 (ii).

REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF COMMONS: on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to refer B. to a Conference, 3129; neg. (Y. 58, N. 109) 3298; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) basis of equality of population, &c., 3414; neg. (Y. 62, N. 109) 3636; Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) Provinces and Census, 3665; neg. (Y. 60, N. 95) 3717; 2° agreed to (Y. 97, N. 60) 3718; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Ontario, neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 4334; Amt. (Mr. *Yeo*) P. E. I., neg. (Y. 54, N. 87) 4335; Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) Missisquoi and Iberville counties, neg. (Y. 54, N. 89) 4341 (ii).

ST. JOHN HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS B. 99: on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to ref. back to Com., neg. (Y. 53, N. 93) 4654 (ii).

SUBSIDIES TO RYS.—CONCURRENCE: on Res., Témiscouata Ry., Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667 (ii).

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE: Res., L. C. Pereira's Salary, Dept. of Interior, neg. (Y. 86, N. 61) 1084 (i).

——— on Res., Chief Clerk's Salary, Dept. of Interior, Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 34, N. 47) 4473 (ii).

VOTERS' LISTS B. 67: on M. (Sir *John Thompson*) for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to ref. back to Com., neg. (Y. 30, N. 63) 4505 (ii).

Divorce (Aikins, Jas. A. M.) B. No. 78 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2636 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

—— **(Donigan, Ada) B. No. 79** (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 2006; 2°*, 2093 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2636 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 79.)

—— **(Mead, Herbert R.) B. No. 81** (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 2068; 2° on a div., 2093 (i); 3° m., 2636; agreed to (Y. 63, N. 31) 2637 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 81.)

—— **(Harrison, Hattie A.) B. No. 92** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1° on a div., 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3640 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

—— **(Wright, Jas.) B. No. 91** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1° on a div., 3300; 2°*, 3363; in Com. and 3° on a div., 3640 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

Dods, P. D., Case *re* Loss of Diamonds: M. for Papers (Mr. *Curran*) 2287 (i).

Dodwell, C. E. W., Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).

Dom. Artillery Association: in Com. of Sup., 1363 (i).

Dom. Buildings in Can., Electric Lighting: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 417 (i).

Dom. Cotton Mills Co.'s Letters Patent: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 920 (i).

Dom. Day Celebration: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4320 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4399 (ii).

"Dom. Illustrated," Copies Purchased: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 397 (i).

Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 4431 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°, 2979; 2°* and in Com., 3301, 3733; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3815; deb. adjd., 3820; deb. rsmd., B. recom. and 3°*, 4204 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 15.)

Dom. Millers' Association incorp. B. No. 70 (Mr. *Stevenson*). 1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1548 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2940 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 71.)

Dom. Notes, Printing: in Com. of Sup., 255 (i).

Dom. Police: in Com. of Sup., 313 (i).

Dorchester Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Donigan, Ada. *See* "Divorce."

Dredge, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i).

Dredging Ottawa, between Pembroke and Des Joachims: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 926 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 991 (i), 4258, 4454 (ii).

Drill Pay and Instruction: in Com. of Sup., 1353 (i); conc., 4209; suppl., 4437 (ii).

Drill Sheds, &c., Care and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 1373 (i).

Drummond County Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4644; conc., 4657 (ii).

—— Postal Service: Ques. (Mr. *Leduc*) 289 (i).

Dugas, Louis E., Esq., Member for Montcalm: Introduced, 161 (i).

Duke of Clarence and Avondale, Address of Condolence: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 72, 96 (i).

—— Reply to Address: Mess. from His Ex., 1393, 2170 (i).

Dual Languages in N. W. T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3062 (ii).

Duty-Pay, Excise Officers: in Com. of Sup., 1014.

Dyer, Eugène A., Esq., Member for Brome: Introduced, 161 (i).

Eatonville Harbour, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2641 (ii).

Edmonton Land Office, Removal: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4043, 4392 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2936; conc., 4467 (ii).

Edwards, W. C., Co.'s incorp. B. No. 17 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 855 (i). (53-54 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

Eugenia Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1985 (i).

Eggs: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4677 (ii).

Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto "Globe": Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3734-3751 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4349 (ii).

Election, General, Polling Rets.: M. for Map (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 112 (i).

—— Officials' Duties: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 73 (i).

—— Petitions. *See* "London;" "Richmond."

—— Statistics: Remarks (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3185 (ii).

Elections, 1891-92, Cor., Ret. Officers and Govt., &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Sutherland*) 969 (i).

—— Last General, Cor., Govt. and Ret. Officers: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2491 (ii).

—— *See* "Controverted."

Electoral Districts in B.C., Voters: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 2287 (i).

Electoral Lists. *See* "Lennox;" "London;" "Voters' Lists."

Elgin, E., Controverted Election, Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

Elliot, Judge. *See* "London Election."

Engraving and Printing, Tenders and Contract: M. for copies* (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).

—— Returns: Enquiry (Mr. *Somerville*) 1637 (i).

Esquimalt Graving Dock: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i), 4439 (ii).

—— Defences, Imp. and Can. Govts.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 244 (i).

—— Fortifications: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 222 (i).

Essex, S., Controverted Election: Judges' Rep., 1.

ESTIMATES, The, 1892-93, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 138 (i).

—— Suppl., 1891-92: Mess. from His Ex., 822 (i).

—— Suppl., 1892-93: Mess. from His Ex., 4265 (ii).

European Immigration Agents: in Com. of Sup., 1491, 1828 (i).

—— *See* "Immigration."

Evidence. *See* "Criminal Law."

EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REPORTS: in Com. of Sup., 313, 971 (i).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i), 4430 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL (CENTRAL) FARM, DAIRY STOCK, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 402 (i).
——— FRENCH COR.: Remarks (Mr. *Frémont*) 3114.
——— REPS.: Remarks (Mr. *Frémont*) 3185 (ii).
——— FRENCH EDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 397 (i).
——— NUMBER, LOCATION, EXPEND., &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Frémont*) 682 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i), 4448 (ii).
EXPIRING LAWS COM.: List of Members, 101 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 100 (i).
——— CAN. PRODUCE TO NEWFOUNDLAND: M. for Ret (Mr. *Hughes*) 113 (i).
——— FREE PRODUCE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).
——— *See* "CUSTOMS."
EXTRA CLERKS, &c., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii).
FABRE, MR., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4424 (ii).
FAIRBAIRN, CHAS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR SOUTH VICTORIA: Introduced, 3 (i).
FARMERS' DELEGATES. *See* "BRITISH"; "TENANT."
FARM PRODUCE. *See* "EXPORTS."
FAVOURABLE NATIONS' CLAUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 34 (i).
——— IMP. DESPATCH: Mess. from His Ex., 1470.
FEATHERSTON, JOS., ESQ., MEMBER FOR PEEL: Introduced, 3 (i).
FENELON FALLS RY. BRIDGE, AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND G. T. R.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 133 (i).
——— SWING BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4438; conc., 4475 (ii).
FINANCE:
ASSISTANT RECEIVER GEN., VICTORIA., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 267.
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY ON MANUFACTURE: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 1366, 1373 (i).
——— BOUNTIES PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 41 (i).
———BOUNTY, CONTINUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 751 (i).
——— Res. prop. and in Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 4697 (ii).
BUDGET, THE: Annual Statement (Mr. *Foster*) 315.
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, EXTRA CLERKS, PAYMENTS FOR DEDUCTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4732.
CIVIL SERVANTS, SUPERANNUATED, &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. *Foster*) 1637 (i).
DEPOSITS IN PEEL SAVINGS BANK, INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 916 (i).
DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 255.
FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 285 (i).
FINANCIAL INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS: Stmnt. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 34 (i).
——— M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 50 (i).
——— REPS. OF MINISTERS AND O. C.'S*: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 111 (i).
FINANCE—*Continued.*
INCOMES OF THE PEOPLE, STATEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 456 (i).
LOANS, GOVT. SHORT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 137 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS. OF CAN.: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. *Wallace*) 188 (i).
PUBLIC DEBT COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).
SAVINGS BANKS, N.B., N.S., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
——— ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3644 (ii).
SINKING FUND, BROKERAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
STATUTORY VOTES, DOM. LIABILITIES UNDER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 969 (i).
SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).
——— MAIL CONDUCTORS: M. for Ret (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2699 (ii).
UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1618 (i).
[*See* "SUPPLY."]
FINKLE, ROLAND, FISHERY INSPECTOR, APPMNT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1365 (i).
FISHERIES:
ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES AND NEWFOUNDLAND: Mess. from His Ex., 1088 (i).
BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, in Com. of Sup., 4478 (ii).
BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 190 (i).
——— APPLICATIONS AND REFUSALS*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bowers*) 417 (i).
CANNED LOBSTERS FEE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Tupper*) 699 (i).
CHARLEBOIS, F., CLAIMS AGAINST FISHERIES DEPT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1036 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 3237 (ii).
FINKLE, ROLAND, FISHERY INSPECTOR, APPMNT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1365 (i).
FISH-BREEDING: conc., 4478 (ii).
FISHERIES, DEPUTY MINISTER, LETTERS, COMPLAINTS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *McMullen*) 418 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 992 (i), 4310, 4460 (ii).
——— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1491 (i).
FISHERY OFFICERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4310.
——— REGULATIONS, ALTERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3054 (ii).
FISH, FISH-OIL, &c., IMPORTED FROM NEWFOUNDLAND*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 159.
FISHING BOUNTY: Enquiry for Rets. (Mr. *Flint*) 914.
——— LICENSES, NORTH SHORE AND ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2641 (ii).
HATCHERIES, ST. MARY'S BAY, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
LOBSTER FISHERIES, ON M. FOR ADJMNT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 160 (i).
——— HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).
PROSSER, WM., FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Allan*) 3114 (ii).
PROTECTION VESSELS: in Com. of Sup., 4319 (ii).
RICHELIEU RIVER, FISHING RIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 35 (i).
U.S. VESSELS IN HUDSON BAY, ALLEGED POACHING: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4262 (ii).
Fisheries Act further Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 107; 2°, 1655; Res. prop., 699; in Com., 1656; M. for Com. on B., 2173; in Com., 2216, 2230 (i).

Fisheries B. No. 9—*Continued.*
Deb. on M. for Com. (Mr. *Tupper*) 2173; (Mr. *McLean*) 2185; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2190; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2195; (Mr. *Welsh*) 2196; (Mr. *Perry*) 2197; (Mr. *Burns*) 2202; (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2204; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2206; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 2209; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2212; (Mr. *Yeo*) 2213; (Mr. *Flint*) 2216 (i).

Fisheries Dept. *See* "MARINE."

Fishing Vessels. *See* "SEA FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT."

Fishing Vessels, U.S. (*Modus Vivendi*) **B. No. 11** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 109; 2°, 176; in Com., 1472, 1639; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 3.)

FLOUR (CAN.) TRADE AND NEWFOUNDLAND: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Hughes*) 112 (i).

FORBES, FRANCIS G., MEMBER FOR QUEEN'S, N.S.: Introduced, 97 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 916 (i).

FRASER, MISS H. AND MR. RODERICK: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).

FRONTENAC ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3116 (ii).

——— WRIT ISSUED (Mr. *Speaker*) 3055 (ii).

GALOPS RAPIDS SURVEY, DEEPENING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).

——— SURVEYS, PLANS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Reid*) 130 (i).

GAMBLE & FLETCHER, COR. *re* PUB. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).

GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 4242 (ii).

GAUDET, BENJ., WARFINGER AT TIGNISH: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).

GEAR AND TACKLE INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 224 (i).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 95 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 3896; 2° m., 4135; 2°, 4143; in Com., 4482; 3°*, 4506 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 23.)

GEOLOGICAL REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2172 (i).

Geological Survey Dept. Act Amt. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 578; 2°*, 1648; in Com., 1654; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 16.)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4386 (ii).

GEORGIAN BAY SURVEY: conc., 4470 (ii).

GERMAN TREATY, PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) 109 (i).

"GERRYMANDER." *See* "REPRESENTATION."

GIBSON, WILLIAM, ESQ., MEMBER FOR LINCOLN AND NIAGARA: Introduced, 3 (i).

GILLIES, JOSEPH A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR RICHMOND, N.S.: Introduced, 3 (i).

GIROUARD, JOSEPH, ESQ., MEMBER FOR TWO MOUNTAINS: Introduced, 106 (i).

GLAZIERS' DIAMONDS. *See* "DODS, P. D."

GLENGARRY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.

"Globe" Printing Co's. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Innes*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com., 1229; 3°*, 1230 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 75.)

"GLOBE." *See* "ELECTION EXPENSES."

GODERICH AND WINGHAM RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4572 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS, ADJOURNMENT: Change of Time, M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4697 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to take in Mondays, 3564 (ii).

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Wednesdays, 2490.

——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Thursdays, 699 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 4259, 4714 (ii).

GOVT. CONTRACTS SINCE CONFDN.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 99; wthdn., 110 (i).

——— SINCE 30TH JUNE, 1887, TO 30TH JUNE, 1891: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McDonald, Huron*) 110 (i).

GOVT. OF N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

GOVT. RYS., ADDITIONAL PROPERTY ACCOMMODATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1984 (i).

——— NAMES, &C., EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 41, 692 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S BODY GUARD, AFFIDAVITS *re* PAY-LIST: read (Mr. *Somerville*) 1189 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Daly*) 1212; (Mr. *Hazen*) 1214; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1215, 1329; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1216, 1329; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1217; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1219; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1222; (Mr. *Denison*) 1319; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 1323; (Mr. *Somerville*) 1324, 1339; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1330; (Mr. *Casey*) 1332; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1333; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1335; (Mr. *Davin*) 1338 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS: Stmnt. presented (Mr. *Foster*) 34 (i).

——— M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 50 (i).

——— REPS. OF MINISTERS AND O. C.'S: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 111 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 255, 284 (i).

GRAIN SHIPMENTS *viâ* NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 291 (i).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Can. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 39.)

GRANITE, EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Ques. (*Mr. Gillmor*) 509 (i).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60. (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1031; 2°*, 1181 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2594 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 40.)

GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO., ENGINEER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 915 (i).

GREAT VILLAGE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 4251 (ii).

GRIEVE, JAMES NICOL, ESQ., MEMBER FOR NORTH PERTH: Introduced, 3183 (ii).

GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2033 (i), 2801 (ii).

GROUNDS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).

GUILLET, GEO., ESQ., MEMBER FOR WEST NORTHUMBERLAND: Introduced, 454 (i).

GUINDON, MRS. N., SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 4450 (ii).

GUYSBOROUGH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

HALIFAX, &C., AND WEST INDIES, &C., STEAM COM.: in Com of Sup., 4282; conc., 4469 (ii).

HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN *vid* YARMOUTH, STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4441 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i), 2362, 2509 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).
HALL'S HARBOUR (N. S.) WORKS, EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).
HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
HAMMOND, E., SEIZURES AND SHARE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2782 (ii).
HARAS NATIONAL CO.: in Com. of Sup. 1465 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i), 4240, 4448; conc., 4477 (ii).
Harbour Commissioners. *See* "ST. JOHN;" "THREE RIVERS."
Harrison, Hattie A. *See* "DIVORCE."
HASTINGS, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep. 1 (i).
HATCHERIES, ST. MARY'S BAY, N. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
HEARN, JOHN, ESQ., MEMBER FOR QUEBEC WEST: Introduced, 508 (i).
HEATING PUB. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4241; conc., 4477 (ii).
HEELEY'S FALLS DAM, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2263 (ii).
HENDERSON, DAVID, ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALTON: Introduced, 3 (i).
HENRY, K. J.: Ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 844 (i).
HEREFORD RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397 (ii).
High River, &c., Irrigation and Water Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 275, 282, 896; conc., 1085 (i).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Carling*) 1062 (i).
HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: prop. Res. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3335; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3361 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Devlin*) 3815 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
ADJOURNMENT: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 2730 (ii).
——— *See* general heading.
ADDRESS IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Northrup*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Bain, Soulanges*) 18 (i).
——— His Ex.'s Reply, 129 (i).
BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 1286 (i), 2370, 4733 (ii).
BYE-ELECTIONS, ISSUE OF WRITS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1491 (i).
CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, CHARGES AGAINST. *See* general heading.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY ELECTION, JUDGES' REP.: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 3733 (ii).
——— EVIDENCE: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 3896 (ii).
CHARGES AGAINST A MEMBER: Ques. checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 4499 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
COMMITTEES. *See* general heading.
——— SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 788 (i).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 134 (i).
——— JUDGES' REPS., 1, 39, 96, 1062, 1152, 1391 (i), 2461, 2714, 2971, 2979, 3681, 4731 (ii).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL. *See* general heading.
ELECTION EXPENSES, PUBLICATIONS IN TORONTO "GLOBE": Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3734-3751 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4348 (ii).
FRANCHISE ACT, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 916 (i).
FRONTENAC ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3116 (ii).
GOVT. BUSINESS, ADJOURNMENT, CHANGE OF TIME: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4697 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to take in Wednesdays, 2490 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Thursdays, 699 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 4259, 4714 (ii).
——— M. (Sir *John Thompson*) Mondays, 3564 (ii).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 762, 974; conc., 1086 (i), 4205 (ii).
LENNOX CO. ELECTORAL LISTS, ORIGINAL, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 159.
L'ASSOMPTION AND PONTIAC, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2700 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLT., 1ST REP. OF COM.: conc., M. (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2826 (ii).
——— PURCHASE OF BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 792 (i).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 789 (i).
LONDON ELECTION. *See* general heading.
MACKENZIE, HON. ALEX., DECEASE: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. House, 1388 (i).
MEMBERS' INDEMNITY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4715 (ii). *See* B. (No. 104).
——— INTRODUCED, 3, 71, 97, 454, 508, 1364, 1391 (i), 2700, 2918, 3183, 3815, 4715 (ii).
——— RESIGNATION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 4393.
NEW MEMBERS, RETURN: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3, 6, 40, 453, 1364, 1391 (i), 2431, 2917, 3183, 3649, 3815, 4717 (ii).
ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c. *See* general heading.
PARLIAMENT, 7TH, 2ND SESSION: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4736 (ii).
PERTH, NORTH, ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1639 (i).
PONTIAC ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2980, 3115 (ii).
PRINTING, PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 794, 976 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS. *See* general heading.
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Acting Sec., 4731 (ii).
RICHMOND CONTROVERTED ELECTION, PETITIONS AND DECISIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Gillies*) 1553 (i).
SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 762 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* "Committees."
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEPUTY, APPMNT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 749 (i).
——— ESTIMATE: in Com. of Sup., 789 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
——— MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, CHANGE OF TIME: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3897 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Continued.*
SPEAKER, DEPUTY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i).
SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE: Opening, 4 (i); Prorogation, 4733 (ii).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i), 3055, 4393 (ii).
VOTERS' LIST, PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 976; conc., 1086 (i).
WARRANTS AND WRITS OF ELECTION, INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 100 (i).
WELLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION. *See* general heading.
WRITS FOR ELECTIONS, ISSUE: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3115 (ii).
—— DELAY: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1089.
—— BYE-ELECTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3186 (ii).
—— EAST YORK, ISSUE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1547 (i).
—— FRONTENAC, VACANCY AND ISSUE: (Mr. *Speaker*) 3055 (ii).
—— MARQUETTE, VACANCY AND ISSUE: (Mr. *Speaker*) 4393 (ii).
[*See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE; "REPRESENTATION."]
HUGHES, SAM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR NORTH VICTORIA: Introduced, 3 (i).
HULL P. O., SUNDAY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3184 (ii).
HURON, W., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
IMMIGRATION:
AGENTS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4431 (ii).
CANADIAN AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1491 (i); conc., 4467 (ii.)
DEPUTY MINISTER, LETTER *re* PAMPHLETS: in Com. of Sup., Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1947 (i).
"DOM. ILLUSTRATED," COPIES PURCHASED: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 397 (i).
EUROPEAN AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).
EXPENSES ($150,000): in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i); conc., 4210 (ii).
FABRE, MR., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4424 (ii).
HETT'S GERMAN PAMPHLET: in Com. of Sup., 2008.
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Carling*) 1062 (i).
—— RATES, TAXES, INSURANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 896; conc., 1085 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 1491, 1828, 1889, 2008 (i); conc., 4210, 4467 (ii).
IMMIGRATION AGENTS' SALARIES:
Deb. in Com. of Sup. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1491, 1540; (Mr. *Carling*) 1492, 1547, 1828, 1853, 1896, 1909, 1928, 1937, 2009; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1495, 1830; (Mr. *Foster*) 1499; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1502; (Mr. *Edgar*) 1502; (Sir *John Thompson*) 1502, 1895; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1503, 1850, 1934, 2017; Mr. *Mulock*) 1506, 2020; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1510, 1828, 1908, 1932; (Mr. *Casey*) 1514, 1830; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1517, 1896; (Mr. *Cameron*) 1521, 1532, 1543, 1919; (Mr. *Perry*) 1524, 1832; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1526, 1836, 1909; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1536; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1538, 1912, 2014, 2023; (Mr. *Gibson*) 1829, 1837; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1837, 1910, 1945; (Mr. *Watson*) 1838, 1929, 1943; (Mr. *Somerville*) 1839, 1905, 2011, 2024; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1842; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 1846; (Mr. *Daly*) 1853, 1938; (Mr. *Flint*) 1889, 1915; (Mr. *Tupper*) 1891; (Mr. *Borden*) 1893; (Mr. *Lister*) 1905, 2013; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1924, 1943; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1936; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 1941; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2025 (i).
[*See* "AGRICULTURE," &c.]
Immigration. *See* "CHINESE."
Immoral and Criminal. *See* "OBSCENE."
IMPORTS OF ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, QUANTITIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 526 (i).
—— BINDING TWINE, QUANTITY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 537 (i).
—— CRUDE COTTON-SEED OIL FOR 1891: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McKay*) 1555 (i).
—— PORK FROM U. S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 292 (i).
—— MEAT AND FARM PRODUCTS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Hughes*) 291 (i).
INCOMES OF THE PEOPLE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 456 (i).
INDIANS:
B. C. INDIANS, PROCLAMATION OF 1892: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 289 (i).
CHISHOLM, D., LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 4479 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 112 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 4408, 4460; conc., 4479 (ii).
MANAGEMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4408 (ii).
RESERVES, B. C., NUMBER, LOCATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barnard*) 511 (i).
INGRAM, A. B., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST ELGIN: Introduced, 36 (i).
—— W. H., APPMNT. AS COL. OF CUSTOMS, ST. THOMAS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 1998 (i).
INLAND REVENUE:
INLAND REVENUE ACT, PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 1648 (i).
—— DETECTIVE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2639 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 751 (i).
DUTY-PAY, EXCISE OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 1014 (i), 4430 (ii).
TOBACCO: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4685 (ii).
—— LAW *re* MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 750 (i).
—— STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Inland Revenue further Act Amt. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°, 1469; 2° objected to, 1648; 2° and in Com., 2007; 3°*, 2172 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 22.)
Inspection. *See* "BOILER;" "STEAMBOAT."
INSPECTORS OF PORTS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 821 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr *White, Cardwell*). 1°, 40; 2°, 456 (i).
INTELLIGRNCE BUREAU, DAILY REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
ACCIDENT AT NEW GLASGOW: Remarks (Mr. *Fraser*) 3088 (ii).
—— ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Carroll*) 292 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Continued.*
ACCIDENT AT TRURO, REPS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 969 (i).
ARCHIBALD, H. D., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Patterson, Colchester*) 969 (i).
ARRANGEMENTS WITH C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 667 (i).
DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYÉS, O. C.'s: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 293 (i).
DISPOSAL TO A COMPANY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3055.
DRAKE, ALFRED, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 2490.
EMPLOYÉS, ALL GRADES, NUMBER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 969 (i).
EXPEND. UNDER INCOME FOR PERMANENT IMPROVEMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) 1371 (i).
EXPROPRIATION OF PROPERTY AT ST. JOHN: Ques. Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1031 (i).
HALIFAX, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i), 2362, 2509, 2628 (ii).
LIVE STOCK TARIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 1365 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2285.
PASSENGER CARS AND C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 399 (i).
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3896 (ii).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 41 (i), 4393 (ii).
RUNNING PRIVILEGES GRANTED C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 510 (i).
ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i), 2563 (ii).
SHIPMENT OF HAY: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4643 (ii).
STATIONERY SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1032.
TRAFFIC, &c., MULGRAVE STATION: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Fraser*) 35 (i).
——— QUINN, MICHAEL, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Guay*) 491 (i), 3332 (ii).
[*See* "RAILWAYS;" "SUBSIDIES;" "SUPPLY."]

I. C. RY., STATEMENT, EXPENSES:
Deb. in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2362, 2380, 2516, 2524, 2563; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2368, 2517; (Mr. *Perry*) 2373, 2613; (Mr. *McAlister*) 2377; (Mr. *Kenny*) 2382; (Mr. *Borden*) 2389; (Mr. *Hazen*) 2394, 2418, 2581; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2396; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2398; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2405; (Mr. *McDougald, Pictou*) 2410; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2427, 2559; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2509, 2517, 2616; (Mr. *Welsh*) 2513; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2521; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 2527; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2530, 2564, 2586, 2594, 2615; (Mr. *Gillies*) 2537; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2542; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2543; (Mr. *Weldon*) 2547; (Mr. *Dickey*) 2548; (Mr. *Flint*) 2552, 2600; (Mr. *Stairs*) 2557; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2564, 2569, 2606, 2616; (Mr. *McLeod*) 2572, 2587, 2597, 2605; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2594; (Mr. *Temple*) 2596; (Mr. *Adams*) 2598, 2611; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2599; (Mr. *Lister*) 2604 (ii).

INTERIOR:
INTERIOR DEPT., CHIEF CLERK'S SALARY: conc. in (Y. 34, N. 47) 4472 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 257, 825, 844, 1154; con., 1084 (i), 4266, 4432; conc., 4472 (ii).
BANFF SPRINGS SURVEY, &c., in Com. of Sup., 4428.
BURGESS, A. M.: Ref. in Com. of Sup., 825 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3300 (ii).
HENRY, J. K.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844 (i).
PEREIRA, L. C.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844, 849-876.
——— SALARY: Res. conc. in (Y. 86, N. 61) 1084 (i).

INTERIOR—*Continued.*
RHEAUME, ANTOINE, LAND GRANT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2490 (ii).
TURNER, H. H.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844 (i).
WHITE PINE AREAS: prop. M. for Map (Mr. *Ives*) 217.
[*See* "MOUNTED POLICE."]
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., 71 (i).
INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i); 4463 (ii).
——— EDUCATION ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4519 (ii).
JAMAICA EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
JEANNOTTE, HORMIDAS, ESQ., MEMBER FOR L'ASSOMPTION: Introduced, 3815 (ii).
JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN MATHA RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4574.
JUDICIARY OF THE PROVINCE OF QUE., REORGANIZATION: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2639 (ii).
JUKES, DR. A., MEDICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1003 (i).
JUSTICE:
ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 310, 971; conc., 1085 (i).
ADMIRALTY COURT, QUE., REGISTRAR: in Com. of Sup., 313 (i).
ALIEN LABOUR LAW, U.S. PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Langelier*) 1548 (i).
ARBITRATION *re* PROVINCIAL ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4430, 4470; conc., 4470 (ii).
BARRETT *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, SUPREME COURT JUDG'T: M. for copy (Mr. *LaRivière*) 158 (i).
——— *See* "LOGAN."
BEHRING'S SEA ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 4460; conc., 4478 (ii).
——— SEAL FISHERIES, PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 36 (i).
BULMER *vs.* THE QUEEN, LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4461 (ii).
COST OF LITIGATED MATTERS: in Com. of Sup., 4426.
CROWN PROSECUTIONS AND SUITS: prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1283 (i).
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 311 (i).
EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REPORTS: in Com. of Sup., 313, 971 (i).
JUDGES ACTING ON COMMISSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 37 (i).
JUDGES IN PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3115 (ii).
JUDGES' SALARIES, INCREASE: prop. Res. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1392 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4693 (ii).
JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 913 (i).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4393 (ii).
LOGAN *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, PLEADINGS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Watson*) 2287 (i).
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE, GOV. GEN.'S WARRANT: in Com. of Sup., 972; conc., 1085 (i).
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1085.
PAIGE, W. W., REPAYMENT OF COSTS: in Com. of Sup. 1014 (i).
PRIVY COUNCIL, COMPLAINTS TO: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1947 (i).
REFUND, SUNDRY PERSONS: in Com. of Sup., 4462 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Continued.*
SUPREME COURT, REPORTER AND LIBRARIAN: in Com. of Sup., 312 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, JUDGES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 310 (i).
WILSON, CONVICT EDWARD, PETS., &C., FOR RELEASE: M. for copies (Mr. *Armstrong*) 2642 (ii).
[*See* "PENITENTIARIES;" "SUPPLY."]
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 2619 (ii).
KAMOURASKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, ACCTS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Carroll*) 510 (i).
KENT (ONT.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
KENTVILLE (N.S.) APPMNT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1088 (i).
——— SUSPENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 3752 (ii).
KENNY, THOMAS E., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALIFAX: Introduced, 161 (i).
KEROSENE OIL, IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Campbell*) 3059 (ii).
KING'S (N.S.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Kingston Belt Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915 (i).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, CERTIFICATE *re* $32,000 PAID BANCROFT & CONNOLLY: M. for copy (Mr. *Gibson*) 2006 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2715 (ii).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
KINGSTON, NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4545 (ii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4523.
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4393 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 664 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433, 4440 (ii).
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4535 (ii).
Labour Prohibition. *See* "ALIEN."
LABRADOR, ALLEGED DISTRESS, RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4263 (ii).
LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1017, 2049; conc., 4212 (ii).
——— NEW BRIDGE AT MONTREAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 524 (i).
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4580.
Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Ross, Lisgar*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
LAKE ST. JOHN AND CHICOUTIMI RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1549 (i).
LAKE ST. JOHN RY., TRAFFIC EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261 (ii).
LAKE ST. LOUIS: in Com. of Sup., 2050 (i).
LAKE ST. PETER, FISHING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2955 (ii).
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4550.
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571.
LAMOUREAUX'S BROS'. CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 2259.
Lands, Conveyance. *See* "ORDNANCE."
Land Grants to Militia (provision) B. No. 96 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 4201; 2° and in Com., 4264; 3°, 4399 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2269 (i).
LAND OFFICE AT EDMONTON, REMOVAL: Despatch respecting, 4392 (ii).
LAND SALES IN QUEBEC CITY: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1089 (i).
LANDS SOLD, GRANTED OR LEASED IN MAN. AND N. W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 241 (i).
LAPRAIRIE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 3681 (ii).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2845 (ii).
LAVALLIÈRE BAY, DREDGING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2457 (ii).
LAROUCHE AND GAGNÉ'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 4456 (ii).
L'ASSOMPTION, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 2714 (ii).
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 752, 974 (i).
LENNOX CO. ELECTORAL LISTS, ORIGINAL, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 159 (i).
——— laid on Table, 287 (i).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
LEPAGE, J. B., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1392 (i).
LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 190 (i).
LETHBRIDGE CUSTOM HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).
LÉVIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 112 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 789, 976 (i).
——— 1ST REP. OF COM.: conc. (M.) 2826 (ii).
LIEUT. GOVERNORS' COMMISSION: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 2268 (i).
——— COMMISSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS: Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 2268 (i).
——— ASSENT: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2238 (i), 2491, 2547, 2957, 3089 (ii).
LIEUT. GOVERNOR (N.B.): Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4732 (ii).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (revival) B. No. 45 (Mr. *Fairbairn*). 1°*, 578; 2°*, 696; in Com., 1228; 3°*, 1229 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4591 (ii).
L'ISLET, APPMNT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750 (i).

L'ISLET CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
LITIGATED MATTERS, COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 4426.
LIVE STOCK RATES ON I. C. R.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 2286 (i).
LOANS, GOVT., SHORT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 137 (i).
LOBSTERS AND WHITE FISH FOR B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 751 (i).
LOBSTER FISHERIES, ON ADJNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 160 (i).
——— *See* "FISHERIES" B. 9.
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).
LOGAN *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, PLEADINGS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Watson*) 2287 (i).
LOISELLE, B., POSTMASTER, STE. ANGÈLE, DISMISSAL, PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Brodeur*) 100 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Moncrieff*). 1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
LONDON ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
——— ELLIOTT, JUDGE, CHARGES AGAINST, HOBBS', &C., PET.: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 665 (i).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Lister*) 823; M., 1719; neg. (Y. 50, N. 93) 2361; Deb. rsmd., 2305 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 52 (i).
——— ORIGINAL VOTERS' LISTS: laid on Table (Mr. *Speaker*) 72 (i).
——— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 1089 (i).
——— QUES. OF PRIV., ORIGINAL VOTERS' LISTS: M. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 37 (i).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lister*) 245 (i).
——— RETURNS: Clerk of Crown in attendance, 287.
——— ELECTORAL VOTERS' LISTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Lister*) 292 (i).
LONGUEUIL WHARF, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1231 (i).
LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE AT WORLD'S EXHIBITION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1037 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2 (Mr. (*Charlton*). 1°*, 40; 2° m., 1062; 2°, 1083; in Com., 2293; Com. rose, 2305 (i); Ms. to recom., 2431, 3090; agreed to (Y. 77, N. 50) 3091; in Com., 3363 (ii).
LOTBINIÈRE AND MEGANTIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395 (ii).
LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ans. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4585 (ii).
LOWELL, JAMES A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR WELLAND: Introduced, 2700 (ii).
LUNENBURG POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).
MACDONALD BROS., SERVICES AT WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).
MACDONALD, SIR JOHN, MONUMENT TO MEMORY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 917 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4458 (ii).
MACKENZIE, HON. ALEX., DECEASE: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) to adjn. Hse., 1388 (i).
MACLEAN, WM. F., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST YORK: Introduced, 2918 (ii).
McCARTHY, MESSRS., LEASE OF LAND AT SOREL: Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3184 (ii).
McDONALD, JOHN A., ESQ., MEMBER FOR VICTORIA N.S.: Introduced 6 (i).
McINTYRE, DISMISSAL, &C., OF POSTMASTER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1985 (i).
McKay Milling Co.'s incorp. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Robillard*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 855 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
McLENNAN, JNO. A. AND PETER. *See* "COCKBURN ISLAND."
McLENNAN, RODERICK R., ESQ., MEMBER OF GLENGARRY: Introduced 6 (i).
McMILLAN, HUGH, ESQ., MEMBER FOR VAUDREUIL: Introduced 133 (i).
McQUEEN AND DAVIE, MESSRS. *See* "BRITISH;" "TENANT FARMERS."
MARINE:
"ALERT" STR., ENQUIRY *re* ACCIDENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750, 917 (i).
"BAYFIELD," STR., SUPPLIES, ENQUIRY: in Com. of Sup. 4461 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 913 (i).
GEAR AND TACKLE INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 224 (i).
MACDONALD BROS., SERVICES AT WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4460 (ii).
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 270 (i), 4432 (ii).
MARINE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 4310 (ii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup. 4309 (ii).
"QUADRA," STR., ENQUIRY *re* ACCIDENT: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 3331 (ii).
"RIMOUSKI," STR., CHANGE OF ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3183 (ii).
SICK MARINERS' DUES, CIRCULAR ISSUED: M. for copy* (Mr. *Laurier*) 159 (i).
TIDAL OBSERVATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept. Amalg. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 109; 2° and in Com., 181; 3°*, 249 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
MAP OF DOM. *re* POLLING RETURNS AT G. E.: M. for copy (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 112 (i).
MARSHALL, JOS. H., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST MIDDLESEX: Introduced, 36 (i).
MANITOBA:
BARRETT *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, LEGAL EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2068 (ii).
BRANDON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2936.
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2269 (i).
LANDS SOLD, GRANTED OR LEASED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 241 (i).
LOGAN *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, PLEADINGS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Watson*) 2287 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL ACT, LEGAL EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 2068 (i).
"MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE," SUPREME COURT JUDG'T.: M. for copy (Mr. *LaRivière*) 158 (i).
PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 744, 973 (i).
Man. and Assiniboia Grand Junction Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 88 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 183; 2°*, 3321; in Com. and 3°*, 3511 (ii). 55-56 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 2006 ; 2°*, 2093 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2638 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

Man. and South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 245 ; 2°*, 289 ; in Com. and 3°*, 696 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396 ; in Com., 4541.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, STEAM COM. : in Com. of Sup., 4277 (ii).

MAIL CONDUCTORS SUPERANNUATED : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2699 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4470 (ii).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4277 ; conc., 4469 (ii).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED :

BAIN, JAS. WM., Esq., Soulanges, 3 (i).
BENNETT, WM. H., Esq., East Simcoe, 129 (i).
BORDEN, W. W., Esq., King's, N.S., 36 (i).
BOWERS, CHAS. ED., Esq., Digby, 7 (i).
BOYLE, ARTHUR, Esq., Monck, 454 (i).
BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ, Esq., Richelieu, 3 (i).
BRYSON, JOHN, Esq., Pontiac, 4715 (ii).
CARGILL, HENRY, Esq., East Bruce, 36 (i).
CARLING, HON. JOHN, London, 161 (i).
COULTER, N. R., Esq., Carleton, N.B., 1391 (i).
DICKEY, ARTHUR R., Esq., Cumberland, 6 (i).
DUGAS, LOUIS E., Esq., Montcalm, 161 (i).
DYER, EUGÈNE A., Esq., Brome, 161 (i).
FAIRBAIRN, CHAS., Esq., South Victoria, 3 (i).
FEATHERSTON, JOS., Esq., Peel, 3 (i).
FORBES, FRANCIS G., Esq., Queen's, N.S., 97 (i).
GIBSON, WILLIAM, Esq., Lincoln and Niagara, 3 (i).
GILLIES, JOSEPH N., Esq., Richmond, N.S., 3 (i).
GIROUARD, JOSEPH, Esq., Two Mountains, 106 (i).
GRIEVE, JAMES NICOL, Esq., North Perth, 3183 (ii).
GUILLET, GEO., West Northumberland, 454 (i).
HEARN, JOHN, Esq., West Quebec, 508 (i).
HENDERSON, DAVID, Esq., Halton 3 (i).
HUGHES, SAMUEL, Esq., North Victoria, 3 (i).
INGRAM, A. B., Esq., East Elgin, 36 (i).
JEANNOTTE, HORMIDAS, Esq., L'Assomption, 3815 (ii).
KENNY, THOMAS E., Esq., Halifax, 161 (i).
LOWELL, JAMES A., Esq., Welland, 2700 (ii).
MACLEAN, WM. F., Esq., East York, 2918 (ii).
MCDONALD, JOHN A., Esq., Victoria, N.S., 6 (i).
MCLENNAN, RODERICK R., Esq., Glengarry, 6 (i).
MCMILLAN, HUGH, Esq., Vaudreuil, 133 (i).
MARSHALL, JOS. H., Esq., East Middlesex, 3 (i).
METCALFE, JAS. H., Esq., Kingston, 3 (i).
MILLER, ARCH. C., Esq., Prince Edward, 3 (i).
NORTHRUP, WM. B., Esq., East Hastings, 3 (i).
OUIMET, HON. JOSEPH A., Esq., Laval, 3 (i).
PATTERSON, HON. JAMES C., West Huron, 161 (i).
PRIDHAM, WM., Esq., South Perth, 508 (i).
PROULX, ISIDORE, Esq., Prescott, 1364 (i).
ROSAMOND, BENNETT, Esq., North Lanark, 3 (i).
SMITH, WM., Esq., South Ontario, 40 (i).
STAIRS, JOHN FITZ-WILLIAM, Esq., Halifax, 71 (i).
TURCOTTE, A. J., Esq., Montmorency, 188 (i).
WILSON, URIAH, Esq., Lennox, 3 (i).

MEMBERS' RESIGNATION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1547 (i), 4393 (ii).

MENNONITES, ENUMERATION IN CENSUS : Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 4263 (ii).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY :

ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES, PAPERS, &C. : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 1088 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE, COMMISSIONERS' REP. : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 2917 (ii)
DUKE OF CLARENCE AND AVONDALE, REPLY TO ADDRESS OF CONDOLENCE : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 1393, 2170 (i).
ESTIMATES, THE, 1892-93 : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 138.
—— SUPPL., 1891-92 : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 822 (i)
—— SUPPL., 1892-93 : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 4265 (ii).
FAVOURED NATION CLAUSES, &C., GERMAN ZOLLVEREIN, &C., TERMINATION, &C. : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 1470 (i).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION : Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 71 (i).
NEWFOUNDLAND BAIT ACT : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 2461, 2917 (ii).
—— RECOGNITION OF LICENSES : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 245 (i).
PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC COASTS FISHERIES : Presented (Mr. *Tupper*) 667 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, HIS EX.'S REPLY : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 129 (i).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE U. S., PAPERS, &C. : Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 216 (i).

METCALFE, J. H., MEMBER FOR KINGSTOO : Introduced, 3 (i).

METEGHAN COVE PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4448 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Midland Ry. of Can. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°*, 3300 ; 2°*, 3363 ; in Com., 3771 ; 3°*, 3778 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

MIDDLESEX, E., W. AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE :

"A," "B" AND "C" BATTERIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).
ACTIVE MILITIA, DRILL, QUALIFIED OFFICERS, &C. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 667 (i).
AMMUNITION, MANUFACTURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i) ; conc., 4209 (ii).
ARMOURIES AND CARE OF ARMS : in Com. of Sup., 1349 (i).
BRIGADE MAJORS : in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
CLAIMS *re* REBELLION N. W. T. (1885) : in Com. of Sup., 1017 ; conc., 1087 (i).
CLOTHING AND OVERCOATS : in Com. of Sup., 1340 (i).
CONTINGENCIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1363 (i)
DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).
DOM. ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION : in Com. of Sup., 1363 (i).
DRILL PAY AND INSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1353 (i) ; conc., 4209 ; suppl., 4437 (ii).
DRILL SHEDS, &C., CARE AND MAINTENANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1373 (i).
FRASER, MISS H. AND MR. RODERICK, PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).
MILITARY BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF : in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
—— BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).
—— DISTRICT NO. 9, SUSPENSION OF OFFICERS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3332 (ii).
—— STORES : in Com. of Sup., 1353 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE—*Continued.*
MILITIA, 69TH BATTALION ANNUAL CAMP: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 4500 (ii).
MONUMENTS, BATTLE FIELDS OF CAN.: conc., 4210.
MURRAY, LIEUT.-COL., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3643 (ii).
PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 1415 (i).
RIFLED ORDNANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1363; conc., 4210 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
TERRITORIAL ACCOUNT, REBELLION, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).
WORSLEY, LIEUT. COL., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3643 (ii)
[*See* "GOV. GEN.'S BODY GUARD;" "SUPPLY."]
MILK CANS, INSPECTION UNDER ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 4262, 4647 (ii).
MILLER, ARCH. C., ESQ., MEMBER FOR PRINCE EDWARD: Introduced, 3 (i).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2431 (ii).
——— (LITTLE) BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 190.
MINISTERS' VISIT TO WASHINGTON, PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3239, 3398 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 333, 1228 (i).
——— *See* "WEST INDIES."
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1002, 2264 (i), 4424, 4461 (ii).
MISCOUCHE (P.E.I.) STATION, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2563 (ii).
MISSISQUOI CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
"MODUS VIVENDI," G. B. AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4728 (ii).
MOLASSES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4678 (ii).
MONCK CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges's Rep., 1 (i).
MONFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4515, 4580.
MONTCALM, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
MONTMAGNY, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
MONTMORENCY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4581 (ii).
MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. CO., PET.: M. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2482 (ii).
Montreal and Lake Maskinongé Ry. Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Beausoleil*). 1°*, 2700; 2°*, 2795; in Com. and 3°*, 3207 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)
Montreal and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 82 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*). 1°*, 2172; 2°*, 2256 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3321 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 49.)
Montreal Board of Trade B. No. 25 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)
MONTREAL CADETS. *See* "PRESENTATION FLAG."
Montreal Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 1636; 2°*, 1740 (i).
MONUMENTS, BATTLE FIELDS OF CAN.: conc., 4210 (ii).
MOOSOMIN STATION, C.P.R., TO CANNINGTON: in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
MORTON DAIRY CO.'S CLAIM: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 916 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 4423, 4463 (ii).
——— REDUCTION OF FORCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2668 (ii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4320 (ii).
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER TRAIN FERRY: conc., 4475 (ii).
MULGRAVE STATION, I.C.R., TRAFFIC, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Fraser*) 35 (i).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).
MURRAY, LIEUT. COL., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3643 (ii).
MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
NANAIMO TO COMOX TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
NATIONALITY OF THE POPULATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 824 (i).
National Mutual Loan and Building Society's B. No. 55 (Mr. *Langelier*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 1061 (i); M. to ref. Rep. back to Banking and Commerce Com., 3556; neg. (Y. 53, N. 96) 3563 (ii).
NEW BRUNSWICK:
BIG FORTUNE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4448.
BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4516 (ii).
CARLETON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 39, 1391 (i).
CHATHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2798 (ii).
DODWELL, C. E. W., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 972.
KENTVILLE POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION; Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1088 (i), 3752 (ii).
LIEUT. GOVERNORSHIP, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4732 (ii).
MAITLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4448 (ii).
METEGHAN COVE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4448 (ii).
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER TRAIN FERRY: conc., 4475 (ii).
PLAISTER ROCK ISLAND RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4514 (ii).
QUEEN'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 96 (i).
ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 988; conc., 1086 (i).
——— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4441 (ii).
——— HARBOUR COMMISSION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4398, 4493 (ii). *See* B. (No. 99).
ST. JOHN TO ST. ROSALIE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).
SHEET HARBOUR, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1032 (i).
———FEES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1032.

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Continued.*
STEWIACKE VALLEY AND MUSQUODOBOIT RY. (I.C.R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4521 (ii).
WOODSTOCK PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3480 (ii).
NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA, BONDING PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 189 (i).
—— DISCRIMINATING TARIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 454 (i).
—— ENFORCEMENT OF BAIT ACT: Mess. from His Ex., 2917 (ii).
—— EXPORTS CAN. PRODUCE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 113 (i).
—— FISHERIES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 159 (i).
—— FLOUR TRADE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Hughes*) 112.
—— IMPERIAL DESPATCHES: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 914, 1227 (i).
—— NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 825 (i), 2956 (ii).
—— PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 315, 508 (i).
—— PAPERS *re* LICENSES: Mess. from His Ex., 245.
—— PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1638 (i).
—— REGULATIONS *re* FISHING: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 134 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 3054 (ii).
—— COR.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 98 (i).
—— BAIT ACT: Mess. from His. Ex., 2461 (ii).
NEW GLASGOW IRON COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4539 (ii).
Nelson and Fort Sheppard Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 189; 2°*, 275 (i).
Niagara Falls and Queenston Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 1061 (i).
Nicola Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°*, 161; 2°*, 275; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 50.)
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4521.
NICOLET RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4449 (ii).
—— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 29 (Mr. *Coatsworth*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 695 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 51.)
NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com. 4575 (ii).
NORFOLK, N. AND S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
NORTHRUP, WM. B., ESQ., MEMBER FOR EAST HASTINGS: Introduced, 3 (i).
NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 265.
NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES. *See* "GOVERNMENT."
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. No. 61 (Mr. *Dewdney*). 1°*, 1062 (i).
N.W.T. further Act Amt. B. No. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 217 (i); 2° m., 2461; neg. (Y. 33, N. 132) 2462; M. to recom., 2483 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
ASSEMBLY, RES. AND MEMORIAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Davis*) 1551 (i).
CALGARY P.O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2938, 2941 (ii).
COURT-HOUSE AND LOCK-UPS: in Com. of Sup., 2943.
DUAL LANGUAGES IN N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3062 (ii).
EDMONTON LAND OFFICE, REMOVAL: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 4043, 4392 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2936; conc., 4467 (ii).
JUKES, DR. A., MEDICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1003 (i).
LETHBRIDGE CUSTOM HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).
MOOSOMIN STATION, C. P. R., TO CANNINGTON: in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE, REDUCTION OF FORCE: prop. Res. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2668 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 265 (i).
OLD MAN'S RIVER, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 992.
REGINA COURT HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2937.
—— GAOL: in Com. of Sup., 748, 973 (i).
SCHOOLS IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).
SETTLERS' GRIEVANCES, N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4407 (ii).
WALROND RANCH CO. AND SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 223 (i).
—— EJECTED SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1946 (i).
—— SETTLERS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).
NOVA SCOTIA, SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 811 (i).
Nova Scotia Steel and Forge Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. *Fraser*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 74.)

NOVA SCOTIA:
ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY., &C., SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Forbes*) 688 (i).
BEAR RIVER RAILWAY BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
BIG TRACADIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4252.
CHURCH POINT WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
CUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
DARTMOUTH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
DIGBY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
GUYSBOROUGH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
HALIFAX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
—— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4441 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
HALL'S HARBOUR WORKS, EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4519 (ii).
KING'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
LUNENBURG POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).
NEW GLASGOW IRON, COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4539.
ORDNANCE LANDS IN ANNAPOLIS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1364 (i).
POINT TUPPER AND SYDNEY MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2641 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*

QUEEN'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, DIGBY, TIME FOR COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).

RICHMOND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ROUND HILL PIER DAM, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2171 (i).

SANDFORD BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 398 (i).

SANDPOINT TO NEW GERMANY RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4542 (ii).

SHELBURNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 4731 (ii).

SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4534 (ii).

THREE SISTERS HARBOUR, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2489 (ii).

TRURO AND STEWIACKE TO NEWPORT, &c., RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).

VICTORIA CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

WESTPORT HARBOUR, CAN BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 399 (i).

Oaths of Office. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."

Obscene Literature, &c., Suppression B. No. 21 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 133 (i); 2° m., 2457; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com. on B. (No. 7) 2461 (ii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 992, 2033 (i), 4060; conc., 4475 (ii).

OLD MAN'S RIVER, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 992.

OLD RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Bergin*). M. to introd., 666; 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 52.)

ONTARIO:

ADDINGTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ALGOMA, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4535 (ii).

BOTHWELL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

BRACEBRIDGE AND BAYSVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4575 (ii).

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4539 (ii).

BRUCE, E. AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

CHATHAM CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1391 (i).

CHIPPEWA SHOAL, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2254 (i).

COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4516 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4546.

COCKBURN ISLAND, LOCATION TICKET OF J. A. MC LENNAN: M. for copy (Mr. *Lister*) 1980 (i).

——— PETER MCLENNAN: M. for copy* (Mr. *Lister*) 2006 (i).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

CULVERT AT STROMNESS, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2253 (i).

ELGIN, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ESSEX, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

EUGENIA, DISMISSAL, &c., OF POSTMASTER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1985 (i).

FENELON FALLS, RY. BRIDGE, AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND G. T. R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes*) 133 (i).

GLENGARRY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

GODERICH AND WINGHAM RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397: in Com., 4572 (ii).

HALDIMAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

HALTON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.

HASTINGS, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

HURON, W., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, TURNING BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 2619 (ii).

KENT CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, CERTIFICATE *re* $32,000 PAID BANCROFT & CONNOLLY: M. for copy* (Mr. *Gibson*) 2006 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2715 (ii).

——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).

——— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 664 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433, 4440 (ii).

KINGSTON, NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4523 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4545.

KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4535 (ii).

LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4580 (ii).

LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i)

LINCOLN AND NIAGARA CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4591 (ii).

LONDON CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4541 (ii).

MCINTYRE, DISMISSAL, &c., OF POSTMASTER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1985 (i).

MIDDLESEX, E., W. AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

MONCK CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4575 (ii).

NORFOLK, N. AND S., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4580 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

ONTARIO, BELMONT AND NORTHERN RY. Co's SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4516 (ii).

ONTARIO, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup, 2918 (ii).

OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. Co's SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4506 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4550 (ii).

OTTAWA POST OFFICE, &c., FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

OXFORD, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION; Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PEEL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PERTH, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1152 (i).

PERTH, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PETERBOROUGH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PETROLIA PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2919.

PICTON P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4466; in Com., 4629 (ii).

PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 2253 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PROSSER, WM., FISHERY OVERSEER, INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2490 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2954 (ii).

ST. CATHARINES AND CENTRAL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4466 (ii).

ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4537 (ii).

SIMCOE, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

SMITH'S FALLS P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2929 (ii).

SYDENHAM RIVER FLOODS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4464, 4500 (ii).

THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4541 (ii).

TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571 (ii).

VICTORIA, N. AND S., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

WATERLOO, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

WELLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1062 (i).

——— *See* general heading.

WELLINGTON, CENTRE AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

WENTWORTH, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

WHITE PINE TIMBER, MAP OF AREAS: M. for copy (Mr. *Ives*) 293 (i).

WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396 (ii).

YORK, E. AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

CHARGES AGAINST A MEMBER: Asking Ques. containing newspaper articles reflecting on a Member, checked and ruled out of order as being improper (Mr. *Speaker*) 4499 (ii).

DIPLOMATIC PAPERS: Ministers' visit to Washington referred to by Mr. *Foster* in Budget Speech; Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) raised a Ques. of Order, there being no official Rep. of negotiations before the House the same should not be discussed, 333. Ruled by Mr. *Speaker* that the Minister of Finance was in Order in referring to same, there being no Rule of Parlt. preventing him from making those statements, 334 (i).

ELLIOTT, JUDGE, CHARGES AGAINST: Mr. *Mulock's* reference to his speech *re* London Election impugning conduct of the Judge checked by Mr. *Speaker*, 69 (i); exception being taken by Sir *Richard Cartwright*, the Rule respecting the protection of Members and impeachment of Judges read, 70 (i).

HOBBS, S.T., AND OTHERS, PET.: M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) to forward same to Judge Elliott, objected to by Sir *John Thompson* and ruled out of Order, 823 (i).

INTERRUPTIONS BY MEMBERS: In Deb. on Representation B., on objection Mr. *Speaker* ruled "When a Member is speaking no Member shall interrupt, except to Order," 3615 (ii).

IRRELEVANCY OF DEBATE: In Com. of Sup., Members called to Order and requested by Mr. *Chairman* to confine themselves to the item before the Chair, 1499 (i), 2922, 2932, 3664 (ii).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: In Deb. on Representation B., the Member for North Victoria took exception to remarks made by the Member for North Wellington; explanation objected to by Mr. *Charlton*, the Member having already spoken. Rule read by Mr. *Speaker* and Member allowed to proceed on M. for adjmnt., 3542 (ii).

REPRESENTATION B.: On M. for 2°, Member requested by Mr. *Speaker* to confine himself to Question before the House, 3663; reference to a previous debate a violation of the Rules (Mr. *Speaker*) 3664 (ii).

PRIVILEGE:

CARON, SIR ADOLPHE, CHARGES AGAINST: M. (Mr. *Edgar*) with unanimous consent of the House to refer to Com. on Priv. and Elec., objected to by Sir *John Thompson* and sustained by Mr. *Speaker*; there being no question of urgency it cannot be taken out of its place on the Notice Paper, 1035 (i).

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S BODY GUARD; Affidavits *re* Pay-List; personal explanation (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1319 (i).

NORTH PERTH ELECTION: Reference having been made by the Member for Lambton to the Secretary of State's visit to that constituency, the same was denied by Mr. *Patterson* (*Huron*) 3055 (ii). Further discussion stopped by Mr. *Speaker*, there being no motion before the Chair; Member allowed to proceed on M. for adjmnt., 3056 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c.—*Continued.*
PRIVILEGE—*Continued.*
LONDON ELECTION: Mr. *Lister's* M. ordering Clerk of Crown to attend with certain papers, &c., respecting the London Election, as a Ques. of Priv. ruled by Mr. *Speaker* in Order; but M. calling for certain other papers ought to be moved when reached in its proper Order on Notice Paper, 246, 248; further ruling and authorities quoted, 287 (i).
OTTAWA TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL: Res. published in *Free Press* censuring the Member for South Norfolk brought to the attention of the House, and the language imputed to have been used therein repudiated by Mr. *Tisdale*, 2561 (ii).
PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. B.: Attention of House called by Mr. *Murray* to a paragraph in the Ottawa *Citizen* reflecting on him as a Member of the House, 2229 (i).
PROCEDURE:
DEBATES, OFFICIAL: on 2nd Rep. of Com., Amt. (Mr. *Wallace*) to ref. back to Com. if carried would supersede the M. for adoption (Mr. *Speaker*) 4598 (ii).
CANADIAN WHITE PINE: Mr. *Ives'* M. for map showing areas; Mr. *Speaker* stated that the Rules of the House should not be violated, even with unanimous consent, 217 (i).
ELLIOTT, JUDGE: Pet. of T. S. Hobbs and others impugning character. Mr. *Lister* moved its reception and reading; Mr. *Speaker* ruled that it not being a question of urgency the House would not be justified in passing it, 665. M. to print Pet. ruled out of Order, the same not having been received; reference should also be made to the Printing Committee for authority, 666 (i).
LIEUT. GOVERNOR'S INSTRUCTIONS: Presentation of Documents. Attention of House called by Mr. *Speaker* to the Rule respecting the same, 2268.
MOTIONS STANDING IN OTHER MEMBERS' NAMES: on Mr. *Macdonald* (*Huron*) moving for Mr. *Campbell* a motion in reference to Imports of Coal Oil, &c., Mr. *Speaker* drew attention to the Rule that no discussion can take place except with general consent of the House, 3059 (ii).
NOTICES OF MOTION: On Motion being allowed to stand at the request of the Govt., Mr. *Casey* called attention to the Rule which requires that Motions should be dropped unless gone on when called, 1550 (i).
N. W. T. ACT AMT. B. 27 (Mr. *McCarthy*): on M. to restore to Order Paper for 2°, the 2° having been previously voted on and negatived, ruled by Mr. *Speaker* in Order; M. to withdraw M. objected to; Rule laid down by Bourinot relating to same read by Mr. *Speaker*, 2486 (ii).
ORDNANCE LANDS IN ANNAPOLIS; Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1364 (i).
Ordnance Lands (Toronto) Conveyance B. No. 58 (Mr. *Dewdney*). Res. prop., 129; in Com., 174; 1°*, 825; 2°*, 1491; in Com., 1639; 3°*, 1642 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 7.)
ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).
OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4506 (ii).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4550 (ii).
Ottawa City Passenger Ry. Co.'s B. No. 16 (Mr. *Robillard*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134 (i); in Com., 2939; 3°*, 2940 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
OTTAWA DEPTL. BUILDINGS, HEATING: conc., 4477 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT FOR ROOFING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4601 (ii).
Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. Co.'s (revival) B. No. 77 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 1946; 2°, 2093 (i).
OTTAWA POST OFFICE, &c., FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
——— RIVER DREDGING, COST, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 926 (i).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 59 (Mr. *McMillan, Vaudreuil*). 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1062 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4230 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
Ottawa, Waddington and New York Ry. and Bridge (revival) B. No. 68 (Mr. *Ross, Dundas*). 1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1497; in Com. and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
OUIMET, HON. JOSEPH A., MEMBER FOR LAVAL: Introduced, 3 (i).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4437; conc., 4475 (ii).
OXFORD, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC COAST FISHERIES: Mess. from His Ex., 667 (i).
PAIGE, W. W., REPAYMENT OF COSTS: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
PARLIAMENT, 7TH, 2ND SESSION: Opening, 1 (i); Prorogation, 4736 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. *Carling*). 1°*, 3300; 2°, 3729; in Com., 4215 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
Patent Relief. *See* "WELSBACH, C. A. VON."
PATTERSON, HON. JAS. C., MEMBER FOR WEST HURON: Introduced, 161 (i).
PAYNE, J. L., PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1548 (i).
PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 736, 972 (i), 4433; conc., 4205 (ii).
——— KINGSTON COAL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4393 (ii).
——— REP.: presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 397 (i).
PEREIRA, L. C.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844, 849, 896.
——— SALARY: Item conc. in (Y. 86, N. 61) 1084 (i).
PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 1415 (i).
PERTH, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1152 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1639.
PERTH, S., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
PETROLEUM, CRUDE, REDUCTION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 1946 (i).
PETROLIA PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2919.

PHILIPSBURG JUNCTION RY. AND QUARRY CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4592 (ii).

PICTON P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., P.E.I., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).

——— REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 108; 2°, 173; in Com., 970; 3°*, 1090 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 20.)

PINSONNEAULT, ALFRED, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 749 (i).

PLAISTER ROCK ISLAND RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4514 (ii).

POINT TUPPER AND SYDNEY MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 2641 (ii).

POLICE. *See* "DOMINION" and "MOUNTED."

PONTIAC CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 2461 (ii).

——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3115 (ii).

——— COUNTY, RY. DEBT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Murray*) 1968 (i).

——— AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY, FURTHER SUBSIDY: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Murray*) 917 (i).

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *Murray*). 1°*, 1153; 2°*, 1230; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 56.)

——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4467; in Com., 4629 (ii).

POPULATION OF ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2700 (ii).

PORK. *See* "IMPORTS."

PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4466; in Com., 4629 (ii).

PORT HAWKESBURY QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2033 (i).

PORTS (QUARANTINE) UNORGANIZED: in Com. of Sup., 2049 (i).

POSTAL SERVICE (N.S.) IMPERFECT: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 4398 (ii).

POST OFFICE:

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1231.

——— SUNDAY TRAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3184.

CAP ST. IGNACE STATION, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 223, 290, 751 (i).

——— P. O.*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Choquette*) 1555 (i), 2667 (ii).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1364.

DES AULNETS P. O., MANAGEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750 (i).

DRUMMOND COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Léduc*) 289 (i).

HULL P. O., OPENING ON SUNDAY: Ques. (Mr. *Devlin*) 3184 (ii).

LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 190 (i).

LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ans. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4585 (ii).

MAIL CONDUCTORS SUPERANNUATED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2699 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE: conc., 4470 (ii).

POSTAL SERVICE (N.S.) IMPERFECT: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 4398 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Continued.*

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 2954 (ii).

STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, PETS., &c. *re* DISMISSAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Brodeur*) 100 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4645 (ii).

ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER, MONEY DEPOSITS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 400 (i).

SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).

SUMMERSTOWN (ONT.) POST OFFICE, RECEIPTS: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1365 (i).

[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS;" "SUPPLY."]

POST OFFICES:

Deb. in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2743, 2768; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 2743, 2768, 2798, 2802, 2859, 2868, 2890, 2894; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2743, 2775; (Mr. *Stairs*) 2746; (Mr. *Flint*) 2747, 2770, 2845, 2890; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2748, 2881; (Mr. *Devlin*) 2749, 2816, 2892, 2899; (Mr. *Borden*) 2750, 2769, 2902; (Mr. *Bowers*) 2751, 2769; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2752, 2798, 2812; (Mr. *Lister*) 2756, 2772, 2870, 2894; (Mr. *Weldon*) 2759; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2759, 2810, 2871, 2890, 2896; (Mr. *Casey*) 2760, 2768, 2806, 2888, 2911; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2764, 2892; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2770; (Mr. *Forbes*) 2773; (Mr. *Macdonell, Algoma*) 2776, 2884; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2798, 2802, 2890, 2894, 2905; (Mr. *Scriver*) 2803; (Mr. *Somerville*) 2804; (Mr. *Monet*) 2806; (Mr. *Choquette*) 2803, 2853; (Mr. *Delisle*) 2814; (Mr. *Guay*) 2815; (Mr. *Langelier*) 2816; (Mr. *Foster*) 2818, 2895, 2905; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2820; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 2821; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2824; (Mr. *Fauvel*) 2824; (Mr. *Perry*) 2825; (Mr. *Leduc*) 2850; (Mr. *Pelletier*) 2851; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 2856; (Mr. *Dupont*) 2857; (Mr. *Legris*) 2861; (Mr. *Allan*) 2862; (Mr. *Brown*) 2866; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2869, 2891, 2915; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 2876; (Mr. *Mc Millan, Huron*) 2877; (Mr. *Corby*) 2880; (Mr. *Gibson*) 2883; (Mr. *Rider*) 2893; (Mr. *Fairbairn*) 2898; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2902; (Mr. *Ingram*) 2912; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2913 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1555; Amt. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1623; neg. (Y. 64, N. 98) 1634; Res. agreed to (Y. 97, N. 63) 1635 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1555; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 1571; (Mr. *Hazen*) 1578; (Mr. *Skinner*) 1585; (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*) 1594; (Mr. *Watson*) 1600; (Mr. *Davin*) 1604; (Mr. *Kenny*) 1606; (Mr. *Foster*) 1608; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) Amt. 1623 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Sir *John Thompson*) 1623; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1629; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 1632 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2492 (ii).

PRESENTATION FLAG, REMISSION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 509 (i).

PRIDHAM, WM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR S. PERTH: Introduced, 508 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

PRINCE (P. E. I.) CONTPOVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).

P. E. I. RY., DISMISSED EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 2004 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

BREAKWATERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Continued.*
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, REP. *re* BLASTING: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 2268 (i).
GAUDET, BENJ., WHARFINGER AT TIGNISH: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).
LIEUT. GOV., P.E.I., Assent: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E.I.*) 2491, 2957 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 2238 (i), 2547, 2957, 3089 (ii).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
—— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2431 (ii).
—— (LITTLE) BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 190 (i).
MISCOUCHE STATION, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2563 (ii).
PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).
PRINCE CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
P.E.I. RY., DISMISSED EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 2004 (i).
QUEEN'S CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1.
ROBERTSON, JOHN F., CLAIM *re* ACCIDENT ON P.E.I. RY.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P. E.I.*) 1367 (i).
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P.E.I., AND MAINLAND: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 403 (i).
SUMMERSIDE AND RICHMOND BAY RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
TIGNISH WHARFINGER, FEES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).
TUNNEL BETWEEN P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98, 403 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 1471 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 256, 912 (i); conc., 4204 (ii).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3734.
PRINTING BUREAU PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
—— SALE OF TYPE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2954 (ii).
—— COM.: List of Members, 104 (i).
—— JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 112 (i).
—— 5TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 2171 (i).
—— 8TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 3643 (ii).
—— 11TH REP.: conc., M. (Mr. *Bergin*) 4693 (ii).
—— PAPER AND BINDING: in Com. of Sup., 794, 976.
—— *See* "ENGRAVING."
PRIVATE BILLS, MISCELLANEOUS, COM.: List of Members, 103 (i).
—— M. to introd. objected to, 666 (i).
—— PETS., RECEPTION: M. to extend time (Sir *John Thompson*) 72 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 454 (i).
—— PRESENTATION, EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 823 (i).
—— RECEIVING PETS.: M. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 970 (i).
—— REPS. FROM COM., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Denison*) 3564 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 3815 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 4214 (ii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM.: List of Members, 101 (i).
PRIVILEGE. *See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c."
PRIVY COUNCIL, APPLICATIONS TO RY. COM. FOR ADJUDICATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1950 (i).
—— COMPLAINTS TO RY. COM.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1947 (i).
—— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 255 (i), 4433, 4440 (ii).
PROCEDURE. *See* "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, &c."
PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC, MEMBERS OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2172 (i).
—— PETITIONS PRESENTED, SESSION 1891: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Fraser*) 100 (i).
PROHIBITION, PLEBISCITE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2646 (ii).
Deb.: (Mr. *Charlton*) 2646, 2664; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2652; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2654; (Mr. *Dickey*) 2654; (Mr. *Curran*) 2655; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2656; (Mr. *Casey*) 2657; (Mr. *Christie*) 2660; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2660; (Mr. *Foster*) 2661; (Mr. *Scriver*) 2666; (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2673, 2698; (Mr. *Watson*) 2678; (Mr. *Perry*) 2681; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2684; (Sir *John Thompson*) 2685; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2686; (Mr. *Bowell*) 2689; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2694; (Mr. *McGregor*) 2697; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2699 (ii).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Acting Sec., 4731 (ii).
PROSSER, WM., FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Allan*) 3114 (ii).
—— INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Allan*) 2490 (ii).
PROTECTION VESSELS: in Com. of Sup., 4319 (ii).
PROULX, ISIDORE, ESQ., MEMBER FOR PRESCOTT: Introduced, 1364 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS. COM.: List of Members, 104 (i).
PUBLIC ACCTS. OF CAN.: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. *Wallace*) 188 (i).
—— Presented (Mr. *Foster*) 37 (i).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS. *See* "DOMINION."
PUBLIC DEBT COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1090 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS:
ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
BANCROFT & CONNOLLY. *See* "KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK."
BEAR RIVER (N.S.) RAILWAY BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, ENGINEERS' REP., &c., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (i).
BREAKWATERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., P. E. I., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).
BRIDGE OVER RICHELIEU RIVER AT SOREL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).
CACOUNA PIER, EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 137.
CANALS, HARBOURS, DOCKS, &c., CONTRACTS FOR ENLARGEMENT, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 417 (i).
CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2617.
CAP ST. IGNACE STATION, NEW P.O.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2667 (ii).
CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, REP. *re* BLASTING: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 2268 (ii).
CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4457 (ii).
COBOURG CUSTOMS, &c., BUILDING, LEASE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1366 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
CONTRACTS. *See* "GOVT."
COTEAU, OVERFLOW OF LAND: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 914 (i).
CULBUTE CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 927 (i).
CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1393 (i).
DOM. BUILDINGS IN CAN., ELECTRIC LIGHTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 417 (i).
DREDGING OTTAWA BETWEEN PEMBROKE AND DES JOACHIMS: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 926 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4258, 4456 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i), 4254 (ii).
EDMONTON CROWN LANDS OFFICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4467 (ii).
EATONVILLE HARBOUR, TOTAL EXPEND.: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2641 (ii).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4439.
——— MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
——— PROP. FORTIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 222 (i).
GALOPS RAPIDS, SURVEY FOR DEEPENING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Reid*) 130 (i).
GAMBLE & FLETCHER, COR. *re* PUB. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 1550 (i).
GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 4242 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY SURVEY: conc., 4470 (ii).
GOVT. CONTRACTS SINCE CONFDN.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 99; wthdn., 110 (i).
——— SINCE 30TH JUNE, 1887, TO 30TH JUNE, 1891: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 110 (i).
GROUNDS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).
HALL'S HARBOUR (N. S.) WORKS, EXAMINATION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1715 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 4247, 4448, 4477 (ii).
HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4241; conc., 4477 (ii).
KAMOURASKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, ACCTS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Carroll*) 510 (i).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, CERTIFICATE *re* $32,000 PAID BANCROFT & CONNOLLY: M. for copy (Mr. *Gibson*) 2006 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, NEW BRIDGE AT MONTREAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 524 (i).
LAVALLIÈRE BAY, DREDGING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2457 (ii).
LONGUEUIL WHARF, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1231 (i).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 4463; conc., 4468 (ii).
MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 2431 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 190 (i).
OTTAWA DEPTL. BUILDINGS, HEATING: in Com. of Sup., 4477 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT FOR ROOFING: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 4601 (ii).
OTTAWA RIVER DREDGING, COST, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Murray*) 926 (i).
PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., P. E. I., GOVT. EXPEND.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Perry*) 233 (i).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS. *See* "DOMINION."
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 271 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1090 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Continued.*
RAQUETTE PIER, DIGBY, (N.S.) TIME FOR COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP P. O., WORKMEN'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3238 (ii).
——— (FRASERVILLE): in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU SUD PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2699 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4656 (ii).
ROUND HILL PIER DAM, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2171 (i).
ST. MAURICE PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3564 (ii).
ST. RAYMOND P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 37 (i).
SANDFORD BREAKWATER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 398 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2954 (ii).
——— LOWEST TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261.
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEERS' REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191, 224 (i).
——— TENDERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 128.
STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4463 (ii).
SYDENHAM RIVER FLOODS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4464, 4500 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINE, B. C. AND N. S., COST: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3897 (ii).
TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4245 (ii).
THREE SISTERS HARBOUR, (N.S.) TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2489 (ii).
WOODSTOCK, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3480 (ii).
YAMASKA RIVER LOCK, NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2171 (i).
——— LOSSES THROUGH ERECTION OF DAM: M. for Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1985 (i).
——— WORKS, TOTAL COST: (Mr. *Mignault*) 1714 (i).
[*See* "PROVINCES;" "SUPPLY," &c.]
"QUADRA," STR., ENQUIRY *re* ACCIDENT: Ques. (Mr. *Corbould*) 3331 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 57.)

QUARANTINE:
BRITISH COLUMBIA: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1547 (i).
CANADIAN CATTLE IN ENG.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 249 (i).
CATTLE DISEASE: in Com. of Sup., 987, 2033 (i).
——— INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 992, 2033 (i).
——— LIVE, ADMISSION FROM U. S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).
GROSSE ISLE: in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2033 (i).
HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY: in Com. of Sup., 2033 (i).
ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).
UNORGANIZED PORTS: in Com. of Sup., 2049 (i).
VICTORIA, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).

Quebec Harbour and River Police (repeal) B. No. 66 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 1225 (i); B. wthdn., 4482 (ii).

QUEBEC :
"ALERT," STR., ENQUIRY *re* LOSS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750, 917 (i).
BERTHIER (MONTMAGNY) P. O., MANAGEMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
BIC, COLLECTOR AT WHARF, SALARY, &c. : Ques.(Mr. *Langelier*) 2638 (ii).
BOUNDARIES of QUEBEC PROV. : Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 99 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 115 (i).
BRIDGE OVER RICHELIEU RIVER AT SOREL : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).
BROME CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1.
CACOUNA PIER, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr *Laurier*) 137 (i).
CAMERON, D. M., EMPLYMNT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2639 (ii).
CAP. ST. IGNACE POST OFFICE, OPENING : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 290, 223, 751 (i).
—— NEW P.O. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2667 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 1555 (i).
CAPE TORMENTE AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395 ; in Com., 4524 (ii).
CHAMPLAIN CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
CHARLEVOIX CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep. 6 (i).
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 2971, 2979 (ii).
COTEAU, OVERFLOW OF LAND : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 914 (i).
DAIRIES AND CHEESE FACTORIES, PROV. OF QUE. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2781 (ii).
DE LA RONDE, LATE PIERRE A. DENIS, PAPERS, &c., *re* SUCCESSION : M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2286.
DRUMMOND CO. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4644 ; conc., 4657 (ii).
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO., ENGINEER'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 915 (i).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 2801 (ii).
JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN MATHA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397 ; in Com., 4574 (ii).
JUDICIARY OF THE PROV. OF QUE., REORGANIZATION : Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2639 (ii).
KAMOURASKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, ACCTS., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Carroll*) 510 (i).
LAKE ST. JOHN AND CHICOUTIMI RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1549 (i).
LAKE ST. PETER, FISHING PRIVILEGES : Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 2955 (ii).
LAKE TÉMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396 ; in Com., 4550 (ii).
—— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397 ; in Com., 4571.
LAMOUREAUX BROS.' CLAIM : in Com. of Sup., 2259 (i).
LAND SALES IN QUEBEC CITY : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1089 (i).
LAPRAIRIE CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 3681 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2845 (ii).
LAVALLIÈRE BAY, DREDGING : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2457 (ii).
LAROUCHE AND GAGNÉ'S CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 4456 (ii).
L'ASSOMPTION CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 2714 (ii).
LÉVIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
L'ISLET, APPMNT. OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 750 (i).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
L'ISLET CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep. 1 (i).
LONGUEUIL WHARF, EXPEND. : Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1231 (i).
LOTBINIÈRE AND MEGANTIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395 (ii).
—— COUNTY MAIL SERVICE : Ans. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4585 (ii).
MCCARTHY, MESSRS., LEASE OF LAND AT SOREL : Ques. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 3184 (ii).
MISSISQUOI CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
MONFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394 ; in Com., 4515, 4580 (ii).
MONTCALM CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
MONTMAGNY, POSTMASTER : Ques.(Mr. *Choquette*)2638.
MONTMORENCY CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (1).
MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394 ; in Com., 4581 (ii).
MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. CO. : Pet. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2482 (ii).
NAPIERVILLE CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
NICOLET CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1.
—— RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 4449 (ii).
OTTAWA RIVER (MRS. N. GUINDON) : in Com. of Sup., 4450 (ii).
PINSONNEAULT, ALFRED, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 749 (i).
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY., FURTHER SUBSIDY : M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. *Murray*) 917 (i).
—— CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 2461.
—— PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4467 ; in Com., 4629 (ii).
—— COUNTY RY. DEBT : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Murray*) 1968 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4467 ; in Com., 4630 (ii).
QUEBEC AND POINTE AUX TREMBLES MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1366 (i).
—— CENTRE CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
—— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
—— HARBOUR AND RIVER WORKS, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
—— LEGISLATURE, SITTINGS, LEGAL : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3644 (ii).
QUINN, MICHAEL, EVIDENCE *re* DISMISSAL : M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 401 (i).
RAILWAY BRIDGE AT QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 291 (i).
RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RY. CO'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395 ; in Com., 4525 (ii).
RICHELIEU CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER, BRIDGE AT SOREL : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).
RICHMOND P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 2890 (ii).
RIMOUSKI CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP (FRASERVILLE) P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
—— WORKMEN'S CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3238 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Continued.*
RIVIÈRE DU SUD WORKS: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4656 (ii).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2699 (ii).
ROSS, HON. J. G., REFUND TO REPRESENTATIVES: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, PETS, &c., *re* DISMISSAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Brodeur*) 100 (i).
—— DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4645 (ii).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 2954 (ii).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
STE. LOUISE (L'ISLET) POSTMASTER, ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2431 (ii).
ST. FLAVIE AND LITTLE MÉTIS TO MATANE, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4577 (ii).
ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. Co's SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4545 (ii).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS RY. ACCIDENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Carroll*) 292 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. Co'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4297: in Com., 4579 (ii).
ST. HENRI P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 2889 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. Co.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4045; conc., 4507 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER RY. BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1549 (i).
—— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2619 (ii).
ST. MAURICE PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3564 (ii).
ST. PLACIDE TO ST. ANDREW'S RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525, 4533 (ii).
ST. RAYMOND P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 37 (i).
ST. RÉMI TO ST. CYPRIEN RY. Co.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4582 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 736, 972, 990 (i), 2889 (ii).
SOULANGES CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
STADACONA P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 222 (i).
TEMISCOUATA CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
TEMISCOUATA RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4552 (ii).
—— CONC.: Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667 (ii).
THREE RIVERS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1788 (i).
VALLÉE, MR. J. S., POSTMASTER, MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
VAUDREUIL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
WEST FARNHAM P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
YALE ESTATE CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
YAMASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
—— LOCK NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2171.
—— LOSSES THROUGH ERECTION OF DAM: M. for Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1985 (i).
—— WORKS, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1714 (i).

[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS," "SUPPLY," &c.]

QUEEN'S (N.B.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 96 (i).
—— (N.S.): Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
—— (P.E.I.): Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
QUINN, MICHAEL, EVIDENCE *re* DISMISSAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Guay*) 401 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 84 (Mr. *Haggart*). 1°, 2488; 2°* and in Com., 4481; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 4603; neg. (Y. 20, N. 128) and 3° of B. 4628 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 27.)
RYS. AND CANALS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Haggart*) 1062 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 273, 286 (i), 4440 (ii).
RY. BRIDGE at QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 291.
RYS., CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES: List of Members, 102 (i).
RY. COMMITTEE. *See* "PRIVY COUNCIL."
RY. STATISTICS; DELAY IN PRESENTING: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3185 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3398 (ii).
RY. SUBSIDIES: Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. on a div., 4728 (ii).
Ry. Works (Toronto) B. No. 18 (Mr. *Denison*). 1°*, 129; 2°*, 134; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 61.)
RAILWAYS:
ARPIN, MR., CHARGES FOR DEMURRAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4643 (ii).
CAPE BRETON RY., CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).
—— TERMINAL ACCOMMODATION; Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1549 (i).
C. P. R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 399 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 987, 2264 (i), 4438 (ii).
—— NORTH SHORE SECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 3480 (ii).
—— PASSENGER CARS AND I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 399 (i),
—— RUNNING PRIVILEGES OVER I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 510 (i).
EXTRA CLERKS, &c., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4439.
GOVT. RYS., ADDITIONAL PROPERTY ACCOMMODATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1984 (i).
—— NAMES, &c., OF EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 41, 692 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
LAKE ST. JOHN RY., TRAFFIC EARNINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261 (ii).
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY. CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4437: conc., 4475 (ii).
P. E. I. RAILWAY, DISMISSED EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 2004 (i).
PRIVY COUNCIL APPLICATIONS TO RY. COM. FOR ADJUDICATION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1950 (i).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS OF RYS.: in Com of Sup., 2264 (i).
WINDSOR BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 2629 (ii).

See also:
ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
B. C. SOUTHERN RY. CO.
BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
BUCKINGHAM AND LIÈVRE RY. CO.

RAILWAYS—*Continued.*
CANADA ATLANTIC RY. CO.
CANADA SOUTHERN RY. CO.
CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.
CANSO AND LOUISBURG RY. CO.
CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
GOVERNMENT RYS.
GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.
KINGSTON BELT LINE RY. CO.
LAKE MANITOBA RY. AND CANAL CO.
LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.
LONDON AND PORT STANLEY RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND ASSINIBOIA GRAND JUNCTION RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
MANITOBA AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
MIDLAND RY. OF CANADA CO.
MONTREAL AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. CO.
MONTREAL ISLAND RY. CO.
NELSON AND PORT SHEPPARD RY. CO.
NIAGARA FALLS AND QUEENSTON RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
NICOLET VALLEY RY. CO.
NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.
ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.
OTTAWA, MORRISBURGH AND NEW YORK RY. CO.
OTTAWA VALLEY RY. CO.
OTTAWA, WADDINGTON AND NEW YORK RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE, &C., RAILROAD AND STEAMBOAT CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. JOHN AND MAINE RY. CO. AND N. B. RY. CO.
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. CO. AND C. P. R.
WINNIPEG AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. CO.
[*See* "SUBSIDIES," "SUPPLY," &c.]

RAPIDE PLAT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).

RAQUETTE PIER, DIGBY (N.S.) TIME FOR COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 398 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).

RATES, TAXES, INSURANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 896; conc., 1085 (i).

REFUND, SUNDRY PERSONS: in Com. of Sup., 4462 (ii).

REGINA COURT HOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2937 (ii).

REGINA COAL: in Com. of Sup., 748, 973 (i).

REPAIRS, FURNITURE, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4240 (ii).

REPAIRS, &C., MARITIME PROVINCES: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:
AGRICULTURE: (Mr. *Carling*) 1062 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL: (Mr. *Foster*) 188 (i).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR, PROF. SAUNDERS': (Mr. *Foster*) 71 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS' REP.: (Mr. *Foster*) 751 (i).
FISHERIES: (Mr. *Tupper*) 3237 (ii).
GEOLOGICAL REPORT,: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 2172 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 112 (i).
INLAND REVENUE: (Mr. *Costigan*) 751 (i).
INTERIOR: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 3300 (ii).
MARINE: (Mr. *Tupper*) 913 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE: (Mr. *Dewdney*) 4320 (ii).
PENITENTIARIES: (Sir *John Thompson*) 397 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED—*Continued.*
POSTMASTER GENERAL: (Mr. *Haggart*) 1364 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY: (Mr. *Patterson, Huron*) 3734 (ii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: (Mr. *Foster*) 37 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS: (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1393 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS: (Mr. *Haggart*) 1062 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: (Mr. *Bowell*) 37.

Representation in H. of C. B. No. 76 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1° m., 1855; 1°, 1874 (i); 2° m., 3116; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3129; deb. rsmd., 3186, 3239; Amt. neg. (Y. 58, N. 109) 3298; 2° m., 3398; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3414; deb. rsmd., 3480. 3566; neg. (Y. 62, N. 109) 3636; deb. rsmd. on M. for 2°, 3649; Amt. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3665; deb. rsmd., 3682; neg. (Y. 60, N. 95) 3717; 2° agreed to (Y. 97, N. 60) 3718; in Com., 3720, 3753, 3778, 3820, 3898, 3966, 4043, 4143, 4321; 3° m., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4329; neg. (Y. 51, N. 90) 4334; Amt. (Mr. *Yeo*) 4335; neg. (Y. 54, N. 87) 4335; Amt. (Mr. *Béchard*) 4336; neg. (Y. 54, N. 89) 4341; Amt. (Mr. *Pelletier*) neg. and 3° of B., 4343 (ii). (55–56 *Vic., c.* 11.)

Deb. on M. for 1° (Sir *John Thompson*) 1855; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1858; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1858, 1871; (Mr. *Colter*) 1858; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1866; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 1861; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1862; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1863; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1864; (Mr. *Watson*) 1865; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 1867; (Mr. *Barnard*) 1871 (i).

Deb. on M. for 2° (Mr. *Laurier*) 3116; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3129 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 3130; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3136; (Mr. *Devlin*) 3147; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3151; (Mr. *Perry*) 3157; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3160; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3164; (Mr. *Béchard*) 3174; (Mr. *Choquette*) 3186; (Mr. *Dupont*) 3192; (Mr. *Rinfret*) 3201; (Mr. *Desjardins, L'Islet*) 3205; (Mr. *Monet*) 3223; (Mr. *Leduc*) 3229; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3233; (Mr. *Edwards*) 3234; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3239; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3247; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3262; (Mr. *Davin*) 3279; (Mr. *Campbell*) 3286; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3295; (Mr. *McCarthy*) Amt., 3319, 3414, 3472 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Dickey*) 3414; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3425; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3436; (Mr. *Casey*) 3441; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 3442; (Mr. *Masson*) 3449; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 3454; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3459; (Mr. *Weldon*) 3464; (Mr. *Davin*) 3472; (Mr. *Flint*) 3481; (Mr. *Hughes*) 3493, 3541; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3499, 3545; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3516; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3528; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 3545; (Mr. *Semple*) 3550; (Mr. *Boyle*) 3566; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 3577; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 3590; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3595; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3603; (Mr. *Lister*) 3612; (Mr. *Montague*) 3618; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 3620; (Mr. *Edwards*) 3630; (Mr. *Christie*) 3634; (Mr. *Somerville*) 3649; Amt., 3665 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Allan*) 3665; (Mr. *Dawson*) 3675; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3682; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3697; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 3705; (Mr. *Yeo*) 3707; (Mr. *McLean, P.E.I.*) 3711; (Mr. *Perry*) 3713 (ii).

Deb. in Com. on section 1—The Dominion (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3720; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3721; (Mr. *Mara*) 3725; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3725; (Mr. *Laurier*) 3727; (Mr. *Corbould*) 3727; (Mr. *Gordon*) 3728 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B.—*Continued.*

Deb. on section 2—Electoral Districts (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 3753; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 3754; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3756, 3898, 3920; (Mr *McMullen*) 3762, 3778, 3878, 3906, 3933; (Mr. *Edwards*) 3780; (Mr. *Boyle*) 3780, 3862; (Sir *John Thompson*) 3781, 3790; (Mr. *Laurier*) 3782; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3785, 3789; (Mr. *Haggart*) 3787, 3949; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 3796, 3876, 3937; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3804; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3806; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3808; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3811, 3838, 3916; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3820, 3849; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3838; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3839, 3891, 3929, 3949; (Mr. *Edgar*) 3857; (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3864; (Mr. *Bowman*) 3869; (Mr. *Weldon*) 3872, 3913; (Mr. *Somerville*) 3879; (Mr. *Campbell*) 3882; (Mr. *Lovell*) 3889; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3893, 3951; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 3915; (Mr. *Montague*) 3919, 3939; (Mr. *Bowell*) 3924; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 3924, 3957; (Mr. *Somerville*) 3936; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 3937, 3956; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3940; (Mr. *Boyle*) 3944; (Mr. *McKay*) 3945; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 3946, 3950; (Mr. *Denison*) 3962, 4074; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3964; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 4070; (Mr. *Coatsworth*) 4073; (Mr. *Maclean, (East York)* 4074 (ii).

Deb. on section 2, sub-section 3—Quebec (Mr. *Laurier*) 3966, 4020; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 3973, 4021, 4050, 4102; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 3978, 4025, 4053; (Mr. *Béchard*) 3992, 4042, 4093; (Mr. *Jeannotte*) 3999, 4027; (Mr. *Choquette*) 4001, 4099; (Sir *John Thompson*) 4002, 4048, 4075; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4007, 4023, 4051; (Mr. *Davin*) 4011; (Mr. *Devlin*) 4018; (Mr. *Chapleau*) 4028, 4034, 4094; (Mr. *Curran*) 4030; (Mr. *Brown*) 4032; (Mr. *Scriver*) 4034, 4041, 4100; (Mr. *Monet*) 4038; (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 4044; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4047, 4098; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4048; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4054, 4061; (Mr. *Bernier*) 4056, 4066; (Mr. *Baker*) 4095; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4102; (Mr. *Desaulniers*) 4104 (ii).

Deb. on section 4—Nova Scotia (Mr. *Forbes*) 4075, 4087; (Mr. *Gillies*) 4079; (Mr. *Borden*) 4082; (Sir *John Thompson*) 4084 (ii).

Deb. on section 6—Prince Edward Island (Mr. *Welsh*) 4106; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 4109, 4119, 4146, 4184; (Sir *John Thompson*) 4114, 4118, 4184, 4193, 4198; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 4123; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4121, 4172; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4125; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 4127, 4189; (Mr. *Perry*) 4129, 4195; (Mr. *McLean, P.E.I.*) 4133; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 4143; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4149, 4186, 4197; (Mr. *Davin*) 4153; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 4159; (Mr. *Yeo*) 4164; (Mr. *Masson*) 4169; (Mr. *Weldon*) 4177; (Mr. *Mulock*) 4178; (Mr. *Laurier*) 4187; (Mr. *Dickey*) 4191; (Mr. *Hazen*) 4199 (ii).

RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.:

ACTIVE MILITIA, DRILL, QUALIFIED OFFICERS, &c.: Mr. *Hughes*, 667 (i).

ALLAN, MESSRS., &c., PETS. *re* DECREASE OF CUSTOMS DUTIES*: Mr. *Laurier*, 159 (i).

ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY., &c., COR., &c., *re* SUBSIDY: Mr. *Forbes*, 688 (i).

ARCHIBALD, H. D., CONDR. ON I. C. R., DISMISSAL*: Mr. *Patterson (Colchester)* 969 (i).

ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, QUANTITIES IMPORTED: Mr *McMillan (Huron)* 526 (i).

BANCROFT & CONNOLLY. *See* "KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK."

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

BARRETT *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, SUP. COURT JUDGT.: Mr. *LaRivière*, 158 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, ENGR.'S REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: Mr. *Bergeron*, 191, 224 (i).

BEEF AND PORK, U. S. AND CAN. FISHERMEN: Mr. *Forbes*, 294 (i).

BEET-ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY ON MANUFACTURE: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 1366, 1373 (i).

—— PROF. SAUNDERS' INSTRUCTIONS: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 1373 (i).

BINDING TWINE, QUANTITY IMPORTED: Mr. *Campbell*, 537 (i).

BOUNDARIES OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC: Sir *Hector Langevin*, 115 (i).

BREAKWATERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO. (P. E. I.) GOVT. EXPEND.: Mr. *Perry*, 233 (i).

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, APPLICATIONS AND REFUSALS*: Mr. *Bowers*, 417 (i).

BRIDGE OVER RICHELIEU RIVER AT SOREL: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2453 (ii).

BRITISH FARM DELEGATES' REPS.: Mr. *McMillan (Huron)* 2432 (ii).

—— *See* "TENANT FARMERS."

CAN. COTTON MILLS CO.'S LETTERS PATENT: Mr. *Edgar*, 920 (i).

CANALS, HARBOURS, DOCKS, &c., CONTRACTS FOR ENLARGEMENT, CONSTRUCTION, &c.*: Mr. *Davies (P.E.I.)* 417 (i).

CAP ST. IGNACE STATION P. O.*: Mr. *Choquette*, 1555 (i), 2067 (ii).

CASCUMPEQUE HARBOUR, REP. *re* BLASTING: Mr. *Perry*, 2268 (i).

CATTLE, LIVE, ADMISSION FROM U. S.*: Mr. *Somerville*, 159 (i).

CHARLEBOIS, F., CLAIMS AGAINST FISHERIES DEPT.: Mr. *Laurier*, 1036 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS, EXTRA PAYMENTS, 1874-1878: Mr *Tisdale*, 1715 (i).

COAL OIL AND KEROSENE, IMPORTS: Mr. *Campbell*, 3059 (ii).

COCKBURN ISLAND, LOCATION TICKET OF J. A. McLENNAN: Mr. *Lister*, 1980 (i).

—— LOCATION TICKET OF PETER McLENNAN*: Mr. *Lister*, 2006 (i).

CONTRACTS. *See* "GOVT."

COTTON-SEED OIL, CRUDE, IMPORTS FOR 1891*: Mr. *McKay*, 1555 (i).

CULBUTE CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Mr. *Murray*, 927 (i).

CUSTOMS AND P. O. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: Mr. *Prior*, 1550 (i).

DE LA RONDE, LATE PIERRE A. DENIS, PAPERS, &c., *re* SUCCESSION: Mr. *Bergeron*, 2286 (i).

DODS, P. D., *re* LOSS OF DIAMONDS: Mr. *Curran*, 2287 (i).

DOM. BUILDINGS IN CAN., ELECTRIC LIGHTING*: Mr. *Davies (P.E.I.)* 417 (i).

DOM. COTTON MILLS CO.'S PATENT: Mr. *Edgar*, 920.

DREDGING OTTAWA BETWEEN PEMBROKE AND DES JOACHIMS: Mr. *Murray*, 926 (i).

ELECTIONS, 1891-1892, COR. RET. OFFICERS AND GOVT., &c.*: Mr. *Sutherland*, 969 (i).

ELECTION PETITIONS. *See* "RICHMOND."

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS IN B. C., VOTERS: Mr. *Mara*, 2287 (i).

ELECTORAL LISTS. *See* "LENNOX," "LONDON," "VOTERS' LISTS."

ELLIOTT, JUDGE. *See* "LONDON ELECTION."

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

ENGRAVING AND PRINTING, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS*: Mr. *Somerville*, 159 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES, IMP. AND CAN. GOVTS., COR.: Mr. *Laurier*, 244 (i).

EUGENIA, DISMISSAL, &c., OF POSTMASTER: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1985 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, NUMBER, LOCATION, EXPEND., &c.: Mr. *Frémont*, 682 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL (CENTRAL) FARM, DAIRY STOCK, &c.: Mr. *McMillan* (*Huron*) 402 (i).

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 100 (i).

EXPORTS OF CAN. PRODUCE TO NEWFOUNDLAND*: Mr. *Hughes*, 113 (i).

—— FARM PRODUCE: Mr. *McMullen*, 292 (i).

FARMERS' DELEGATES. *See* "BRITISH;" "TENANT."

FARM PRODUCE. *See* "EXPORTS."

FENELON FALLS RY. BRIDGE, AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND G. T. R.*: Mr. *Hughes*, 133 (i).

FISH, FISH OIL, &c., IMPORTED FROM NEWFOUNDLAND*: Mr. *White* (*Shelburne*) 159 (i).

FISHERIES, DEPUTY MINISTER, LETTERS, COMPLAINTS, &c.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 418 (i).

FLOUR (CANADIAN) TRADE AND NEWFOUNDLAND: Mr. *Hughes*, 112 (i).

GALOPS RAPIDS, SURVEYS, PLANS, &c.: Mr. *Reid*, 139 (i).

GALOPS RAPIDS, SURVEY OR DEEPENING*: Mr. *Somerville*, 159 (i).

GAMBLE & FLETCHER, COR. *re* PUB. BUILDINGS, VICTORIA, B.C.: Mr. *Prior*, 1559 (i).

GLAZIERS' DIAMONDS. *See* "Dods, P. D."

GOVT. CONTRACTS SINCE CONFEDN; Mr. *Macdonald*, (*Huron*) 99: wthdn., 110 (i).

—— 30TH JUNE, 1887, TO 30TH JUNE, 1891*: Mr. *Macdonald* (*Huron*) 110 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS, REPS. OF MINISTERS AND O. C.'S*: Mr. *Mulock*, 111 (i).

GOVT. RYS., ADDITIONAL PROPERTY ACCOMMODATION: Mr. *McMullen*, 1984 (i).

—— NAMES, &c., EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *McMullen*, 41, 692 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.

IMPORTS OF ARTIFICIAL FERTILIZERS, QUANTITIES: Mr. *McMillan* (*Huron*) 526 (i).

—— BINDING TWINE, QUANTITY: Mr. *Campbell*, 537 (i).

—— CRUDE COTTON-SEED OIL FOR 1891*: Mr. *McKay*, 1555 (i).

—— PORK FROM U. S.*: Mr. *Hughes*, 292 (i).

—— U. S., MEAT AND FARM PRODUCTS*: Mr. *Hughes*, 291 (i).

INGRAM, W. H., APPMNT. AS COL. OF CUSTOMS, ST. THOMAS: Mr. *Casey*, 1998 (i).

INDIAN RESERVES, B.C., NUMBER, LOCATION, &c.; Mr. *Barnard*, 511 (i).

KAMOURASKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, ACCTS., &c. Mr. *Carroll*, 510 (i).

KEROSENE OIL, IMPORTS: Mr. *Campbell*, 3059 (ii).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, CERTIFICATE *re* $32,000 PAID BANCROFT & CONNOLLY*: Mr. *Gibson*, 2006.

LACHINE CANAL, NEW BRIDGE AT MONTREAL: Mr. *Curran*, 524 (i).

LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *Charlton*, 2269 (i).

LANDS SOLD, GRANTED OR LEASED IN MAN. AND N. W.T: Mr. *Edgar*, 241 (i).

LAVALLIÈRE BAY, DREDGING*: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2457.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*

LENNOX CO. ELECTORAL LISTS, ORIGINAL, &c.*: Mr. *Wilson*, 159 (i).

LIEUT. GOVERNORS' COMMISSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS: Mr. *Laurier*, 2268 (i).

LIVE STOCK RATES ON I. C. R.: Mr. *Wood* (*Westmoreland*) 2286 (i).

LOGAN *vs.* CITY OF WINNIPEG, PLEADINGS, &c.*: Mr. *Watson*, 2287 (i).

LOISELLE, B., POSTMASTER, STE. ANGÈLE, DISMISSAL, PET., &c.*: Mr. *Brodeur* 100 (i).

LONDON ELECTION, PET. OF T. HOBBS, &c., *re* JUDGE ELLIOTT: Mr. *Lister*, 1719 (i).

—— ELECTORAL VOTERS' LIST*: Mr. *Lister*, 292.

MAIL CONDUCTORS SUPERANNUATED: Mr. *Brodeur*, 2699 (ii).

"MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE," SUPREME CT. JUDG'T.: Mr. *LaRivière*, 158 (i).

—— *See* "LOGAN."

MILITIA. *See* "ACTIVE," and general heading "MILITIA."

MAP OF DOM., *re* POLLING RETURNS AT G. E.: Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*), 112 (i).

MCINTYRE, DISMISSAL, &c., OF POSTMASTER: Mr. *Landerkin*, 1985 (i).

MCLENNAN, JNO. A. AND PETER. *See* "COCKBURN ISLAND."

MCQUEEN & DAVEY. *See* "BRITISH" and "TENANT FARMERS' DELEGATES."

MULGRAVE STATION, I. C. R., TRAFFIC, &c.: Mr. *Fraser*, 35 (i).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAN. FLOUR TRADE: Mr. *Hughes*, 112 (i).

—— CAN. FISHERIES*: Mr. *White* (*Shelburne*) 159 (i).

NORTH-WEST ASSEMBLY, RES. AND MEMORIALS: Mr. *Davin*, 1551 (i).

OTTAWA RIVER DREDGING, COST, &c.: Mr. *Murray*, 926 (i).

P. E. I. RY., DISMISSED EMPLOYÉS: Mr. *Perry*, 2004 (i).

PIERS, &c., IN PRINCE CO., P.E.I., GOVT. EXPEND.: Mr. *Perry*, 233 (i).

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY., FURTHER SUBSIDY: Mr. *Murray*, 917 (i).

—— COUNTY RY. DEBT: Mr. *Murray*, 1968 (i).

PORK. *See* "IMPORTS."

PRINTING. *See* "ENGRAVING."

PRIVY COUNCIL, APPLICATIONS TO RY. COM. FOR ADJUDICATION, &c.: Mr. *McCarthy*, 1950 (i).

—— COMPLAINTS TO RY. COM.: Mr. *McCarthy*, 1947 (i).

PROHIBITION PETITIONS PRESENTED, SESSION 1891*: Mr. *Fraser*, 100 (i).

PROSSER, WM., FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: Mr. *Allan*, 3114 (ii).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS. *See* "DOMINION."

QUINN, MICHAEL, EVIDENCE *re* DISMISSAL: Mr. *Guay*, 401 (i), 3332 (ii).

RY. COMMITTEE. *See* "PRIVY COUNCIL."

RYS. *See* "GOVT." and general heading.

RICHELIEU RIVER, BRIDGE AT SOREL: Mr. *Bruneau*, 2453 (ii).

RICHMOND CONTROVERTED ELECTION, PETITIONS AND DECISIONS: Mr. *Gillies*, 1553 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU SUD, PUBLIC WORKS*: Mr. *Choquette*, 2699 (ii).

ROBERTSON, JOHN F., CLAIM *re* ACCIDENT ON P. E. I. RY.: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 1367 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—*Continued.*
ROYAL COMMISSION ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 39 (i).
SAW-LOGS, REMOVAL OF EXPORT DUTY: Mr. *Rider*, 1715 (i).
SETTLERS' CLAIMS AND WALDRON RANCH CO.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 292 (i).
SICK MARINERS' DUES, CIRCULAR ISSUED*: Mr. *Laurier*, 159 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEERS' REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: Mr. *Bergeron*, 191, 224 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, TENDERS: Mr. *Sutherland*, 128.
STATUTORY VOTES, DOM. LIABILITIES UNDER*: Mr. *Fraser*, 969 (i).
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, PETS., &c., *re* DISMISSAL*: Mr. *Brodeur*, 100 (i).
ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER, MONEY DEPOSITS: Mr. *Brodeur*, 400 (i).
ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, RY. ACCIDENT*: Mr. *Carroll*, 202 (i).
ST. THOMAS, COLL. OF CUSTOMS, APPMNT.: Mr. *Casey*, 1998 (i).
SUGAR BOUNTY. *See* "BEET-ROOT."
SUBMARINE TUNNEL, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: Mr. *Perry*, 403 (i).
SUPERANNUATION, MAIL CONDUCTORS*: Mr. *Brodeur*, 2689 (ii).
TEMPERANCE COLONIZATION CO., STOCK AND SCRIP HOLDERS, &c.: Mr. *Sproule*, 929 (i).
TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND, PROCLAMATIONS, &c.: Mr. *Davies* (*P.E.I.*) 684 (i).
TUNNEL. *See* "SUBMARINE."
VOTERS IN ELECTORAL LISTS, B. C.: Mr. *Mara*, 2287 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS, REVISION, 1886, 1889, 1891, TOTAL COST: Mr. *Landerkin*, 683 (i).
—— AMOUNTS PAID REVISING OFFICERS: Mr. *Flint*, 930 (i).
WALDRON RANCH CO., SETTLERS' CLAIMS*: Mr. *McMullen*, 292 (i).
WELLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION, PROCEEDINGS AT TRIAL, &c.: Mr. *Tisdale*, 244 (i).
WEST INDIES, FIN. MIN.'S VISIT, REPS., &c.: Mr. *Mills* (*Bothwell*) 1372 (i).
WEST BAY AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP.: Mr. *Cameron*, 2287 (i).
WHITE PINE TIMBER, MAP OF AREAS: Mr. *Ives*, 293.
WHYCOCOMAGH AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP.*: Mr. *Cameron*, 2287 (i).
WILSON, CONVICT EDWARD, PETS., &c., FOR RELEASE: Mr. *Armstrong*, 2642 (ii).
YAMASKA RIVER, LOSSES THROUGH ERECTION OF DAM: Mr. *Laurier*, 1985 (i).
REVELSTOKE AND ARROW LAKE (C. P. R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4510 (ii).
RHÉAUME, ANTOINE, LAND GRANT FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2490 (ii).
RICHELIEU CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER, BRIDGE AT SOREL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bruneau*) 2453 (ii).
—— FISHING RIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 35 (i).
RICHMOND (N.S.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION, PETITIONS AND DECISIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Gillies*) 1553 (i).
—— Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
RICHMOND P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 2890 (ii).
RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).
RIFLED ORDNANCE, IMPROVED: in Com. of Sup., 1363 (i); conc., 4210 (ii).
RIMOUSKI CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
"RIMOUSKI," STR., CHANGE OF ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3183 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP (FRASERVILLE) P.O: in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
—— P.O., WORKMEN'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 3238 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU SUD, PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Choquette*) 2699 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4656 (ii).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
ROBERTSON, JOHN F., CLAIM *re* ACCIDENT ON P.E.I. RY.: M. for Pets., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1367.
ROSAMOND, BENNETT, ESQ., MEMBER FOR NORTH LANARK: Introduced, 3 (i).
ROSS, HON. J. G., REFUND TO REPRESENTATIVES: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
ROUND HILL PIER DAM, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 2171 (i).
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1286 (i), 2370, 4732 (ii).
ROYAL COMMISSIONS ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 39 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2172 (i), 2700, 3089 (ii).
—— INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3239 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (i).
STE. ANGÈLE POSTMASTER, PETS., &c., *re* DISMISSAL: M. for copies (Mr. *Brodeur*) 100 (i).
—— DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Brodeur*) 4645 (ii).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 2954 (ii).
STE. ANNE'S LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
STE. LOUISE (L'ISLET) POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2431 (ii).
ST. CATHARINES AND CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4466 (ii).
St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. *Carpenter*). 1°*, 315; 2°*, 418; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)
—— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4537 (ii).
ST. CÉSAIRE POSTMASTER, MONEY DEPOSITS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 400 (i).
ST. FLAVIE AND LITTLE MÉTIS TO MATANE, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4577 (ii).
ST. HENRI P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 2889 (ii).
St. John and Maine Ry. Co. and N.B. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *Skinner*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 59).
ST. JOHN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4441 (ii).
—— FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 988; conc., 1086 (i).
St. John (N.B.) Harbour Commissioners' B. No. 99 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 4398; M. for Com., 4493; in Com., 4498, 4603; 1° of B., 4506; 2°*, 4603; in Com., 4647; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 53, N. 93) 4654 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

St. JOHN RIVER, INCLUDING TOBIQUE: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).

——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION (I.C.R.): in Com. of Sup., 988 (i), 2563 (ii).

——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).

St. JOHN TO St. ROSALIE, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).

St. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4545 (ii).

St. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS, RY. ACCIDENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Carroll*) 292 (i).

St. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4297; in Com., 4579 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4645; conc., 4567.

St. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (i).

——— RY. BRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 1549 (i).

——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2619 (ii).

St. MAURICE PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3564 (ii).

St. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2263 (i).

St. PLACIDE TO St. ANDREW'S, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525, 4533 (ii).

St. RAYMOND P. O., ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Delisle*) 37 (i).

St. RÉMI TO St. CYPRIEN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4394; in Com., 4582 (ii).

St. THOMAS, COL. OF CUSTOMS, APPMNT.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 1998 (i).

St. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 736, 972, 990 (i), 2889 (ii).

SANDFORD (N.S.) BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr *Flint*) 398 (i).

SANDPOINT (N.S.) TO NEW GERMANY, RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4542 (ii).

SAN FRANCISCO AND VICTORIA (B.C.) STEAM COM.: in Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONTRACTS FOR DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3184 (ii).

——— CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2954 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).

——— TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 4261 (ii).

SAVINGS BANK AT St. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3644 (ii).

——— N.B., N.S., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4272 (ii).

SAW-LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Ives*) 1231 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Ives*) 1231, 1270; (Mr. *Corbould*) 1239; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1240, 1271; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1250; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1254; (Mr. *McGregor*) 1262; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1264; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1264; (Mr. *Devlin*) 1267; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1269; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1276; (Mr. *Allan*) 1279: (Mr. *Foster*) 1281 (i).

——— EXPORT DUTY, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Rider*) 1032 (i).

— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Rider*) 1705 (i).

School Savings Bank incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Desjardins, Hochelaga*). 1°*, 314; 2°, 418 (i); M. to transfer to Orders of the Day, 4466; in Com. and 3°*, 4638 (ii).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Sea Fisheries Development, &c., B. No. 5 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 97; 2°*, 130; M. for Com., 161; in Com., 166 (i); 3°*, 2490 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

SECRETARY OF STATE:

CAN. COTTON MILLS Co.'s LETTERS PATENT: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 920 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

——— EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 283 (i).

——— LIST, NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 917 (i).

——— EXTRA PAYMENTS, 1874-1878: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1715 (i).

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4426 (ii).

COPYRIGHT ACT, PROCLAMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1366 (i).

——— RECIPROCITY WITH U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 137 (i).

DOM. COTTON MILLS Co.'s LETTERS PATENT: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 920 (i).

ELECTIONS, GENERAL, POLLING RETURNS: M. for Map (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 112 (i).

——— 1891-92, COR., RET. OFFICERS AND GOVT., &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Sutherland*) 969 (i).

——— COR., GOVT. AND RET. OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 2491 (ii).

ELECTION OFFICIALS' DUTIES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 73 (i).

ELECTORAL LISTS. *See* "LENNOX," "LONDON," "VOTERS' LISTS."

ENGRAVING AND PRINTING, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Somerville*) 159 (i).

——— CONTRACT, &c.: Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1637 (i).

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 1096 (i).

LIEUT. GOVERNORS' COMMISSIONS: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 2268 (i).

——— INSTRUCTIONS: Presented (Sir *John Thompson*) 2268 (i).

LONDON ELECTORAL VOTERS' LISTS*: M. for copies (Mr. *Lister*) 292 (i).

MAP OF DOM. *re* POLLING RETURNS AT G. E.: M. for copy (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 112 (i).

OLD RECORDS, CLASSIFICATION: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 256, 912 (i): conc., 4204 (ii).

——— BUREAU PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

——— BUREAU, SALE OF TYPE: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2954 (ii).

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC, MEMBERS OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2172 (i).

ROYAL COMMISSIONS, INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3239 (ii).

——— ISSUED SINCE CONFEDN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 39 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 2172 (i), 2700, 3089 (ii).

TEMPERANCE COLONIZATION Co., STOCK AND SCRIP HOLDERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 929 (i).

VOTERS IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, B. C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 2287 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*
VOTERS' LISTS, AMOUNTS PAID REVISING OFFICERS: M. for List (Mr. *Flint*) 930 (i).
—— FINAL PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 2641.
—— DELAY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1637 (i).
—— PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 1086 (i).
—— REVISION, 1886-89-91, TOTAL COST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 683 (i).

Seditious and Unlawful Associations Act (*Chap. 10 Consolidated Statutes, L. C.*) **Amt. B. No. 85** (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1°m., 2488.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* "COMMITTEES."

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 4716; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 752, 974 (i).
SERJEANT-AT-ARMS, DEPUTY, APPMNT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 749 (i).
—— ESTIMATE: in Com. of Sup., 789 (i).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
—— MESSENGERS (LIBRARY): in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
SETTLERS' CLAIMS AND WALDRON RANCH CO.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).
—— N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 223 (i).
—— GRIEVANCES, N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4407 (ii).

Shares. *See* "TRANSFER."

Sheep Creek. *See* "HIGH RIVER."

SHEET HARBOUR, COST OF CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1032 (i).
—— FEES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 1032 (i).
SHELBURNE (N.S.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 4731 (ii).
SICK MARINERS' DUES, CIRCULAR ISSUED: M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 159 (i).
SIMCOE, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
SINKING FUNDS, BROKERAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, CHANGE OF TIME: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 3897 (ii).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4456 (ii).
SMALL-POX ON "EMPRESS OF JAPAN": Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1547 (i).
SMITH'S FALLS P. O., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2929 (ii).
SMITH, WM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR S. ONTARIO: Introduced, 40 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, ENGINEERS' REPS., &c., *re* BUILDING: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 191. 224 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 2050 (i).
—— TENDERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 128.
SOULANGES CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
SPAIN AND SPANISH W. INDIES, TRADE RELATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4602 (ii).
SPANISH W. INDIES AND CAN., TRADE RELATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 509 (i).
—— EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 4499 (ii).
SPEAKER, DEPUTY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i).
SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE: 4 (i), 4734 (ii).
STADACONA POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Frémont*) 222.
STAIRS, JOHN FITZ-WM., ESQ., MEMBER FOR HALIFAX: Introduced, 71 (i).
STANDING ORDERS COM.: List of Members, 103 (i).
STATISTICS. *See* "ARTS;" "AGRICULTURE."
STATUTORY VOTES, DOM. LIABILITIES UNDER*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Fraser*) 969 (i).
STEWIACKE VALLEY AND MUSQUODOBOIT RY. (I.C.R.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4521 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 114; 2°, 752; Res. in Com., 752; B. in Com., 1394, 1642; 3°*, 1789 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

STRAITS OF NORTHUMBERLAND, SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4463 (ii).
SUBMARINE. *See* "TUNNEL."

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Haggart*). Res. prop. (1st) 4394; in Com., 4506; conc. and Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667; (2nd) 4466; in Com., 4629; (3rd) 4644; in Com., 4667; 1°* and 2°* of B., 4668; 3°*, 4727 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4275 (ii).

SUBSIDIES. *See*
ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY.
BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
BRACEBRIDGE AND BAYSVILLE RY. CO.
BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON RY. CO.
CAPE TORMENTE AND MURRAY BAY RY.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.
GODERICH AND WINGHAM RY. CO.
HEREFORD RY. CO.
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.
JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN MATHA RY. CO.
KINGSTON, NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CO.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
LAKE ERIE AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE COLONIZATION CO.
LINDSAY, BOBCAYGEON AND PONTYPOOL RY. CO.
LOTBINIÈRE AND MEGANTIC RY. CO.
MONFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.
NEW GLASGOW IRON, COAL AND RY. CO.
NICOLA VALLEY RY. CO.
NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.
ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
ONTARIO, BELMONT AND NORTHERN RY. CO.
OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
PHILIPSBURG JUNCTION RY. AND QUARRY CO.
PLAISTER ROCK ISLAND RY.
PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY.
PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RY. CO.
REVELSTOKE AND ARROW LAKE (C.P.R.)
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. FLAVIE AND LITTLE MÉTIS TO MATANE RY.
ST. JOHN TO ST. ROSALIE RY.
ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.

SUBSIDIES—*Continued.*
St. Placide to St. Andrew's Ry.
St. Rémi to St. Cyprien Ry. Co.
Sandpoint (N.S.) to New Germany Ry.
Stewiacke Valley and Musquodoboit Ry. (I.C.R.)
Sydney and Louisburg Ry.
Témiscouata Ry. Co.
Thousand Islands Ry. Co.
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.
Truro and Stewiacke to Newport, &c., Ry.
Woodstock and Centreville Ry. Co.
Sugar-Beet Bounty, Continuation: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 751 (i).
——— Cultivation, French Edition of Reps.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 750 (i).
——— *See* "Beet-Root."
Summerside and Richmond Bay Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 40 (i).
Summerstown (Ont.) Post Office, Receipts: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1365 (i).
Sunday Observance. *See* "Lord's Day."
Superannuation: in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).
——— Mail Conductors*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2699 (ii).
Supply B. (1892) No. 62 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. in Com. and 1°* of B., 1087; 2°, 1090; 3°*, 1091 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)
Supply B. (1893) No. 100 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. in Com., 4576; conc. in and 1° of B., 4603; 2°, 4715; 3°*, 4729 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)
SUPPLY:
[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noticed under this head.]
Amts. and Remarks to Ms. for Com.: Amt. (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Commercial Treaties, 1104; neg. (Y. 62, N. 106) 1151. Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Denison*) Affidavits *re* Gov. Gen.'s Body Guard, 1319. Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) Duty on Binding Twine, 1656; neg. (Y. 63, N. 107) 1713. Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) Diplomatic Papers, 1789; neg. (Y. 57, N. 98) 1827. Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, &c.) West Indian Trade, 1877; (Mr. *Edgar*) Copyright Laws, 2233; (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) Lieut. Governor's Assent to Bills, 2238; (Mr. *Devlin*) Civil Servants, 2238 (i); (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) Preferential Trade with Great Britain, 2492; (Mr. *Casey*) Civil Servants and Double Pay, 2500; (Mr. *McMullen*) Savings Banks, 4272; (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Railway Subsidies, 4275; (Mr. *Mulock*) Audit of Accounts, I.C.R., 4276; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Election Expenses, Publications in Toronto *Globe*, 4349; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Dom. Day Celebration, 4399; (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) Tenant Farmers' Delegates Reps., 4401; (Mr. *McMullen*) Settlers' Grievances, N.W.T., 4407; (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) Indian Affairs, Management, 4408 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex.: Transmitting Estimates for 1892-93, 138: Suppl., 1891-92, 822 (i); Suppl., 1892-93, 4265 (ii).
Res. (Mr. *Foster*) for Com., 33; Ms. for Com., 249, 310, 589, 752, 825, 971, 1104, 1153, 1319, 1373, 1415, 1491, 1656, 1789, 1877, 2008, 2233 (i), 2362, 2492, 2563, 2715, 2798, 2845, 2918, 4240, 4272, 4348, 4399 (ii).
In Com., 250, 310, 664, 752, 825, 971, 1152, 1154, 1340, 1373, 1415, 1491, 1714, 1828, 1889, 2008, 2241, 2257 (i), 2362, 2509, 2563, 2715, 2798, 2845, 2918, 4240, 4277, 4386, 4408.

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Committee:
Administration of Justice. See "Justice."
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Census, 983 (i), 4437 (ii).
Columbian Exhibition, 983 (i), 4433; conc., 4474 (ii).
Criminal Statistics, 1160 (i).
Dairying Interests, 1464 (i).
Experimental Farms, 1424 (i).
Haras National Co., 1465 (i).
Jamaica Exhibition, 976 (i).
Patent Record, 1159 (i).
Adulteration of Food. See "Collection of Revenues."
Canals. See "Collection of Revenues;" "Railways."
Charges of Management:
Assistant Receiver Gen., Victoria, 250 (i).
Dominion Notes, Printing, 255 (i).
Inspector, 250 (i).
Public Debt, Commission, 253 (i).
Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., P.E.I., 250 (i).
Sinking Funds, Brokerage, &c., 254 (i).
Civil Government:
Auditor General's Office, 267 (i).
Contingencies, Deptl.:
Agriculture, 286 (i).
Departmental Buildings, care, &c., 286 (i).
Finance and Treasury Board, 285 (i).
Governor Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 284 (i).
Railways and Canals, 286 (i),
Civil Service Examiners, 283 (i).
Customs Dept., 267, 1007, 1018 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433 (ii).
Governor General's Sec.'s Office, 255 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 275 (i).
Contingencies, 282 (i).
Rates, Taxes, Insurance, &c., 896; conc., 1085 (i).
Interior Dept., 257, 825, 844, 1154; conc., 1084 (i), 4206, 4432, 4472 (ii).
North-West Mounted Police, 265 (i).
Justice Dept., 913 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Dept., 270 (i), 4432 (ii).
Militia and Defence Dept., 256 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 256, 912 (i); conc., 4204 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 255 (i), 4433, 4440 (ii).
Public Works Dept., 271 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept., 273 (i)), 4440 (ii).
Collection of Revenues:
Adulteration of Food, 4430 (ii).
Canals: Lachine, 1017 (i).
Customs:
Board of Customs and Protective Service, 1018 (i); conc., 4205 (ii).
Craven, George, Gratuity, 1007 (i).
General Vote, 811 (i).
Inspectors of Ports, Travelling Expenses, 821 (i).
Nova Scotia, Salaries and contingencies, 811 (i).
Ontario, Salaries, &c., 812 (i).
Dominion Lands: Agents' Salaries, &c., 4431 (ii).
Excise:
Customs Officers' Commissions, 1015 (i).
Duty-pay, Excise Officers, 1014 (i).
General Vote, 4430 (ii).
Paige, W. W., Repayment of Costs, 1014 (i).
Tobacco Stamps, 1007 (i).
Post Office:
Mail Service, conc., 4470 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Collection of Revenues—Continued.
Public Works:
Esquimalt Graving Dock, Maintenance, &c., 1017 (i).
Railways:
Intercolonial, 2628 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1017 (i), 2629 (ii).
Windsor Branch, 2629 (ii).
Weights and Measures:
Contingencies, 1016 (i).
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Police: General Vote, 313 (i).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Behring's Sea Arbitration, 4469: conc., 4478 (ii).
Commissioners' Expenses, 993 (i).
Fish-Breeding, conc., 4478 (ii).
Fishery Officers, Salaries, 4310 (ii).
Intelligence Bureau, Daily Reps., 992 (i).
Lobster Hatcheries, 4317 (ii).
Protection Vessels, 4319 (ii).
Geological Survey: General Vote, 4386 (ii).
Government of N. W. T.: Schools, 993 (i).
Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Immigration:
Canadian Agents, 1491 (i); conc., 4467 (ii).
European Agents, 1828 (i).
Expenses ($150,000) 1889 (i); conc., 4210 (i).
Hett's German Pamphlet, 2008 (i).
Indians, 4408, 4460; conc., 4479 (ii).
Justice, Administration of:
Admiralty Court, Que., Registrar, 313 (i).
Circuit Allowances, B.C., 311 (i).
Exchequer Court, Editing Reports, 313, 971 (i).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, Gov. Gen.'s Warrant, 972; conc., 1085 (i).
Supreme Court, Reporter and Librarian, 312 (i).
Travelling Expenses, Judges, Man., 311 (i).
——— Judges, N.W.T., 310 (i).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Committees, Sessional Clerks, &c., 788 (i).
Contingencies, 788 (i).
Debates, Official, conc., 4205 (ii).
Deputy Speaker's Salary, 974 (i).
Printing, Paper and Binding, 794, 976 (i).
Salaries, 762 (i).
Serjeant-at-Arms' Estimate, 789 (i).
Sessional Clerks, &c., 975 (i).
Voters' List, Printing, 976; conc., 1086 (i).
Library:
Purchase of Books, 792 (i).
Salaries, 789 (i).
Sessional Messengers, 976 (i).
Senate:
Reporting Debates, 974 (i).
Salaries and contingencies, 752 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Maintenance and Repairs, 4305 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and Liverpool, conc., 4478.
Canso, Arichat, Port Hood, &c., 4277 (ii).
Halifax and St. John *vid* Yarmouth, 4304 (ii).
Halifax, &c., and W. Indies, &c., 4282; conc., 4469.
Magdalen Islands, 4277 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies, &c.—Continued.
Tidal Observations, 4305 (ii).
San Francisco and Victoria, B.C., 4279 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 4310 (ii).
Militia:
"A," "B" and "C" Batteries, &c., 1419 (i).
Ammunition, Manufacture, &c., 1161 (i); conc., 4209 (ii).
Armouries and care of Arms, 1349 (i).
Brigade Majors, 1161 (i).
Clothing and Overcoats, 1340 (i).
Contingencies, &c., 1363 (i).
Dom. Artillery Association, 1363 (i).
Drill Pay and Instruction, 1353 (i); conc., 4209; suppl., 4437 (ii).
Drill Sheds, &c., Care and Maintenance, 1373 (i).
Military Branch and District Staff, 1161 (i).
Military Stores, 1353 (i).
Monuments, Battle Fields of Can., conc., 4210 (ii).
Permanent Forces, 1415 (i).
Rifled Ordnance, Improved, 1363 (i); conc., 4210.
Royal Military College, 1375 (i).
Mounted Police, 4423 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitration *re* Provincial Accounts, 4430; conc., 4470 (ii).
Banff Springs, Survey, &c., 4428 (ii).
Bayfield, Str., Supplies, Enquiry, 4461 (ii).
Bulmer *vs.* The Queen, Litigation, 4461 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, 1004 (i).
Commercial Agencies, 4426 (ii).
Costs of Litigated Matters, 4426 (ii).
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., 4424 (ii).
Georgian Bay Survey, conc., 4470 (ii).
International Customs Bureau, 1006 (i), 4463.
International Education Association, 1006 (i).
Jukes, Dr. A., Medical Services, 1003 (i).
Mounted Police Commission, 4463 (ii).
Old Records, Classification, 4429 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Plant, 4429 (ii).
Refund, Sundry Persons, 4462 (ii).
Ross, Hon. J. G., Refund to Representatives, 1002 (i).
Straits of Northumberland, Survey, 4463 (ii).
North-West Territories. See "Government."
Ocean and River Service:
Cattle Shipments, Inspection, 992, 2033 (i).
Macdonald Bros., Services at Wreck, 4460 (ii).
Mulgrave and Point Tupper Train Ferry, conc., 4475 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 748 (i).
Dorchester, 972 (i).
Kingston, 664 (i); conc., 4205; suppl., 4433, 4440.
Manitoba, 744, 973 (i).
Regina Gaol, 748, 973 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 736, 972 (i).
Pensions:
Fraser, Miss H. and Mr. Roderick, 1018 (i).
Veterans of 1812, 1018 (i).
Police. See "Dominion" and "Mounted."
Public Works—Capital:*
Cape Tormentine Harbour, 2617 (ii).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, 4439 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, Turning Basin, 2619 (ii).

**See* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Capital—Continued.
Kingston Graving Dock, 2715 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Ship Channel, 2619 (ii).

Public Works—Consolidated Fund:
Buildings:
Ottawa Post Office, &c., Fire, 990 (i).
Quebec Drill Hall, 989 (i).
St. John Custom House, Fire, 988: conc., 1086.
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 990 (i).
Dredging:
Manitoba, Red River, 992 (i).
Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and N.B., 991 (i).
Harbours and Rivers:
Maritime Provinces, Repairs, &c., 990 (i).
Quebec Harbour and River Works, Repairs, &c., 991 (i).
Roads and Bridges:
Old Man's River, Bridge, 992 (i).

Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Military Buildings, Victoria, 2952 (ii).
Vancouver P. O., &c., 2951, 4442 (ii).
Victoria Drill Hall, 2951 (ii).
Manitoba:
Brandon Public Building, 2936 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Chatham Post Office, 2798 (ii).
St. John Custom House, 4441 (ii).
North-West Territories:
Calgary P. O., &c., 2938, 2941 (ii).
Court Houses and Lock-Ups, 2943 (ii).
Edmonton Registry Office, 2936; conc., 4467.
Lethbridge Custom House, &c., 2938 (ii).
Regina Court House, &c., 2937 (ii).
Nova Scotia:
Dartmouth Post Office, 2742 (ii).
Halifax Drill Hall, 4441 (ii).
Halifax Public Buildings, 2742 (ii).
Lunenburg Post Office, &c., 2768 (ii).
Ontario:
Orillia Public Buildings, 2918 (i).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings:
Gas and Electric Light, 4242 (ii).
Grounds, 4240 (ii).
Heating, 4241: conc., 4477 (ii).
Major's Hill Park, conc., 4468 (ii).
Telephone Service, 4245 (ii).
Petrolia Public Building, 2919 (ii).
Picton P.O., 2934 (ii).
Smith's Falls P.O., &c., 2920 (ii).
Quebec:
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, 2801 (ii).
Laprairie P.O., 2802, 2845 (ii).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) P.O., 2868 (ii).
St. Henri P.O., 2868 (ii).
St. Hyacinthe P.O., 2889 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 2889 (ii).
Richmond P.O., 2890 (ii).
West Farnham P.O., 2894 (ii).
Dredging:
British Columbia, 4456 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, 4454 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 4258 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec, 4456 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

COMMITTEE—*Continued.*

Public Works—Income—Continued.
Experimental Farms, 4448 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
New Brunswick:
St. John River, including Tobique, 4256 (ii).
Nova Scotia:
Big Tracadie Breakwater, 4252 (ii).
Great Village River, 4251 (ii).
Maitland Wharf, 4448 (ii).
Meteghan Cove Pier, 4448 (ii).
Raquette Pier, 4247 (ii).
Ontario:
Kingston Harbour, 4257 (ii).
Prince Edward Island:
Bay Fortune Breakwater, 4448 (ii).
Piers and Breakwaters, Repairs, 4252 (ii).
Quebec:
Nicolet River, 4449 (ii).
Ottawa River (Mrs. N. Guindon) 4450 (ii).
Yamaska River, 4257 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Architects, Engineers, &c., 4259 (ii).
Clerical Assistance, 4457 (ii).
Macdonald, late Sir John, Monument, 4458 (ii).
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 4240 (ii).
Slides and Booms:
Saguenay District (Larouche and Gagné's Claims) 4456 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
Moosomin Station, C. P. R., to Cannington, 4258.
Nanaimo to Comox, 4259 (ii).

Quarantine:
Cattle Disease, 987, 2033 (i).
Grosse Isle, 2025, 2033 (i).
Halifax, 2032 (i).
Port Hawkesbury, 2033 (i).
St. John, 2032 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4212 (ii).
Unorganized Ports, 2049 (i).
Victoria, B.C., 2032 (i).

Railways and Canals—Capital:*
Canals:
Cornwall, 2053 (i).
Lachine, 2049 (i).
Lake St. Louis, 2050 (i).
Murray, 2054 (i).
Rapide Plat, 2054 (i).
St. Lawrence River and Canals, 2054 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, 2241 (i).
Soulanges, 2050 (i).
Trent, 2055 (i).
Railways:
Canadian Pacific:
Construction, 987 (i), 2264, 4438 (ii).
Cape Breton:
Construction and Equipment, 988 (i).
Intercolonial:
Halifax, accommodation, 2264, 2362, 2509 (i).
St. John, accommodation, 988 (i), 2563 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Surveys and Inspections, 2264 (ii).
Extra Clerks, &c., Salaries, 4439 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow:
Construction, 4437; conc., 4475 (ii).

*See "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Carillon and Grenville:
Dam, Strengthening and Repairing, 2260 (i).
Guard Lock, Grenville, 2260 (i): conc., 4213 (ii).
Lock No. 6, Dry Retaining Walls, 2260 (i).
Chambly:
Dry Rubble Protection Wall, 2257 (i).
East Chamber Wall, Lock 5, 2257 (i).
Fences on Canal Frontage, 2257 (i).
Lamoureaux Bros.' Claim, 2259 (i).
Supplies Purchased, 2257 (i).
Yale Estate Claim, 2260 (i).
Culbute: Settlement of Claims, &c., 2236 (i).
Lachine: Lock Walls, &c., Rebuilding, 2250 (i); conc., 4212 (ii).
Rideau: Valuator's Expenses, 988 (i).
Ste. Anne's Lock, 2260 (i).
St. Peter's, 2263 (ii).
Trent Valley:
Construction of Dredge, 2262 (ii).
Fenelon Falls, Swing Bridge, 4438; conc., 4475 (ii).
Heeley's Falls' Dam, repairing, 2263 (ii).
Welland:
Bridge over old Lock No. 2, 2252 (i).
Chippewa Shoal, 2254 (i).
Culvert at Stromness, 2253 (i).
Port Colborne, Restoring Drainage, 2253 (i).
Swing Bridge, 2253 (i).
Statistics. See "Arts, Agriculture."
Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."
Superannuation:
Wallace, W., ex-Postmaster, Victoria, B.C., 796.
Scientific Institutions:
Meteorological Service, 4309 (ii).
Territorial Account:
Claims *re* Rebellion, N.W.T., 1017; conc., 1087 (i).
Unprovided Items:
Per Auditor Gen.'s Rep., 1890-91, 1818 (i).
CONCURRENCE:
Ammunition, 4209 (ii).
Arbitration *re* Provincial Accounts, 4470 (ii).
Behring's Sea Arbitration, 4478 (ii).
Canada and Liverpool Mail Service, 4478 (ii).
Carillon and Grenville Canal, 4213 (ii).
Chisholm, D., Land Damages, 4479 (ii).
Columbian Exhibition, 4474 (ii).
Debates, Official, 4205 (ii).
Detective Service, Customs, 4205 (ii).
Drill Pay, Militia, 4209 (ii).
Edmonton Crown Lands Office, &c., 4467 (ii).
Fish-Breeding, 4478 (ii).
Georgian Bay Survey, 4470 (ii).
Halifax, &c., and West Indies, &c., 4469 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 4477 (ii).
High Commissioner, Rates, &c., 1085 (i).
Immigration, 4210, 4467 (ii).
Indians, 4479 (ii).
Interior Dept., Chief Clerk's Salary (Y. 34, N. 47) 4472 (ii).
Justice, Miscellaneous Expenses, 1085 (i).
Lachine Canal, 4212 (ii).
Mail Service, 4470 (ii).
Major's Hill Park, 4468 (ii).
Monuments, Battle Fields of Can., 4210 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
CONCURRENCE—*Continued.*
Mulgrave and Point Tupper Train Ferry, 4475 (ii).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings, Heating, 4477 (ii).
Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., 4475 (ii).
Pereira, L. C. (Y. 86, N. 61) 1084 (i).
Printing and Stationery Dept., 4204 (ii).
Rifled Ordnance, 4210 (ii).
St. John Custom House Fire, 1086 (i).
Territorial Account, Rebellion, N.W.T., 1087 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, 4475 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4212 (ii).
Voters' Lists, &c., Printing, 1086 (i).
SUPREME COURT REPORTER AND LIBRARIAN: in Com. of Sup., 312 (i).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4534 (ii).
SYDENHAM RIVER FLOODS: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 4464, 4500 (ii).
TARIFF CHANGES: (Eggs) 4677; (Molasses) 4678; (Tobacco) 4685. *See* Res., 4670 (ii).
TELEGRAPH LINES, B. C. AND N. S., COST: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*) 3897 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4245 (ii).
TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4552 (ii).
——— conc., Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 4657; neg. (Y. 45, N. 92) 4667 (ii).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
TEMPERANCE COLONIZATION CO., STOCK AND SCRIP HOLDERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 929 (i).
TENANT FARMERS' DELEGATES REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3637 (ii).
——— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1638 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3566 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 3116 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4401 (ii).
——— M. for copies (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 2432 (ii). Deb. (Sir *John Thompson*) 2435, 2443; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2435, 2444; (Mr. *Casey*) 2435; (Mr. *Charlton*) 2437; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2438; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2440; (Mr. *Lister*) 2441; (Mr. *Flint*) 2444; (Mr. *Watson*) 2449; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2450; (Mr. *Carling*) 2452; (Mr. *Davin*) 2452 (ii).
——— VISIT, MR. CAHAN'S EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *White, Shelburne*) 2432 (ii).
TERRITORIAL ACCOUNT, REBELLION, N.W.T.: conc., 1087 (i).
THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396; in Com., 4541 (ii).
THREE RIVERS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners' B. No. 98 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 1788 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 4265; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4499 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 10.)
THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 1788 (i).
THREE SISTERS HARBOUR (N.S.) TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 2489 (ii).

TIDAL OBSERVATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4305 (ii).
TIGNISH WHARFINGER, FEES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).
TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571 (ii).
TOBACCO, CAN., LAW *re* MANUFACTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 750 (i).
——— in Com. on Ways and Means, 4685 (ii).
——— STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
Tobique Valley Ry. Co. and C. P. R. (agreement) B. No. 56 (Mr. *Skinner*). 1°*, 823; 2°*, 915; in Com. and 3°*, 2093 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: conc., 4212 (ii).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: Presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 37 (i).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 224 (i).
TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND, PROCLAMATIONS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies*, *P.E.I.*) 684 (i).
Transfer of Shares in Corporations B. No. 48 (Mr. *Ives*). 1°, 749 (i).
TREATIES, &C.:
CANAL TOLLS, U. S. AND CANADA, ADDRESS TO HIS EX.: M. (Sir *John Thompson*) 4644 (ii).
COMMERCIAL RELATIONS, CANADA AND G. B.: prop. M. (Mr. *Fauvel*) 1979 (i).
FAVOURED NATIONS CLAUSES, IMP. DESPATCH: Mess. from His Ex., 1470 (i).
——— CLAUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 34 (i).
GERMAN TREATY, RECENT, PRESS DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *O'Brien*) 109 (i).
MINISTERS' VISITS TO WASHINGTON: Remarks (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 1228 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 3239, 3398 (ii).
"MODUS VIVENDI," G. B. AND U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4728 (ii).
NEWFOUNDLAND. *See* general heading.
PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.: prop. Res. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1555; Amt. (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 1623; neg. (Y. 64, N. 98) 1634; Res. agreed to (Y. 97, N. 63) 1635 (i).
SPAIN AND SPANISH W. INDIES, TRADE RELATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4602 (ii).
SPANISH W. INDIES AND CANADA, TRADE RELATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*) 509 (i).
TRADE RELATIONS WITH U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 224 (i).
TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND, PROCLAMATIONS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 684 (i).
WASHINGTON. *See* "MINISTERS' VISIT."
WEST INDIAN TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
WEST INDIES, FIN. MIN.'S VISIT, REPS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 1372 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, JUDGES, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 310 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 2055, 2262 (i); conc., 4473 (ii).
TRUDEL, EDMOND, SEIZURES AND SHARES; Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 3237 (ii).
TRURO AND STEWIACKE TO NEWPORT, &C., RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4395; in Com., 4525 (ii).
TUNNEL BETWEEN P. E. I. AND MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 98 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Perry*) 1471 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Perry*) 403 (i).
TURCOTTE, A. J., ESQ., MEMBER FOR MONTMORENCY: Introduced, 188 (i).
TURNER, H. H.: Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 844, 1156.
U. S. NEWSPAPERS, FREE ENTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Innes* 1230 (i).
U. S. VESSELS IN HUDSON BAY, ALLEGED POACHING: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 4262 (ii).
Unlawful Associations. *See* "SEDITIONS."
UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 1818 (i).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 1547 (i), 3055 (ii).
VALLÉE, MR. J. S., POSTMASTER, MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 2638 (ii).
VALUATOR'S EXPENSES, RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i).
VANCOUVER P. O., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2951, 4442 (ii).
VAUDREUIL CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Vessels. *See* "FISHING;" "SEA FISHERIES."
VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).
VICTORIA, B.C., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2032 (i).
Victoria Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1°*, 749; 2°*, 855; in Com. and 3°*, 1373 (i). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 69.)
VICTORIA, N. AND S., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS: Judges' Reps., 1 (i).
——— (N. S.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
VOTERS IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, B. C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mara*) 2287 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS, AMOUNTS PAID REVISING OFFICERS: M. for List (Mr. *Flint*), 930 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Flint*) 930, 962; (Mr. *Patterson*, *Huron*) 930; (Mr. *Laurier*) 930; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 931 (Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*) 932; (Mr. *Charlton*) 935; (Mr. *Wallace*) 938; (Mr. *McMullen*) 940; (Mr. *Sproule*) 947; (Mr. *Macdonald*, *Huron*) 951; (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) 954; (Mr. *Casey*) 955; (Mr. *Ingram*) 955; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 957; (Mr. *Murray*) 958; (Mr. *Davies*, *P. E. I.*) 960; (Sir *John Thompson*) 961 (i).
Voters' Lists (1891) B. No. 67 (Mr. *Patterson*, *Huron*). 1°, 1227 (i); 2° m., 3300; 2°, 3301; in Com., 4480; 3° m., 4500; Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) 4501; neg. (Y. 30, N. 63) 4505 (ii). (55-56 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)
VOTERS' LISTS, FINAL PRINTING: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*, 2641 (ii).
——— PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 976; conc., 1086.
——— DELAY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1637 (i).
——— REVISION, 1886, 1889, 1891, TOTAL COST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 683 (i).
Voting. *See* "COMPULSORY."
WALROND RANCH CO. (N.W.T.) EJECTED SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1946 (i).
——— SETTLERS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 292 (i).

WALROND RANCH CO. : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 223 (i).
WALLACE, W., EX-POSTMASTER, VICTORIA, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 796 (i).
WARRANTS AND WRITS OF ELECTION, INCOMPLETE RET. : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 100 (i).
WASHINGTON. *See* "MINISTERS' VISIT."
WATERLOO (N.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff : M. for Com. and Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 4668; in Com., 4677 (ii).
——— Res. for Com., 34; in Com., 1087 (i); conc. in, 4603, 4715 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES : in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 2252 (i).
WELLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1062 (i).
——— PROCEEDINGS AT TRIAL, &C. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 244 (i).
——— Ques. of Priv. (M.) declaring Seat Vacant (Mr. *Tisdale*) 392 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *John Thompson*) 454 (i).
——— Deb. rsmd., 578 (i).
WELLINGTON, CENTRE AND N., CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS : Judges' Reps., 1 (i).
Welsbach, Carl Auer Von, Patent Relief, B. No. 75 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 1714; 2°*, 1882 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2594 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 77.)
WENTWORTH, N., CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
WEST BAY AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP. : M. for copy (Mr. *Cameron*) 2287 (i).
WEST FARNHAM P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
WEST INDIAN TRADE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
WEST INDIES, FINANCE MIN.'S VISIT, REPS., &C. : M. for copies (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1372 (i).
WESTPORT HARBOUR, N.S., CAN BUOYS : Ques. (Mr. *Bowers*) 399 (i).
WHITE PINE TIMBER AREAS : M. for Map (Mr. *Ives*) 217, 293 (i).
WHYCOCOMAGH AS A PORT OF ENTRY, INSPECTOR'S REP. : M. for copy (Mr. *Cameron*) 2287 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Mr. *Moncreiff*). 1°, 3479 (ii).
Winding-Up Act Amt. B. No. 97 (Sir *John Thompson*). 1°*, 4202; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 4506 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 28.)
WINDSOR BRANCH RY. : in Com. of Sup., 2629 (ii).
Winnipeg and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Masson*). 1°*, 1636; 2°*, 1740 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2461 (ii). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 62.)
Witnesses. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."
WILSON, CONVICT EDWARD, PETS., &C., FOR RELEASE : M. for copies (Mr. *Armstrong*) 2642 (ii).
WILSON, URIAH, ESQ., MEMBER FOR LENNOX : Introduced, 3 (i).
Woman's Baptist Missionary Union of the Mar. Provs. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1228 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 76.)
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s B. No. 33 (Mr. *Macdonald, Winnipeg*). 1°*, 245; 2°*, 289; in Com. and 3°*, 1740 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 63.)
WOODSTOCK TO CENTREVILLE RY., SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4396 (ii).
WOODSTOCK AND CENTREVILLE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4397; in Com., 4571 (ii).
WOODSTOCK (N.B.) PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. *Colter*) 3480 (ii).
WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXHIBITION : conc., 4474 (ii).
WORSLEY, LIEUT. COL., DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 3643 (ii).
WRITS FOR BYE-ELECTIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3186 (ii).
——— FRONTENAC, VACANCY AND ISSUE : (Mr. *Speaker*) 3055 (ii).
——— EAST YORK, ISSUE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1547 (i).
——— ELECTIONS, ISSUE : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 3115 (ii).
——— L'ASSOMPTION AND PONTIAC, ISSUE : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2700 (ii).
——— PONTIAC, ISSUE : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2980 (ii).
——— DELAY IN ISSUING : Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 1089 (i).
Wrecking in Can. Waters B. No. 8 (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°, 106; 2° m., 173; 2°, 970; in Com., 1091; 3°*, 1153 (i). (55-56 *Vic., c.* 4.)
Wright, Jas. B. *See* "DIVORCE."
YALE ESTATE CLAIM : in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).
YAMASKA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
——— LOCK NAVIGATION : Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 2171.
——— LOSSES THROUGH ERECTION OF DAM : M. for Rep. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1985 (i).
——— WORKS, TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. *Mignault*) 1714 (i).
YORK, E., CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT, 1547 (i).
YORK, N. (ONT.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judges' Rep., 1 (i).